

2 Candidate Appearances and Candidate Evaluations

2.1 *Candidate Evaluations Based on Appearances*

As previously mentioned, candidate evaluations are often considered to be a key factor in addition to political issues and party identification that influences individual vote choices, particularly since the Michigan or Ann Arbor model has highlighted the importance of political candidates in its social psychological model and has thereby shaped the research on candidate effects (Campbell et al. 1960). Given their impact on voting decisions, a considerable amount of literature has been published on appearances of political candidates and leaders. Qualitative approaches have been undertaken to generate in-depth psychological assessments of political leaders (e.g., Winter 2013), while quantitative studies have analyzed a range of personal characteristics that can have an impact on trait evaluations of political candidates.

One of the first TV appearances that gained popular and scientific attention was the 1960 TV debate between Vice President Nixon and his challenger, Senator John F. Kennedy (Druckman 2003: 563). The common interpretation of the first TV debate postulates that the perception of Kennedy as the winner of the debate has largely been affected by Kennedy's good and healthy-looking appearance compared to the Nixon who was still recovering from an injury and sickly looking without the help of make-up. Since such a lead for Kennedy could not be found for those citizens who listened to the radio, the debate is seen as early evidence that voters derive social information from physical appearances and non-verbal communication (Druckman 2003; Kraus 1996).

Since that early debate, more recent attention has focused on physical appearances of political candidates and politicians in office. Over half a century later, the importance of physical appearances, particularly facial features, has been sufficiently studied in political science and the concept of "faces as a low-information heuristic" (Lenz & Lawson 2011: 587) has been widely established (Murray 2014: 33). Psychological studies have shown that these trait inferences based on candidate faces are made rapidly – in less than a second (Todorov et al. 2005; Fiske & Taylor 2017: 70). While candidate appearances and visual images have mainly been discussed as a low information heuristic that is used by unsophisticated voters

(Lau & Redlawsk 2001: 954; Sniderman et al. 1986: 428), political candidates' physical appearances can affect voters regardless of their level of sophistication (Bucy 2011: 195; Bucy 2000: 194; Sniderman et al. 1986: 246–427). Recent empirical evidence suggests that in some instances sophisticated voters can rely on candidate evaluations even more so than unsophisticated voters (Clarke et al. 2017). The view that candidate appearances are relevant for all voters regardless of their level of sophistication is also in line with previous research. The level of sophistication could determine to which personality traits voters pay attention to in their attitude formation. Miller, Wattenberg, and Malanchuk (1986) found that sophisticated voters pay attention to different leadership qualities than unsophisticated voters. Personal characteristics such as reliability, competence, and integrity are particularly important for sophisticated voters, whereas unsophisticated voters seem to pay more attention to the charisma and personal characteristics of political leaders (Miller et al. 1986: 531). In general, it can be assumed that the use of candidate heuristics in political decision-making processes has increased over time (Bittner 2011: 104–108; Garzia 2014: 83–84; Garzia 2017: 647).

Studies looking at potential appearance effects of political candidates have covered a broad range of physical and biographical characteristics. When predicting outcomes of presidential elections according to an index of biographical candidate characteristics, the index performed well at predicting the popular vote and its performance was comparable to sophisticated econometric models (Armstrong & Graefe 2011: 703). The index included information about the candidate's families and their marital status, their level of education and previous professional experiences – especially in the military and politics, traumatic personal experiences, sociodemographic characteristics such as their ethnicity, gender and age, as well as physical characteristics such as height, weight, facial hair, wearer of glasses, baldness, physical attractiveness, and facial competence. In addition, further aspects such as their intelligence, region of origin, the prevalence of their first and last name, and their status as celebrities due to previous activities were considered (Armstrong & Graefe 2011: 704–706).

One strand of research has focused on attractiveness as a decisive factor in candidate appearances. The positive effect of attractiveness has been found in several countries, especially across Western democracies (for example the USA and European countries), such as Finland (Berggren et al. 2010) and Germany (Rosar et al. 2008; Jäckle & Metz 2016; Jäckle & Metz 2017). Overall, these studies have found that attractive political candidates have an advantage in comparison to their less attractive competitors. When

considering the political expertise of voters, Hart et al. (2011) have found that political experts overcorrected for physical attractiveness, whereby they evaluated attractive candidates to be less favorable (Hart et al. 2011: 190). Nonetheless, voters are likely to be affected by the physical attractiveness of candidates.

In contrast to studies that have focused on physical attractiveness following a conventional concept of beauty, a number of studies have focused on “looking the part” (Murray 2014: 33) rather than looking more beautiful than the competition. Those studies rely on the assessment of competence that is derived from physical appearances, especially faces (Todorov et al. 2005; Ballew & Todorov 2007). Researchers have found that more competent looking facial features are preferred by voters (Todorov et al. 2005). These findings are further supported by several studies providing scenarios of war and peace: During hypothetical times of war, more dominant facial features are deemed more beneficial for politicians than baby-facedness or having faces with more feminine features (Laustsen & Petersen 2017). Furthermore, Knutson (1996) has pointed out that faces express dominance or submissiveness to varying degrees (Knutson 1996: 176) and in the light of wars or threatening scenarios voters are likely to prefer dominant facial features (Murray 2014: 41).

This preference for strong political leaders in times of war can also be explained by evolutionary theories – according to Murray (2014), who argues that this preference in physically strong leaders is due to “evolutionary adaptations derived from humans’ violent ancestral environment” (Murray 2014: 43). Positive effects for politicians’ physical features such as stature measured in height and weight can occur within war time scenarios and even during times of peace (Murray 2014: 43).

Considering physical appearances, candidates are often evaluated based on their gender (Huddy & Terkildsen 1993; Debus 2017: 39); following evolutionary theories, this might be further related to the presumed physical strength of a political leader (Murray 2014: 41), resulting in a disadvantage for female politicians.

Additional evidence has been found that the ethnicity of politicians shapes how voters perceive and evaluate them (Masters 1994; McDermott 1998; Pietraszewski 2016; West 2017). This aspect gains particular relevance in multi-ethnic societies with ethnic groups that differ in their degree of political representation.

Besides their visual appearances, politicians’ paraverbal behavior can also determine how political leaders are perceived (Schubert 1991). The paraverbal behavior includes several aspects such as the “fundamental fre-

quency or pitch, intensity or amplitude, variation in pitch and intensity, speech rate, and speech fluency” (Schubert 1991: 209). Recent studies have established that politicians’ voice pitch has an impact on leadership evaluations (Klofstad 2016). According to this research, overall lower-pitched voices are evaluated more favorably compared to higher-pitched voices, especially when competing against a male contestant (Klofstad 2016: 734). Some evidence has also suggested that a higher-pitched voice might be favorable for male candidates when competing against female politicians (Klofstad 2016: 734). In addition to these paraverbal characteristics, gestures and motion patterns while giving speeches can have an impact on politicians’ candidate evaluations (Koppensteiner & Grammer 2010; Koppensteiner 2013).

Many of these studies build on the assumption that political candidates’ physical appearance, for example their facial features, can be used as heuristics to evaluate candidates. Consequently, it is not far-fetched to assume that likewise, facial expressions and emotional displays can be used to infer character traits and evaluate politicians quickly and automatically (Fiske & Taylor 2017: 70). Such an approach has been previously chosen by social psychologists in order to investigate the impact of emotional expressions (e.g., Hareli & Hess 2012). Before discussing these processes that potentially underlie how emotional expressions of politicians affect viewers, the assessment of political leaders along personality traits will be examined in more detail.

The Dimensionality of Candidate Trait Evaluations

According to psychological research on person perception and the stereotype content model, impressions about individuals are typically formed according to two underlying dimensions – warmth and competence (Fiske et al. 2007; Abelson et al. 1982). The dimension of warmth consists of factors such as likeability and friendliness, which can be described as personal factors and are less related to job performances. Warmth can also include empathy for others; as a result, aspects of external efficacy such as caring about ordinary people have been described early on as “political empathy” (Kinder 1986: 241).

In contrast to the dimension of warmth, the dimension of competence is strongly related to performance impressions such as competence (e.g., intelligence, knowledgeableness), and strong leadership skills. Instead of competence and warmth, scholars such as Caprara and Vecchione (2013) describe two similar dimensions: integrity and leadership (Caprara & Vecchione 2013: 44).

The terms “integrity” and “leadership” are sometimes used interchangeably with “friendliness” and “energy/extraversion” by Caprara and Vecchione (Caprara & Vecchione 2013: 44). These terms represent two latent clusters of the Big Five personality traits, whereby integrity stands for “a blend of agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability” (Caprara and Vecchione 2013: 44) and leadership consists of “a blend of energy/extraversion and openness to experience” (Caprara and Vecchione 2013: 44). In this dichotomy, the two broader dimensions can also be described as “friendliness” and “energy/extraversion” (Caprara & Vecchione 2013), whereby friendliness equates to the dimension of warmth and energy/extraversion equates to the dimension of competence. Schumann (2014) has pointed out that while electoral research has focused on politicians’ characteristics, it has rarely described them in terms of personality trait dimensions such as the Big Five (Schumann 2014: 592).

In social psychology, and more specifically the field of person perception, these two underlying dimensions are commonly described as “warmth” and “competence” (Fiske et al. 2007). In political science, this dichotomy has only been introduced lately (e.g., Blumenberg & Blumenberg 2017; Ferreira Da Silva & Costa 2019). Furthermore, an interesting observation has been made by Caprara & Vecchione (2013) stating that politicians are not only typically evaluated along these two dimensions like others, but that politicians frequently score higher on both dimensions than nonpoliticians (Caprara & Vecchione 2013: 44). Consequently, an ideal political candidate scores highly on both dimensions, thereby fulfilling expectancies as a diplomatic statesman as well as a competent leader. Such expectations could reflect the idea of the representative function of politicians within a representative democracy that is at least to some extent built on political elites. Furthermore, the evaluation of politicians according to these two dimensions has been found as stable over time (Caprara & Vecchione 2013: 44). In a similar vein, previous studies have investigated whether politicians are compared to an ideal politician, “a superman”, or whether they are judged as ordinary people (Kinder 1986; Sullivan et al. 1990). Sullivan, Aldrich, Borgida, and Rahn (1990) found that citizens held politicians to higher standards and appeared to favor ideal attributes of their political candidates: “We concluded, therefore, that most people want their presidential candidates to be as trustworthy, altruistic, and in control as possible” (Sullivan et al. 1990: 482). These expectations seemed even slightly higher for challengers than for the incumbents (Sullivan et al. 1990: 482).

