

# 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.<sup>1</sup>

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

traditionally been less important. In addition to the replication of earlier findings within a different cultural and political context, the experimental design is modified and extended based on earlier findings in order to investigate the possible impact of emotional displays on viewers. The need for such a replication study, complementing prior research on emotional expressions and the impact of emotional messages has been pointed out (Brader 2011: 344).

Most recently, a growing political polarization has been observed in several established Western democracies. This holds true for the electorate as well as the political elite. An increasing divide between voters has been found, whereby moderate views and sympathies towards the previously established mainstream parties are less widespread. Additionally, a social sorting of partisans has taken place in some countries, such as the U.S. (Mason 2018; Mason & Wronski 2018), so that both main parties have a distinguishable clientele with unique sociodemographic characteristics. Since populist parties – especially right-wing populism with nationalist views – have been electorally successful across Europe in recent elections, scholars have shifted their attention towards voters' emotions and emotional appeals when investigating the lure of populist parties (e.g., Salmela & von Scheve 2018). In this light, a noticeable number of contributions have focused on anger as a mobilizing force of political participation and protest (e.g., van Troost et al. 2018), especially with regard to right-wing authoritarian activities and support (Marcus et al 2019; Webster 2018). Previously, a large body of research has focused on the role of anxiety for political information processing, while the role of anger and complexity of concurrent emotions has been neglected (Marcus et al. 2019: 121, 130). Anger has gained more attention in order to explain support for authoritarian ideologies, distrust in supranational institutions such as the EU, reactions to terror attacks and voting behavior (e.g., Marcus et al. 2019; Vasilopoulou & Wagner 2017; Vasilopoulos et al. 2019; Wagner 2014). Based on the affective intelligence theory (for comparison see Marcus et al. 2000; Marcus 2002), threatening information can induce anxiety and anger concurrently (Marcus et al. 2019: 110) or trigger anger on its own (Marcus et al. 2019: 111). In contrast to a state of uncertainty that could evoke anxiety, the individual experience of anger is seen as a response to perceived norm violations and particularly common for citizens with strong prior moral convictions (Marcus et al. 2019: 120). The predominant experience of anger subsequently fosters the reliance on heuristics when forming political decisions (Marcus et al. 2019: 117). Candidate appearances can be

used as one fast heuristic in individual voting decisions (Lau & Redlawsk 2001).

Therefore, this book focuses on emotional expressions as the political communication strategy of politicians. These emotional expressions might be displayed intentionally, while they could also mirror true emotions. Likewise, these emotional expressions could evoke affective responses from viewers or evoke cognitive processing followed by an appraisal of the situation. Affective and cognitive processing are the two main pathways when processing emotions as social cues (van Kleef 2016). Expressions of anger might not necessarily evoke anger, since the social context is key when a situation is appraised cognitively. Politicians' anger expressions could evoke anger, if it is an affective reaction towards a common target (Hareli & Hess 2010; de Melo et al. 2012). Anger expressions might simultaneously lead to a positive appraisal of the politician who displayed anger. Following the idea of reverse appraisal, observers evaluate a social situation based on its context-specific setting – even unconsciously or pre-consciously. Hence, minor alterations of the social setting can alter the outcome of anger expressions.


This contribution aims to shed some light on the potential impact of anger expressions on voters and to provide a general framework for the study of politicians' emotional expressions regardless of their ideology and communication style. To put it differently, this book asks how emotional expressions such as anger and indignation impact the evaluation of politicians and political leaders. The theoretical framework of this study should be applicable to all communication settings within the political sphere.

The book sets out to analyze these effects empirically by focusing on politicians who were members of parties which were part of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> German Bundestag, i.e., party members of the CDU/CSU, SPD, Greens, FDP and the Left. Besides focusing on the evaluation of politicians as a social group in a stereotypical manner, this study investigates emotional expressions by three key political figures at the time in more detail - Angela Merkel, Sigmar Gabriel and Gregor Gysi.

