

Candidate Emotionality
Jack Glaser
Goldman School of Public Policy
University of California, Berkeley

Well, I think that this might mark a bit of a change in gears. For one thing, I'm going to be focusing more on the behavior of the targets of evaluation — the candidates themselves, although really still in the service of understanding how their behavior affects voters' opinions of and behavior towards them, so we're still in that same ballpark. I think a bigger shift is going to be that I'm not really going to present any original data. The one empirical study that I've done in this area I'll briefly describe, because it's relevant but it's not earth shattering, so I'll bring that up. I have reviewed this research on candidate emotionality, and on affect in politics fairly comprehensively, and I'll even describe to you a theoretical integrative model that Peter Salovey and I proposed a while back, that I think still actually has some value to it in this context.

So what I want to talk about first, and John actually already did quite a nice job of this, to talk about some of the research, more generally, on the role of affect, or emotion and mood and evaluation in electoral politics and how that influences voters' decisions and behaviors, but I want to shift pretty quickly from that to talk more specifically about my particular topic, which is candidate emotion itself. I'll talk about specific research that's been done today. There is not a lot of it, but there is some very compelling work. And then I'll relate some of that to the general theory of Ekman and Friesen's work on display rules and Matsumoto's refinement of that. That bears well on this topic.

And then I will resort to some heavy-handed anecdotal evidence — mostly in the form of pictures like this, recognizing that it's just that and it's only suggestive. But I think that when you're trying to predict presidential election outcomes, you have a small amount in terms of the number of outcomes, and sometimes these powerful historical examples can be telling in one way or another, but I wouldn't blame you for being highly skeptical of any suggestions that I make.

Then I'll move from there to suggest some key emotions that candidates may or may not express, or may express in different ways that could be particularly influential in voters' judgments of them, and then I'll be so presumptuous as to even suggest a few possible new items that could be included in the survey. The first one I'll suggest and then I'll debunk it very quickly, hopefully in the service of providing a good criterion for what would be good measures to include.

Oh, before that, (and that's the future items), but before that I actually kind of cheated and went to the ANES website —maybe that's not cheating, because we actually reward that — and then created some very, very descriptive graphs of unpartialled proportions of voter preferences and the like.

But just to give you a sense of what's already available through this universally available database, and all I got were the descriptives off of the website, but you can get the raw data fairly easily. If I had started the process more than a few days ago, I might have actually gone and done that. A few of the studies that I'm going to describe are also based on NES data from the days when it was just the NES.

So there's already been reference to the Abelson and Kinder, Peters and Fisk work, but with regard to the role of voter affect these guys I think used NES data, I know for sure that Granberg and Brown did but I think that both of these studies used NES data to demonstrate that voters' affective reactions to candidates were, in their estimation, more influential than their more cognitive assessments. Granberg and Brown qualified that to say that the influence of affect was less stable and less predictive of voting in the absence of relevant cognition, specific information about candidates. So I guess that one could conclude that the combination of affect and cognition could be particularly predictive of voter decisions and behaviors.

Campaigns implicitly know this. I don't think that they've read these articles, but the Goldwater campaign said in 1964, "In your heart you know he's right," so they were appealing to this affective reaction and trying to legitimize it. Similarly, the 2004 Bush campaign in some markets used this tagline, "Alone in the voting booth, why take the risk?" So it's sort of implicitly saying, "Whatever your rational decision-making process is telling you, when you're in the voting booth let your gut take over." As Stephen Colbert would say, "I looked it up in my gut." That was the expression.

There are a number of ways that affect can affect voter decision-making, and they're not inherently irrational. So there's this long held assumption that this is a bad thing, that people should be making highly rational decisions (*unintelligible*) emotion and cognition, but never the two shall meet. There is some compelling argumentation that affect can serve, for example, in George Marcus' conceptualization affect can serve, in particular, anxiety can serve to motivate people to vote, to change circumstances. Then in Schwartz and Clore's theory, affect can serve as information. So to the extent that we --and this is kind of like online processing-- to the extent that we have formed a summary evaluation in affective form based on the accumulation of maybe more cognitive information — we can draw on that, our affective orientation towards something, without having to go back in a memory based fashion to recreate our attitude.

