

The Face of Populism: Examining Differences in Facial Emotional Expressions of Political Leaders Using Machine Learning

Sara Major* Aleksandar Tomašević †

August 8, 2024

Abstract

Populist rhetoric employed on online media is characterized as deeply impassioned and often imbued with strong emotions. The aim of this paper is to empirically investigate the differences in affective nonverbal communication of political leaders. We use a deep-learning approach to process a sample of 220 YouTube videos of political leaders from 15 different countries, analyze their facial expressions of emotion and then examine differences in average emotion scores representing the relative presence of 6 emotional states (anger, disgust, fear, happiness, sadness, and surprise) and a neutral expression for each frame of the YouTube video. Based on a sample of manually coded images, we find

*Department of Sociology, University of Novi Sad, Serbia, sara.mejdzor@ff.uns.ac.rs

†Department of Sociology, University of Novi Sad, Serbia, atomashevic@ff.uns.ac.rs

that this deep-learning approach has 53-60% agreement with human labels. We observe statistically significant differences in the average score of negative emotions between groups of leaders with varying degrees of populist rhetoric.

1 Introduction

In the growing body of literature on populism, the category of emotion has most frequently been utilized in discrete ways to describe its emergence and tenacity (Demertzis 2006)—by reference to the disillusioned silent majority, heightened emotions surrounding political leaders, and emotionally charged divisions between the people and the elite (Moffitt & Tormey 2014, Mudde 2017, Norris & Inglehart 2019). Compared to pluralist parties, who are commonly portrayed as more affectively neutral, populist rhetoric is most often characterized as deeply impassioned and imbued with strong (negative) emotions (Bonansinga 2020*a*, Salmela & von Scheve 2018). Although the nature of the relationship between emotionality and populist discourse has rarely been subject to systematic empirical scrutiny (Widmann 2021), this link has become one of the main focal points of research on political communication in recent years. Comprehensive research on the matter is thus crucial for gaining insight into the extent to which populist narratives and performances are rooted in and shaped by emotion, and by extension, how emotion may be utilized as a tool for building and maintaining political support (Nguyen 2019).

In the past, studies of populist communication have generally focused on its verbal elements, by analyzing the affective content of the words used in oral or written addresses of political leaders (Bobba 2019, Breeze 2019, 2020, Cochrane et al. 2022,

Jacobs et al. 2020, Martella & Bracciale 2022, Widmann 2021). While advantageous in its own way, this type of analysis can pose a challenge to researchers primarily due to language barriers and the fact that written text usually contains only a small amount of words that have an inherent affective connotation (Widmann 2021). At the same time, currently available sentiment analysis tools are predominantly based on and developed for the English language, while the output for other languages is often of lower quality (Mohammad 2016). These circumstances therefore limit the possibility of result generalization and cross-cultural comparison.

Visual analyses, although insufficiently represented in the given field of research, may provide further insight into the characteristics of affective populist communication as they are not hindered by the same limitations as text-based studies (Moffitt 2022*b*) and allow for analysis of the visual rhetoric constructed and utilized by political leaders (Mendonça & Caetano 2021). Within the scope of visual research on political emotion display, two main schemes of analysis have shown to be especially valuable: the ethological approach (Masters et al. 1986) and the Facial Action Coding System (FACS) (Ekman & Friesen 1976).

Studies within the former largely focus on the analysis of political candidates' non-verbal representations in news coverage, their displays during political campaigns and debates, as well as the impact of different forms of representation on viewers and success in political elections (Bucy et al. 2020, Bucy & Grabe 2007, 2008, Grabe & Bucy 2009, Sullivan & Masters 1988). The Facial Action Coding System, on the other hand, allows for a more in-depth analysis of the (micro)expressive behavior of political leaders during speeches and public performances. Due to its complexity, Ekman's classification system has been applied in a limited number of studies (Stewart

et al. 2009, 2015, Stewart & Ford Dowe 2013) but as the process of visual analysis gradually becomes automated (Joo et al. 2019) this research method is becoming more accessible to researchers from various fields of interest (Ash & Caliskan 2022, Bossetta & Schmøkel 2023).

Our study expands on the existing framework of FACS research on political emotion display and applies a computer vision approach for detecting emotions from the facial expressions of political leaders. Because it is relatively new, this approach faces various methodological challenges which we aim to address by following the recommendations outlined by Barrett et al. (2019), such as using big data techniques and automated detection in naturalistic settings, integrating traditional methods with machine learning, and sampling visual data across diverse contexts and cultures.

Since the introduction of the FER dataset (Goodfellow et al. 2013), different machine learning algorithms have been developed for solving the challenge of facial expression recognition, which essentially requires performing two tasks: (1) detection of facial expression, and (2) emotion recognition from the detected facial expressions. We develop a reproducible and principled computational workflow in Python for the analysis of video content of political leaders' public performances. Our work relies on the existing Python library *fer* (Shenk et al. 2021) which bundles a pre-trained convolutional neural network (CNN) Keras models for face detection (Zhang et al. 2016a, based on) and emotion recognition (Arriaga et al. 2017, 2020).

We find that populist leaders on average express more negative emotions and that the emotionally neutral facial expression is less frequently detected in their public appearances compared to non-populist leaders. Overall, our work points towards a new direction in computational studies of the affective aspects of populist political

communication and provides a roadmap for overcoming the limitations of the current approach in future studies.

2 Populism as performance

Defining populism represents a challenging task for researchers as there is barely any consensus on what such a definition should (or should not) include, and the concept itself becomes increasingly muddled as the term is used to describe a growing number of phenomena (Gidron & Bonikowski 2013). Most conceptualizations of populism can, however, be classified (Rovira Kaltwasser et al. 2017) into one of three main approaches: (1) the ideational approach (Mudde 2004), (2) the discursive approach (Norris & Inglehart 2019, Ostiguy 2017) and (3) the political-strategic approach (Weyland 2017). For the purposes of this study, we adopt the discursive approach, which conceives populism primarily as a rhetorical style based on first-order principles pertaining to *who* should rule—the people, as “the only legitimate source of political and moral authority in a democracy”—but which says very little about the *how* (Norris & Inglehart 2019). Whereas the ideational approach claims populism is a “thin-centered” ideology (Mudde 2004) and emphasizes the interpretation of politics as “a Manichean struggle between a reified will of the people and a conspiring elite” (Hawkins & Kaltwasser 2018) (Hawkins and Rovira Kaltwasser, 2018), the discursive approach highlights the ways in which this interpretation is framed and communicated as an anti-establishment discourse (Aslanidis 2017). We find this to be the most comprehensible understanding of populism as it considers the operationalized elements of the populist communication logic (Engesser et al. 2017) and examines the rhetorical components implicit in the ideological definition

(Aslanidis 2016).

From this perspective, the populist rhetoric has widely been characterized by the use of “dramatization, polarization, moralization, directness, ordinariness, colloquial and vulgar language” (Engesser et al. 2017), and low-order appeals within which leaders “use a language that includes slang or folksy expressions and metaphors, are more demonstrative in their bodily or facial expressions as well as in their demeanor, and display more raw, culturally popular tastes” (Ostiguy 2017). Because it represents a form of symbolic resistance to the more formalized and composed self-representation of mainstream pluralist leaders, i.e., the “establishment” and “political elite”, the populist performance ¹is subversive to the normative communication structures of political dialogue. As such, it appeals to “common sense” (Bucy et al. 2020) and claims to give a voice to “the ordinary people” (Inglehart & Norris 2016).