Due to Angela Merkel's long-time role as chancellor, she is widely known by the public and she is highly visible on German television. At the time the experiment was conducted – in the spring of 2015 – Sigmar Gabriel was leader of the Social Democratic Party, and Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy as part of the grand coalition between the CDU/CSU and the SPD. By contrast, Gregor Gysi was the parliamentary leader of the Left during this time. All three politicians have been in politics for a considerable period of time, whereby Merkel was by far the most

well-liked politician out of the three in the spring of 2015. The following Figure 1 displays the overall ratings of the three politicians since 2000 and highlights the period of data collection.

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



*Note:* The figure displays assessments according to scalometer ratings from 01/2000 to 12/2017 based on the Politbarometer (Berger et al. 2001a; Berger et al. 2001b; Berger et al. 2002a; Berger et al. 2002b; Forschungsgruppe Wahlen 2015a; Forschungsgruppe Wahlen 2017). The vertical dashed lines indicate the period in which the experimental data with three panel waves were collected. Author's own illustration.

The findings of these case studies will provide a deeper understanding of the impact of anger expressions by politicians. Two of the three key politicians belonged not only to the government at that time, but also represent mainstream parties. In contrast to traditional catch-all parties, the Left was the largest opposition party within the German Bundestag at the time of the data collection and can be regarded as a left-wing populist party (e.g., Bakker et al. 2016a). Hence, the impact of anger expressions can be compared for these three politicians who vary with regard to their status within the political system of government and opposition as well as in terms of the party types they represent.

Emotional expressions can be seen as one channel of information, cues or signals which are used to make social inferences about others and shape

how persons are perceived (Hareli & Hess 2012; Hochschild 2012). Hence, this social psychological axiom of person perception also applies to the evaluation of politicians. Before this relationship is explored in more detail, it is necessary to determine what is understood as emotion and emotional expressions. A multitude of concepts exist which define emotions differently and emphasize varying functions of emotional expressions. The structure of emotions is discussed in the following Subchapter 1.2.1.

### 1.2.1 The Structure of Emotions

While the definition of emotional states is discussed controversially, Parrott (2004) suggests that emotions are “best thought of as processes that unfold in time, involving a variety of components” (Parrott 2004: 5). Cognitive evaluations of situations are such crucial components, so-called appraisals (Parrott 2004: 5; Scherer 2003). Taking appraisal theory into consideration, the following definition can be applied: “an emotion can be loosely defined as a reaction to personally significant events, where ‘reaction’ is taken to include biological, cognitive, and behavioral reactions, as well as subjective feelings of pleasure or displeasure” (Parrott 2004: 6).

Psychological research has studied emotions and the three main angles regarding their physiological, cognitive, and social and cultural implications (Parrott 2004: 18). This book focuses predominantly on the social function of emotions and emotional expressions. The social signaling function of emotions has recently gained support and scientific attention (Crivelli & Fridlund 2018; Fischer et al. 2019). Through such an evolutionary or social psychological approach, the focus shifts from the internal state of the person who experiences the emotion to the emotional expression in a social situation. As Masters (1991) puts it: “Nonverbal cues are social signals – and as such, their relationship to the inner state of an individual may often be less important than their function as mechanisms of interaction and social regulation” (Masters 1991: 167). Emotions are not usually freely expressed without some form of regulation. The social conventions for displaying emotions can also be described by “display rules” that exist within societies (Ekman & Friesen 1975; Hochschild 2012). Likewise, emotion expressions can signal violations of norms and societal standards (Hareli et al. 2019).



### The Valence Model

Earlier research in political psychology has applied the two-dimensional valence model (see Steenbergen & Ellis 2006: 109). The valence approach classifies emotions into positive and negative emotions. This dichotomous classification provides the most basic distinction possible. It distinguishes between positive emotions (such as happiness, pride, hope) and negative emotions (such as anger, anxiety, fear) without any further distinction between the discrete emotions. Due to its simplicity, the valence approach is commonly implemented in sentiment analysis tools, which are used in quantitative text analysis (e.g., Kouloumpis et al. 2011). One well-known contribution within political psychology is the theory of “the rationalizing voter”, in which Lodge and Taber (2013) base their assumptions on the theory of motivated reasoning including a valence approach towards emotions (Lodge & Taber 2013). However, the valence approach is often seen as being insufficient, particularly so in political psychology. Based on previous research, Redlawsk and Lau (2013) also deem the valence approach to be insufficient for studies in political psychology and highlight the importance of discrete emotions: “Instead, discrete emotions – such as anxiety, enthusiasm and anger – are key to understanding affect” (Redlawsk & Lau 2013: 154). This view is shared by several political psychologists and political communication scholars (e.g., Marcus et al. 2006: 34–35; Steenbergen & Ellis 2006: 109–110; Grabe & Bucy 2009: 101; Petersen 2010: 357). According to Steenbergen and Ellis (2006), studies have shown that the valence approach is insufficient for the study of negative emotions:

“[...] it is sometimes necessary to discriminate between two different types of negative affect: anxiety (e.g., feeling afraid, anxious, uneasy, or worried) and aversion (e.g., feeling angry, bitter, contemptuous, disgusted, hateful, loathing, or resentful [...]).” (Steenbergen & Ellis 2006: 109)

The need occurs because emotions of the same valence are rooted in different antecedents (Steenbergen & Ellis 2006: 112), and therefore can result in varying responses. Put differently, discrete emotions can have “distinct triggers and effects” (Petersen 2010: 357), which need further consideration. Some discrete emotions cluster together as a “family of emotions” (Brader & Marcus 2013: 175).

Marcus, MacKuen, Wolak and Keele (2006) emphasize the distinguishable features of negative emotions, and the distinct role of anger within the circumplex model (Marcus et al. 2006: 35). This assessment is based on a study by Bodenhausen, Sheppard and Kramer (1994), who demonstrate

that anger and sadness affect social information processing differently when these emotions are experienced (Bodenhausen et al. 1994: 57–59).

Similarly, the varying distinct features of negative emotions have also been highlighted when focusing on the affective state of the receiver, whereas positive emotions are assumed to manifest in less distinct, more coherent positive feelings (Isbell et al. 2006: 57).

By pointing out that emotions with a negative valence can differ substantially in terms of their experiences and consequences (Isbell et al. 2006: 65), the valence model appears as insufficient for a detailed analysis of the impact of negative emotional expressions by political leaders. Consequently, in recent years the valence approach has been applied less frequently in political psychology, which has mostly shifted towards the analysis of discrete emotions, particularly in assessing the impact of voters' emotional dispositions on their information processing and their voting behavior (e.g., Banks & Valentino 2012; Mattes et al. 2017; Small & Lerner 2008).

### The Circumplex Model

The circumplex or dimensional model has been developed subsequently to the concept of emotional valence (Russell 1980). In addition to their valence, it classifies emotions into their level of arousal: high and low (aroused and calm). This arousal dimension can also be referred to as activation dimension (Bakker et al. 2014; Hill et al. 2013; Scherer 2005) because it represents the varying degrees of physiological, mental, and physical activity of emotions (Bakker et al. 2014: 409; Scherer 2005). The level of activation can be distinguished as active or passive (Scherer 2005: 720). Following this distinction along two dimensions, four categories of emotions exist: positive-active, positive-passive, negative-active and negative-passive emotions. Discrete emotions can be distinctively assembled within these four categories; however, the circumplex model has been criticized for its circular arrangement of emotions. This model has categorized negative emotions into “activated” and “unactivated” and thereby placed anger in close proximity to fear (Russell & Barrett 1999: 808). Both emotions show high levels of arousal or activation. For this reason, it has been discussed whether anger is in fact in closer proximity to enthusiasm than previously believed (Brader & Marcus 2013: 179). Enthusiasm as well as anger show high levels of power and dominance, while fear is linked to low levels of dominance (Mehrabian & Russell 1974; Bakker et al. 2014). Therefore, a third dimension of dominance should be reconsidered when classifying emotions (Bakker et al. 2014). Dominance is linked to feelings of being in control (Mehrabian & Russell 1974) and a coping potential due to control

and power in social situations (Scherer 2005: 722). By considering a third dimension, emotions such as fear and anger can be clearly distinguished. Another circumplex model is Plutchik's "wheel of emotions". In this model anger is placed opposite to fear and therefore distinguishes these two emotions clearly (Plutchik 2001).