In addition, Caprara and Vecchione (2013) describe the functional use of heuristics in evaluating politicians' personalities:

“The use of this kind of dispositional heuristic allows voters both to simplify the personal information that is made available about candidates and to anchor their judgments to personality traits that are most relevant for holding political offices.” (Caprara & Vecchione 2013: 44)

In line with *role theory*, the dimension of competence is often regarded to be closely related to the social role of politicians, the role expectations politicians face and therefore relating to their job performance, whereas the dimension of warmth is considered to be more personal attributions which are less strongly linked to the social role of politicians and their job performance. However, if the dimension of warmth includes aspects such as integrity or friendliness (Caprara & Vecchione 2013; Ohr & Oscarsson 2011: 188–190) or political empathy (Kinder 1986), this dimension might be more strongly related to the job performance than has been previously accounted for. If agreeableness and conscientiousness strongly shape this dimension, values such as cooperative, considerate, and scrupulous behavior gain importance. These attributes are very well in line with the image of an ideal politician who is a diplomatic statesman or stateswoman, able to cooperate, create and agree on consensual solutions. Therefore, this second dimension is not completely unrelated to the performance of politicians regarding their social roles and professional requirements for politicians.

Over the last three decades, the two dimensions of warmth and competence have gained support within the literature on person perception (Abelson et al. 1982; Fiske et al. 2007; Cuddy et al. 2008). Nonetheless, additional dimensions have been discussed within the literature, for example an additional third dimension of integrity (Ohr & Oscarsson 2011: 188–190). Other scholars have investigated four underlying dimensions: competence, leadership, integrity, and empathy, which have also shaped the measurement of candidate appearances in the American National Election Study (ANES) since the 1980s (Kinder 1986; ANES 2010). By analyzing open-ended survey questions some studies have suggested evaluations along five underlying trait dimensions: competence, integrity, reliability, charisma, and personal attributes (Miller et al. 1986).

In addition, Funk (1999) has highlighted the necessity to differentiate between varying trait assessments which influence overall candidate evaluation (Funk 1999: 701). Drawing on ANES survey data and using a confir-

matory factor analysis, she found the three trait dimensions of leadership effectiveness, integrity, and empathy (Funk 1999: 710).

According to Bittner (2011), more than two dozen different classifications of leadership evaluations have been developed by researchers (Bittner 2011: 34). More recent studies have mostly found two or three dimensions on which candidates are evaluated (Bittner 2011: 30). Using longitudinal election studies across seven industrialized Western democratic countries over forty years, Bittner analyzed the dimensionality of leadership traits and gained sufficient support for a two-dimensional model (Bittner 2011).

Scholars who propose a two dimensionality of leadership assessments typically differentiate between the two dimensions of warmth and competence (Fiske et al. 2002; Cuddy et al. 2008; Abelson et al. 1982). In political science, these dimensions are often labeled as “personality and performance” (e.g., Kinder et al. 1980: 317; Vetter & Gabriel 1998: 75), and sometimes as “character and competence” (e.g., Bittner 2011). Bittner (2011) describes character as consisting of honesty and compassion, while competence includes intelligence and strength of leadership (Bittner 2011: 7). In essence, the conceptualization of these two dimensions typically fits to the general concept of warmth and competence evaluations.

Some scholars propose a three-dimensional structure of leader assessments, whereby they further distinguish between competence/leadership, empathy, and integrity (e.g., Funk 1999: 715). Others have grouped candidates traits along the three dimensions of competence, character, and personal attraction (e.g., Glass 1985: 525).

Despite these attempts at distinguishing trait evaluations, a large amount of research studies in election research focuses only on overall ratings instead of specific trait evaluations (Bittner 2011: 16). From a comparative perspective these overall assessments are crucial to determine the effect of candidate appearances across countries (Garzia 2017: 638). These overall ratings are often measured as thermometer ratings (e.g., Stewart & Ford Dowe 2013), and sometimes as *scalometer* favorability ratings (e.g., by Gallup; Saad 2012). The scalometer ratings have a particularly long-standing tradition within German electoral research, and are frequently included in the Politbarometer and German Election Study (GLES) (e.g., Forschungsgruppe Wahlen 2017; Rattinger et al. 2017). Such overall assessments, either measured by thermometer or scalometer favorability ratings, have often been criticized as broad measurements that lack a clear distinction and could measure a multitude of factors (e.g., Garzia 2017: 636). However, they are commonly used in two-party systems, in which a net favorability score can be calculated between both main candidates (e.g.,

Lavine & Gschwend 2007). Some scholars have argued that the overall favorability of a candidate is more closely related to the dimension of warmth than competence evaluations (Laustsen & Bor 2017: 105), while earlier studies have found that the overall evaluation is particularly influenced by performance and competence-assessments of political leaders despite minor cultural differences (Pancer et al. 1999: 363; Ohr & Oscarsson 2011; Garzia 2017: 636).

In general, more specific trait evaluations appear as superior measurements compared to overall assessments of leadership skills. Research has shown that trait evaluations are also not free from biases which could occur due to effects of voters' party identification and ideology (Garzia 2017: 636–637) and the fact that voters might not be able to perform specific trait evaluations when they know only little about the politicians in question, particularly lesser well-known candidates (Kinder 1986: 254).

Next, Subchapter 2.2 discusses how politicians' emotional expressions potentially affect viewers and their candidate evaluations along these trait dimensions. In order to do so, possible underlying mechanisms will be outlined considering social psychological findings, evolutionary theories, and cognitive theories of information processing. The next section focuses specifically on the role of emotional expressions as heuristics or social cues and further possible mechanisms that explain how emotional expressions affect candidate trait evaluations.

2.2 Candidate Evaluations Based on Politicians' Emotion Expressions

2.2.1 The Social Function of Emotions

Social psychology has a long tradition of focusing on the interpersonal aspects of emotional expressions, whereby the social functions of emotional expressions are considered (Parkinson et al. 2005: 214–217). These theoretical contributions are often built on evolutionary theories to gauge the importance of emotional expressions (e.g., Plutchik 2001). More recently, the communicative function of emotional expressions has been studied theoretically and empirically by social psychologists. One noticeable contribution by van Kleef (2009) describes the communicative function of emotional expressions in depth by postulating a model called “Emotions As Social Information (EASI)” (van Kleef 2009; van Kleef 2010; van Kleef 2016). The following section describes the EASI model and related theories in more detail to exemplify the theoretical underpinnings of emotions as so-

cial functions. By doing so, further causal and underlying processes such as emotional contagion, appraisal and attribution theories, and the theory of affective intelligence are mentioned as parts that can be integrated within the framework of the EASI model. In addition, the evolutionary and ethological arguments of previous studies in the field of emotional expressions are described to complete the theoretical framework by linking these theories to social contextual factors for the following analysis.⁵

Emotions as Social Information in Communicative Acts

The social function of emotional expressions can be considered in light of their informative value regarding the social interaction for those who observe the emotional expressions. Such a focus on emotional expression within the framework of social interactions (Parkinson et al. 2005) is closely related to models of communicative interactions (e.g., Bühler 1990). While some early mathematically inspired communication models only consider a sender, a receiver, and a message, for example the Shannon-Weaver model (Shannon & Weaver 1998), even early linguistic functionalist communication models consider several different communicative functions that occur with any communicative act. Following these traditional interpersonal communication approaches such as Karl Bühler's communication model and Roman Jakobson's communicative functions models (Bühler 1990; Jakobson 1960), each communication is imbedded in a social interaction that involves a message which is expressed by a sender and evaluated by a receiver through several noticeable channels of communications. Such simple communication models present the varying components of any communication, whereby the addresser addresses the addressee by uttering a message in a specific context, making contact in a given code (Jakobson 1960). These components correspond to six communicative functions: the emotive, conative, poetic, referential, phatic, and metalingual functions (Jakobson 1960). In this light, emotional expressions can be considered as another channel of communication which serves an expressive or emotive function (Jakobson 1960). This emotive function of language transmits – voluntarily or involuntarily – information about the emotional state and attitudes of the sender of any speech act. Social psychologists typically refer to the sender of a message as the “emoter” – the one who expresses the emotion – and to the receiver of a

5 Some of the theoretical arguments have been made in a recent publication that was also based on the same research project and data (Gabriel & Masch 2017; Masch & Gabriel 2020).

message as the “observer” – the one who perceives the emotional expression (Hess 2014; van Kleef 2016). In the context of negative-active emotions, the emoter has also been described as the “anger agent”, observers as the “third party”, and the subject or object of anger as the “target” (Miron-Spektor & Rafaeli 2009: 155; see also Hareli & Rafaeli 2008). The third-party observers are described as almost impartial bystanders to the situation as they are not personally linked to the “anger agent” or the “target”. Otherwise they can be described as the “partner” of either side (Miron-Spektor & Rafaeli 2009: 155). Such a distinction between impartial and partial observers is suitable for the context of politics, in which some voters strongly support and identify with a certain political party, while others remain independent observers. In addition, it highlights the role of the asymmetric and televised communication between politicians and voters, who rarely interact directly with politicians, but rather observe social interactions between politicians in the news and political talk shows.

One prominent view in social psychology and sociology is that the emotional expressions can then be interpreted as social cues by the observer in a heuristic manner. According to Hochschild (2012) emotional expressions act as signifiers whereby they can amplify any given verbal message; for example, expressions of anger can signify that the issue is of importance to the emoter and further indicate that they care about the given matter (Hochschild 2012: 31–34). In the *Emotions As Social Information* theory, van Kleef considers three factors to be crucial: the social-contextual factors setting the stage as well as the observers' affective and cognitive responses as two underlying mechanisms (van Kleef 2010: 333–337).

As in typical communication models, social-contextual factors matter when emotions are expressed publicly. These communicative settings are often considered as effects of direct face-to-face communication between emoters and observers. Van Kleef has researched extensively on interpersonal effects of emotional expressions regarding such professional settings as business negotiations and conflict solutions as well as such personal matters as relationships with friends and family members (van Kleef 2009; van Kleef 2016). A large amount of these studies focus on direct social interactions between emoters and observers who are often simultaneously the targets of emotional expressions at the workplace; however, it is possible to apply the theoretical assumptions to effects that occur within an asymmetric communicative setting between politicians and citizens.

Such asymmetric communicative settings with regards to space and time occur frequently within the field of politics (Meyrowitz 1985); for example, politicians' emotional expressions during a speech are televised and

observers perceive them potentially time-delayed in the comfort of their own homes or on the go via mobile devices and streaming services. Nonetheless, the social contextual factors of the emoter and observer have to be considered, as well as the situation and context in which the emotions are expressed (van Kleef 2010: 337). More broadly, cultural factors should be considered when studying interpersonal effects of emotional expressions (van Kleef 2010; Barrett 2017). This also includes cultural and societal display rules of emotional expressions as they have been discussed by psychologists and sociologists alike (Barrett 2017; Ekman & Friesen 1975; Hochschild 2012; Parkinson et al. 2005).

The effects of these emotional displays can be influenced by contextual factors. According to appraisal theory, emotion expressions raise questions about the underlying motivation for emotional displays. Following Barrett, Mesquita, and Gendron (2011) three types of contextual factors for the evaluation of emotional displays could occur:

“(a) *stimulus-based* context, in which a face is physically presented with other sensory input that has informational value; (b) *perceiver-based* context, in which processes within the brain or body of a perceiver can shape emotion perception; and (c) *cultural* contexts that affect either the encoding or the understanding of facial actions.” (Barrett et al. 2011: 286)

Hence, these three types of contextual factors are considered in this study. The emotional displays are evaluated rooted in the cultural context of the current German political discourse. To date, no study has systematically analyzed how German political leaders’ expressions of anger affect viewers’ evaluation of them. According to the *perceiver-based* context, the individual predispositions of the viewer are considered in how expressions of anger by politicians can influence candidate evaluations. Individuals’ predispositions prime the perception and evaluation of emotional displays (Lodge & Taber 2013: 34). Such predispositions have developed over a long period of time and include the interest in politics, ideological viewpoints, party affiliations, and individual personality traits that could influence how emotional displays are perceived (Campbell et al. 1960: 499–519; Lavine et al. 2002: 343; Zaller 1992).