This mode of communication has shown to be highly effective as a means of garnering media attention and cultivating a dedicated base of supporters—especially in the new media environment—and populist leaders seem to be overall more adept at capitalizing on it than other, non-populist political figures (Bobba 2019, Davidson & Enos 2022). Since digital media hinges on the attention economy (Wells et al. 2020) and thus tends to favor “dark participation” (Larsson 2022), populist leaders and political parties may fare well online due to the transgressive nature of their

¹This does not imply that, on average, there is a tendency for Japanese leaders to be more neutral. In fact, in Japan, we observe the same tendency as seen in the entire sample — the speeches of Shinzo Abe (LDP) from the populist group have the highest average score of negative emotions (0.58), while Natsuo Yamaguchi (NKP) from the moderately pluralist group has the lowest average score (0.30). Conversely, the average scores of neutrality show the opposite trend. These results are not extreme compared to the sample distributions shown in 2.

self-representation and the simplification, emotionalization, and negativity inherent in populist messaging (Bucy et al. 2020, Engesser et al. 2017). Social media is a particularly convenient tool for the proliferation of populist messages and imagery as it allows political actors to circumvent the mainstream media, reach large audiences, and communicate and interact directly with ‘the people’ (Lalancette & Raynauld 2019, Moffitt 2022a). At the same time, online platforms allow for an instant audience response, as the “feedback loop between producer and consumer is much more intense and rapid than with television and radio (Finlayson 2022). This form of ‘mediatized populism’ (Mazzoleni 2014) allows for a specific type of political performance, one which is largely unmitigated and relies heavily on portraying political leaders favorably to (online) audiences by framing them as expressive, dominant, and disruptive figures who are in tune with “the will of the people”.

In recent years, much attention has been paid to the strategies of (affective) populist communication online, especially through analyses of verbal content shared by populist leaders and parties on Twitter and Facebook (e.g. Bracciale & Martella 2017, Gründl 2022, Jacobs et al. 2020, Martella & Bracciale 2022, Widmann 2021). Given the rise of visual communication in politics and the rapid developments of Web 2.0 practices (Grabe & Bucy 2009, Larsson 2022, Messaris 2019), our primary aim was to expand the scope of research on the affective self-representation of populist leaders online by examining the characteristics of their non-verbal emotional communication. The facial expressions of political leaders are a particularly valuable area of research in this context, since digital media provide a breadth of material for analysis—well-lit, high-quality close-up shots of political leaders are now more prevalent than ever. We used this abundance of available data sources to our advantage and processed 220 YouTube videos uploaded to official accounts of political

parties and their leaders, amounting to a total of 77 hours of video material. Our analysis examines potential differences in facial expressions between populist and non-populist political leaders during public performances, and more specifically, the characteristics of their negative emotional expressions and neutrality in emotional stance (i.e., absence of emotional expression).

3 Data & Method

To create our sample, we first had to differentiate and categorize political parties (and, by extension, their leading figures) as either populist or pluralist. For this purpose, we used data from the Global Party Survey (GPS) (Norris 2020), an expert survey from 2019 which offers an overview of key ideological and issue positions for 1043 parties from 163 countries worldwide. While expert surveys certainly have their limitations (Wiesehomeier 2018) and may not be able to fully capture the nuances of populist rhetoric, this database remains the most comprehensive comparative overview of political parties globally. Among other data, such as ideological framework and party size, the survey also offers an estimate of the degree to which existing parties employ populist rhetoric. In the questionnaire design, populist rhetoric is defined as “language which typically challenges the legitimacy of established political institutions and emphasizes that the will of the people should prevail” (Norris 2020), whereas pluralist rhetoric “rejects these ideas, believing that elected leaders should govern, constrained by minority rights, bargaining and compromise, as well as checks and balances on executive power” (Norris 2020). The populist rhetoric scale in (V8 in GPS dataset) is based on expert assessments of rhetorical style given these parameters. The variable *Type_Populism* categorizes this scale into four ordinal

groups: strongly pluralist, moderately pluralist, moderately populist, and strongly populist. We also use the “Type_Values” variable in supplementary analysis to examine ideological differences in expression of emotions (see Supplement section E – Ideological differences).

From the GPS dataset, fifteen countries with competitive popular elections were chosen: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Croatia, France, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Serbia, South Africa, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States. This sample, although limited, provides somewhat broad coverage of various cultures and political systems globally. Three parties with varying degrees of populist rhetoric—strongly populist, strongly pluralist, and either moderately populist or moderately pluralist—were selected from each country. We primarily focused on minor and major political parties as defined by the GPS variable categorizing parties based on their share of the vote in contests for the lower house of the national parliament. Fringe parties (less than 3% of the vote) were generally excluded from the sample since their audience reach and influence is considerably less than that of their larger counterparts competing at the same scale in their respective countries. Likewise, due to this criteria, only two parties from the US were included in the sample. Table 4 from the Supplementary Information contains information about the selected parties and their leaders.

We then identified one leader per party who has held a prominent political position over the past decade (up to 2019, covered by the GPS), and found their official YouTube channel or their party’s official YouTube channel. From these channels, five videos were selected for each leader based on the following criteria:

- (1) *View count.* Videos that reached a larger audience were given priority over

videos that did not perform comparatively as well on the platform. View count was used as a filtering mechanism to single out videos with large and potentially diverse audiences, because the most viewed videos on the official YouTube channels of major political parties usually refer to topics of wider public interest. This is partially due to the “popularity bias” on YouTube, meaning it has a tendency to recommend political content that aligns with the interests of the majority (Heuer et al. 2021).

- (2) *Unmediated representation.* Only direct and unmediated representations of the given political leaders were included, i.e., videos which were not in any way previously modified by third parties such as news outlets. These consisted mainly of speeches, press conferences, ads, and promotional videos. This was done to ensure that the given results would reflect the leaders’ self-representation, rather than their representation in news coverage.
- (3) *Consistent framing.* A preference was given to videos where the face of the leader was in focus for an extended period of time and which did not frequently switch between disparate camera angles. This allowed for an overall consistent frame of reference for each given video.
- (4) *Video quality.* High-quality, well-lit videos were selected whenever possible so as to improve analysis accuracy.

This selection process resulted in a sample of 220 videos, representing 44 political leaders from 15 different countries. The sample is not gender-balanced as only five female leaders are present, which reflects the global underrepresentation of women in leadership positions within major political parties. As a result, our analysis does not

account for gender, which we acknowledge as a limitation of our approach. Additionally, because the sample is limited by the timeframe of the currently available GPS dataset, it hasn't captured more recent global developments on the populist-pluralist spectrum (e.g. Giorgia Meloni and the Brothers of Italy movement or the Servant of the People party in Ukraine are not present in the dataset). Given these limitations, our sample is conceived as a diverse snapshot of the state of populist and pluralist rhetoric in the second decade of the 21st century and does not capture the full scope or evolution of populism today.

We processed each video in the sample by extracting 300 frames uniformly distributed over the length of the video, which were the basis for our main analysis. To improve the robustness of the overall approach, we also included an alternative frame processing approach in the supplementary material, based on processing every 50th frame of the video. Given that the majority of the YouTube videos have 24–30 frames per second, this is equivalent to selecting a frame every 1.67–2.00 seconds, which is a reasonable time window if we expect to capture potential changes in facial expression. The average number of frames per video extracted using this approach was 273.03, which makes the resulting time-series of emotion scores comparable in length with the first approach.

For each selected frame of every video in the sample the following procedure is applied. First, face detection is applied to the extract frames using a multi-task cascaded framework based on convolutional neural networks (CNN) (Zhang et al. 2016b). This framework is suitable for detecting faces in videos because it performs simultaneous face detection and alignment, which is important as we cannot expect that political leaders will be looking straight at the camera in each extracted video

frame. After face detection was applied to all frames, there were videos in which multiple faces were detected throughout the frame. These videos were manually checked to confirm which of the detected faces corresponds to the selected political leader.