#### Emotions as Discrete Emotions

The study of emotion research has emerged as a subfield of psychology. Early accounts of the evolution of emotional expression date back to Darwin (Darwin 1965). The structure of emotions has since been studied systematically and widely discussed for more than four decades. In emotion research, scholars have largely agreed on the existence of a few distinct universal basic emotions (Ekman & Friesen 1971; Ekman 1992). Despite this overall agreement, no consensus exists regarding the actual number of distinct basic emotions. Most scholars suggest several basic emotions ranging between eight and twelve discrete emotions (see also Brader & Marcus 2013: 170), although the distinct number of existing discrete emotions remains controversial within the field of emotion research. More recent research discusses up to 17 potential discrete emotions (e.g., Ekman & Cordaro 2011). Anger is commonly considered to be a basic emotion.

#### Compound Emotions

Prior empirical research has recently found that "compound emotions" exist (Du et al. 2014). The term "compound emotions" refers to two discrete emotions that form a new and distinguishable emotion. In an experiment, participants were asked to display reactions towards certain events and occurrences. When asked to imagine either a positive or negative surprise, participants formed facial expressions that were clearly distinguishable from each other. Hence, the combination of two discrete emotions (surprise and joy vs. surprise and disgust) led to different facial expressions. Therefore, some scholars discuss compound emotions as being emotions in their own right (Du et al. 2014). The research into compound emotions also aligns with a recent development in emotion research to consider further emotions as discrete emotions (Ekman & Cordaro 2011), whereby Ekman & Cordaro discuss up to 17 emotions as being discrete, which is a noticeable extension of the traditional six discrete emotions that had been established since the early stages of emotion research by Ekman and colleagues (Ekman & Friesen 1971; Ekman et al. 1972).

The valence approach, however, is often too broad and more nuanced evaluations of a communicative context need to be considered when emo-

tions are expressed by politicians, for example character frames and narratives (Grabe & Bucy 2009: 101). By focusing more specifically on anger as a negative-active emotion, which can easily be accompanied by indignation, wrath, and other strong negative emotions of the same nature, a more nuanced differentiation can be reached. Negative-passive emotions such as sadness and hopelessness, are not considered within the negative-active expression of politicians, since these emotions are clearly passive emotions which could potentially lead to different evaluations. Early studies in political science differentiate between politicians' expressions of anger/threat, fear/evasion and happiness/reassurance (McHugo et al. 1985; Sullivan & Masters 1988; Bucy & Grabe 2008). This three-factor model of emotional expressions can be regarded as a practical compromise in the field of politics between the valence approach and discrete emotions. The empirical structure of emotions expressed by German politicians is discussed in more detail in Subchapter 4.3.1. This book focuses particularly on a range of negative-active emotional expressions that can be characterized by a negative valence, a high level of arousal, and a high level of dominance or coping potential. While such a classification is not commonly used in political psychology, it enables this book to focus on anger and a range of closely related emotional expressions that can include outrage, indignation, and contempt, while it does not entail negative emotions with low arousal, or high arousal and low coping potential, such as fear. Emotions with low arousal and/or low coping potential are classified as "passive" in this book. The meaning of the discrete emotions within the group of "negative-active" emotions is discussed in more detail in the next section.

### 1.2.2 Emotion Expressions of Anger and Indignation

According to evolutionary psychologists like Ekman (1992), anger is a universal basic emotion, while some biologists have claimed that anger evolved later as a social function to be distinguished from disgust (Jack et al. 2014). Carver (2004) describes anger as a neurobiological reaction of approach towards frustrating setbacks, resistance, or blockages when pursuing (personal) goals (Carver 2004: 7; Carver & Harmon-Jones 2009). This view is further shared and elaborated on by political and social psychological research (Searles & Mattes 2015: 172; Brader & Marcus 2013: 179–180).

In the social-psychological literature, anger is discussed as having two sides. One side is a negative expression of negative emotions. However, anger is always aimed at something or someone and addresses an object

cognitively. Therefore, anger can have a positive component which represents (justified) anger towards the present state of affairs or individuals. The positive side of anger has only recently found recognition within the literature of social psychology (Hess 2014). The trade-off between emotions and reason has been discussed since the days of ancient Greek philosophers (see also van Kleef 2016: 1; Hess 2014: 55), and so the potential positive side had already been mentioned by Aristotle:

