Studien zur Wahl- und Einstellungsforschung 34

Lena Masch

# Politicians' Expressions of Anger and Leadership Evaluations

## Empirical Evidence from Germany

Nomos

The series „Studien zur Wahl- und Einstellungsforschung“

is edited by

Prof. Dr. Hans Rattinger, University of Mannheim
Prof. Dr. Oscar W. Gabriel, University of Stuttgart
Prof. Dr. Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, University of Mannheim

Volume 34

Lena Masch

# Politicians' Expressions of Anger and Leadership Evaluations

## Empirical Evidence from Germany

Nomos

ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0001-8967-3807

**The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek** lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de

a.t.: Stuttgart, Univ., Diss., 2018

ISBN 978-3-8487-6563-8 (Print)
978-3-7489-0680-3 (ePDF)

**British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data**
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-3-8487-6563-8 (Print)
978-3-7489-0680-3 (ePDF)

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**
Masch, Lena
Politicians' Expressions of Anger and Leadership Evaluations
Empirical Evidence from Germany
Lena Masch
284 pp.
Includes bibliographic references.

ISBN 978-3-8487-6563-8 (Print)
978-3-7489-0680-3 (ePDF)

Onlineversion
Nomos eLibrary

**D 93**

1st Edition 2020
© Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden, Germany 2020. Printed and bound in Germany.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers. Under § 54 of the German Copyright Law where copies are made for other than private use a fee is payable to "Verwertungsgesellschaft Wort", Munich.

No responsibility for loss caused to any individual or organization acting on or refraining from action as a result of the material in this publication can be accepted by Nomos or the author.

# Acknowledgments

This doctoral dissertation grew from a DFG-funded research project on emotions and politics at the University of Trier in 2013 into the book you have before you today. First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor, Prof. em. Dr. Oscar W. Gabriel, for his advice and guidance throughout this process. I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Ulrich Rosar for his advice and feedback. I am grateful to my colleagues at the Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf, the University of Koblenz and Landau, the University of Stuttgart, and the University of Trier for their comments in colloquia, and further discussions during coffee breaks. I would also like to thank all student assistants for their help during the research process, namely Felicitas Reick, Maren Reiners and Diana Thiesen. I would like to thank Dr. Anna-Maria Renner for her feedback and Anna Gaßner for commenting on earlier drafts, Lars Masch, Don MacDonald and Nicolas Wilson for their help with proofreading, and Marco Gratz for his technical advice. Last but not least, I would like to thank my friends and family for their support.