The second step is emotion detection within the verified detected face box. We relied on implementing the mini-Xception architecture of CNN (Arriaga et al. 2017) aimed at detecting 6 basic facial expressions of emotion, as well as a neutral expression. Similar to the face detection approach outlined above, this implementation is aimed at real-time emotion detection from video input for robotic applications. This model achieves 66% accuracy (see Arriaga et al. 2017, p. 3 for more details) on the FER2013 dataset (Goodfellow et al. 2013) which is a standard benchmark for emotion detection. The dataset consists of 30,000 small images (48x48 pixels) showing diverse facial expressions of different emotions.² Each emotional expression has approximately 6000 images, except disgust, which is only present in 600 images. According to Goodfellow et al. (2013), human classification accuracy is in the range of $65\% \pm 5\%$, but no additional information about the sample size, number of coders, or detection procedure is given.

²FER2013 was constructed using Google Images API queries for emotion-related keywords like “blissful” and “enraged”, combined with queries introducing diversity in gender, age and ethnicity represented in the images. Images were then labeled by human coders (Goodfellow et al. 2013, pp. 3-4). Unfortunately, no information is provided by the authors of the dataset regarding the number of human coders nor their background, or the labeling methodology applied to extract training labels for every image included in the FER2013 dataset. Benchmarks based on the FER2013 dataset should be taken with caution, especially in social science applications, because the dataset construction and validation documentation lacks crucial information about inter-coder reliability, coding procedures, and potential biases in the image selection process.

In order to provide additional information and to validate the output of the machine learning approach, we conducted a small image annotation study where 5 coders annotated a sample of 514 randomly selected frames extracted from 220 videos. Coders received basic training in emotion recognition and, due to limited resources, answered only two questions about every image: (1) Can you clearly see the face of a politician in this image? (Yes/No), (2) Is this face expressing positive emotion, negative emotion, or is it a neutral expression? (“Positive emotion”, “Negative emotion”, “Neutral expression”). The majority vote label was set as the “human-coded label” and compared with the output of the machine learning algorithm, whose label is defined based on the highest score out of the sum of positive emotions, negative emotions, or the neutrality score. A detailed description and the results of the data annotation study can be found in Supplement F.

The result of the emotion detection procedure on a single video frame is an array of 7 emotion scores, each representing the predicted proportion of an expressed emotion. Each score is matched with one of 7 labels: “angry”, “disgust”, “fear”, “happy”, “sad”, “surprise” and “neutral”. The lowest possible score indicating the absence of a particular emotion is 0, while the highest score, which indicates a “clean” expression of a single emotion, is 1. In a statistical sense, the resulting data are compositional as they do not carry absolute, but rather relative information about the expressed emotions. This data is organized as a data frame consisting of 7 columns and approximately 300 rows, storing emotional scores for each selected frame of the video.

Because we were primarily interested in neutral emotional expressions and expressions of negative emotions, we created an additional variable which sums the scores

of negative emotions: anger, fear, disgust, and sadness. Figure 1 shows examples of faces with a high detected score of negative emotion and a high score of neutral expression.



Figure 1: Example frames showing a high detected score of negative emotions (top: angry 0.78, disgust 0.00, fear 0.09, happy 0.00, sad 0.07, surprise 0.00, neutral 0.04) and a high detected score of neutral expression (bottom: angry 0.07, disgust 0.00, fear 0.04, happy 0.00, sad 0.02, surprise 0.08, neutral 0.79).

The entire analysis was performed in Python and the code is publicly available in the GitHub repository: <https://github.com/atomashevic/face-of-populism>. The code is organized into three sections. The data processing part of the code can be used to reproduce emotion score data files from the list of YouTube URLs for the videos included in the sample. It can easily be modified to expand the sample to a larger number of videos. Face and emotion detection relies heavily on the *fer* Python library and that part of the code is presented in the Jupyter notebook. Finally, we have data analysis scripts for performing data wrangling and statistical tests as well as

producing Figures 2, 3, and 4.

4 Results

In the entire sample, there are 203 successfully processed videos using the approach of selecting 300 frames uniformly distributed across the entire length of the video clip. For 17 videos, multiple faces were detected without consistent classification of each person as a unique face, and these videos were discarded from the analysis. Pluralist leaders are present in 96 videos (31 strongly pluralist and 65 moderately pluralist) and populist leaders are present in the remaining 107 videos (69 strongly populist and 38 moderately populist). For every video, the emotion recognition procedure returns the score of the 6 detected emotions (anger, disgust, fear, happiness, sadness, surprise) as well as the score of the neutral expression for each of its frames. These scores sum up to 1 and they can be viewed as proportions of each emotion present in the compound facial expression detected in the frame.

Human image annotation was performed on a sample of 514 images extracted from 220 videos. Agreement between human coders ranged from 30.3% to 69.8%, while Cohen's Kappa coefficient varied from 0.15 to 0.462. Overall, Fleiss' Kappa is 0.231, which suggests fair agreement between coders but is also indicative of how difficult the task of recognizing the emotional expression in a single, randomly selected video frame is. When only selecting cases where a majority vote label exists (458 images), agreement between that label and the result of the machine learning classification is 55.2%, with a Cohen's Kappa of 0.311 and F1 score of 0.502. This suggests moderate agreement and performance of the machine learning model relative to human

consensus. When only selecting cases where the majority of coders and the model agree that a face is clearly visible (present) in the image (356 cases), agreement is 59.8% (Kappa 0.320, F1 score 0.530).

For each video, we calculated the mean score of each emotional state for all frames, as well as the mean of neutral expression, and the mean of negative emotional expression for the entire video. Descriptive statistics of these values are presented in Table 1.

| | Mean | SD | Min. | Median | Max. |
|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| Anger | 0.227 | 0.134 | 0.034 | 0.200 | 0.726 |
| Disgust | 0.003 | 0.008 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.066 |
| Fear | 0.127 | 0.091 | 0.014 | 0.099 | 0.548 |
| Happiness | 0.077 | 0.083 | 0.000 | 0.051 | 0.414 |
| Sadness | 0.206 | 0.110 | 0.023 | 0.181 | 0.568 |
| Surprise | 0.031 | 0.037 | 0.000 | 0.020 | 0.273 |
| Neutral | 0.328 | 0.169 | 0.020 | 0.300 | 0.807 |
| Negative emotions | 0.563 | 0.185 | 0.156 | 0.570 | 0.964 |

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for extracted emotions for the entire sample, $N = 203$ videos

Results suggest that negative emotions are more frequently expressed in the entire sample, with anger (0.227) as the emotion having the highest average score, followed by sadness (0.206) and fear (0.127). As a consequence, the average proportion of negative emotions is greater than 0.5, which means that on average negative emotions are detected more frequently than positive emotions (e.g., happiness) and neutral expressions combined. There are clear issues with the detection of disgust and surprise, where a low maximum level suggests low positive predictive value for these

emotions. However, our focus is on differences in the expression of negative emotions and in scores of neutral states. Aggregating negative emotions enables us to surpass the false positive issues within the group of negative emotions (e.g., expression of fear being classified as sadness, disgust as anger, Khaireddin & Chen 2021) and minimizes the impact of the low positive predictive value of disgust and surprise.

Looking at the maximum values of average detected scores, the largest average scores of specific negative emotions were found in videos of populist leaders. The highest proportion of anger was detected in a video of Andrej Plenković (HDZ, Croatia), disgust in a video of Narendra Modi (BJP, India), fear in a video of Saša Radulović (DJB, Serbia) and sadness in a video of Donald Trump (GOP, USA). The video with the highest aggregate proportion of negative emotions, where one of the negative emotions is dominant in almost every analyzed frame, is the video titled “Special Message from President Trump”, published on December 23, 2020. On the other hand, the highest average score of neutral expression is found in a video of Yukio Edano (CDP, Japan), whose party belongs, in contrast with previous examples, to the moderately pluralist group.³

To further examine differences between pluralist and populist leaders, we used the GPS measure of populist rhetoric in a binary way to split the sample into groups of pluralist (*Party Populism* 1-2) and populist (*Party Populism* 3-4) leaders. The

³This does not imply that, on average, there is a tendency for Japanese leaders to be more neutral. In fact, in Japan, we observe the same tendency as seen in the entire sample—the speeches of Shinzo Abe (LDP) from the populist group have the highest average score of negative emotions (0.58), while Natsuo Yamaguchi (NKP) from the moderately pluralist group has the lowest average score (0.30). Conversely, the average scores of neutrality show the opposite trend. These results are not extreme compared to the sample distributions shown in Figure 2.

distribution of the average scores of negative emotion and neutral expression is shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Distribution of average scores of negative emotions (left) and neutral expression (right) of videos featuring populist and pluralist leaders.