“[...] since those who do not get angry at things at which it is right to be angry are considered foolish, and so are those who do not get angry in the right manner, at the right time, and with the right people. It is thought that they do not feel or resent an injury, and that if a man is never angry he will not stand up for himself; and it is considered servile to put up with an insult to oneself or suffer one's friends to be insulted.” (Aristotle: Nic. Eth. 1126a)

Hess (2014) shows that not only has the positive side of anger been acknowledged in ancient Greece, but also that its negative side and destructive power have been discussed as least since ancient Rome with Seneca's “De Ira” (Hess 2014: 55). Seneca's letter “De Ira” aims at providing advice on how to regulate emotions and particularly anger, which Seneca describes as the most maddening and destructive emotion of all:

“You have importuned me, Novatus, to write on the subject of how anger may be allayed, and it seems to me that you had good reason to fear in an especial degree this, the most hideous and frenzied of all the emotions. For the other emotions have in them some element of peace and calm, while this one is wholly violent and has its being in an onrush of resentment, raging with a most inhuman lust for weapons, blood, and punishment, giving no thought to itself if only it can hurt another, hurling itself upon the very point of the dagger, and eager for revenge though it may drag down the avenger along with it. Certain wise men, therefore, have claimed that anger is temporary madness.” (Seneca LCL 214: 106–107)

The destructive side of anger is known in many diverse cultures across the world (Parkinson et al. 2005: 77–81), where anger is often seen as destructive or dangerous (Parkinson et al. 2005: 79). This assessment holds true particularly for collectivist societies (Parkinson et al. 2005: 79). In individualist societies anger can also be connected with assertiveness and seen in a more positive light. The two sides of anger in individualistic societies are described as follows: “[...] anger does not seem to be represented solely

seen in disruptive or destructive terms in individualistic societies, but is also seen as a means to emphasize one's rights, or to put right wrongs" (Parkinson et al. 2005: 80).

While Hess (2014) also notes these two distinct sides of anger, additional features of anger become apparent when focusing on cross-cultural comparisons. The English word "anger" is used in a broader sense than in other languages (Wierzbicka & Harkins 2001: 5). The Latin word "ira" could also be translated as "wrath", which connotes with rage and quick, rash, unreflective decisions. Seneca's fears and worries about anger are closely related to these elements of wrath and thus anger as a broader category. However, anger does not necessarily have to involve a "blind rage" or "irascibility" and Seneca noted that already himself: "An angry man may not be an irascible man; an irascible man may, at times, not be an angry man" (Seneca LCL214: 116–117).

"Anger" is used to describe a basic emotion within the English language and combines several varying aspects that are distinguished with several nouns in other languages and cultural contexts. Anger can be seen as "a basic or superordinate emotion category" (Durst 2001: 126), a broader category that does not exist in several other languages, such as German, Mandarin, or Russian (Barrett 2016; Durst 2001; Wierzbicka & Harkins 2001: 5).

Since this study focuses on German politicians and politics, the German linguistic concept of anger seems to be worth mentioning, since language represents culture. A semantic analysis by Durst (2001) shows that no single German counterpart exists that equally conveys the broad range of meanings to anger (Durst 2001: 117), with a main difference of the broadness that anger encompasses: "anger/angry seems to cover a wider range of use than each of the German words in question" (Durst 2001: 116). The German language has been said to commonly distinguish between three kinds of anger, namely rage/fury ("Wut"), anger/annoyance ("Ärger"), and wrath ("Zorn") (see also Barrett 2016; Durst 2001). Further negative components of anger are discussed as "bad anger" ("böse") (Durst 2001: 117), while more positive aspects are discussed as moral "outrage" or "indignation". These distinctions exist within the English language as well (Wierzbicka & Harkins 2001: 5):

"Anger is indeed intuitively simpler than related emotion concepts like outrage or indignation (in English), which are often explained in terms of it. For example, outrage is considered to be a 'stronger version' of anger, and indignation to be anger arising from some specific offence or injustice. Thus it may appear that 'anger' is basic to a num-

ber of other emotions, and in lexicography as well as psychology there is a well established tradition of defining complex emotions in terms of ones that appear to be simpler.” (Wierzbicka & Harkins 2001: 5)

Wrath and anger can certainly differ, while wrath is more closely related to the madness, unpredictability, and unstableness described by Seneca.<sup>2</sup> Seneca has also acknowledged these different aspects of anger when relating the lack of linguistic differences for aspects of anger in Latin compared to ancient Greek:

“The other categories which the Greeks, using a multiplicity of terms, establish for the different kinds of anger, I shall pass over, since we have no distinctive words for them; and yet we call men bitter and harsh, and, just as often, choleric, rabid, clamorous, captious, and fierce – all of which designate different aspects of anger.” (Seneca LCL 214: 116–117)

By illustrating these cultural specifics that have existed since the classical period, different aspects of anger come to mind and further emphasize Hess's claim for the need to “distinguish anger from hostility and aggression” (Hess 2014: 56). While those aspects can certainly accompany anger, they do not have to do so *per se*. Likewise, anger is distinct from contempt and disgust, while those emotions can also occur in conjunction. When focusing on its positive side, anger can be interpreted as an approach emotion and signal strength to observers (Hess 2014: 56–58), or as taking a moral stance, thereby signaling a moral character (Parrott 2019).

According to Haidt (2003), anger and other negative-active emotions such as contempt and disgust can be seen as moral emotions and more specifically as “other-condemning emotions” (Haidt 2003: 855). Haidt (2003) defines anger along with elevation, compassion, and guilt as prototypical moral emotions (Haidt 2003: 853). To illustrate this point, Haidt compares the selfish emotional life of a *homo economicus*, who is only interested in his own affective state and well-being with the range of potential emotional states for *homo sapiens* in general (Haidt 2003: 855, 866). Haidt calls anger “the most underappreciated moral emotion” (Haidt 2003: 856) by pointing out that anger has often been described regarding its negative aspects, but it has rarely been seen as the well-intentioned reac-

---

2 The German title of Seneca's “*De Ira*” is typically translated in German with “über den Zorn” [on wrath] instead of “über den Ärger” [on anger]. This ambiguity has been also noted by Durst (Durst 2001: 116).



tion it can be (Haidt 2003: 856), for example when it emerges as a result of perceived injustices (Haidt 2003: 856; Tavis 1989: 261). While anger can be felt out of self-interest, because one feels unfairly treated, one's anger can be evoked due to the unfair treatment of others, if it is perceived as unfair:

“Anger may be most frequently triggered by perceived injustices against the self, and sympathy may be most strongly felt for one's kin, but the point here is that some emotions are easily triggered by triumphs, tragedies, and transgressions that do not directly touch the self, whereas other emotions are not.” (Haidt 2003: 854)

As a moral emotion, anger can evoke action tendencies due to its approach character towards injustices (Haidt 2003: 857). This mechanism of attack not only results in destruction, it also facilitates the functioning of society by ensuring cooperation among members of society, the adherence to laws and rules. This can also extend to explain acts of reciprocal altruism (Haidt 2003: 855; see also Trivers 1971), which would not be feasible between rational actors with a mere self-interest in their own advancements.

This is especially the case in questions of moral violations regarding justice and injustice; from an evolutionary standpoint it can be argued that anger has emerged to enforce morally adequate behavior within a given social group (Haidt 2003; Hess 2014; Trivers 1971): “anger can be conceived of an emotion employed to condemn violations linked to notions of justice, freedom, fairness, individualism, individual choice, and liberty” (Hess 2014: 58).

One important aspect in the evaluation of emotional expressions is the level of control inherent in the emotional expression that is conveyed by the emoter. In contrast to more submissive emotional expressions, expressions of anger are typically associated with a high level of control over the situation, as pointed out by Hess (2014): “Thus an angry person experiences a motivation-incongruent (low goal conduciveness) unpleasant state but considers the situation to be potentially under his or her control (high coping potential)” (Hess 2014: 60).

This high coping potential is expressed by the approach of the target, which can then be interpreted as independence, assertiveness, and self-confidence (Parkinson et al. 2005: 80). These positive assessments are particularly widespread in individualistic cultures, despite the fact that anger can also violate social conventions and display rules. In collectivist societies – such as Japan – anger is more commonly perceived as a violation of the societal rules and as aggressive behavior (Parkinson et al. 2005: 80). There-

fore, anger expression could directly impact the candidate evaluation of character traits, especially along the dimension of competence. This point is also highlighted by Hess (2014): "In sum, angry individuals are perceived as threatening but at the same time the anger can signal strength and the ability and motivation to address bad situations" (Hess 2014: 63).