Lena Masch Düsseldorf, February 2020

# Table of Contents


List of Abbreviations 17

1 Introduction: Why Politicians' Emotion Expressions Matter 19

1.1 The Relevance of Studying Politicians' Emotion Expressions 19

1.2 Emotions and Emotional Displays 24

1.2.1 The Structure of Emotions 33

1.2.2 Emotion Expressions of Anger and Indignation 37

1.3 Outline of the Book 44

2 Candidate Appearances and Candidate Evaluations 46

2.1 Candidate Evaluations Based on Appearances 46

2.2 Candidate Evaluations Based on Politicians' Emotion Expressions 53

2.2.1 The Social Function of Emotions 53

2.2.2 Affective Responses 58

2.2.3 Cognitive Responses 60

2.2.4 Social-Contextual Factors 65

2.3 Candidate Evaluations Based on Politicians' Anger Expressions 71

2.3.1 Anger and Affective Responses 71

2.3.2 Anger and Cognitive Responses 75

2.3.3 Anger and Social-Contextual Factors 78

2.3.4 Review: Theoretical Expectations and Hypotheses Regarding the Impact of Anger Expressions 80

3 The Prevalence of Anger Expressions on German Television 89

3.1 The Visual Media Content Analysis of German News and Talk Shows 89

3.2 Politicians' Emotional Expressions on German Television 92

4 Methods and Approaches to the Study of Emotion Expressions 101

4.1 Determining an Appropriate Research Method 101

4.2 The Experimental Method 106

4.3 The Experimental Design 113

4.3.1 Pre-Test: The Structure of Politicians' Emotion Expressions 113

4.3.2 The Procedure 120

4.3.3 The Material 126

4.3.4 The Sample 129

4.3.5 Potential Threats to the Internal Validity of the Study 132

4.4 The Measurement of Key Concepts 138

4.4.1 Measurements of the Dependent Variable: The Structure of Leadership Evaluations 138

4.4.2 Measurements of Covariates and Moderating Variables 158

4.5 Manipulation Checks of the Experimental Treatment 161

4.5.1 Self-Reported Affective and Cognitive Responses 162

4.5.1.1 Perceptions of Emotional Expressions 162

4.5.1.2 Affective Responses Based on Emotional Expressions 164

4.5.2 The Facial Expressions of Anger 166

4.5.3 Political Issues and Anger Expressions 170

5 The Impact of Anger Expressions on Leadership Evaluations 175

5.1 The Average Treatment Effects 175

5.1.1 The Evaluation of Overall Favorability Ratings 179

5.1.2 The Evaluation of Warmth 184

5.1.2.1 The Evaluation of Likeability Ratings 184

5.1.2.2 The Evaluation of Trustworthiness 187

5.1.3 The Evaluation of Competence 190

5.1.3.1 Problem-Solving Skills 191

5.1.3.2 Leadership Skills 193

5.1.4 The Evaluations of Specific Candidate Impressions 196

5.1.4.1 Evaluations of Emotionality 197

5.1.4.2 Evaluations of Politeness 197

5.1.4.3 The Evaluation of Agitation 199

5.1.4.4 The Evaluation of Aggressiveness 199

5.1.4.5 The Evaluation of Arrogance 200

5.1.4.6 The Evaluation of Gender Stereotypical Attributes 201
5.1.4.6.1 The Evaluation of Decisiveness 202
5.1.4.6.2 The Evaluation of Resilience 202
5.1.4.7 The Evaluation of External Efficacy 203
5.1.5 Summary of the Main Effects 204
5.2 Overview of Potential Moderating Factors 208
5.3 The Broader Implications of the Experimental Treatment 214
5.3.1 The Longevity of the Treatment Effects 214
5.3.2 Spillover Effects on Political Parties 218
5.3.3 The Response Time 224
5.3.4 Summary of the Broader Implications 233

6 Conclusion: Current Evidence and Future Directions in Research on Politicians' Emotion Expressions 235
6.1 Summary of Empirical Findings 235
6.2 Concluding Remarks and Implications for Future Research 240

Bibliography 247

Appendix 283

# List of Figures


Figure 1: Overall Ratings of Angela Merkel, Gregor Gysi and Sigmar Gabriel 32

Figure 2: The Most Frequent Female and Male Politicians Within the Media Sample of News Broadcasts 93

Figure 3: Self-Reported Feelings Towards Angela Merkel 104

Figure 4: Multidimensional Scaling of Discrete Emotions 118

Figure 5: Interest Over Time in Key German Politicians 138

Figure 6: Correlation Matrix of Leadership Trait Evaluations for Angela Merkel 144

Figure 7: Correlation Matrix of Leadership Trait Evaluations for Gregor Gysi 144

Figure 8: Correlation Matrix of Leadership Trait Evaluations for Sigmar Gabriel 145

Figure 9: Correlation Matrix of Leadership Trait Evaluations for Politicians in General 145

Figure 10: Network Graph of Angela Merkel's Character Traits Assessments 156

Figure 11: Network Graph of Gregor Gysi's Character Traits Assessments 156

Figure 12: Network Graph of Sigmar Gabriel's Character Traits Assessments 157

Figure 13: Network Graph of Politicians' Character Traits Assessments 157

Figure 14: External Classification of Facial Expressions Within the Anger Conditions 168

Figure 15: Strongest Anger Expression Within the Experimental Groups of Male Politicians, Female Politicians, Angela Merkel, Gregor Gysi, and Sigmar Gabriel 169

Figure 16: Word Clouds Based on the Experimental Treatments 174

Figure 17: Changes in the Overall Evaluations of Politicians 183

Figure 18: Changes in the Evaluation of Likeability 187

Figure 19: Changes in the Evaluation of Trustworthiness 190

Figure 20: Changes in the Evaluation of Problem-Solving Skills 193

Figure 21: Changes in the Evaluation of Leadership Skills 196

Figure 22: Interaction between the Experimental Treatment, Treatment Order and Party Identification for the Evaluation of Angela Merkel (With Exposure to Gregor Gysi) 212

Figure 23: Evaluation of Angela Merkel, Gregor Gysi, and Sigmar Gabriel in Three Panel Waves 216

Figure 24: Moderating Effects of Party Identification on the Evaluation of the SPD 223

Figure 25: Interaction Effect Between the Experimental Treatment and Positive Changes Towards Gysi for Non-Supporters (Candidate Orientation) 232

Figure 26: Interaction Effect Between the Experimental Treatment and Positive Changes Towards Gysi for Non-Supporters (Semantic Differentials) 232