Overall, all average values have a large spread in both groups, with pluralist leaders having several videos with less than a 0.2 average negative emotion score and more than a 0.75 average score of neutral expression. In terms of central tendency, we see denser grouping of pluralist leaders between the 0.4 and 0.6 negative emotions score, while populists tend to cluster in areas between 0.6 and 0.8. In terms of

neutral expression, we have a thicker cluster of points for populists in the range between 0.2 and 0.4. Figure 1 suggests that, for populist leaders, we are more likely to observe lower average scores of neutral expression and higher average scores of negative emotion. The reverse tendency can be observed in the case of pluralist leaders. Negative emotions are dominant in 73.8% of populist videos, compared to 45.8% of pluralist videos.

The mean average score of negative emotions in the populist group is 0.616 (95% CI 0.584–0.649), compared to the 0.500 mean average score for pluralists (95% CI 0.464–0.537). The difference between the two groups is statistically significant ($t = 4.691$, $p = 0.000005$, $d = 0.66$ moderate effect size). This finding suggests that pluralists generally tend to have an average score of negative emotions around 0.5, which roughly translates to the situation where negative emotion is the prevailing expression in one half of the video (in fact, that percentage is 46.1% compared to 66.7% for populists; see Table 3 in the Supplement). On the other hand, for populists, more than one half of each video where they appear is dominated by negative emotions.

The mean average score of neutral expression for populists is 0.289 (95% CI 0.260–0.318), compared to the 0.374 mean for pluralists (95% CI 0.338–0.409). While this difference in means is statistically significant ($t = -3.636$, $p = 0.00035$, $d = -0.515$ moderate effect size), it is smaller than the one observed in the case of negative emotions.

To investigate the robustness of these differences, we took into account the differences between moderate and strong pluralists/populists provided by the GPS. The distributions of average scores in these four groups are compared and shown in Figures 3 and 4.




Figure 3: Raincloud plot showing the distribution of average scores of negative emotions across four degrees of populism. Every data point is presented as a colored dot and above them boxplots and density plots are displayed. The dashed vertical bar indicates the score of 0.5.

In the case of negative emotions (Figure 3), we observe four flat distributions with thick tails. However, the median point of all distributions progressively moves towards more negative emotions as we move from strong pluralists to strong populists. What is apparent in these differences is the low frequency of videos featuring populist leaders where the average score of negative emotions is below 0.5. It is worth pointing out that examples of extremely high scores of negative emotions are present also in pluralist groups.

Similarly, in the case of neutral expression (Figure 4), we have flat distributions (except in the case of moderate populists) with long right tails containing videos of leaders who maintain a neutral expression throughout most of their recorded




Figure 4: Raincloud plot showing the distribution of average scores of neutral expression across four degrees of populism. Every data point is presented as a colored dot and above them boxplots and density plots are displayed. The dashed vertical bar indicates the score of 0.5.

appearance. Again, median values move progressively towards lower neutrality as we move from pluralists towards populists, except that no large difference can be seen when comparing strong and moderate populists. In the case of strong populists, however, we have a larger number of videos where the neutral expression is almost completely absent.

Overall, the results of one-way ANOVA suggest that the differences between the group means are statistically significant both in the case of negative emotions ($F = 7.109$ $p = 0.000152$), with strong effect size measured by eta-squared (0.104), and neutral expression ($F = 5.625$ $p = 0.001038$), with moderate effect size (0.084). Results from Tukey HSD post-hoc tests reveal significant differences between leaders

coming from parties employing strong populist rhetoric and leaders coming from pluralist parties (mean difference 0.1559 $p = 0.0005$ in comparison with strong pluralists, and mean difference 0.1148 $p = 0.0029$ in comparison with moderate pluralists). For neutral expression we find the opposite case, as strong pluralists differ from both groups of populists (mean difference 0.135, $p = 0.0056$ for moderate populists, and mean difference 0.129 $p = 0.0032$ for strong populists).

Overall, these results reveal differences in the average scores of negative emotion and neutrality between populist and pluralist leaders on a modest sample. These differences are more pronounced when we focus on candidates coming from parties who strongly rely on either pluralist or populist rhetoric, with strong pluralists on average favoring more neutral expressions, while strong populists more frequently express negative emotions—meaning that, for the majority of their public appearance, we can observe facial expressions of negative emotions.

5 Discussion

The present study examines facial emotional expressions of populist and non-populist political leaders across fifteen countries using a deep-learning-based computer-vision algorithm to investigate differences in their expressions of negative emotions (anger, disgust, fear, and sadness) and neutral stances, i.e., facial expressions which lack emotional disposition. Our findings indicate that populist leaders tend to express negative emotions more frequently than non-populist leaders, and conversely, that neutral expressions are less common in their public performances than they are in those of more conventional, pluralist political figures. The significance and the effect

size of these differences are higher compared to differences between ideological groups (see Supplement E). These findings align with the theoretical framework on the characteristics of affective populist communication (Bonansinga 2020*b*, Salmela & von Scheve 2018, Engesser et al. 2017), as well as with previous, mostly text-based research which indicates that populist leaders employ language which is associated with negative emotion at a higher rate than mainstream, pluralist politicians (Breeze 2019, Caiani & Di Cocco 2023, Macagno 2022, Martella & Bracciale 2022, Widmann 2021).

Overall, the results provide new evidence of a style of affective, non-verbal communication more common to political leaders whose rhetoric is populist-leaning, and thus further substantiate the idea that populism is performative in nature Bucy et al. (2020), Moffitt (2022*b*). As such, because it is subversive in relation to established political conventions, the populist performance is especially well-suited for the environment of social media where the principle of “any press is good press” often applies—that is, the quantity of audience attention bears more weight than its quality (Wells et al. 2020). On one hand, the populist use of negative emotional displays in video may therefore be a mechanism through which they maintain relevance, considering that controversial content online ordinarily generates more engagement among consumers (Larsson 2022). On the other, populists’ facial expressions can provide affective heuristics for audiences, influencing their evaluation of candidates’ political competence (Boussalis & Coan 2021) and allowing them to quickly reduce complex political issues into simple, emotional interpretations by visually framing them as negative. Further analysis of the role of non-verbal cues in political communication—such as facial expressions of emotion—would be beneficial to gaining a better understanding of the populist performance as a whole.

Apart from these findings, the present study introduces an open-source workflow for the analysis of political videos and provides a new open dataset of time-series emotion scores, as well as tools for the annotation of images in R and a new dataset of human labelled images which can be used to benchmark different machine learning approaches to facial expression recognition. Overall, these contributions aim to make large-scale computational studies of facial expressions of emotion more accessible and rigorous in the future.

Given the exploratory nature of the study and its reliance on machine learning algorithms for emotional detection, there are several notable limitations with significant impact on the results presented in this paper. There is a group of limitations inherent to the way we constructed the sample, and another related to the machine learning approach to detecting emotions from facial expressions.