Specifically then, moving on, the "affect-as-information" thesis is a more general theory, but specifically in and around the political decision-making, Victor Ottati and his colleagues, Bob Wyer and Linda Isbell have shown that that happens in political decision-making as well, although in those studies it seems a little more irrational because the affect is induced experimentally, and isn't specifically tied substantively to the candidates that are being judged, so it's more like a priming effect. This is really the idea that — really more the affect-as-information idea is related to what Popkin called "low information rationality," which is that political judgments can be made with relatively minimal information. Those judgments might, in fact, be very

similar to the ones that would be made with more information or more systematic analysis. Some of this low information rationality might be, and a large part of it, I think, is based on party identification, which has some systematicity to it.

People who identify with particular parties do tend to hold similar policy positions, but Rosenberg and colleagues have shown that even just showing people photographs of candidates can influence their judgments, which I would not want to put necessarily in the rationality column. Similarly, Sullivan and Masters have shown that very short video clips of candidates can also influence people's judgments. In both of those cases, it might have as much or more to do with attractiveness and charisma, than to do with policy positions.

Of course, when people make judgments of candidates, especially in this more sort of heuristic fashion, those judgments are only going to be made through the lens of the media. In particular, the news media that they've presented them through, and Kinder, Peters and Krosnick show that generally the media, obviously, moderates how people make judgments to the extent that it doles out the information and it tints the information and the like.

But, again, more specifically in the realm of emotion and politics, Shields and McDowell showed that partisan media representatives, they described the emotions of particular candidates in this particular study, Geraldine Ferraro and George Herbert Walker Bush and the vice presidential debates — I guess that was 1984 — that Republican and Democratic news people described the emotions of those candidates in very different ways, particularly in ways that were more favorable to the candidate of their own party. Mullen et al., (*unintelligible*) a study that some of you might be familiar with, but it showed that the extent to which the affect displayed by news anchors like Peter Jennings, Dan Rather and Mike Wallace — the affect that they displayed differentially — when talking about different presidential candidates was related to, and then there's a question about causality, but it was certainly related to the positivity of the attitudes of their typical viewer. So there's maybe a more subtle (*unintelligible*), you know, this is (*unintelligible*) newscaster emotionality affecting voter judgments of candidates.

Also, now getting down to the actual issue of affect or emotion of candidates--again, there's a nice and consistent but small corpus of research here--McHugo, Lanzetta, Sullivan and Masters and their colleagues in this and other studies have shown that voters' physiological responses to candidates can be different from the more deliberate self-reports that they give, and they show this using electromyographic measurements of subtle affective responses to Ronald Reagan versus Walter Mondale, for example, showing that even Mondale supporters exhibit emotional reactions consistent with Reagan's emotional expressions in a way that they don't with Mondale, which shouldn't be all that surprising with Reagan having been an actor, even if he wasn't one of the best.

Then you have another study by Victor Ottati with Terkildsen and Hubbard, which shows that low motivation voters are actually more likely to make their judgments in a heuristic fashion when they're viewing a candidate who is expressing a more positive, and specifically happy emotion. This is going to come back in my recommendations later on with regard to the happiness of a candidate's expressivity influencing voters, and possibly being something worthy of measurement.

Sullivan and Masters, also with regard to happiness, show that happy and reassuring candidates — you've got to be careful here because I'm using this word differently now — their candidate displays effect, not "affect," and more attitude change than even party identification, at least in their study or issue agreement or leadership assessment. So these things that you would really expect to be highly influential in voters' judgments of candidates are scoring below just simple, happy and reassuring kind of affective presentation of a candidate.