# List of Tables


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Table 1: | The Number of Politicians in Each Video Sequence | 94 |
| Table 2: | The Emotionality in the Media Sample | 94 |
| Table 3: | The Emotional Expressions in News Broadcasts and Political Talk Shows | 95 |
| Table 4: | The Valence of the Emotional Expressions | 95 |
| Table 5: | The Valence and Arousal Levels of the Emotional Expressions | 96 |
| Table 6: | Emotional Expressions of Male and Female Politicians and Specific Politicians | 97 |
| Table 7: | Emotional Expressions According to the Political Status | 99 |
| Table 8: | The Percentages of Discrete Emotions in 400 Video Sequences | 115 |
| Table 9: | Mean Values of the K-Means Clustering for 17 Discrete Emotions | 117 |
| Table 10: | Overview of the Experimental Design | 122 |
| Table 11: | Number of Participants in Each Panel Wave (Waves 1 – 3) | 123 |
| Table 12: | Descriptive Statistics of the Participants in Wave 1 | 131 |
| Table 13: | Parsimonious Factor Solutions for the Evaluation of Politicians | 149 |
| Table 14: | A Three-Factor Solution for Politicians in General and Angela Merkel | 151 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Table 15: | A Three-Factor Solution for Gregor Gysi and Sigmar Gabriel | 152 |
| Table 16: | Overview of Reliability Measures Based on Cronbach's Alpha | 161 |
| Table 17: | Percentages of Perceived Discrete Emotions for Politicians as Social Groups | 163 |
| Table 18: | Percentages of Perceived Discrete Emotions for Political Leaders | 164 |
| Table 19: | Percentages of Affective Responses to Anger Expressions | 165 |
| Table 20: | Number of Words Within the Negative-Active Treatment Conditions | 170 |
| Table 21: | Number of Topics Mentioned Within the Negative-Active Treatments | 171 |
| Table 22: | Changes in the Overall Evaluation of Politicians | 182 |
| Table 23: | Changes in the Evaluation of Likeability | 186 |
| Table 24: | Changes in the Evaluation of Trustworthiness | 189 |
| Table 25: | Changes in the Evaluation of Problem-Solving Skills | 192 |
| Table 26: | Changes in the Evaluation of Leadership Skills | 195 |
| Table 27: | Changes in the Evaluation of Emotionality | 197 |
| Table 28: | Changes in the Evaluation of Politeness | 198 |
| Table 29: | Changes in the Evaluation of Agitation | 199 |
| Table 30: | Changes in the Evaluation of Aggressiveness | 200 |
| Table 31: | Changes in the Evaluation of Arrogance | 201 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Table 32: | Changes in the Evaluation of Decisiveness | 202 |
| Table 33: | Changes in the Evaluation of Resilience | 203 |
| Table 34: | Changes in the Evaluation of External Efficacy | 204 |
| Table 35: | Overview of Treatment Effects According to the Change in Each Variable from Pre- to Post-Test | 206 |
| Table 36: | Overview of Effects of Additional Variables for Politicians in General | 207 |
| Table 37: | Overview of Main Effects and Moderating Effects for Politicians' Anger Expressions | 214 |
| Table 38: | Longevity of Effects on the Overall Evaluation of Angela Merkel, Gregor Gysi and Sigmar Gabriel | 217 |
| Table 39: | Longevity of Effects on the Evaluation of Gregor Gysi's Leadership Qualities | 218 |
| Table 40: | Changes in the Evaluation of the CDU | 220 |
| Table 41: | Changes in the Evaluation of the Left and the SPD | 222 |
| Table 42: | Longevity of Spillover Effects on the Evaluation of Political Parties | 224 |
| Table 43: | Quantile Regressions on the Response Time of Candidate Orientation | 227 |
| Table 44: | Quantile Regressions on the Response Time of Semantic Differentials | 229 |
| Table 45: | Interaction Between the Experimental Treatment and Positive Evaluation of Gregor Gysi on the Response Time for Non-Supporters | 231 |

# List of Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| AfD | Alternative for Germany (Alternative für Deutschland) |
| ANES | American National Election Studies |
| API | Application Programming Interface |
| CDU | Christian Democratic Party (Christlich Demokratische Union) |
| CSU | Christian Social Union in Bavaria (Christlich-Soziale Union in Bayern) |
| DFG | German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) |
| EASI | Emotions as Social Information (Model) |
| EMG | Electromyography |
| EU | European Union |
| FACS | Facial Action Coding System |
| fMRI | Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging |
| FDP | Free Democratic Party (Freie Demokratische Partei) |
| GLES | German Longitudinal Election Study |
| MTurk | Amazon Mechanical Turk |
| OLS | Ordinary Least Squares |
| PEGIDA | Patriotic Europeans Against the Islamisation of the West (Occident) (Patriotische Europäer gegen die Islamisierung des Abendlandes) |
| PVV | Party for Freedom (Partij voor de Vrijheid) |
| SPD | Social Democratic Party Germany (Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschland) |