Firstly, the sample of YouTube videos is not globally representative and does not provide ample coverage of the global political spectrum in regard to the use of populist or pluralistic rhetoric. As we have shown in the supplementary analysis (see Supplement C: Country-level differences), the differences between populist and pluralist leaders are not consistent in all investigated countries. Larger research infrastructure is required to process a more substantial number of videos, leaders and countries and the current computational toolset needs to be extended to enable seamless automatic processing of videos. This also relates back to the gender imbalance of the current sample. While it is reasonable to hypothesize that gender influences emotional expression among political leaders (Boussalis et al. 2021), in this case, including more women without significantly increasing the overall size of the sample and the number of leaders would mean focusing only on countries where there is at least one

female leader of a non-fringe political party. This creates the risk of introducing bias towards Western countries in the sample and disregarding the global scope.

Secondly, a key component of our analysis is the measure of populist rhetoric supplied by the Global Party Survey database (Norris 2020) which significantly limits the timeframe of the analysis (no leaders, parties and videos after 2019 were taken into consideration), but also imposes the inherent limits of an expert survey. While the GPS is the only available source of multi-dimensional measurements of populist rhetoric on a global scale, the experts surveyed may operate within different understandings of what populist rhetoric is. This is particularly challenging in developing countries, where fewer experts answered the survey, as well as in autocratic regimes where experts may not have been able to provide a fair assessment of the (ruling) political parties (or refused to do so). By focusing on large countries with free elections, we tried to mitigate some of the risks, but there is the possibility that some measurements used in this study reflect expert biases, especially since we used a single, aggregate measure of populist rhetoric. Future studies should aim for more granularity and robustness in the measurement of populist rhetoric, which may be obtained by following a text-as-data approach and obtaining the measures using computational and machine learning tools, where expert survey scores provide external validation (Jankowski & Huber 2023).

Furthermore, since we lacked the resources necessary to process every political speech from each party's official YouTube channel, the first criterion of selection is the view count of the videos. Our expectation is that this metric serves as a proxy for the relevance of the speech content to a wider audience over a longer period of time. However, since we have no information about the audience, it is possible we are

observing a demand-side effect, where audiences who consume populist videos might show a stronger preference for those that prominently feature negative emotions. This could introduce a specific bias in the sample.

One of the major limitations of our current workflow is that the video-processing algorithm does not focus on one singular face and does not consistently label the same faces between frame jumps, which requires researchers to select videos with consistent framing and a small number of different faces. Solving this problem will allow for faster and more reliable collection of larger samples.

The next major limitation is a result of the machine learning model deployed for emotion recognition. We conducted a small validation study to compare the performance of our model with the consensus of 5 human coders. Although results show evidence of moderate agreement between humans and the machine learning model, there is high inconsistency between human coders even for the simple task of assessing whether a given facial expression shows positive emotion, negative emotion, or a neutral expression. There is an urgent need for large-scale image annotation studies with expert coders if we are to assess the performance and accuracy of FER models in the future, especially on difficult “in the wild” image datasets such as ours. However, it is worth noting that in our main analysis we focus on averages across 300 frames of each video, making our analysis robust to misclassification of a smaller number of individual frames. That being said, we believe that fair agreement between the human majority vote and machine learning model does not compromise the validity of our findings.

Overall confidence in the presented results would surely be higher if we based our analysis on a computer-vision approach which was shown to have higher accuracy,

at least on FER2013 data. One of the possible alternatives would be to follow recent work (Bossetta & Schmøkel 2023, Schmøkel & Bossetta 2022) and use proprietary API such as Amazon’s Rekognition. Nonetheless, the aim of this paper was to introduce an open-source approach focusing on free computing resources and the deployment of machine learning algorithms on systems that are accessible to individual researchers in social sciences, including graduate students without significant institutional support for computational work.

This study was focused on exploring basic mean-level differences between the given groups. It is worth noting that the full output of our emotion detection workflow includes time series data which are suitable for multivariate analysis. Even though time series are compositional in nature, they can be transformed (Greenacre 2021) so that traditional time series methods can be applied to explore affective dynamics (Ryan et al. 2023), find additional differences in relation to other factors (such as type of public address, the proximity of elections, ideology, etc.) and cluster political leaders according to patterns of correlations in time-series. Furthermore, multivariate change point detection methods (James & Matteson 2015) could be used to identify the key moments in speech where significant changes in emotional expression occur, which can further be linked to textual analyses of transcripts. This would allow researchers to identify the rhetorical elements which trigger switches in the emotional dynamics of leaders’ political addresses.

As computational studies of political communication rapidly embrace machine learning tools and algorithms, this study offers an extension of an open-source toolbox for the analysis of affective non-verbal political communication. Analyses presented in this paper are based on a novel dataset which is only a starting point for further

studies, and which will hopefully expand in the future to encompass a more diverse sample of political leaders in videos obtained from different platforms. Gaining this kind of insight into the visual aspects of emotional political communication, coupled with the existing analyses of its verbal elements, holds the potential for a more comprehensive understanding of how leaders convey political messages, persuade audiences, and present themselves to the public using digital media platforms.

6 Data availability

Data files are stored as CSV files. Processed data used for both the main and supplementary analyses can be found at: <https://github.com/atomashevic/face-of-populism>. Repository contains a CSV file with a list of URLs of all YouTube videos used in the analysis as well as Python code that can be used to reproduce the CSV files with processed data. CSV file extracted from GPS data is available in the repository and the original GPS dataset is available at: <https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/GlobalParty>

Code used for image annotation and the resulting dataset can be found at: <https://github.com/atomash/annotation>.

7 Acknowledgements

The authors did not receive any financial support for this research. The annotation of images was made possible thanks to the dedicated work and effort of our undergraduate students, A. Nadj, M. Milanko, and A. Mišić, who volunteered as

coders.

References

- Arriaga, O., Valdenegro-Toro, M., Muthuraja, M., Devaramani, S. & Kirchner, F. (2020), 'Perception for Autonomous Systems (PAZ)'.
- Arriaga, O., Valdenegro-Toro, M. & Plöger, P. (2017), 'Real-time Convolutional Neural Networks for Emotion and Gender Classification'.
- Ash, E. & Caliskan, C. (2022), 'Fight or Flight on Fox?: Partisan Fear Responses on U.S. Cable News Shows'.
- Aslanidis, P. (2016), 'Is populism an ideology? a refutation and a new perspective', *Political studies* **64**, 88–104.
- Aslanidis, P. (2017), 'Avoiding bias in the study of populism', *Chinese political science review* **2**(3), 266–287.
- Barrett, L. F., Adolphs, R., Marsella, S., Martinez, A. M. & Pollak, S. D. (2019), 'Emotional Expressions Reconsidered: Challenges to Inferring Emotion From Human Facial Movements', *Psychological science in the public interest: a journal of the American Psychological Society* **20**(1), 1–68.
URL: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100619832930>
- Bobba, G. (2019), 'Social media populism: Features and 'likeability' of Lega Nord communication on Facebook', *European Political Science* **18**(1), 11–23.
- Bonansinga, D. (2020a), 'Who Thinks, Feels. The Relationship Between Emotions, Politics and Populism'.

- Bonansinga, D. (2020b), 'Who Thinks, Feels. The Relationship Between Emotions, Politics and Populism', *Partecipazione e Conflitto* **13**(1), 83–106.
- Bossetta, M. & Schmøkel, R. (2023), 'Cross-Platform Emotions and Audience Engagement in Social Media Political Campaigning: Comparing Candidates' Facebook and Instagram Images in the 2020 US Election', *Political Communication* **40**(1), 48–68.
- Boussalis, C. & Coan, T. G. (2021), 'Facing the Electorate: Computational Approaches to the Study of Nonverbal Communication and Voter Impression Formation', *Political Communication* **38**(1-2), 75–97.
- Boussalis, C., Coan, T. G., Holman, M. R. & Müller, S. (2021), 'Gender, candidate emotional expression, and voter reactions during televised debates', *The American political science review* **115**(4), 1242–1257.
- URL:** <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-political-science-review/article/gender-candidate-emotional-expression-and-voter-reactions-during-televised-debates/B259E3277178F68F52CCEADF5AE0CD40>
- Bracciale, R. & Martella, A. (2017), 'Define the populist political communication style: The case of Italian political leaders on Twitter', *Information, Communication & Society* **20**(9), 1310–1329.
- Breeze, R. (2019), 'Emotion in politics: Affective-discursive practices in UKIP and Labour', *Discourse & Society* **30**(1), 24–43.
- Breeze, R. (2020), 'Angry tweets: A corpus-assisted study of anger in populist political discourse', *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict* **8**(1), 118–145.