Laura Tiedens has shown using clips of a real politician, Bill Clinton, and then replicating with a fictitious or unknown politician, that anger displays — when the politician talks about a specific topic in an angry way, and actually in Clinton's case I think it was actually with regard to the Lewinsky scandal — that that actually increases, or yields a relatively high status rating, relative to when the candidate talks about the same issue in a more sad fashion. And so we could possibly infer that angry displays are in some way, under some circumstances, advantageous in terms of promoting the electoral fortunes of a particular candidate.

This is the one empirical study that I've participated in, which is with Laura Stroud and Peter Salovey, and what we've primarily found there, the big effect was that when we showed people a fictitious candidate reading a speech in either an emotional or a relatively unemotional tone (with varied emotion) — a range of different emotions versus more of a, not quite flat affect, but more of a monotonic kind of an expression, and we varied the label that we gave him as either being a Republican, a Democrat or we didn't label him at all — the party match of the subjects and the candidate's party label was the most influential factor in terms of their judgments of him on a number of different dimensions, like their liking for him, their judgment of his competence, and their indication that they would be inclined to vote for him.

But in the absence of a party label, when he was not labeled as a Republican or a Democrat, the more emotional candidate was preferred to the less emotional candidate, indicating that in the absence of a strong heuristic cue, like party identification, emotionality itself, or emotional expressiveness might confer some preferability to a candidate.

This is not quite on candidate emotion, but Roseman, Abelson and Ewing, showed that with messages — pamphlets that they gave out to people varied the emotional tone of the message, and they measured the

emotional predisposition toward that topic of the respondents — they typically found emotional resonance such that people were more convinced, or they were more persuaded when there was emotional resonance in the case of anger and pity. But they found this cross-resonance where if the person was fearful, they responded better or were better persuaded by a hopeful message. This too, I think, is highly relevant to presidential campaigns, although it's only been shown to date with these text-based messages and not with an actual candidate talking. Fear appeals alone, without any kind of hope included in that, generally, it will send very negative responses.

Okay, now moving on to more of a theoretical framework. Ekman and Friesen's ideas about display rules and the manner in which we are expected to express emotions vary as a function of culture and context. Just like there are universal perceptions of emotions, there are quite a lot of universalities in terms of when and where it's appropriate to display certain types of emotions. Ought to be useful in terms of thinking about candidate emotionality.

I would think that generally, and again, here's where the anecdotal evidence might be useful — generally, politicians are going to be relatively constrained in the range of emotion or the intensity of emotion that they express, so that would be one sort of overarching dimension of display rule. This is possibly going to be a liability for candidates who really have to work at that, because as Arlie Hochschild has argued, people who are in a position of chronically managing their emotions, like flight attendants and people who are working in the service industry, they actually bear a burden and show psychological consequences of that in terms of stress and related problems.

Anecdotally, it's pretty compelling that extreme displays of emotion are politically devastating. This is maybe the sort of archetypal example. This is Edmund Muskie in 1968. He was far and away the leading contender for the Democratic nomination for the Presidential race, and in March of that year he at least appeared to — it's still controversial as to what he was really doing — but it looks like he was sobbing at a stump speech in response to some questions about accusations about his wife. Arguably, under any other circumstances, it would have been a reasonable emotional reaction even to display that. But for a politician, the history, the way that the history is written, it says that that was devastating for him and that he quickly fell in the polls. A few months later, Humphrey had pretty much wrapped up the nomination. Is that right, Humphrey in '68?

Unidentified Speaker: Yes.

So that's one powerful anecdotal example. It's hard to disentangle the true history from the lore around it, but it's at the very least a message that goes out to candidates that says pretty much, "Don't cry in public unless the circumstances are really quite extreme."