When the goal of anger expressions is helping others, these expressions might even have positive effects on the evaluation of someone's empathy (Hess 2014: 58; Kinder 1986: 241). In the context of politics, such anger expressions could be aimed towards policies or politicians who represent certain policies. However, it has to be noted that other social psychologists such as Parkinson et al. (2005) deem a moral component of indignation as not being a necessity.

In contrast to outbursts and indignation, a vast amount of research in political science has previously focused on negative campaigning as well as incivility, a form of negativity that is accompanied by hostility and attacks aimed at other politicians (Mattes & Redlawsk 2015; Mutz 2015; Mutz 2007; Mutz & Reeves 2005; Nai & Walter 2016). Although such incivility can be shown in conjunction with anger, it is certainly a specific component of anger that can be distinguished in its own right.

Previous research on negativity and negative campaigning has found that personal attacks on politicians' character traits are more likely to be evaluated as unjust by viewers compared to policy attacks (Benoit 2016: 40). Furthermore, uncivil behavior that classifies as "incivility" has potentially negative effects on politicians' ratings and evaluations (Mölders & van Quaquebeke 2017). Moreover, Walter and Nai (2016) describe a possible "boomerang" or "backlash" effect that might occur as a result of negative campaigning (Walter & Nai 2016: 98), whereby displays and expressions of negativity in the form of attacks on other politicians and their policies might lead to negative evaluations of the attacker. Lau and Redlawsk (2016) also describe frequent potential backlash effects on those politicians who sponsored negative advertisements (Lau & Redlawsk 2016: 249). Negative advertisements appear "when a candidate criticizes the opponent, his or her policies or party" (Lau & Redlawsk 2016: 253).

The many facets of anger underline the claim that anger is a complex emotion whose expressive evaluation depends heavily on the contextual setting. Emotions are expressed in specific moments for various reasons; this context is likely to influence the evaluation of emotional expressions: "Emotions (more so than moods) are context specific" (Gooty et al. 2010: 982).

While this book mainly focuses on expressions of anger in a broad sense of negative-active emotions, it should be noted that positive emotions are not of lesser complexity. A simple smile can be distinguished as to whether it appears genuine and real (“Duchenne smile”) or forced and faked (“volitional smile”), thereby directly influencing its evaluation (Ottati et al. 1997: 1154; see also Stewart & Ford Dowe 2013; Stewart et al. 2015). Positive emotions can also have negative sides and lead to unfavorable outcomes (Parrott 2014: 282–285), especially if they are seen as inappropriate (Bucy & Newhagen 1999). However, the impact of positive emotions on the evaluation of politicians is not the focus of this book.

As a social function, “anger serves to blame others or recruit allies in resistant situations” (Parkinson et al. 2005: 216). Hochschild (2012) presents an overview of discrete emotions and the momentary focus of the person who experiences the emotion (Hochschild 2012: 240–241). For anger, Hochschild (2012: 240) describes an experienced discrepancy between the current situation and a preferred outcome. According to Hochschild, the individual as a causal agent feels as if they could attack if they wanted to. Indignation is similarly classified, while Hochschild adds the notion that the individual agent disapproves of the current state of affairs (Hochschild 2012: 240). Similar to Haidt’s classification of “other-condemning emotions” (Haidt 2003), Hochschild classifies disgust and contempt as being partially related to anger and indignation (Hochschild 2012: 241).

The study of negative emotions is particularly relevant because negative emotions could potentially have a stronger impact on voters than positive emotions. In the context of negative campaigning, Lau & Redlawsk noted that negative ads are more memorable than positive ads (Lau & Redlawsk 2016: 250). Their finding is in line with wider psychological research claiming that negative events are more memorable than positive events (Baumeister et al. 2001).

Like the focus on personal attacks in studies dealing with negative campaigning, anger has often been assessed as having an interpersonal target whereby the opposing candidate is often held accountable for the undesirable present state (Parkinson et al. 2005: 202; Smith & Lazarus 1993: 238).