# 1 Introduction: Why Politicians' Emotion Expressions Matter

## *1.1 The Relevance of Studying Politicians' Emotion Expressions*

Modern representative democracies are built on two core principles: contestation and participation (Dahl 1989). Hence, voting can be considered as the most important form of political participation in modern democracies. If citizens can freely choose among competing parties in an election, this process legitimizes the elected government and legislative in representative democracies. As a result, voting is often conceptualized as civic duty that citizens intend to express (Fiorina 1976). Since the second half of the 20th century, electoral research has determined decisive factors in individual voting behaviors. Early accounts of voting behavior have considered class voting and social networks as influential factors (Lazarsfeld et al. 1969), followed by a social psychological account of the Michigan model, which focuses on individual attachments towards a political party as long-term effects (Campbell et al. 1960). Taking the well-established Michigan model into account, electoral behavior can be explained by three factors. First and foremost, someone's party identification acts as a funnel of causality for all subsequent judgments, as it is a strong predisposition that is the product of one's upbringing and socialization. Consequently, political issues and candidate appearances are evaluated by individual voters as short-term effects (Campbell et al. 1960).

With a gradual decline of social cleavages and a shrinking manifestation of social classes, there has been a dealignment between political parties and societal groups across developed democracies since the 1980s (Dalton 1984; Dalton & Bürklin 2003; Dalton 2002; Dalton 2014; Arzheimer 2017). In an individualized society, stable long-term effects such as party identification lose importance, and short-term effects, such as political issues and candidate appearances, should gain momentum (Campbell 1960: 399). Likewise, voting decisions are made closer to the election date and the number of independents as well as swing voters has increased; as a result, short-term voting decisions have spread across the electorate (Roth & Wüst 2007: 402–406; Reinemann et al. 2013: 9). In addition to these societal developments across Western democracies, the mediatization and digitalization further shape the ways in which political issues and candidate appearances can affect voting decisions (Beck & Beck-Gernsheim 2002).

In the information age, media reports and visual cues are omnipresent. The internet enables citizens, and potential voters, to watch television and newscasts on-demand or even live-stream public appearances of party conventions – whenever they choose. Hence, potential voters can select the content they consume, which also includes the possibility to avoid politics altogether. However, even citizens with a low interest in politics might take notice of politicians and their appearances if video clips are trending online. Such video clips may be particularly noticeable when political *faux pas* or extraordinary statements occur and are caught on camera. Previous research has shown that online users share content more often when the content induces emotions high in arousal (Berger 2011). Such content could then reach citizens with at least a slight interest in politics. Therefore, the internet does not necessarily diminish the importance of TV appearances for politicians; on the contrary, the internet potentially reaches a broader audience as noticing an appearance of a political leader becomes even less restricted by time and place, as it had already occurred before with the advent of television (Meyrowitz 1985).

Studies on social media activities can show that TV appearances of political candidates even drive social media activity (Shah et al. 2015: 242). During U.S. TV debates, politicians' nonverbal communications, such as their facial expressions and gestures, are particularly talked about in these online discourses in real time (Shah et al. 2015: 242), highlighting the need for further insights into the candidate perceptions and their trait evaluations by viewers. Such inevitable effects of televised nonverbal communication on viewers have been discussed ever since television first started shaping mass communication and introducing visual cues as a predominant source of information (Frey 1999). Hence, the digital age might favor candidate appearances and the potential impact of candidate appearances on individual vote choices.[1]

The personalization of politics in modern democracies has been linked to television as a tool of mass communication (Meyrowitz 1985; Frey 1999). In presidential democracies, candidate appearances have traditionally been studied more closely than in parliamentary democracies as a result of the heightened amount of power that is vested in the president. Due to the decline of party alignments, the term *candidate-centered politics* has been coined (Wattenberg 1991); in contrast, German politics has been de-

1 This trend is also reflected in a growing number of studies that focus on visual political communication in the digital age (e.g., Lalancette & Raynauld 2019; Spier et al. 2018; Veneti et al. 2019).

scribed in the past as lacking personalization (Kaase 1994). While campaign strategies became noticeably more *presidentialized* across political parties (Poguntke 2005: 77–79; Brettschneider & Gabriel 2002: 137), this development did not translate into a continuously growing influence of political candidates on individual voting decisions (Brettschneider & Gabriel 2002: 140). Contextual factors that can change between elections shape the impact candidate evaluations have on voting decisions (Brettschneider & Gabriel 2002: 153), such as the emphasis of political issues during election campaigns (Poguntke 2005: 80). In recent general elections, candidate evaluations affected individual voting intentions, especially candidates' trustworthiness and competence ratings (Ohr et al. 2013: 227), and candidate preferences were in some instances even influenced by a candidate's likeability rating (Klein & Rosar 2016: 104).