- Bucy, E. P., Foley, J. M., Lukito, J., Doroshenko, L., Shah, D. V., Pevehouse, J. C. & Wells, C. (2020), ‘Performing populism: Trump’s transgressive debate style and the dynamics of Twitter response’, *New Media & Society* **22**(4), 634–658.
- Bucy, E. P. & Grabe, M. E. (2007), ‘Taking Television Seriously: A Sound and Image Bite Analysis of Presidential Campaign Coverage, 1992-2004’, *Journal of Communication* **57**(4), 652–675.
- Bucy, E. P. & Grabe, M. E. (2008), “‘Happy warriors’ Revisited: Hedonic and agonistic display repertoires of presidential candidates on the evening news’, *Politics and the Life Sciences* **27**(1), 78–98.
- Caiani, M. & Di Cocco, J. (2023), ‘Populism and emotions: a comparative study using machine learning’, pp. 1–16.
- Chang, W., Cheng, J., Allaire, J. J., Sievert, C., Schloerke, B., Xie, Y., Allen, J., McPherson, J., Dipert, A. & Borges, B. (2024), *shiny: Web Application Framework for R*.
URL: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=shiny>
- Cochrane, C., Rheault, L., Godbout, J.-F., Whyte, T., Wong, M. W.-C. & Borwein, S. (2022), ‘The Automatic Analysis of Emotion in Political Speech Based on Transcripts’, *Political Communication* **39**(1), 98–121.
- Davidson, T. & Enos, J. (2022), ‘Are populist political parties more popular on social media? evidence from europe, 2010-2020’.
URL: <https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/kdyc6/>
- Demertzis, N. (2006), Emotions and Populism, in S. Clarke, P. Hoggett & S. Thomp-

- son, eds, 'Emotion, Politics and Society', Palgrave Macmillan UK, London, pp. 103–122.
- Ekman, P. & Friesen, W. V. (1976), 'Measuring facial movement', *Environmental Psychology and Nonverbal Behavior* **1**(1), 56–75.
- Engesser, S., Fawzi, N. & Larsson, A. O. (2017), 'Populist online communication: introduction to the special issue', **20**(9), 1279–1292.
URL: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1328525>
- Finlayson, A. (2022), 'YouTube and political ideologies: Technology, populism and rhetorical form', **70**(1), 62–80.
URL: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0032321720934630>
- Gidron, N. & Bonikowski, B. (2013), 'Varieties of Populism: Literature Review and Research Agenda', *SSRN Electronic Journal* .
- Goodfellow, I. J., Erhan, D., Carrier, P. L., Courville, A., Mirza, M., Hamner, B., Cukierski, W., Tang, Y., Thaler, D., Lee, D.-H., Zhou, Y., Ramaiah, C., Feng, F., Li, R., Wang, X., Athanasakis, D., Shawe-Taylor, J., Milakov, M., Park, J., Ionescu, R., Popescu, M., Grozea, C., Bergstra, J., Xie, J., Romaszko, L., Xu, B., Chuang, Z. & Bengio, Y. (2013), 'Challenges in Representation Learning: A report on three machine learning contests'.
- Grabe, M. E. & Bucy, E. P. (2009), *Image Bite Politics: News and the Visual Framing of Elections*, Series in Political Psychology, Oxford University Press, Oxford ; New York.
- Greenacre, M. (2021), 'Compositional Data Analysis', *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* **8**(1), 271–299.

Gründl, J. (2022), ‘Populist ideas on social media: A dictionary-based measurement of populist communication’, **24**(6), 1481–1499.

URL: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444820976970>

Hawkins, K. A. & Kaltwasser, C. R. (2018), Introduction: The ideational approach, *in* ‘The ideational approach to populism’, Routledge, pp. 1–24.

Heuer, H., Hoch, H., Breiter, A. & Theocharis, Y. (2021), Auditing the biases enacted by YouTube for political topics in germany, *in* ‘Proceedings of Mensch und Computer 2021’, MuC ’21, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, pp. 456–468.

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3473856.3473864>

Inglehart, R. & Norris, P. (2016), ‘Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism: Economic Have-Nots and Cultural Backlash’, *SSRN Electronic Journal* .

Jacobs, K., Sandberg, L. & Spierings, N. (2020), ‘Twitter and Facebook: Populists’ double-barreled gun?’, *New Media & Society* **22**(4), 611–633.

James, N. A. & Matteson, D. S. (2015), ‘Ecp: An R Package for Nonparametric Multiple Change Point Analysis of Multivariate Data’, *Journal of Statistical Software* **62**, 1–25.

Jankowski, M. & Huber, R. A. (2023), ‘When correlation is not enough: Validating populism scores from supervised Machine-Learning models’, *Political analysis: an annual publication of the Methodology Section of the American Political Science Association* **31**(4), 591–605.

URL: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/8CB3DCBECD1E37872074E7F8A9DE20BA/S1047198722000328a.pdf/div->

class-title-when-correlation-is-not-enough-validating-populism-scores-from-supervised-machine-learning-models-div.pdf

Joo, J., Bucy, E. P. & Seidel, C. (2019), ‘Automated Coding of Televised Leader Displays: Detecting Nonverbal Political Behavior With Computer Vision and Deep Learning’, *International Journal of Communication* **13**(0), 23.

Khairuddin, Y. & Chen, Z. (2021), ‘Facial Emotion Recognition: State of the Art Performance on FER2013’.

Kobakian, S. & O’Hara-Wild, M. (2018), *taipan: Tool for Annotating Images in Preparation for Analysis*.

URL: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=taipan>

Lalancette, M. & Raynauld, V. (2019), ‘The Power of Political Image: Justin Trudeau, Instagram, and Celebrity Politics’, *American Behavioral Scientist* **63**(7), 888–924.

Larsson, A. O. (2022), ‘Picture-perfect populism: Tracing the rise of european populist parties on facebook’, **24**(1), 227–245.

URL: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444820963777>

Macagno, F. (2022), ‘Argumentation profiles and the manipulation of common ground. The arguments of populist leaders on Twitter’, *Journal of Pragmatics* **191**, 67–82.

Martella, A. & Bracciale, R. (2022), ‘Populism and emotions: Italian political leaders’ communicative strategies to engage Facebook users’, *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research* **35**(1), 65–85.

- Masters, R., Sullivan, D., Lanzetta, J., Mchugo, G. & Englis, B. (1986), ‘The facial displays of leaders: Toward an ethology of human politics’, *Journal of Social and Biological Systems* **9**(4), 319–343.
- Mazzoleni, G. (2014), Mediatization and Political Populism, *in* F. Esser & J. Strömbäck, eds, ‘Mediatization of Politics’, Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Mendonça, R. F. & Caetano, R. D. (2021), ‘Populism as Parody: The Visual Self-Presentation of Jair Bolsonaro on Instagram’, *The International Journal of Press/Politics* **26**(1), 210–235.
- Messarlis, P. (2019), The digital transformation of visual politics, *in* A. Veneti, D. Jackson & D. G. Lilleker, eds, ‘Visual Political Communication’, Springer International Publishing, pp. 17–36.
- Moffitt, B. (2022a), ‘How Do Populists Visually Represent ‘The People’? A Systematic Comparative Visual Content Analysis of Donald Trump and Bernie Sanders’ Instagram Accounts’, *The International Journal of Press/Politics* p. 19401612221100418.
- Moffitt, B. (2022b), ‘Taking Account of the Visual Politics of Populism’, *Polity* **54**(3), 557–564.
- Moffitt, B. & Tormey, S. (2014), ‘Rethinking Populism: Politics, Mediatization and Political Style’, *Political Studies* **62**(2), 381–397.
- Mohammad, S. M. (2016), Sentiment Analysis: Detecting Valence, Emotions, and Other Affectual States from Text, *in* H. L. Meiselman, ed., ‘Emotion Measurement’, Elsevier ; Woodhead Publishing, Amsterdam.