A *stimulus-based* context for the impact of negative-active emotional displays can include all factors that are necessary conditions for an appraisal to occur. This can include the social situation in which the emotion is expressed, the political issues that give cause to the expression of anger, and the status of the politicians within the political system.

Furthermore, previous research has shown that trait judgments depend on situational evaluations such as the political message (Bucy & Bradley 2004) or times of peace and war (e.g., Laustsen & Petersen 2017). These contextual aspects are analyzed in more detail in the following subchapters.

Underlying Causal Mechanisms

The *Emotions As Social Information* model considers two potential underlying causal mechanisms that can affect how emotional expressions have an impact on observers – affect and inferential or cognitive responses (van Kleef 2009; van Kleef 2010; van Kleef 2016). These two mechanisms have also been identified by political psychologists as potential underlying mechanisms that influence voters, whereby these mechanisms can work separately as well as interact with each other when voters form judgments such as candidate evaluations (e.g., Redlawsk & Pierce 2017: 425).

Affective responses refer to reactions that are induced by the emotional expressions and result in a change of the affective state of the observer. These responses can consciously or unconsciously affect the observer. Common phrases such as “having a contagious smile” exemplify the general idea of emotional contagion. One basis for this emotional contagion is facial mimicry whereby facial expressions are mimicked physiologically, therefore resulting in affective responses for the observers themselves (Wood et al. 2016). Affective responses are then pleasant or unpleasant feelings that are evoked by the emotional expressions of others.

In addition to affective responses that might occur, emotional expressions can evoke cognitive inferential responses that affect judgments and dispositions towards the emoter. As previously stated, these inferential processes might occur consciously or unconsciously. The information processing of emotional expressions can be further described by theories of social psychology such as appraisal theory, attribution theory, and lastly dual-mode theories of information processing such as the theory of affective intelligence. The theory of affective intelligence is a suitable framework of information processing that has been commonly applied in the field of political psychology (Ridout & Searles 2011: 441). Its role in this study is to distinguish between heuristic and systematic information processing in regard to the expression of emotions. These two potential mechanisms are outlined in more depth by describing the theoretical assumptions that can be derived from a range of theories regarding affective and cognitive responses.

2.2.2 Affective Responses

Hatfield, Cacioppo, and Rapson (1992) define a primitive form of emotional contagion as “the tendency to automatically mimic and synchronize expressions, vocalizations, postures, and movements with those of another’s person and consequently, to converge emotionally” (Hatfield et al. 1992: 153–154, see also Hatfield et al. 1993: 96). The authors acknowledge various forms of emotional contagion, i.e., underlying mechanisms which cause emotions to be “contagious” – mimicry and feedback (Hatfield et al. 1993: 97–99).

For face-to-face interactions, Hatfield et al. (1993: 97) mention that people continuously mimic emotional expressions (Hatfield et al. 1993). They particularly emphasize the mimicry of facial expressions which most likely occurs rapidly and unconsciously (Hatfield et al. 1993: 97–99) or even automatically (Kelly 2004: 99). Supporting their claims with previous research which used EMG measurements of facial activity in response to emotional expressions, they note that particularly positive emotions, for example smiling, seem to evoke mimicry – participants moved their cheeks after seeing positive emotions, while they moved their brow region after seeing negative emotions (Hatfield et al. 1993: 97). Furthermore, research has shown that infants already mimic facial expressions, indicating that the behavior and its mechanism are innate. Mimicry is not limited to facial expressions, however; studies have also presented evidence for synchronized conversational rhythms and nonverbal behavior in general (Kelly 2004: 100), for example movement and postures (Hatfield et al. 1993: 97). Synchrony is closely related to mimicry, whereby the conversational speakers synchronize during their social interactions by mimicking each other (Kelly 2004: 100).

As a second mechanism, Hatfield et al. (1993) suggest a feedback loop that is based on facial mimicry (Hatfield et al. 1993: 97). Because individuals mimic facial expressions, movements, and postures of others, they might make cognitive inferences occur about their own emotional state which has been evoked by the emotional expression of others. However, the authors state that it is uncertain to which extent these feedback loops are essential for experiencing emotions (Hatfield et al. 1993: 98).⁶

6 It is important to note that such feedback processes are not just discussed in the context of emotional contagion, they are also discussed within the wider context of emotion research and the experience of emotional states.

Similar concepts to emotional contagion have emerged in psychological research, as pointed out by Kelly (2004), who mentions three similar concepts to emotional contagion which have been discussed within the psychological literature (Kelly 2004: 99–100). For one, emotional contagion could be at work due to basic learning processes (Kelly 2004: 99); she exemplifies this with learned reactions such as “when a loud voice causes momentary fear” (Kelly 2004: 99). Furthermore, the concept of “behavioral entrainment” has been defined as a mechanism that is closely related to synchrony, in which one individual changes their behavior in accordance with another individual, whereby this mechanism is said to increase the positive affect towards the emoter or interaction itself (Kelly 2004: 100). Finally, McIntosh, Druckman, and Zajonc (1994) mention a concept that is almost synonymous to emotional contagion – “socially induced affect”, which also indicates affect that is induced socially by someone who expresses emotions (Kelly 2004: 100; McIntosh et al. 1994).

Finally, one additional aspect needs further consideration. Researchers have previously suggested that emotional contagion depends on the individual abilities of the emoter as well as of the observer (Kelly 2004: 101; Hatfield et al. 1994). For observers, these abilities include the emotional intelligence of an individual, which consists of several components, the important one in this case being the decoding of emotional expressions (Hatfield et al. 1994: 147–182; Kelly 2004: 101). This individual capacity is important for observers, since people who possess a high emotional intelligence might be more likely to be affected by emotional contagion (Hatfield et al. 1994: 147–182; Kelly 2004: 101). Likewise, the emotional expressivity of the emoter also comes into play according to Hatfield et al. (Hatfield et al. 1994: 128–146). Following their assumptions, emoters need to express emotions strongly for any emotional contagion to occur, so that individuals with a lower emotional intelligence are also affected (Hatfield et al. 1994: 146; Kelly 2004: 101).

Regardless of the individual differences between viewers, mechanisms of emotional contagion can elicit affective responses to emotional expressions. Such affective reactions have often been considered as preceding cognitive reactions to emotional expressions of others. Zajonc (1984) has coined the term “primacy of affect”, which assumes that emotional responses can be evoked “without the participation of cognitive processes” (Zajonc 1984: 118–119). According to this view, affective reactions precede cognitive efforts and are derived unconsciously or pre-consciously. Nonetheless, cognitive responses can shape how politicians' emotional expressions have an impact on observers. What follows is an account of cog-

nitive theories that can facilitate a deeper understanding of the voters' reactions to politicians' emotional expressions.

2.2.3 Cognitive Responses

One of the predominant cognitive approaches to the study of emotion has built on appraisal theory (Parrott 2004: 12). This approach has been put forward by cognitive psychologists such as Lazarus (1984), Scherer (1997), and Roseman (2001).

The basic idea of appraisal theory concerns the experience of emotions, in which the cognitive appraisal or evaluation of a situation leads to the emotion experience. This approach is widely established among cognitive psychologists, but is however not without contestation and so Parrott (2004) concedes that these evaluations have to be made rapidly for an emotion-inducing effect to occur: "Many times, however, it seems that appraisals, if they indeed play a role in producing emotions, must be very quick, outside conscious awareness, and independent of our rational faculties" (Parrott 2004: 12).

Taking appraisal theory into consideration, scholars who have studied the impact of emotional expressions on person perception have suggested the notion of "reverse appraisal" (e.g., Hareli & Hess 2012) or "reverse engineering" (e.g., Hareli & Hess 2019). Reverse appraisal has been described as cognitive processes and appraisals that are derived by "inferring information about another's mental state from his or her appearance or behavior" (Gratch & Marcella 2014: 9). Reverse appraisal theory builds on appraisal theory as underlying fundamental processes that have resulted in the emotion expressions of the emoter, while the observers infer which information might have caused the emotion expression. Hence, reverse appraisal theory aims at identifying the emoter's "beliefs, desires, and intentions" (Gratch & Marcella 2014: 9). Due to these "appraisal attributions" (Gratch & de Melo 2019), the definition of reverse appraisal theory is connected to attribution theory, which is therefore, mentioned at this stage.

Attribution theory was first developed by Heider (1958), who proposed that ordinary citizens act as "naïve scientists" by trying to understand the behavior of others and searching for causal explanations for their behavior (Heider 1958; Fiske & Taylor 2017: 164–165). Kelley (1973) and Weiner (1972; 1985; 1986) have subsequently further shaped the development of attribution theory with their contributions (Fiske & Taylor 2017: 167–171). Following Weiner (1972), attribution theory aims to identify the un-

derlying causes of behavior: “Attribution theorists investigate the perception of causality, or the judgment of why a particular incident occurred. The allocation of responsibility manifestly guides subsequent behavior” (Weiner 1972: 203). Attribution theory has emerged in psychology and since then has also been applied in social and political psychology to describe “how ordinary people make sense of and explain social events” (Yoon 2015: 41). In the field of political science – especially electoral behavior, the attribution of responsibility has been described as being central for determining public support and vote choices (Yoon 2015: 43), while the focus of political scientists has been on accountability as a cause for sociotropic voting (Yoon 2015: 43) and pocketbook voting (Tilley et al. 2018). Thus, the notion of responsibility or accountability of politicians has often been linked to the rational choice paradigm instead of attribution theory – with a few exceptions (e.g., Wagner 2014).

One important aspect in attribution theory is personal agency. The attribution of personal agency plays an important role in the evaluation of the self as a motivational factor (Weiner 1972) and in the person perception of others (e.g., Haider-Markel & Joslyn 2008; Harell et al. 2017), whereby internal and external attributions are distinguishable. Internal attributions indicate a high personal agency, in which the outcome of a social event or an individual achievement can be attributed to the agents' capabilities, intelligence, or effort (Weiner 1972: 204). In contrast to internal attributions, external attributions indicate the social situation itself as a crucial causal element for the outcome or individual achievement. Weiner developed attribution theory further by integrating the notion of stability and controllability (Weiner 1985; 1986). According to Weiner's studies on educational achievement, achievement can be linked to individual effort and ability – factors that are of internal control but differ in regard to their level of stability (Weiner 1985: 551). In addition, external factors are often less likely to be controllable and can be stable or unstable; for example, in educational research, these external factors could include task difficulty, chance, or luck (Weiner 1972: 207). Personal success might be attributed to the individual skills of students, while their failings might have been under their control or could be alternatively explained by societal disadvantages. Hence, the control of an agent over the situation is important for the evaluation of a performance. This also holds true for the field of politics and political ideologies (Haider-Markel & Joslyn 2008: 294–295). Attitudes towards the distribution of social benefits can be the result of underlying beliefs about agency and controllability. People who believe that everyone is in control of their own financial and social situation are less likely to sup-

port social policies, while those who believe poverty and homelessness can be caused by external factors are more likely to support them (Haider-Markel & Joslyn 2008: 294). The theory of attribution has also been applied to cultural aspects of liberalism and conservatism such as attitudes towards marriage equality (Haider-Markel & Joslyn 2008) and anti-immigration policies (Harell et al. 2017).