In non-democratic, totalitarian societies, dictators are often known for their urge to control their public image by censoring any unfavorable images. While the rule of law and freedom of the press prohibit such censorship in modern democracies, democratic leaders are still likely to care about their public image as a means to foster support. The public image of political leaders is not a modern phenomenon either. In the Roman Empire, the coinage of currencies was used to mint the emperors in a favorable light such as victors after a battle (Manders 2012). Since ancient times, the possibilities of self-presentation for political leaders have increased tremendously. Political leaders of all major parties in developed democracies use social media platforms such as Facebook and Instagram to curate their image. They also appear as guests on YouTube channels as well as the more traditional television talk shows. During election campaigns, TV debates between leading candidates gain particular public attention which is indicated by a high viewership. In all these varying forms of televised public appearances, the nonverbal communication of politicians is crucial to foster support (Frey 1999). Displaying certain emotions is one means of appealing to supporters (Glaser & Salovey 1998).

Due to present-day use of mobile devices such as smartphones and tablets, there is a potential for citizens to be constantly exposed to new information, which also includes political issues as presented in newspaper articles and online political discussions. While more information becomes available, issue orientation does not necessarily become more important, as it also becomes more challenging in *post-truth politics*, which raises the necessity for citizens to carefully consider the reliability of sources of information. This adds to the notion of *information overload*, a term that has been coined to describe the constant exposure to new information given

limited cognitive capacities (Bomann & Jones 2003). As current affairs are followed intensely by only a small percentage of the public, many voters use *information shortcuts* when participating in politics, for example when casting their votes in an election or signing an online petition. These information shortcuts are particularly crucial in cases of low information voting (Lau & Redlawsk 2001) and difficult decisions in times of complexity and uncertainty (Clarke et al. 2017). Widely used *information shortcuts* are heuristics such as party affiliations, ideological stereotypes, endorsements from trusted sources, polls, and candidate appearances (Lau & Redlawsk 2001: 953–954; Popkin 1995).

Some heuristics, such as ideological stereotypes, polls, and endorsements from political elites and institutions, are more likely to be applied by well-informed voters, compared to heuristics that are used by nearly everyone. These popular heuristics include party affiliations as well as candidate appearances (Lau & Redlawsk 2001: 958). However, this view has been challenged recently with some evidence that all voters apply candidate heuristics (Bucy 2011: 195), and other evidence that sophisticated voters are even more likely to apply candidate heuristics (Clarke et al. 2017). Regardless of their level of sophistication, voters generally tend to use candidate heuristics when confronted with difficult decisions in uncertain situations (Clarke et al. 2017: 769).

During the past two decades, a growing body of literature has focused on the personalization of politics (e.g., Bittner 2011; Garzia 2017; Lobo & Curtice 2014; Karvonen 2010), which states an increasing importance of candidate appearances on individual voting behavior (Karvonen 2010: 4). This view is contested, however, since some scholars have pointed out that candidate effects have remained stable since the advent of television (Garzia 2017: 646; Hayes 2009). Scholars agree on deeming candidate effects as being crucial even within parliamentary systems and parliamentary elections (Brouard & Kerrouche 2013; Ferreira Da Silva & Costa 2019: 117).

The effect of candidate appearances on voting decisions has been studied from several angles, from a focus on the candidates' attractiveness (e.g., Rosar et al. 2008; Jäckle & Metz 2017) to their competence ratings derived from visual cues (Ballew & Todorov 2007; Dumitrescu et al. 2015; Mattes et al. 2010; Spezio et al. 2008; Todorov et al. 2005). The latter studies showed that competence judgments based on visual appearances (pictures or short video clips) are even useful predictors of election outcomes (see also Benjamin & Shapiro 2009; Todorov et al. 2005).

In comparison to issue voting, candidate appearances have long been considered as less valid grounds for a vote choice from a normative perspective, especially in parliamentary democracies (Rosar et al. 2008: 65). More recently, candidate assessments based on candidate appearances have also been considered as affecting vote choices across election types (Dalton 2006: 217).

In a similar vein, previous studies indicate that images of candidates can spillover and shape the evaluation of political parties and even the issue-ownerships of political parties (Hayes 2005). As yet, such processes of reciprocal causation between party leaders and political parties have gained little attention in political science and have rarely been studied (Garzia 2017: 642). Nonetheless, some empirical evidence from Western European countries exists indicating that the evaluation of party leaders can affect citizens' party identifications (Garzia 2017: 643; Garzia 2013a; Garzia 2013b). Given this interdependence between key political figures and political parties, the impact of politicians' emotional expressions on candidate perceptions and their trait evaluations is relevant to the study of individual voting behavior.

A growing polarization of party systems can be observed in several developed democracies, especially across Europe. Populist right-wing parties have risen across Europe and openly expressed anti-establishment and/or anti-European sentiments (e.g., Akçali & Korkut 2012; Corbetta & Vignati 2014; Decker 2016). When doing so publicly their appearances are often combined with displays of anger by their key players or even contempt for other politicians and the political establishment as it was expressed by Donald Trump during the 2016 U.S. presidential election campaign (Redlawsk et al. 2018). In addition, compared to Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump used a heightened amount of emotional appeals during the election campaign (Nai & Maier 2018). Emotional expressions of anger/threat have been associated with those who challenge existing power structures (Bucy & Grabe 2008: 81) and are therefore more likely to be expressed by trailing candidates (Bucy & Grabe 2008: 84), or politicians of the opposition (Bucy & Grabe 2008: 90).