- Mudde, C. (2004), ‘The Populist Zeitgeist’, *Government and Opposition* **39**(4), 541–563.
- Mudde, C. (2017), Populism: An Ideational Approach, *in* C. Rovira Kaltwasser, P. A. Taggart, P. Ochoa Espejo & P. Ostiguy, eds, ‘The Oxford Handbook of Populism’, Oxford Handbooks, Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom ; New York, pp. 27–47.
- Nguyen, C. (2019), ‘Emotions and populist support’.
URL: <https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/e2wm6/>
- Norris, P. (2020), ‘Measuring populism worldwide’, *Party Politics* **26**(6), 697–717.
- Norris, P. & Inglehart, R. (2019), *Cultural Backlash: Trump, Brexit, and Authoritarian Populism*, Cambridge University Press.
- Ostiguy, P. (2017), Populism: A Socio-Cultural Approach, *in* C. Rovira Kaltwasser, P. A. Taggart, P. Ochoa Espejo & P. Ostiguy, eds, ‘The Oxford Handbook of Populism’, Oxford Handbooks, Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom ; New York, pp. 73–95.
- Posit team (2024), *RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R*, Posit Software, PBC, Boston, MA.
URL: <http://www.posit.co/>
- Rovira Kaltwasser, C., Taggart, P. A., Ochoa Espejo, P. & Ostiguy, P., eds (2017), *The Oxford Handbook of Populism*, Oxford Handbooks, Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom ; New York.
- Ryan, O., Dablander, F. & Haslbeck, J. M. B. (2023), Towards a Generative Model for Emotion Dynamics, Preprint, PsyArXiv.

- Salmela, M. & von Scheve, C. (2018), ‘Emotional Dynamics of Right- and Left-wing Political Populism’, *Humanity & Society* **42**(4), 434–454.
- Schmøkel, R. & Bossetta, M. (2022), ‘FBAdLibrarian and Pykognition: Open science tools for the collection and emotion detection of images in Facebook political ads with computer vision’, *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* **19**(1), 118–128.
- Shenk, J., CG, A., Arriaga, O. & Owlwasrowk (2021), ‘Justinshenk/fer: Zenodo’, Zenodo.
- Stewart, P. A., Bucy, E. P. & Mehu, M. (2015), ‘Strengthening bonds and connecting with followers: A biobehavioral inventory of political smiles’, *Politics and the Life Sciences* **34**(1), 73–92.
- Stewart, P. A. & Ford Dowe, P. K. (2013), ‘Interpreting President Barack Obama’s Facial Displays of Emotion: Revisiting the Dartmouth Group: Interpreting Obama’s Facial Displays of Emotion’, *Political Psychology* **34**(3), 369–385.
- Stewart, P. A., Salter, F. K. & Mehu, M. (2009), ‘Taking leaders at face value: Ethology and the analysis of televised leader displays’, *Politics and the Life Sciences* **28**(1), 48–74.
- Sullivan, D. G. & Masters, R. D. (1988), ‘“Happy Warriors”: Leaders’ Facial Displays, Viewers’ Emotions, and Political Support’, *American Journal of Political Science* **32**(2), 345–368.
- Wells, C., Shah, D., Lukito, J., Pelled, A., Pevehouse, J. C. & Yang, J. (2020), ‘Trump, twitter, and news media responsiveness: A media systems approach’,

22(4), 659–682.

URL: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444819893987>

Weyland, K. (2017), Populism: A Political-Strategic Approach, *in* C. Rovira Kaltwasser, P. A. Taggart, P. Ochoa Espejo & P. Ostiguy, eds, ‘The Oxford Handbook of Populism’, Oxford Handbooks, Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom ; New York, pp. 48–72.

Widmann, T. (2021), ‘How Emotional Are Populists Really? Factors Explaining Emotional Appeals in the Communication of Political Parties’, *Political Psychology* **42**(1), 163–181.

Wiesehomeier, N. (2018), Expert surveys, *in* ‘The Ideational Approach to Populism’, Routledge, pp. 90–111.

Zhang, K., Zhang, Z., Li, Z. & Qiao, Y. (2016*a*), ‘Joint face detection and alignment using multitask cascaded convolutional networks’, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* **23**(10), 1499–1503.

Zhang, K., Zhang, Z., Li, Z. & Qiao, Y. (2016*b*), ‘Joint Face Detection and Alignment Using Multitask Cascaded Convolutional Networks’, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* **23**(10), 1499–1503.

A Supplementary: Alternative frame processing approach

In our main analysis we presented the results based on the frame-processing approach of selecting 300 uniformly distributed frames from each video. An alternative, which yields roughly the same number of frames per video (273.03 on average), is to select and process every 50th frame of each given video. With this approach, we arrive at 209 successfully processed videos—six more than in the main analysis, because we find more consistent face selection in several videos when the algorithm receives this type of input. For shorter videos, this reduces the probability that, when selecting exactly 300 frames, a significant proportion of these frames captures cutaways to other people or the audience instead of the leader delivering their speech. Pluralist leaders are present in 101 videos (31 strongly pluralist and 70 moderately pluralist) and populist leaders are present in the remaining 108 videos (70 strongly populist and 38 moderately populist). Descriptive statistics for emotion variables obtained from this frame processing approach are presented in Table 2.

These results are quite similar to those presented in Table 1, with no major deviations in terms of central tendency or variability of the 8 variables. Anger, sadness, and fear are the most common emotions and negative emotions have an average score higher than 0.5.

Again, we observe statistically significant differences in the means of negative emotions and neutral expression between populists and pluralists (negative emotions: $t = 3.742$, $p = 0.00024$; neutral expression: $t = -3.222$, $p = 0.00148$). The sample mean differences are smaller than in the main analysis, but with no changes in the

| | Mean | SD | Min. | Median | Max. |
|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| Anger | 0.223 | 0.130 | 0.031 | 0.195 | 0.728 |
| Disgust | 0.003 | 0.006 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.051 |
| Fear | 0.122 | 0.087 | 0.015 | 0.093 | 0.530 |
| Happiness | 0.084 | 0.099 | 0.001 | 0.053 | 0.594 |
| Sadness | 0.204 | 0.109 | 0.021 | 0.183 | 0.573 |
| Surprise | 0.030 | 0.037 | 0.000 | 0.018 | 0.275 |
| Neutral | 0.332 | 0.167 | 0.021 | 0.309 | 0.812 |
| Negative emotions | 0.552 | 0.182 | 0.147 | 0.558 | 0.965 |

Table 2: Descriptive statistics for extracted emotions for the entire sample, $N = 209$ videos

statistical significance (negative: 0.116 in main analysis, 0.091 alternative; neutral: -0.075 in main analysis, - 0.074 in alternative). The distribution of average scores is shown in Figure 5.

Figures 6 and 7 illustrate the differences in the distribution of mean emotion scores for four subsamples according to the degree of pluralist/populist rhetoric. The results of one-way ANOVA remain in accordance with the main analysis, but with weaker effect size in the case of negative emotions. The differences between the group means are statistically significant both in the case of negative emotions ($F = 4.886$, $p = 0.002712$) with moderate effect size measured by eta-squared (0.073), and neutral expression ($F = 5.180$ $p = 0.001846$) with moderate effect size (0.077).