Weiner has further found that high achievers tend to approach tasks, while low achievers tend to avoid them (Weiner 1972). This notion is important for person perception, since those who approach problems or express approach emotions are likely to be seen as being more capable and competent due to their status as high achievers (Hess 2014: 63), while those who avoid conflicts, problematic topics, and choose emotions of avoidance could be seen as being less capable and competent.

Finally, several contributions within the social psychological literature have noted that the attribution process does not necessarily derive the true cause for any outcome or social situation, since individuals are not free from causal bias (Weiner 1972: 206). This causal bias has also been described as misattribution (Fiske & Taylor 2017: 172–173). Such attributions could be the result of effortful thinking or be made as snap judgements.

When describing potential underlying cognitive responses to emotional expressions, the processing of such information needs to be considered. A vast amount of studies within political psychology has built on individual processing of information, most noticeably the theory of affective intelligence (e.g., Marcus et al. 2000; MacKuen et al. 2007). This theory builds on dual-process theories, whereby individuals apply one of two cognitive strategies in order to process information (Tversky & Kahneman 1974; Kahneman 2011). Kahneman divides cognitive thinking into two underlying systems which determine how information is processed – “system 1” and “system 2” (Kahneman 2011). These two systems have various names within the literature while referring to the same concept of two different thought processes. System 1 is also called automatic or heuristic processing as well as disposition system, whereas system 2 can also be described as systematic processing or surveillance system (Kahneman 2011; Marcus et al. 2000). As indicated by their names, system 1 is the initial system that is most often applied in everyday life, especially in routine behavior, which does not require a great deal of cognitive effort. Decisions are made quickly and automatically within system 1. For example, heuristics and information shortcuts are used to derive judgements. In contrast to system 1, system 2 requires a larger amount of cognitive effort. It involves the systemat-

ic processing of information and can also work as a surveillance system for the automatic processes. The theory of affective intelligence claims that certain emotions such as anxiety are particularly well-suited to activate system 2 thinking, i.e., a more thoughtful and systematic consideration (Marcus et al. 2000: 63). Therefore, several framing experiments have aimed at inducing anxiety to study participants' attention and information searches (e.g., Brader 2005), whereby thorough cognitive processes within the realm of system 2 processing have been expected after inducing anxiety. The results of these studies suggest a link between anxiety and an increase in attention and information seeking (Brader 2005; Brader 2006; Redlawsk et al. 2007; Valentino et al. 2008). According to the theory of affective intelligence and other dual-mode theories, intensive cognitive processes can also be the result of unexpected or irritating situations, as it has been pointed out by Redlawsk and Pierce (2017):

“On the other hand, when novel and unexpected/uncertain situations arise, the surveillance system recognizes the mismatch between expectations and reality, and takes over, inhibiting system 1 processing, and drawing attention to the anxiety-causing stimuli (say, something your party's candidate said that is opposite your preferences.) This turns processing to system 2: where more analytic processes take over, including increased information search.” (Redlawsk & Pierce 2017: 413)

Such an increase of deliberation due to unexpected affective responses has also been discussed in light of the expectancy violation theory (Johnston et al. 2015: 488). Affective responses have been further discussed with regard to political candidates and party identification. Johnston, Lavine, and Woodson (2015) have suggested that unexpected candidate evaluations can lead to more deliberate cognitive processing and can override the use of party cues:

“From this perspective, we might once again suggest that respondents who report positive evaluations of the out-party candidate or negative evaluations of the in-candidate actually experience anxiety as a result, and our problem is one of measurement rather than theory.” (Johnston et al. 2015: 489)

In the context of politicians' emotional expressions, it is important to consider how underlying mechanisms of emotional contagion and cognitive responses such as heuristics, appraisal theory, and attribution theory fit within the framework of information processing. The theory of affective intelligence suggests that emotional states influence how intensely cogni-

tive processes take place (Marcus et al. 2000). Emotional contagion is most likely to occur quickly and automatically (van Kleef 2016). Therefore, conscious cognitive effort is not necessary, and it is likely that emotional contagion occurs within the realm of automatic information processing or system 1 thinking. In the absence of anxiety and contradictory information, individuals are likely to apply automatic processes because they have no reason to worry, to be anxious or doubtful of the information. While it is now widely established that anxiety can activate the surveillance system, the potential impact of anger on cognitive processes has gained less attention – empirically and theoretically (Ryan 2012: 1140). Recent advances in the theory of affective intelligence have linked anger to automatic information processing (Marcus et al. 2019). While some have suggested that anger prevents information seeking behavior (Valentino et al. 2008), a few studies could show that anger can also trigger information searches (Huddy et al. 2007; Ryan 2012). However, despite the fact that both emotional states can potentially lead to heightened attention and information seeking, the question remains whether these emotional states are linked to balanced information searches. Thus far, several studies have indicated that the impact of these emotional states depends on contextual factors and can result in biased and unbalanced information seeking (Ladd & Lenz 2011; Redlawsk et al. 2007: 174, Ryan 2012: 1149; Valentino et al. 2009).

Affective responses can therefore influence citizens' evaluations of politicians without activating deliberate cognitive processes (e.g., Lodge & Taber 2013: 35–42). Similarly, even cognitive information processing can occur pre-consciously, for example as “hot cognition” (Lodge & Taber 2013: 43–45). Therefore, cognitive responses to emotional expressions can occur within system 1 or system 2 processing, since even cognitive responses and appraisals can be made rapidly and unconsciously.

Previous research on candidate appraisal has largely been built on the use of candidate images as heuristics and information shortcuts by voters (Lau & Redlawsk 2001; Popkin 1995; Sullivan et al. 1990) – without the need for deep thinking, therefore placing these cognitive responses within the context of system 1 and automatic cognitive processing. This approach has also been applied to the effect of emotional expressions, whereby the emotional expressions are used as social cues to make snap judgments (Bucy 2011; Hareli & Hess 2012; Hochschild 2012). The use of heuristics and information shortcuts is particularly proposed as underlying mechanisms when non-verbal displays of candidates are concerned (Bucy & Grabe 2008). As heuristics, these judgments do not require a large amount of effortful thinking.

Although voters use their cognitive capabilities, the cognitive effort is only minimal and therefore fast and falls within system 1. Assuming that the underlying cognitive responses to emotional expressions are built on appraisal or rather reverse appraisal theory and/or attribution theory, it is highly debated how much cognitive effort is needed for these theories to work. Scholars of appraisal theory and those who have put forward the idea of reverse appraisal theory have emphasized that these judgments might be made quickly, unless the appraisal is made within a novel situation (Ellsworth 2013: 129). If situations are familiar, however, it is likely that appraisal processes are made rapidly (Ellsworth 2013: 129). Reverse appraisal could occur when common patterns of behavior can be identified to evaluate a situation. For attribution theory to take place, it is possible that more thoughtful processes are needed. Hence, depending on the underlying cognitive and affective responses, candidate evaluations could be made quickly or formed after more thorough thought processes.

According to some information processing theories, voters keep “running online tallies” as summary evaluations of politicians (Lodge & Taber 2013: 52). These judgments are formed spontaneously and updated with each appearance of the political candidate. The original situation that led to the evaluations is thereby not stored in memory, only an affective tag is added to the politician in question (e.g., Lodge & Taber 2013). In addition, competence judgments are highly context-sensitive (Laustsen & Petersen 2017). When processing and evaluating media appearances of politicians including their emotional displays, voters use these underlying cognitive processes and update the running online-tally, the summary evaluation that is later used as an information shortcut to cast the vote (e.g., Lodge & Taber 2013). Affective and cognitive responses can be at work simultaneously, interacting with each other and building the underlying mechanisms of candidate evaluations.

2.2.4 Social-Contextual Factors

The social and cultural context has to be considered when emotional expressions are studied (Barrett et al. 2011; Parkinson et al. 2005; van Kleef 2016). This includes the status of the emoter, the dispositions of observers, and situational context of emotional expressions (Barrett et al. 2011).

Previous research has found that display rules of emotions exist within any given culture and determine whether and what kind of emotions should be expressed (Ekman & Friesen 1975). These display rules deter-

mine the time and place in which emotion expressions are appropriate for emoters, particularly if emotions are expressed publicly. The appropriateness of emotional expressions has also been studied by sociologists with the notion of “feeling rules” (Hochschild 2012) and has been investigated in the context of politics (Bucy & Bradley 2004; Bucy & Newhagen 1999).

Political communication scholars have analyzed in which context emotional displays by televised political leaders are assessed as being appropriate by viewers (Bucy & Bradley 2004; Bucy & Newhagen 1999; Grabe & Bucy 2009). Experimental studies have shown that negative and less intense emotional displays are more likely to be judged as being appropriate, while positive or intense emotions are more likely to be evaluated as being inappropriate emotional displays for political leaders (Bucy & Newhagen 1999: 76). From these findings, it can be inferred that negative-active emotions such as anger and indignation are potentially more likely to be seen as inappropriate or at least in need of further contextual information. It can be assumed that expressed anger only results in a positive evaluation if it is seen as appropriate, i.e., reasonable and meaningful.

A sociological perspective on emotion expressions was introduced by Arlie Hochschild (2012), who established the concept of *emotional labor* that corresponds with certain feeling rules. Hochschild based her work on Erving Goffman’s “theory of dramaturgy” that he laid down in “The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life” (Goffman 1959).

In his work, Goffman uses theatrical metaphors such as performing and acting on a front stage to illustrate how ordinary citizens are aware of their appearance, manner, and lastly the impressions they make on others during social interactions. He believed that individuals aimed at presenting the best version of themselves to others in any social interaction. Such performances also require practice or preparation in private moments, much like an actor needs to practice his performances. Hochschild then transfers the idea of impression management to the expression of emotions, by which individuals seek advantages in their social lives (Hochschild 2012: 62). In her contribution, she focuses on emotional labor as a term that describes the amount of work employees, typically in the service industry, have to bring up in order to regulate their emotions as part of their job requirement (Hochschild 2012: 57). She notes, however, that emotional labor is part of almost any job (Hochschild 2012: 11); thus, emotional labor is likely to be part of a politicians’ job when making public appearances, especially at party conventions and campaigning events. The amount of emotional labor that has to be put into any performance depends on a set of feeling rules. Similar to the idea of Ekman’s display rules, Hochschild

coins the term feeling rules, which “guide emotion work by establishing the sense of entitlement or obligation that governs emotional exchanges” (Hochschild 2012: 56). Although Hochschild mainly frames feeling rules as a part of economical exchanges, feeling rules also exist within private lives (Hochschild 2012: 56). Feeling rules can also be seen as established emotional conventions (Hochschild 2012: 57), whereby citizens can hardly describe these conventions but can easily spot violations of such rules by inappropriate emotional expressions that do not coincide with the expected behavior of the emoter (Hochschild 2012: 58–59).