This rise of right-wing populism has also been linked to the emergence of a new social cleavage, a transnational cleavage of support and opposition towards supranational institutions and agreements (Hooghe & Marks 2018). This cleavage also reemphasizes existing cleavages such as capital and labor between winners and losers of globalization (Hooghe & Marks 2018). The emergence of such a new cleavage could potentially cause a realignment between parties and voters, in this case right-wing populist par-

ties and voters. However, not only are right-wing populism, nationalism, and protectionism on the rise and pose a threat to democratic values (most likely as a response to a more globalized world) – left-wing populist parties have also gained support. This is especially the case for countries whose economies have been hit hard by the financial crisis, such as Greece and Spain. Both the rise of Syriza in Greece and Podemos in Spain have been linked to the global financial crisis (Stavrakakis & Katsambekis 2014; Ramiro & Gomez 2017). Hence, the emotional appeals of populist parties and potential realignment processes between populist parties and voters could be crucial for the continuity of democratic societies. Political leaders are particularly crucial for populist movements (Mudde & Kaltwasser 2017: 62). The self-presentation as a prototypical "charismatic strongman" and a "simple man" are frames that are commonly used by populist leaders to appeal to the public, especially during election campaigns (Mudde & Kaltwasser 2017: 62; Grabe & Bucy 2009: 105–108). Therefore, the study of candidate evaluations can also add beneficial insights into the growing research on populism.

This book focuses on the emotional communication displayed by party leaders and key political figures in order to explore how emotion expressions affect candidate evaluations. Candidate appearances are often mediated and televised by mass media and are thereby predominantly asymmetric in nature. Emotional displays might affect trait inferences regarding trustworthiness, leadership skills and likeability and therefore gain particular importance in times when media attention shifts towards the candidate. As candidate appearance effects are widely studied with regard to the personalization of politics, the question arises as to whether politicians' emotional displays shape the evaluation of political candidates. Subsequently, voting decisions could be impacted.

## *1.2 Emotions and Emotional Displays*

The study of emotions has long been neglected in political science, as its scientific discourse has been dominated by the rationalist approach and the rational choice paradigm with a strong normative preference favoring rationalism to emotions (e.g., Marcus 2000). In electoral research, this has traditionally resulted in attempts to model voting decisions according to the rational choice paradigm with a focus on issue voting (e.g., Bartels 1986). However, the social sciences and humanities have experienced an *affective turn* (Hoggett & Thompson 2012; Clough & Halley 2007); as a re-

sult even the model of the homo economicus has been frequently adjusted to acknowledge cognitive limitations, emotions, and feelings as being reasons for individual choices and actions (Kahneman 2003; Kaufman 1999; Chong 2013). As underlying driving forces of political decisions and behavior, emotions have gained more attention, especially within the field of political psychology. Consequently, many studies in political science have focused on emotions in recent years, and especially on emotional states of citizens, potential voters, and activists (e.g., Schoen 2010). The theory of affective intelligence (e.g., Marcus et al. 2000; MacKuen et al. 2007; Marcus et al. 2019) is a noteworthy contribution in the field and has consistently emphasized the importance of emotions, especially enthusiasm, fear, and lately anger, on citizens' cognitive information processing and lastly their voting decisions. When voters encounter new information, it is generally assumed that they use affective and cognitive mechanisms while processing the information, and subsequently forming attitudes and making political decisions (Redlawsk & Pierce 2017). When investigating the role of emotions for political behavior, especially political participation, negative-active emotions such as anger have gained particular attention: "Anger in particular has increased in importance as scholars uncover its role in motivating participation and partisanship" (Searles & Mattes 2015: 172).

Group-based anger has been considered as motivation for collective action and found that this kind of anger can lead to collective action tendencies: "All these results suggest that group-based anger and group efficacy predict collective action tendencies when one's in-group is disadvantaged" (van Zomeren et al. 2004: 654–655). Besides the field of collective action and political participation, emotions have also been considered as being decisive factors in mobilizing voters (e.g., MacKuen et al. 2007; Kalmoe 2019). In this light, it is not only relevant to study which emotions drive political beliefs and attitudes, but also how politicians' emotional displays – political leaders in particular – influence impressions of political candidates. Further research is needed to investigate whether these impressions alter attitudes towards politicians, and potentially even towards voting decisions. Compared to voters' emotional states, emotional expressions of candidates and political leaders have gained less scientific attention in recent years. Moreover, when they did, these studies have often focused on specific aspects of emotional expressions, e.g. verbal expressions. However, since emotional expressions are multifaceted, more research is needed regarding the impact of candidates' verbal and nonverbal emotional expressions; this also holds true for the effects of visual displays in general (Dumitrescu 2016).