However, the focus on another person is problematic, since nonhuman objects – such as cars and computers – can be the reason or target of someone’s anger (Crivelli & Fridlund 2018: 8; Parkinson et al. 2005: 203). Anger could also be related to abstract concepts such as ideas, ideologies and political issue positions. Building on this assumption, blaming someone else is not a necessary condition for anger. Anger can be caused by some form of resistance that prevents someone from “getting through”, in-

cluding resistance in social interactions and arguments, if a conversational partner refuses to consider one's viewpoint: "when someone just won't listen or acknowledge our point (when we can't 'get through' to them)" (Parkinson et al. 2005: 203–204).

### 1.3 Outline of the Book

To date, few studies have investigated the association between politicians' emotional expressions and candidate – or leader – evaluations.<sup>3</sup> Hence, this book aims to fill the existing gap with regard to the effects political leaders' anger expressions can have on citizens. In order to do so, it begins by reviewing the relevant literature on candidate appearances, and candidate evaluations in the light of emotional expressions, particularly anger expressions. The second chapter also introduces potential underlying causal mechanisms that shape the perception of candidate evaluations. Theoretical expectations about the impact of anger on candidate evaluations are then presented while considering theoretical contributions in the areas of political psychology, social and evolutionary psychology as well as sociology. It systematically explores key factors of social interactions and investigates their implications for the appraisal of anger expressions.

The theoretical background of this book is followed by a third chapter that presents empirical evidence for the prevalence of anger expressions by German politicians on German television, particularly as seen in the news and political talk shows. The data used in this book were collected as part of a larger research project funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) on politics and emotions.<sup>4</sup> A media content analysis of German news and political talk shows was conducted in order to determine the prevalence in which emotional displays can be seen on TV. These empirical findings are drawn from the content analysis that lasted a year between

---

3 In this book the term "candidate evaluations" is sometimes used interchangeably with leadership evaluations for two reasons: The term frequently occurs within the respective literature on voting behavior and secondly, political leaders have often been or will be political candidates at some point. Hence, it is possible to consider political leaders at least as potential candidates.

4 The original title of the research project was "Die Bedeutung emotionaler Botschaften für die politische Urteilsbildung" [the relevance of emotional messages for political judgments]. The principal investigators of this project were Prof. em. Dr. Oscar W. Gabriel, University of Stuttgart, and Prof. Dr. Jürgen Maier, University of Koblenz and Landau.

May 2013 and April 2014, and thereby covers the heightened period of campaigning leading up to a general election, in which the highest amount of angry attacks could be expected. The relevance of anger displays can be established by analyzing the media content analysis data. In addition to the media content analysis, this book draws on data from an experiment that was conducted as part of the previously mentioned research project. The experimental data are used to answer the main research question of this book – how do citizens evaluate politicians' personality traits based on their expressions of anger?

Therefore, the fourth chapter outlines the experimental design which was developed to analyze the impact of politicians' emotional expressions on the evaluation of their personalities and their respective political parties. It further discusses the suitability of the experimental method to answer the research question, then describes the development of the experimental design and provides an empirical analysis of the emotion structure of discrete emotions as displayed by politicians on television. Furthermore, it gives an overview of the measurements of the dependent and independent variables of this study, i.e., the experimental treatment. This chapter also pays particular attention to the validity of emotional expressions, by analyzing a manipulation check that was administered within the survey questionnaire as well as external measurements of validity.

Thereafter the fifth chapter presents the experimental findings, starting with the average treatment effects of anger expressions on the evaluation of politicians' character traits, followed by an overview of moderating effects of individual predispositions on the treatment effects. As a next step in the analysis, the longevity of effects as well as spillover evaluations on political parties are tested. The longevity of treatment effects in the context of electoral choices and candidate evaluations has rarely been studied empirically – with a few exceptions (e.g., Gerber et al. 2011; Lodge et al. 1995). If exposure effects remain two weeks after the experimental treatment was administered, such long-standing effects could highlight the relevance of televised emotional expressions on the evaluation of political candidates. A spillover effect is tested by analyzing the evaluation of the respective political parties after participants saw emotional expressions by their leading politicians. Lastly, the response time is analyzed to provide some insight into whether video clips with emotional expressions increased the amount of time participants spent considering the candidate evaluations. Finally, the sixth chapter provides a summary of the empirical findings, discusses their implications, and concludes by providing recommendations for future research.