Previous studies researching the nonverbal communication of politicians – and more particularly the effect emotional expression (especially facial expressions) of political leaders have on viewers – have built on evolutionary theories and ethological arguments (e.g., Bucy & Grabe 2008; Masters et al: 1986; Stewart & Ford Dowe 2013; Stewart et al. 2009b; Sullivan 1996; Sullivan & Masters 1988).

Since the early studies that focused on political leaders' emotional expressions (Masters et al: 1986), social psychological as well as ethological arguments have laid the theoretical foundations for this field of research. Because social psychological theories regarding politicians' emotional expressions have been previously elaborated on, this section deals with ethological arguments that can aid in explaining the impact that emotional expressions might have on viewers. Ethological arguments partially determine which emotional expressions are seen as appropriate for incumbents and challengers by the general public. This ethological notion of appropriateness is grounded in societal conventions and expectations that have evolved to establish order in social groups and communities. In the early stages of biopolitics, a field combining biology and politics (see Peterson & Somit 2017),⁷ researchers studied primate behavior to gain a better understanding of human politics, particularly with a focus on the nonverbal communication of politicians and political leaders (Schubert & Masters 1991). By studying nonhuman social behavior, hierarchies within communities become transparent. These hierarchies in turn then determine which emotional displays are appropriate – in the sense that they are suitable expressions for those who lead the social group, aim to remain in power, or

7 Throughout this book, biopolitics is used to refer to the intersection between the life sciences and politics. The term “biopolitics” is also used by post-structuralists who focus on Foucault's concept of biopolitics, a term to describe the ways in which the state governs the shape and health of the public body, i.e., its citizens (Liesen & Walsh 2012).

for those who strive to gain higher social standing and even lead the group themselves.

These studies focus on the social status within a social group when expressing emotions. According to the *biopolitical* framework, political leaders are best advised to display emotional expressions of happiness/reassurance – especially political leaders who are incumbents wishing to remain in power. Politicians from the opposition wishing to induce a shift in public support in favor of the opposition can attack the incumbents and show expressions of anger and indignation by criticizing the status quo. Lastly, passive emotional expressions such as displays of sadness and fear are rarely beneficial to leaders who are either in power or pursuing office (Sullivan et al. 1991; Stewart et al. 2009b: 51). This ethological framework can also have been setting emotional conventions and defining what kind of emotional expressions citizens expect from politicians. Those emotions that are expected are also seen to be appropriate, while violations of these conventions will be most noticeable to viewers – for example, politicians who cry publicly⁸ (see also Brooks 2011; Knutson 1996; Tiedens 2001). Crying has been shown to decrease the overall evaluations of male and female politicians alike, while it can have slight positive effects on their empathy ratings (Brooks 2011: 609).

From an evolutionary perspective, emotional expressions can be studied regarding their “functional significance for social behavior” (Masters 1991: 166). This view was first made popular by Darwin (Darwin 1965) and since then has resulted in a vast amount of social psychological literature that focuses on the social function of emotion expressions (e.g., Fischer & Manstead 2008; Fischer & Roseman 2007; Fischer & van Kleef 2010; Parkinson et al. 2005). Based on an evolutionary perspective, nonverbal cues can be derived from sensory information such as taste, touch, smell, sound, and sight, whereby sound and sight are most important for social cues within social groups (Masters 1991: 166). Facial expression, move-

8 One example is a public appearance by Peer Steinbrück, who cried during a public event in the election campaign in 2013, while he was running for office for the Social Democrats. His emotional expressions were picked up by German newspapers. *Die Zeit* wrote “Steinbrück moved to tears” [Steinbrück zu Tränen gerührt] and *Spiegel Online* used the headline “Steinbrück’s emotional outburst – tears don’t lie” [Steinbrücks Gefühlsausbruch. Tränen lügen nicht], see: <http://www.zeit.de/politik/deutschland/2013-06/steinbrueck-traenen-frau-spd-konvent> (last accessed: 06 May 2020) and <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/steinbruecks-emotionen-wenn-harte-hunde-weinen-a-906155.html> (last accessed: 06 May 2020).

ments, of political leaders can be assessed as carrying social meaning to other group members (Sullivan et al. 1991; Stewart et al. 2009b: 50–51).

Within this framework, the nonverbal characteristics of politicians who express emotions are central for the interpretation by the observer. Previous research in communication studies has emphasized that the appropriateness of emotional expressions by politicians affects how citizens judge politicians by applying an *emotional appropriateness heuristic* (Bucy & Newhagen 1999; Bucy 2000). The evaluation of politicians therefore depends heavily on whether emotions are assessed as appropriate, which is heavily affected by the situation and communicative context (Bucy 2000: 215). If emotional expressions were seen to be appropriate, they resulted in more favorable evaluations of politicians, while emotional expressions that were seen as inappropriate resulted in less favorable evaluations (Bucy 2000: 215).

According to ethological assumptions, group members evaluate the nonverbal and verbal communications of political leaders from their status as incumbents or challengers (Schubert & Masters 1991). Voters can hold different expectations towards politicians depending on their position within the political system. It is also not far-fetched to assume that communicative behaviors of politicians are evaluated in comparison to each other. Such comparative evaluations by voters have been previously highlighted as being an integral part of the electoral campaign seasons; this is particularly true for presidential systems:

“The political setting of presidential campaigns creates what is fundamentally a choice problem. Thus, the process of impression formation is, from the beginning, a task that must result in a choice between two individuals. This setting means that candidates will be comparatively assessed on the key dimensions of competence and personal qualities.” (Rahn et al. 1990: 155)

For the U.S. presidential election in 1984, the comparative choice problem of two main candidates is exemplified further: “Therefore, the question is not simply whether Mondale was perceived to be competent or not, but whether he was seen to be more or less competent than Reagan” (Rahn et al. 1990: 141). While the importance of candidate evaluations in presidential elections seems apparent, the comparative evaluation of candidates has also been shown in multi-party systems.

By looking at the physical attractiveness of political candidates in the North-Rhine Westphalia state election in 2005, it could be shown that comparative assessments influence the electoral success of candidates with-

in the constituencies. Attractive candidates have a relative advantage when competing against less attractive candidates within the same constituency, especially the more extreme the attractiveness of competing candidates varies (Rosar et al. 2008: 76).

In addition, it has been noted that the disposition of the emoter as well as the observer are important for processes of emotional contagion (Elfenbein 2014; Hatfield et al. 1994). Next to such politicians' characteristics as their status, political party affiliations, gender, and ethnicity, observers' individual predispositions are crucial for their assessment of emotional expressions and evaluations of the emoter.

Linked to the emoter's characteristics, studies have found that observers with similar characteristics regarding age, gender, and ethnicity evaluate those people more positively who are more similar to them (Bailenson et al. 2008; McDermott 1998). Hence, it seems worthwhile to consider factors that indicate a homophilic relationship between emoters and observers, i.e., politicians and citizens.

Furthermore, the dispositions of the observers have to be taken into consideration. Research into party identification has suggested that identifying with a political party provides a crucial basis for the stereotypical evaluation of others, whereby persons belonging to the same party are evaluated significantly higher than those who belong to another party, similarly to a different social group or social identity (e.g., Green et al. 2004; Mayer 2016; Ohr & Quandt 2012). Following this approach, strong party attachments are seen as being part of an individual's social identity. Hence, in-group favoritism could occur for party members, comparable to the effects of sociodemographic characteristics. In addition to party identifications, political ideology could have a significant effect on the evaluation of politicians' emotion expressions. This might be particularly true in a multiparty system in which party identification has declined over the last decades (Dalton 2014; Dalton & Bürklin 2003) and voters could sympathize with several parties belonging to one block of parties that represents similar ideological views along the dimensions of cultural and social as well as socioeconomic liberalism.

Moreover, a range of individual personal characteristics could have an impact on the evaluation of politicians' disposition of observers. Previous research has discussed individual personality traits and moods as being potential factors that could shape individual evaluations of political candidates (e.g., Lodge & Taber 2013). While someone's mood is a temporary state that could potentially affect the reaction towards any form of emo-

tional expression (Forgas & Bower 1987), individual trait characteristics could affect how emotional expressions of politicians are assessed.

Previous studies have also focused on the impact of personality traits in order to explain political attitudes (Ulbig & Funk 1999; Peterson & Maiden 1993; Bakker & de Vreese 2016), political participation and voter turnout (e.g., Gerber et al. 2011; Schoen & Schumann 2007; Schoen & Steinbrecher 2013), as well as the vote choice of populist parties (e.g., Bakker et al. 2016a) or vote switching (Bakker et al. 2016b). Personality traits have also been linked to political ideologies, particularly liberalism and conservatism (e.g., Hibbing et al. 2013; Carney et al. 2008; Jost 2017). Furthermore, differences between liberals and conservatives have been linked to varying cognitive styles (Jost et al. 2003) as well as to different affective and physiological responses (Smith et al. 2011); for example, conservative ideological beliefs have been linked to stronger physiological responses and feelings of disgust induced by disgusting images compared to those who hold more liberal beliefs (Smith et al. 2011). Hence, political ideology has been studied as result of underlying individual cognitive and affective processes and personality traits, especially along the dimensions of the Big Five (openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism).

2.3 Candidate Evaluations Based on Politicians' Anger Expressions

This section provides a detailed account of the existing literature regarding the impact politicians' anger expressions might have on viewers and also discusses potential effects in light of the previously described underlying mechanisms.

2.3.1 Anger and Affective Responses

Experimental studies that use physiological measures might be most suited to detect mechanisms of emotional contagion. Early research into the effects of politician's emotional expressions used such physiological measurements. The Dartmouth group has identified some evidence for affective responses in participants due to televised images of political leaders and trailing candidates, mainly for Ronald Reagan and opponents (e.g., McHugo et al. 1985; McHugo et al. 1991; Sullivan & Masters 1988). By focusing on psychophysiological measures such as participants' skin resis-

tance levels, heart rates, and facial muscular activity (corrugator and zygomatic muscle activities of frowning and smiling), researchers could find that Reagan's displays of anger/threat led to less relaxed skin resistance levels compared to Reagan's displays of happiness/reassurance (McHugo et al. 1985: 1521). Participants were also more likely to react with tenser corrugator muscles, i.e., frowning, to images of his displays of anger/threat (McHugo et al. 1985: 1521). Without sound, no increase in heart rate activity could be monitored, while the image-plus-sound condition of anger/threat displays led to higher heart rate activity across all groups (McHugo et al. 1985: 1525). Furthermore, participants reported higher levels of confusion without sound after seeing images of Reagan's anger/threat displays, which researchers attributed to an ambiguity without sound (McHugo et al. 1985: 1519). Overall, they found rather negative emotional responses for participants who did not support Reagan (McHugo et al. 1985: 1521). In contrast to non-supporters, they observed positive reactions in Reagan supporters to his anger/threat displays: "Reagan's supporters reported substantially different emotional reactions. They responded empathically to happiness/reassurance and anger/threat displays, and they had a mixed reaction to the fear/evasion displays" (McHugo et al. 1985: 1521). Thus, indicating that the observer's attitudes towards politicians and political leaders can moderate the response to their anger expressions. Likewise, drawing on ANES data, Finn and Glaser (2010) found marginally significant effects of anger on the voting behavior, whereby participants were slightly less likely to vote for Obama if they felt anger towards him (Finn & Glaser 2010: 270). However, these effects were only significant at a 10-percent level and could not be found for the opposing candidate McCain.