Candidate appearances are likely to evoke affective responses in viewers: "there is little doubt that exposure to nonverbal communication generates emotion in viewers" (Dumitrescu 2016: 1669). When emotional expressions are part of these appearances it becomes even more likely that these appearances evoke emotions in viewers. Several mechanisms can explain affective emotional responses in interpersonal communications (van Kleef 2016: 37–55). The emotions of political leaders can be mimicked by viewers but do not necessarily have to lead to congruent reactions, i.e. anger leading to feelings of anger. Whether emotional expressions evoke congruent emotional reactions is likely to depend on the viewers' views, dispositions and the situational context in which the message is received. Since the underlying mechanism of candidate appraisals could also be based on cognition – consciously or pre-consciously, varying effects could alter how emotional expressions are perceived and affect candidate evaluations (for comparison see van Kleef 2016: 56–78).

Experimental research designs have been applied to study the impact of emotional expressions since the so-called "Dartmouth group" started their research on the impact of emotional expressions of U.S. presidents (e.g., McHugo et al. 1985; Masters et al. 1986; Sullivan & Masters 1988). During the mid-1980s this research group of political psychologists at Dartmouth University applied experimental tools to study the effects of politicians' emotional expressions on voters. Several studies analyzed varying aspects of viewers' responses including physiological measures (McHugo et al. 1985). These studies mainly differentiate three forms of emotional expressions based on an ethological perspective: happiness/reassurance, anger/threat, fear/evasion (e.g., Sullivan & Masters 1988). Since then, this categorization has been used to classify and study nonverbal behavior of political leaders (e.g., Bucy & Grabe 2008, Stewart et al. 2009b).

Ethological and social psychological arguments have been applied in order to explain the assessment of politicians' emotional displays (McHugo et al. 1985; Sullivan et al. 1991: 188; Sullivan & Masters 1988; Masters & Sullivan 1989a). However, this branch of research has only gained attention sporadically (Brader & Marcus 2013: 190), as only a few studies have been conducted that focused on emotional expressions by politicians (Bucy & Bradley 2004; Bucy & Grabe 2008; Bucy & Newhagen 1999; Glaser & Salovey 1998; Stewart et al. 2009a; Stewart, et al. 2009b; Stewart & Ford Dowe 2013; Stroud et al. 2005, Redlawsk et al. 2016; Redlawsk et al. 2018). One of the more recent attempts, Stewart and Ford Dowe (2013), investigated how former U.S. president Barack Obama's facial expressions are interpreted by viewers. The ethological arguments in some of these

studies base emotional displays on social group standings (e.g., Stewart & Ford Dowe 2013; Sullivan 1996; Sullivan & Masters 1988). Following this ethological framework, facial expressions of happiness/reassurance are typically displayed by leaders of social groups and hence, advisable for incumbent leaders who wish to remain in power. In contrast, facial expressions related to anger/threat are typically displayed by the political opposition wishing to defeat the incumbent. Furthermore, displays of fear should not be displayed by anyone pursuing a higher social standing within any given group (Schubert & Masters 1991). In the 1980s and 1990s, studies by the Dartmouth group showed that facial displays of happiness/reassurance had a positive impact on the ratings of Ronald Reagan (e.g., McHugo et al. 1985); negative-passive emotions of fear/evasion barely had a positive effect on his evaluation (Sullivan et al. 1991: 201). For negative-active emotional displays of Reagan, they found contrasting effects (Sullivan et al. 1991): "anger/threat excerpts were intermediate, generating moderately positive responses from supporters but not from critics" (Sullivan et al. 1991: 201). By providing varying party labels when presenting emotional expressions of a putative politician, party identification has also been established as a decisive factor for the evaluation of such emotional expressions (Stroud et al. 2005). Participants preferred candidates of the party they supported (Stroud et al. 2005: 37), and in the absence of party cues, they viewed strong emotional expressions as more favorable (Stroud et al. 2005: 38).

More recently, similar positive effects could be observed when analyzing facial expressions of Barack Obama (Stewart & Ford Dowe 2013). A few studies have recently dealt with negative-active expressions of political leaders (Redlawsk et al. 2016; Redlawsk et al. 2018). They differentiated between various forms of negative-active expressions, such as anger and contempt, and focused specifically on the effects of contempt on viewers. However, distinct expressions of anger have been widely neglected until recently, with the exception of some studies that have investigated how uncivil behavior might affect attitudes towards politicians and political trust (Mutz 2015; Mutz 2007; Mutz & Reeves 2005). Nonetheless, these studies have not focused on negative-active emotions such as anger and indignation, but rather analyze a specific side of negative-active emotions – incivility and attack politics. These forms of negative campaigning have been linked to politicians' expressions and viewers' perceptions of contempt rather than anger (Roseman et al. 2019). Hence, the effects caused by displays of genuine anger and indignation on candidate evaluation are likely to vary from the effects of incivility on candidate evaluations.