How could I not include Howard Dean, so I probably don't need to say "yeehaw", but I will. Here's probably a case where Dean's emotional expressivity is not necessarily the primary cause of his downfall. He was already starting to fall in the primaries at the time that this happened, and this was maybe an over-compensatory emotional expression, but a lot of people believe that his campaign just completely fell apart after this. I would argue that that was, at least in part, mediated by the media interpretation of it, particularly the blogosphere, which proceeded to present this event. (*Laughter*) This is not real. He never strangled a kitten, and for that matter, his head never exploded. This is easy to find. I mean, when I did the Google image search for Howard Dean, he just came up among the first few pages, so these are influential.

The other end of emotional expressivity extremes is Michael Dukakis, who was widely criticized for not expressing enough emotion when a bizarre question was asked of him during a debate with Bush. It was not this exact picture, but that's the only picture that I could find of them debating. It's having to do with the hypothetical rape of his wife, I think, and he was very intellectual about it and expressed very little emotional. And I can't really imagine what the appropriate emotional reaction to a question like that would be, but whatever it was, it was not satisfying to viewers in general. I don't know that we could attribute his loss to that, but it didn't help. This one is really going to come back to haunt McCain, but I'm pretty sure that he was joking around in this picture, and so I just threw it in there for fun.

So getting back to the general idea of display rules, David Matsumoto has conducted a study that I think is particularly relevant. This was intended primarily to be a cross-cultural study where he was comparing Japanese and U.S. students, and he had them rate the appropriateness of different emotional displays under different circumstances varying, in part, the status of the displayer and the displayee — high, low status interactions and the like.

One of the things that he found that I think is the most relevant is that emotional displays were rated as more appropriate, in general, by low status. So an emotionally expressive display was more tolerated or was more accepted when it was exhibited by a low-status individual toward a high-status individual than the other way around. (*unintelligible*) really had quite large effects, in fact, and it was true for mostly negative affect like anger, disgust, fear, sadness, and then surprise, which is kind of ambiguous, valence-wise. And there was no difference between them for happiness, so again happiness sort of comes up. At the very least, this is saying that expressions of happiness by candidates aren't going to hurt them, with candidates being inherently high-status people—well, aspiring to be high-status people, but typically already so.

Okay, so this leads me to wonder if there are some (*unintelligible*). Now, I'm going to have some gratuitous pictures, but this leads me to wonder if there are some emotions when displayed by candidates for high office that are particularly advantageous. I think that I've already suggested this, that happiness is probably — and it's probably not a coincidence that the term "happy warrior" is what's used to describe candidates,

but I think that expressions of happiness — and this is one of the more subtle ones on Clinton's part, but if you look at most pictures of Clinton, he almost always has some kind of positive affect on his face, except when he's wagging his finger. And then Arnold Schwarzenegger, he's the ultimate happy warrior. He's just almost always got a smile on his face, and I don't think it's a coincidence, by the way, that the State of California, the fifth or sixth largest economy, in the world has twice elected actors who had virtually no governmental experience prior to being elected governor. I'm not saying that to be critical, cynical or anything, but I think that it's telling that both Reagan and Schwarzenegger are sort of known for their positive affect and their happiness, although, I'm going to bring up Reagan in another way.

It's possible that anger in the right situation, especially to the extent that it confers, according to Laura Tiedens' work, that it confers higher status, could be advantageous. We see a picture of Nixon looking kind of angry, and we immediately start saying, "Well, that must be a counter-example," but Watergate aside, Nixon was a very successful politician. I'm just speculating here because I've done no systematic analysis on these things, but just to kind of jog some thought on this subject, and I'm not implying that Hillary Clinton is a particularly consistently angry person or anything, but it was a good picture of her displaying something looking a little angry.

I think that Reagan is more known for his hopefulness, and I think that he's the prototypical example of somebody who was really effective in the Roseman, Abelson and Ewing way of integrating fear messages with hopeful appeals, and in fact, really contrasted with Carter in that way, who was really promoting more of a fear — unfortunately at the time—, appeal without the hope, or at least it wasn't coming across. It's hard to think of Jimmy Carter as not a hopeful person, but it wasn't coming across in the way that it did with Reagan. Again, this is highly anecdotal.