Although emotional contagion has been reported to be stronger for negative emotions than for positive emotions, emotional responses towards anger expressions have been incoherent across studies (Miron-Spektor & Rafaeli 2009: 155–156). In contrast to the notion of "smiling is contagious" for positive emotion expressions, anger expressions have evoked varying emotional responses. Emotional contagion of anger can occur when emoters express their anger about a target to friends or family members who offer an empathetic response, which could then result in a shared anger towards the same target (Miron-Spektor & Rafaeli 2009: 158–159). Such an empathetic response and emotional contagion could also occur for party supporters, when party leaders express anger about a common political opponent and their ideological conceptions. However, psychological studies have found varying responses towards anger expressions (Miron-Spektor & Rafaeli 2009: 156).

Instead of emotional contagion, expressions of anger can potentially trigger complementary emotional reactions, which are also evoked automatically (van Kleef 2016: 38; Moody et al. 2007). According to van Kleef (2016), fear is the complementary response to anger, whereby expressions of anger can involuntarily evoke fear (van Kleef 2016: 42, 45). Empirical evidence of the complementary effect of emotional expressions comes from research on business and management studies in workplace settings. Experimental studies in negation research have shown that anger expressions evoked more cooperative behavior compared to friendlier expressions; however, threats were even more efficient in evoking cooperation (Sinaceur et al. 2011: 1029). Hence, Sinaceur et al. (2011) concluded that a component of threat in anger expressions could shape participants' cooperative behavior in negotiation settings (Sinaceur et al. 2011: 1029). Whereas this complementary reaction is highly plausible in those social interactions, it might less directly translate to the field of politics and political leaders' emotional expressions and their effect on viewers.

If political leaders express anger in certain contextual settings, citizens could potentially experience fear as a direct reaction. At least two contextual settings could evoke such a response in democratic societies by resembling expressions of anger that are closely linked to the madness initially described by Seneca (Seneca LCL214: 116–117): First, if a hot-headed political leader expresses an unreasonable anger that threatens the stability of a country. Particularly in presidential systems, the president as head of the military could decide to order preemptive strikes if a threat is perceived; which in turn could result in instability, violence, and war. Second, a politician of the opposition with a fiery temper who threatens the democratic principles of society and/or the human rights of certain minorities within the society could evoke fear among citizens who value the democratic order of society, human rights, and freedom. For this complementary reaction to take place, cognitive responses to anger expressions might be necessary. If anger expressions contain rage and are interpreted as signs of madness (Seneca LCL214: 116–117) or mental instability by observers, the political leader could be seen as unbalanced, unpredictable, or unhinged, resulting in an evaluation of being unfit for office. Bucy and Grabe (2008: 81) exemplify such an evaluation by the downfall of presidential candidate Howard Dean in 2004. During the Democratic National Convention 2004, he uttered a scream that led to the widely unfavorable perception of him as being “unpresidential”, which cost him his nomination as Democratic candidate (Bucy & Grabe 2008: 81). For this effect to occur, the affective responses to anger expressions might interact with cognitive responses. The

example of presidential candidate Howard Dean's scream during the Democratic National Convention 2004 could have induced appraisals that led to the evaluation of being unhinged or "unpresidential". This further highlights the varying forms of anger, in which anger that is related to madness and rage could lead to negative evaluations, while a more "controlled" anger is less likely to evoke such evaluations. If political candidates show madness, they might be less likely to get elected. A raging president might be feared, as well as the anger displays of political candidates who pose a threat to the democratic order of society. Hence, in this context it is important to mention that the focus of this study lies on anger expressions that do not threaten the democratic principles of society. Otherwise, anger expressions could elicit strong opposing reactions from citizens due to their verbal content and political ideas.

Similarly to complementary emotional reactions, a noticeable amount of literature within political science and political communication research has discussed counter-empathetic findings or backlash effects for behavior that is associated with negativity and negative campaigning (e.g., Mattes & Redlawsk 2015; Lau et al. 2007; Fridkin & Kenney 2011), incivility (Mutz 2015), and disrespectful behavior (Mölders et al. 2017). These backlash effects might be related to general human tendencies of avoiding the experience of negative feelings and negative emotions (Carver 2006; Carver et al. 2000). The expression of specific negative emotions such as anger can elicit avoidance behavior (Carver et al. 2000), whereas facial expressions of fear have been shown to potentially elicit approach behavior in others (Marsh et al. 2005). However, backlashes are potentially highly context-dependent and neutral expressions are not necessarily more beneficial for the evaluation of political leaders. Stewart, Waller, and Schubert (2009a) could show that the removal of micro-expressions during a speech can lead to stronger negative emotional reactions by viewers. By removing micro-expressions of anger and happiness from a speech by former U.S. President George H. W. Bush, participants felt even more angry and threatened compared to those who saw the original speech (Stewart et al. 2009a: 129). The video clips were taken from a speech that was broadcast in regard to the commitment of US troops to the First Gulf War in 1990 (Stewart et al. 2009a: 126). Hence, these results further support the idea that political leaders are expected to signal dominant nonverbal cues in certain situations, including dominant emotional expressions, such as happiness and anger (Stewart et al. 2009b).

2.3.2 Anger and Cognitive Responses

Only a few studies in political science and political psychology have focused on the specific impact of anger expressions on the evaluation of political candidates. Recently, scholars have proposed differentiating between distinct forms of negative emotions such as anger and contempt (Mattes et al. 2017; Redlawsk et al. 2016; Redlawsk et al. 2018) and have focused specifically on the role contempt plays in the evaluation of political candidates – most prominently Donald Trump's expressions of contempt at the Iowa Caucus in 2016 (Redlawsk et al. 2018).

Following reverse appraisal theory, viewers could also sympathize with the emoter and experience anger towards the initial target or cause of anger expression (Hess 2014: 58–61). By doing so, appraisal processes could influence and interact with affective responses (Redlawsk & Pierce 2017: 411). Feelings of anger have been studied as underlying factors for vote choices and party support in regard to perceived government responsibilities in causing and handling the recent financial crisis (Wagner 2014). A panel survey conducted in the UK has shown that those who express feelings of anger due to the financial crisis can blame the national government for the crisis, which can in turn lower the likelihood of support for the government in an election (Wagner 2014: 698–700). In addition, anger has been shown to affect attitudes, such as the support for membership in the European Union (Vasilopoulou & Wagner 2017). Survey participants who stated being angry with Great Britain's EU membership were more likely to favor leaving the EU in a survey that took place 14 months prior to the Brexit vote (Vasilopoulou & Wagner 2017). Similarly, anger regarding the economic situation has been found to increase the support for populist parties, such as Podemos in Spain (Rico et al. 2017).

Social psychological research on collective action has found a mobilizing effect of anger (van Zomeren et al. 2004; van Zomeren et al. 2008), particularly when anger can be seen as an affective response to perceived injustices against a social group within society (van Zomeren et al. 2008: 521). The mobilizing power of anger is explained by an underlying action tendency of anger:

“More specific to collective action, when group-based inequality or deprivation is perceived as unjust, group-based emotions like anger should motivate collective action because they invoke specific action tendencies to confront those responsible in order to redress their unfair deprivation.” (van Zomeren et al. 2008: 506)

Due to these action tendencies, anger has been previously described as an approach emotion (Frijda 1987; van Zomeren et al. 2008: 506). Besides research on collective action, anger has also been linked to political protest, protest parties and movements such as the Tea Party movement in the United States (Sparks 2015), and Pegida in Germany (Vorländer et al. 2018). Political activists often frame protests as a result of a perceived injustice and the intention to approach and lastly abolish these perceived injustices regardless of the underlying ideology. Hence, these protests are closely connected to the social function of anger expressions. In addition to some forms of political protest, further evidence suggests that anger can also have a mobilizing impact on a variety of participatory acts and campaigning (Valentino et al. 2011; Valentino & Neuner 2017) as well as the expression of partisanship as social identity during campaign seasons (Huddy et al. 2015). Anger has also been shown to moderate the support of policies that highlight social inequalities within the society – for example, induced anger has been shown to moderate the support of health care reforms depending on ideological and racial predispositions (Banks 2014).

Knutson's study on person perception (1996) builds on two experiments which differentiated the emotional content of facial expressions. Based on his findings, Knutson inferred that emotion expressions are used by observers as heuristics to make trait inferences about the emoter (Knutson 1996: 177). Most relevant to the study of anger expression, Knutson found that anger expressions led to inferences of high dominance and low affiliation: "subjects inferred high dominance and high affiliation from happy expressions, high dominance and low affiliations from angry and disgusted expressions, and low dominance from sad and fearful expressions" (Knutson 1996: 176). In terms of competence and warmth, this finding could suggest that anger expressions lead to higher inferences of competence in a professional setting and lower inferences of warmth for those who express anger. As noted by Knutson, these findings are also largely dependent on the given context and details of facial expressions, such as a gaze's direction, could lead to varying inferences (Knutson 1996: 177).

Similarly to Knutson's findings, Tiedens (2001) reported that expressions of anger have led to higher status evaluations than expressions of sadness. These effects occurred in four different studies, two of which focused on workplace scenarios: one correlation study found a positive association between the co-workers' degrees of competence and their perceived anger; one experiment by Tiedens also focused on a hypothetical job interview, whereby angry candidates were assessed as being more qualified than sad applicants (Tiedens 2001: 92). The other two experiments focused on the

field of politics. One experiment showed participants U.S. President Clinton's expressions of anger and sadness regarding the Monica Lewinsky scandal. Tiedens established that participants viewed Clinton more favorably after seeing his expressions of anger than those who saw his sadness (Tiedens 2001: 88). Tiedens also acknowledged that this effect might be due to the verbal content of the video clips, which differed slightly due to the real-world nature of the material (Tiedens 2001: 89). These varying emotional reactions by Clinton towards the accusations can also be assessed in terms of appropriateness, in which his anger expressions alongside his denial might have been the more appropriate response culturally (Bucy 2011: 199). Since the underlying causal effect remains unclear, Tiedens (2001) replicated the initial experiment with anger and sadness expressions by an unknown politician. Thereby she showed that participants were more likely to vote for the candidate if they saw his expressions of anger compared to his expressions of sadness; they also rated him as more likely being a good politician based on his anger expressions, and evaluated him as being more competent when seeing his expressions of anger compared to his sadness (Tiedens 2001: 90). However, participants also perceived him as less likeable when they saw his anger (Tiedens 2001: 90). She also found that the positive effects of his anger expression on his *status conferral* were fully mediated by the perceived competence (Tiedens 2001: 90). Hence, this finding suggests that politicians' anger expressions have a positive effect on their competence ratings, while anger expressions can have a negative effect on their evaluation of likeability and warmth.