In the last decade, political psychology has firmly established that emotions are best studied as discrete emotions which resulted in a number of studies that have subsequently focused on specific emotions such as happiness, contempt, disgust, and anger (e.g., Brader & Marcus 2013: 175–182). Politicians' expressions of these discrete emotions have rarely been studied. Some studies imply that "the look of losing" for candidates at least partially consists of negative-passive emotions such as avoidance behavior (Bucy 2016). On the contrary, politicians' displays of confidence have led to positive evaluations (Dumitrescu et al. 2015).

Happiness has only gained attention sparingly (e.g., Stewart & Ford Dowe 2013; Stewart et al. 2015); while it is widely established to distinguish between negative emotions such as fear and anger, positive emotions have often been grouped together and analyzed as one (Brader & Marcus 2013: 175). A few studies have analyzed the impact of politicians' smiles on viewers and political supporters and highlighted the need to distinguish specific forms of smiles (e.g., Stewart et al. 2015). Hereby, the ability of leaders to reassure their supporters with positive emotional displays seems of particular importance in facilitating positive leadership evaluations (Stewart et al. 2015: 86). Likewise, voters' hopefulness towards presidential candidates has been linked to voting behavior (Finn & Glaser 2010). However, even displays of positive emotions are context-specific because they can be deemed as being inappropriate behavior in certain situations (Bucy & Bradley 2004). Given those situations, strategic displays of positive emotions could severely backfire and diminish politicians' approval ratings if they are perceived as inadequate or inauthentic (Bucy & Bradley 2004).

Besides happiness, humor and wit are rhetorical devices that can foster support and improve leadership evaluations (e.g., Carpenter et al. 2019; Stewart 2011). Likeability ratings are particularly susceptible to displays of self-deprecating humor, which can increase politicians' likeability (Stewart 2011). Other-deprecating humor at the cost of someone else however, can backfire for politicians (Stewart 2011). Thus, the specific context of emotional displays, nonverbal behavior and verbal utterances is likely to influence cognitive appraisals by viewers and following leadership evaluations.

In a similar vein, displays of contempt or disgust of political competitors might co-occur with anger in a same speech or appearance; their potential effects, however, could vary significantly from anger expressions. Voters who experience contempt towards candidates are less likely to vote for such candidates (Redlawsk et al. 2018). Furthermore, politicians might implement a disgust rhetoric to foster support on issues of morality; however, such a distinct emotional rhetoric can lead to a backlash against the speak-

er in parts of the electorate (Gadarian & van der Vort 2018: 539). Likewise, aggressive metaphors can be evaluated positively – at least within specific sociodemographic groups that show a high number of individuals with an aggressive personality trait (Kalmoe 2019). Another experimental study provides empirical evidence that anger can lead to backlash effects that lower likeability and competence ratings compared to more neutral messages (Van't Riet et al. 2019). Additionally, the study also showed that these effects can be moderated based on participants' predispositions towards the political messages (Van't Riet et al. 2019). In order to understand the occurrence of backlash effects, it seems necessary to distinguish the various types of anger and to consider the circumstances of emotion expressions.

While emotional expressions of politicians have gained some attention by political scientists, effects of emotional displays by German politicians on German citizens have rarely been studied empirically. The impact of German politicians' nonverbal communication on the evaluation of their character traits has been analyzed with student samples from other countries in order to avoid previous exposure effects (Frey 1999: 111). In addition, an early study focused on the frequencies of emotional displays on German television (Masters et al. 1991). The impact of emotional expressions by German political leaders on the German public has not been studied systematically. Most assumptions about the impact of emotional displays on viewers are derived from findings based on American political culture, especially U.S. presidential candidates (see also Brader & Marcus 2013: 190) and a few findings from France (Masters & Sullivan 1989a; Masters & Sullivan 1989b). Conducting a similar design in Germany provides a crucial cross-cultural comparison of emotional displays. For example, the North American culture has been known to be more emotionally expressive than other cultures (Barrett 2017: 34). Previous studies have also shown different effects of anger expressions in France and the U.S. Hence, it is insightful to gain further evidence on the impact of emotional expressions on viewers. In addition, evidence from parliamentary systems has been lacking.

Presidential systems place more emphasis on their presidents and presidential candidates as potential political leaders, whereas voters in parliamentary systems typically vote for the party instead of political candidates. As a result, the evaluations between parties and politicians are likely to be intertwined in parliamentary systems (Dalton 2006: 217). Therefore, it is worthwhile replicating these previous studies at a different time, place, and within a different cultural context, one in which political candidates have