Then I'm being a little bit suggestive here, but it does seem empirically that expressing sad emotions is not an effective thing for candidates to do, except of course, under the most obvious circumstances where sadness would be the only appropriate emotion. So again, at least relative to anger, Laura Tiedens' work suggests that sadness is inferior. I'm going to go out on a limb and suggest that John Kerry, actually, chronically has kind of a sad look on his face. I have to wonder. I mean, again, I would never try to draw an inference about the binomial outcome of an election based on the shape of somebody's eyebrows, but I think that it's food for thought. But at the very least, I think that extreme expressions of emotion are disadvantageous for politicians, but that doesn't really put us anywhere very valuable. I think that's conventional wisdom.

Here's the model that Peter Salovey and I generated a while back to try to comprehensively explain the various roots that the expressed affect of a candidate could lead to different voting behaviors, and so these are the ones that the literature seemed to suggest that the affect itself could cause greater persuasion,

because people might be paying better attention when there's this extra stimulus and they might have better memory for something that's expressed affectively. Credibility could go kind of either way. If it's extreme affect, it's probably going to undermine credibility and then you have the idea of emotional resonance leading to differential message persuasion, or it could affect candidate liking or inferred ideology based on the inferred personality of the person. If they express certain kinds of emotions, they may be more caring, cold, strong or weak. And then to the extent that emotion is expressed consistently with display rules, that ought to be favorable to candidates who might be judged as more or less suitable for public office.

Let me just take a minute to run through some of the existing ANES items on affect. So there's the overall negative and positive feelings towards candidates that's been on the website. They only started with 52, but maybe it started at 48. There is also a feeling thermometer, but it tracks really closely to this, so I'm just showing this. One of the things that just pops out, and I'm not going to try to interpret this data because these are completely impartial data, but it kind of jumps out that the variability or the volatility of these judgments seems to have decreased over time.

I don't know if that's just an artifact of specific historical incidents or not, but there are questions on whether or not the candidate has made the voter — so it doesn't have emotionality, but affect — has it made the voter feel angry? Has the candidate — so I've got Democrat and Republican data here — made the voter feel afraid? Feel hopeful? Feel proud? And then these are sort of quasi-emotional, but not really quite getting there, attributes of a leader that are rated by the respondents.

So, "would you agree that this candidate expresses the attributes of a strong leader?" Here's one trend that is fairly obvious. Knowledgeable? That's another fairly obvious one. (*Laughter*) I'm not trying to be facetious—and then I don't know if you guys know why, but I guess they dropped this question after '96 "inspiring?" This unfortunately might be the most affect-like question to the extent that it would be hard to be inspiring without being in some ways expressive, but it doesn't tell us much about differentiated specific emotions.

So I'll just wrap up by saying, "Here's a possible question. How often does the candidate seem to be...?" And then these various emotions, but I'd be concerned that this would be a waste of the question, because you could probably achieve this --correlating everything else you've got from the existing website--, but you could get this rating by having a smaller sample — either a smaller sample who rate the candidate on these emotions, and then just make a reasonable assumption that those overall nomothetic ratings are going to relate to the ANES sample, or you could even have experts fax code them on a broad sampling of behaviors, so I would kind of throw that one out. I would put it up and then throw it out.

But it may be useful to ask them something more specific with that that would get more at the idea of display rules and whether or not candidates are adhering to political emotional display rules. Something along the lines of, "Do you think [whichever] candidate expresses the appropriate emotions at the appropriate times," and then asking, "always? most of the time?" I'm not sure how you would structure the rest of the question. And then finally, "Is this talk ever going to end?" and the answer is yes. So I'll leave it at that. (*End of Glaser_1 file*)