Hareli, Shomrat, and Hess (2009) found that expressions of anger, happiness, and neutral displays led to higher evaluations of dominance after participants saw pictures of actors with varying emotional expressions, while expressions of shame and guilt led to lower evaluations of dominance and higher evaluations of submissiveness. The authors link these findings of high dominance evaluations to the approach dimension of these emotions (Hareli et al. 2009: 383). In a vignette study, Hareli and Hess (2010) found that verbal expressions of anger can result in higher ratings of self-confidence, masculinity, and aggressiveness, while they simultaneously decrease the evaluations of warmth and gentleness (Hareli & Hess 2010: 137). In this study, participants received a fictitious scenario of a job candidate who responded to blame for an allegedly poor performance at his former workplace with verbal expressions of anger, sadness, or happiness. The fictitious applicant was then evaluated as being more self-confident, masculine, and aggressive by participants who received the manipulation in which the applicant reacted with anger (Hareli & Hess

2010: 137). In a replication study that additionally tested a vignette with neutral emotion responses, Hareli & Hess (2010) found that in comparison with neutral verbal responses, verbal expressions of anger led to lower ratings of self-confidence but also higher ratings of the job applicant's aggressiveness, masculinity, and even warmth (Hareli & Hess 2010: 134–136). Hareli and Hess interpret their findings as evidence for the theory of reverse appraisal, because the perception of the job applicant's emotional reactions in the situational setting determined the evaluation of the candidate (Hareli & Hess 2010: 139).

Glaser and Salovey (1998) have also pointed out the potential of positive evaluations as a result of anger expressions and the necessity to avoid displays of fear, as hypothesized by the ethological framework:

“A visibly angry candidate may be seen as passionate, strong, or both. A candidate who expresses sadness over a tragedy is more likely to be seen as caring and compassionate, but perhaps also weak, and one who shows fear is more certainly to be perceived as weak.” (Glaser & Salovey 1998: 168)

2.3.3 Anger and Social-Contextual Factors

Contextual factors can occur on three levels: the emoter, situational factors, and the characteristics of viewers (Barrett et al. 2011). In addition to these candidate characteristics, empirical evidence also exists showing that individual characteristics of the observers influence the evaluation of emotional expressions. Drawing upon biopolitical assumptions regarding the status of politicians and their emotional behavior, Bucy and Grabe (2008) could show that trailing candidates were more likely to display anger/threat than frontrunners (Bucy & Grabe 2008: 90). Likewise, Ridout and Searles (2011) reported additional empirical evidence that trailing candidates were more likely to use anger appeals than leading candidates during campaigns for 26 U.S. Senator positions in 2004 (Ridout & Searles 2011: 454). Hence, the position within the political system appears to have an impact on whether candidates choose to express emotions as a successful strategy. In the context of U.S. politics, party identification of supporters and non-supporters has been found to moderate the effect of anger/threat expressions in some instances, as previously mentioned (Bucy & Grabe 2008: 92; McHugo et al. 1985: 1521), while Tiedens found no effect for party identification in the support of Clinton staying in power (Tiedens 2001: 88).

The assessment of anger expressions has also been linked to the perceived appropriateness of the situation. If seen as appropriate, politicians' negative emotional expressions, could result in positive evaluations (Bucy 2000: 218). However, these effects were not necessarily dependent on an explicit evaluation of appropriateness, as significant main effects of negative displays on the evaluation of Clinton's honesty, trustworthiness, and credibility could be found (Bucy 2000: 212). Furthermore, taking the ethological framework into consideration, it can be expected that anger expressions are particularly suitable for politicians of the opposition, or for trailing candidates (Bucy & Grabe 2008). Expressions of anger and happiness by those politicians who are socially expected to challenge the incumbents and the status quo could be seen as appropriate emotional expression. These emotional expressions signify dominant instead of submissive behavior, which is crucial for those who aim to gain or maintain power (Stewart et al. 2009b: 52).

In regard to negative campaigning, previous research has hypothesized and found that some individuals are more sensitive towards negative messages and insults (Fridkin & Kenney 2011: 309, 322). However, no effect for individual levels of education on reaction towards negative campaigning was found (Fridkin & Kenney 2011: 315). Bradley et al. (1998) reported an attention bias for viewers regarding their reactions towards emotional facial expressions, whereby participants with high levels of anxiety paid more attention to threatening emotional facial expressions compared to those participants with low levels of anxiety (Bradley et al. 1998: 748–751). Hence, when studying negative emotional expressions such as anger, it seems beneficial to consider personality traits which reflect levels of anxiety and conflict avoidance tendencies. Expressions of anger could induce potential backlashes for observers holding those personality traits (Ulbig & Funk 1999).

Furthermore, effects of emotional contagion and cognitive reactions can be moderated by individual predispositions (Barrett et al. 2011). As previously mentioned, the expression of specific negative emotions such as anger can elicit avoidance behavior (Carver et al. 2000). The strength of individual avoidance and approach tendencies might also be linked to individual differences in personality structures such as personality traits of neuroticism and extraversion (Carver et al. 2000: 747–749; Carver 2006: 109).

Previous research in political science has considered individual differences in responses to expressions of negativity, negative campaigning and uncivil behavior, by proposing that reactions might be dependent on individual preferences of conflict avoidance. Mutz & Reeves (2005) have

shown that individuals with high levels of conflict avoidance react more strongly towards uncivil behavior, resulting in a stronger decline of trust in politicians and political institutions such as congress and government (Mutz & Reeves 2005: 6–7).

Studies have also shown that messages of negativity and conflict can also lead to withdrawal from political participation for certain voters depending on their personality dispositions regarding neuroticism and anxiety based on genetic dispositions (Settle et al. 2017), as well as for those with low trait aggression (Kalmoe 2019: 423). Kalmoe (2019) has found that aggressive metaphors can mobilize voters, whereby the mobilizing effect depends on the personal predisposition of the observers – more precisely their level of trait aggression. Voters with high trait aggression are more likely to be less-educated young male voters compared to well-educated elderly female voters (Kalmoe 2019: 423). Such individual differences could be strategically considered by politicians in their campaigning efforts and micro-targeting attempts (Kalmoe 2019: 424).

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

This section provides a review of crucial factors that determine how emotional expressions are perceived. The aim of this section is twofold. First, it gives an overview of important factors in relation to candidate evaluations and second, it states the hypotheses as a basis for judging effects that can be expected within the experimental study of emotional expressions by politicians.

Politicians' Political Status and the Evaluation of Anger Expressions

Taking ethological considerations into account, the first theoretical expectation concerns the status of politicians within the political system. Based on these assumptions, politicians of the opposition should be more likely to display anger because they gain the most from doing so. Their anger expressions could even lead to an increase in support and more favorable evaluations. In accordance with this first theoretical expectation and previous research (e.g., Bucy & Grabe 2008), the first hypothesis deals with the evaluation of anger expressions in relation to the social status of the politicians as emoters of anger expressions. Therefore, the first hypothesis is stated as follows:

H1(a-b): Displays of anger increase ratings for politicians of the opposition (a) and decrease ratings for politicians of the government (b).

Candidate Evaluations Along the Dimensions of Person Perceptions

As previous studies have shown, political candidates are evaluated at least along two dimensions of personality traits. One dimension can be described as warmth, including characteristics such as friendliness and compassion, and the other dimension can be described as competence, including leadership strength and the capability to solve political problems. Previous studies have shown that anger can have a positive impact on evaluations of dominance, since it signals an active approach of an issue or problem. Hence, it can be expected that the effects of anger expressions vary across the character traits under investigation. Evaluations of warmth might be affected negatively, while evaluations of competence could be affected positively by expressions of anger. Following this second expectation the hypothesis H2_(a-b) states that distinct characteristics are evaluated differently when the emoter expresses anger. Previous evidence suggests that character traits which indicate dominance might be affected positively by the experimental treatment (e.g., Hareli & Hess 2010; Hess 2014; Tiedens 2001). Due to the potential backlash effects of negative campaigning and negativity (e.g., Van't Riet et al. 2019), positive effects on politicians' warmth are not expected at this stage. These assumptions are further clarified in hypothesis H2_(a-b).

H2(a-b): Emotional expressions of anger have a positive impact on the evaluation of politicians' competence (a), while they have a negative impact on the evaluation of politicians' warmth (b).

Candidate Evaluations Based on the Target of Their Anger Expressions

Previous research has also shown that the evaluation of anger expressions is highly dependent on the given context (Barrett et al. 2011), particularly so in relation to the cause and target of the anger (Hess 2014). When anger expressions are deemed to serve a good cause, they could lead to more favorable evaluations, particularly leadership evaluations (Hess 2014; Glaser & Salovey 1998). Anger expressions that are disrespectful personal attacks on other politicians, on the other hand, might rather lead to negative evaluations (e.g., Mölders et al. 2017). The third expectation focuses on the underlying cause of anger that is responsible for the anger expressions. Due to the experimental design, the following hypothesis takes the varying nature of the corresponding messages into account. These assumptions can be tested with a comparison of the two case studies that focus on Gregor Gysi's moral anger and Sigmar Gabriel's incivility. Therefore, the follow-

ing hypothesis H3_(a-b) takes the cause of anger expressions into consideration, whereby a good cause is more likely to result in positive candidate evaluations; whereas expressions of anger in the context of personal attacks and incivility are less likely to result in favorable evaluations.

H3(a-b): If expressions of anger arise from a good cause, such as fighting injustices, anger expressions lead to more favorable evaluations (a). If the expressions of anger are rooted in incivility, expressions of anger lead to less favorable evaluations (b).

Candidate Evaluations and the Strength of Anger Expressions

The fourth expectation is built on the finding that negative emotions often have a stronger impact on those who experience them rather than other emotions (Baumeister et al. 2001). Positive emotions such as happiness have even been described as the norm, especially for political leaders (e.g., Bucy 2016). Hence, for the following empirical investigation, it can be expected that expressions of anger have a stronger impact on the evaluation of politicians compared to other common emotional expressions such as happiness. In line with previous research in psychology, hypothesis H4 then assumes that anger expressions have a stronger impact on observers than positive or neutral expressions. Therefore, the largest change in attitudes should be observed for the experimental groups which received anger expressions of politicians.

H4: Politicians' expressions of anger have a stronger effect on viewers than their positive expressions.

Candidate Evaluations and Moderating Effects of Individual Dispositions

The fifth theoretical expectation states that individual personal dispositions might affect how observers evaluate expressions of anger. Because individuals differ from each other, it is expected that expressions of anger are more appealing to some observers than to others. This can potentially be affected by a range of attributes. First and foremost, party identification should play a role in whether candidates are evaluated more favorably, whereby those observers who support the political party in question react more positively towards anger expressions by their candidate. Likewise, and particularly so for voters who do not have a strong party identification, political ideology should make a difference in the sense that those who are closer to the ideology of a political candidate, i.e., on the same side of the political spectrum, should react more positively towards his or her anger, since they are more likely to agree with his or her view. In addition to these factors, personal dispositions such as neuroticism and ex-

traversion could have an impact on how individuals respond to anger expressions, influencing their attitudes towards conflict and the experience of negative emotional expressions (see also Carver 2006: 107). Neurotic citizens could be more likely to respond negatively towards expressions of anger because they are more likely to avoid and disapprove of aggressive behavior. Likewise, citizens who are less extroverted could respond in a similar manner. Therefore, hypothesis H5_(a-b) and hypothesis H6 focus on individual characteristics of the observers. Hypothesis H5_(a-b) assumes moderating effects based on existing party identifications and hypothesis H6 specifies moderating effects of individual personality traits.

H5(a-b): If participants support a political party, they are more likely to respond favorably to anger expressions by their party leaders (a). If participants do not support the political party, they are less likely to respond favorably and more likely to respond negatively to anger expressions by party leaders (b).

H6: If participants score high on neuroticism, they respond on average more negatively to anger expressions.

Candidate Evaluations in Light of Automatic and Systematic Processing

According to the theory of affective intelligence, one expectation that can be made affects the amount of time observers need to make their judgment about the candidate, i.e., the candidate evaluation. If observers apply systematic processing strategies after being exposed to the emotional expressions of politicians, they might need more time to evaluate a candidate. If observers rely on heuristics, or if processes of emotional contagion are at play, their evaluations should be made quickly. If observers are irritated by their own affective reactions towards the emotional expression of the political candidate, they could take a longer time to make a judgment (Johnston et al. 2015). In addition to individual dispositions and characteristics, individual information processing of the emotional expressions might have an impact on the evaluation of the politicians. Assuming that the observers paid attention to the emotional expressions of politicians, two hypotheses are tested in the empirical analysis based on the sixth theoretical expectation. If heuristics are at work – or automatic processing such as unconscious inferences – the response time should not differ between experimental and control groups. Hence, the experimental groups showing anger should not show higher response times. If more systematic processing is at work, the response time should be higher for the experimental treatment group than for the control group without video. Since the direc-

tion of this theoretical expectation is rather more exploratory than confirmatory, hypothesis H7 is stated as testing a difference.

H7: If systematic information processing is at work, the response times should differ between the experimental and control groups and the experimental groups should show higher response times.

Hypothesis H8 is also based on cognitive processes, whereby a state of heightened arousal due to irritating information could result in more systematic information processing (Redlawsk & Pierce 2017: 419). Hence, hypothesis H8 states:

H8: If emotional expressions induce irritating affective responses for viewers, such as enthusiasm about candidates from the other end of the political spectrum, participants need on average longer to evaluate the respective politician.

These eight hypotheses build on the core theoretical framework of this study. Subsequently, four additional hypotheses are tested which are built on broader theoretical assumptions that are taken from previous studies on the personalization of politics. Since empirical evidence is lacking when it comes to the effects of politicians' emotional expressions, the following assumptions are derived from different strands of research. Therefore, the following assumptions are more exploratory in nature. Nonetheless, a hypothesis is stated for each assumption in order to guide the research process.

Candidate Evaluations and the Longevity of Candidate Impressions

When analyzing the effects of emotional expressions on viewers one question that follows is whether these effects are long-lasting. Drawing on literature on political scandals, there is some evidence that scandals might not have long-lasting effects on citizens, and that citizens are particularly forgiving if they had already formed a positive image of the politician (Mitchell 2014; McDermott et al. 2015). Furthermore, the subject matter of the scandal can alter whether the scandal lowers ratings of support, so that politicians' private matters are often less important for voters than performance-related scandals such as tax evasion or corruption (Funk 1996). However, when politicians campaign on issues with a high moral standpoint, scandals of infidelity can harm their approval ratings more than politicians who do not maintain an overly moral image (McDermott et al. 2015). This finding is explained by a perceived hypocrisy that leads to an inauthentic view of the politician (McDermott et al. 2015). It adds further

weight to the argument that the context is key for candidate evaluations; in this example, political issue ownership and authenticity are relevant when voters are confronted with new information about politicians.

One assumption regarding the longevity of emotional expressions on viewers is that these emotional expressions could shape leadership evaluations permanently if they relate to a significant event for viewers. Likewise, continuous exposure to similar emotional expressions could influence leadership ratings in the same manner. Many experimental studies focus only on immediate short-term effects, while neglecting possible long-term effects of candidate appearances. Only a few studies have investigated the longevity of televised campaign effects and the evaluation of political candidates (Gerber et al. 2011; Lodge et al. 1995). Previous experiments have focused on televised campaign effects and drawn divergent conclusions for the longevity of campaign effects. Lodge, Steenbergen and Brau (1995) have found that viewers were not able to recall specific campaign information about two putative congressional candidates from memory, especially if more than a week had passed since the exposure (Lodge et al. 1995: 315–316). They concluded, however, that overall assessments of candidates, could still be affected by the initial exposure. They explained this finding as supporting the concept of an online running tally that voters keep of political candidates, without the need to retain the initial facts (Lodge et al. 1995: 321).

By administering a large-scale field experiment as part of a gubernatorial election campaign by Rick Perry, governor of Texas in 2006, Gerber, Gimpel, Green, and Shaw (2011) analyzed the magnitude and longevity of campaign advertisements. Television advertisements were randomly administered and combined with a survey component to assess the favorability of both candidates and the vote intention. The researchers found strong short-term effects for the campaign advertisements that declined rapidly and did not last longer than a week (Gerber et al. 2011: 146–147). Due to the absence of any long-lasting effects, the authors interpreted these findings as indications of priming effects instead of further support for the model of online processing of candidate evaluations (Gerber et al. 2011: 148). Nonetheless, according to the authors, further research should be conducted to analyze the longevity of effects based on campaign advertisements, with a specific focus on the quality of campaign messages such as negative campaign advertisements or their emotional content (Gerber et al. 2011: 149).

Hence, it seems worthwhile to test the longevity of experimental effects for emotional expressions. Long-lasting effects could be expected for citi-

zens who were initially affected more strongly by being exposed to political leaders, while a certain amount of continuous decay could be expected after the initial exposure. The effects could also be longer-lasting if the emotional expressions were noteworthy or violated social norms.

Due to the experimental design, the longevity of the experimental treatments can be tested by analyzing the second post-test, which was administered one week after the initial exposure (for more details see Subchapter 4.3). Hence, hypothesis H9 postulates a more conservative assumption that the experimental effects will not be longer lasting, which is derived from previous research on campaign advertisements, whereby effects strongly decayed after one week (Lodge et al. 1995; Gerber et al. 2011).

H9: Expressions of anger have a short-term effect on the evaluation of politicians' personality traits.

Candidate Evaluations and Their Potential Spillover Effects

One more expectation can be derived from the personalization of politics. Research on the personalization of politics has shown that candidate evaluations can have a reciprocal impact on the evaluation of political parties (Hayes 2005; Garzia 2017; Garzia 2014; Garzia 2013a; Garzia 2013b). Hence, the evaluation of political parties could be affected by politicians' expressions of anger. In addition to spillover effects on political parties, the emotional expressions of politicians might also have a broader impact on the evaluation of politicians as a social group.

Hypothesis H10 addresses the relevance of the experimental effects with regard to the evaluation of political parties. Much like the evaluation of politicians as a social group, a spillover effect could occur, whereby the evaluation of political parties is affected by emotional expressions of their political leaders. This hypothesis tests a spillover effect that is adapted from findings on the personalization of politics (Hayes 2005; Garzia 2017; Garzia 2014; Garzia 2013a; Garzia 2013b) and has not been tested in regard to politicians' expressions of anger.

H10: If the emotional expression of a key figure within a political party (a party leader) results in more favorable or less favorable views of that politician, these effects can result in a more or less favorable evaluation of the respective political party.

In addition to these spillover effects of prominent politicians on political parties, the emotional expressions of several politicians could have an impact on the perceived stereotype of politicians. During the data collection, material was collected on politicians as a social group as well as specific po-

litical leaders, allowing a focus on politicians in general as well as political leaders. Since the previous hypotheses focus on political leaders, hypothesis H11 concentrates on the evaluation of politicians as a social group. Changes in the evaluation of politicians as a social group could be seen as spillover effects from candidate evaluations that are derived from each single politician whose anger expressions were included in the video clips. According to the nature of spillover effects, hypothesis H11 presumes that the effects on the evaluation of politicians as a social group are smaller compared to changes in the evaluation of individual political leaders. This hypothesis is based on the assumptions of the previous hypotheses, whereby several characteristics of a politician and his or her anger expressions can affect the impact of anger on viewers (see H1 – H6). Weaker effects can be expected if the contextual information, such as the position or party affiliation of a politician is missing, or varying strongly with each politician who is seen in the experimental treatment.

H11: The evaluation of individual political leaders is affected more strongly by their expressions of anger than the evaluation of politicians as a social group.

Candidate Evaluations and Contextual Information Surrounding Political Candidates

Because research on emotional expressions has found that the impact of emotional expressions is often context-specific (e.g., Barrett et al. 2011), a range of circumstantial factors could modify the impact of anger on viewers in addition to the political message. Previous research on candidate appearances has suggested that politicians are evaluated in relation to each other (Rahn et al. 1990). Empirical research on candidates' physical attractiveness has suggested that more physically attractive candidates have a relative advantage compared to less attractive adversaries in the same constituency (Rosar et al. 2008: 76). Likewise, it could be assumed that political candidates are also evaluated in comparison to each other when expressing emotions.

This theoretical expectation states that contextual factors influence the evaluation of politicians' emotional expressions – including the emotional expressions of others. An experiment that exposes participants to more than one political leader can test such contextual effects and so these previous empirical findings of candidate evaluations are particularly relevant for experiments in which participants were exposed to more than one political leader. Considering anchor heuristics in comparative evaluations (Tversky & Kahneman 1974: 1128), the expressions of the first politician might pro-

vide an anchor for the following inferences and evaluations of the second politician.

Similar ideas or concerns arise from survey research which has studied primacy and recency effects of items in survey questionnaires. Instead of survey items, these effects could also occur for video clips that show emotional expressions. Prior survey research has shown that the presentation of visual information in surveys has led to primacy effects in participants' response behavior (Krosnick & Alwin 1987: 202, 206). Moreover, potential biases due to contrast effects have been discussed when designing questionnaire items for list experiments (Kuklinski et al. 1997: 328). Such contrast effects can occur when one questionnaire item has an impact on the response of another item in close proximity, for example in list experiments and item batteries. Typically, one item affects the perception of a subsequent item. Likewise, these contrast effects might occur when several videos are administered. Therefore, hypothesis H12 focuses on such contrast effects, whereby the order in which the anger expressions of political leaders are presented could influence their assessments given that politicians are evaluated in comparison to each other.

H12: Emotional expressions of candidate appearances anchor any following emotional expressions of other candidates. Hence, subsequent candidate evaluations are impacted by prior displays of emotional expressions.