The results from Tukey HSD post-hoc tests reveal significant differences between leaders coming from parties employing strong populist rhetoric and leaders coming




Figure 5: Distribution of average scores of negative emotions (left) and neutral expression (right) of videos featuring populist and pluralist leaders.

from pluralist parties (mean difference 0.1298 $p = 0.0057$ in comparison with strong pluralists, and mean difference 0.0961 $p = 0.0166$ in comparison with moderate pluralists). For neutral expression we again find the opposite case, as strong pluralists differ from both groups of populists (mean difference 0.138 $p = 0.0037$ for moderate populists, and mean difference 0.1131 $p = 0.0122$ for strong populists).

Overall, we conclude that using an alternative frame processing approach does not change the outcomes of statistical tests, but the reduced effect size in the case of




Figure 6: Raincloud plot showing the distribution of average scores of negative emotions across four degrees of populism. Every data point is presented as a colored dot and above them boxplots and density plots are displayed. The dashed vertical bar indicates the score of 0.5

negative emotions and overall shrinkage of the absolute differences between groups should certainly be noted.

B Supplementary: Dominant emotions per frame

Another way of conceptualizing differences in emotional expression is to look at the proportions of frames in which a certain emotion or type of emotional expression is dominant among the groups (Table 3).




Figure 7: Raincloud plot showing the distribution of average scores of neutral expression across four degrees of populism. Every data point is presented as a colored dot and above them boxplots and density plots are displayed. The dashed vertical bar indicates the score of 0.5.

| | Anger | Disgust | Fear | Happiness | Sadness | Surprise | Neutral | Negative emotions |
|----------------------|-------|---------|-------|-----------|---------|----------|---------|-------------------|
| Main analysis | | | | | | | | |
| Pluralists | 0.162 | 0.001 | 0.094 | 0.072 | 0.123 | 0.019 | 0.428 | 0.461 |
| Populists | 0.262 | 0.004 | 0.084 | 0.062 | 0.234 | 0.010 | 0.345 | 0.667 |
| Supplementary | | | | | | | | |
| Pluralists | 0.176 | 0.000 | 0.096 | 0.073 | 0.132 | 0.020 | 0.438 | 0.484 |
| Populists | 0.248 | 0.000 | 0.080 | 0.076 | 0.225 | 0.011 | 0.358 | 0.640 |

Table 3: Mean proportion of all frames in which emotion or group of emotions has the highest score, and mean proportion of frames in which negative emotions have a sum score ≥ 0.5 , per category of leader and split by frame processing approach.




Figure 8: Mean and raw scores of negative emotions for every country (ISO country codes on x-axis) in the sample and for populist and pluralist leaders. Transparent points are raw scores, thicker points are means for every group.

C Supplement C: Country-level comparison

The sample of YouTube videos and leaders who appear in them is not representative for any country included. We have selected only a few political parties and deliberately excluded small parties from the analysis. Nonetheless, here we provide a brief overview of raw and mean scores of negative emotions and neutral expression for every country in the sample, split by populist and pluralist leaders. Both Figure 8 and 9 show that the differences between populists and pluralists are not always consistent between the countries.

For example, in the case of Serbia, Croatia and South Africa, pluralists show more negative emotions (average score > 0.5 in all three cases). On the other hand, in Serbia, Croatia, Australia, the Netherlands and Brazil, we have cases where populists are on average more neutral in their public appearances.




Figure 9: Mean and raw scores of neutral expression for every country (ISO country codes on x-axis) in the sample and for populist and pluralist leaders. Transparent points are raw scores, thicker points are means for every group.

Larger samples with more coverage of political parties and movements are needed in order to investigate whether these differences and inconsistencies are consequences of sampling variability or true effects.

D Supplementary: Political leaders

| Country | Leader | Party | Acronym | Populism Category | Ideology Category |
|------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Argentina | Alberto Fernández | Justicialist Party | PJ | Strongly populist | Right Conservative |
| | Mauricio Macri | Republican Proposal | PRO-UCR (coalition) | Moderately pluralist | Right Conservative |
| | Sergio Massa | Renewal Front | 1País (coalition) | Moderately populist | Right Conservative |
| Australia | Warren Truss | National Party of Australia | NAT | Moderately populist | Right Conservative |
| | Bill Shorten | Australian Labor Party | ALP | Strongly pluralist | Left Liberal |
| | Scott Morrison | Liberal Party of Australia | LP | Moderately pluralist | Right Conservative |
| Brazil | Simone Tebet | Brazilian Democratic Movement | MDB | Moderately pluralist | Right Conservative |
| | Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva | Workers' Party | PT | Moderately pluralist | Left Liberal |

Continued on next page

Table 4 – *Continued from previous page*

| Country | Leader | Party | Acronym | Populism Category | Ideology Category | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|---------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Croatia | Jair Bolsonaro | Bol-Social Party | Liberal | PSL | Strongly populist | Right Conservative |
| | Andrej Plenković | Croatian Democratic Union | | HDZ | Moderately populist | Left Conservative |
| | Zoran Milanović | Mi-Social Democratic Party | Demo- | SPH (coalition) | Moderately pluralist | Left Liberal |
| | Ivan Vilibor Sinčić | Vilibor Key of Croatia (formerly named Human Shield) | Croatia | OOP (coalition) | Strongly populist | Right Conservative |
| France | Marine Le Pen | Le National Rally | | FN | Strongly populist | Right Conservative |
| | Emmanuel Macron | Renaissance (formerly named En Marche) | | REM | Moderately pluralist | Right Liberal |
| | François Bayrou | Bayrou Democratic Movement | | MoDem | Strongly pluralist | Right Liberal |
| Hungary | Viktor Orbán | Fidesz | | Fidesz | Strongly populist | Right Conservative |

Continued on next page

Table 4 – *Continued from previous page*

| Country | Leader | Party | Acronym | Populism Category | Ideology Category |
|--------------|------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| India | Ferenc Gyurcsány | Democratic Coalition | DK | Strongly pluralist | Right Liberal |
| | Péter Jakab | Jobbik | Jobbik | Strongly populist | Right Conservative |
| | Narendra Modi | Bharatiya Janata Party | BJP | Strongly populist | Right Conservative |
| | Sonia Gandhi | Indian National Congress | INC | Moderately pluralist | Left Liberal |
| | Mamata Banerjee | All India Trinamool Congress | AITC | Moderately populist | Left Conservative |
| | Italy | Matteo Salvini | Lega Nord | CD (coalition) | Strongly populist |
| Enrico Letta | | Democratic Party | CCS (coalition) | Strongly pluralist | Left Liberal |
| Beppe Grillo | | Five Star Movement | M5S | Strongly populist | Left Conservative |

Continued on next page

Table 4 – *Continued from previous page*

| Country | Leader | Party | Acronym | Populism Category | Ideology Category |
|--------------------|--------------------|--|---------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Japan | Shinzo Abe | Liberal Democratic Party | LDP | Moderately populist | Right Conservative |
| | Natsuo Yamaguchi | Komeito | NKP | Strongly pluralist | Left Conservative |
| | Yukio Edano | Constitutional Democratic Party of Japan | CDP | Moderately pluralist | Left Liberal |
| Netherlands | Geert Wilders | Party for Freedom | PVV | Strongly populist | Left Conservative |
| | Alexander Pechtold | Democrats 66 | D66 | Strongly pluralist | Right Liberal |
| | Mark Rutte | People's Party for Freedom and Democracy | VVD | Moderately pluralist | Right Liberal |
| Serbia | Aleksandar Vučić | Serbian Progressive Party | SNS | Strongly populist | Right Conservative |
| | Zoran Lutovac | Democratic Party | DS | Moderately pluralist | Left Liberal |

Continued on next page

Table 4 – *Continued from previous page*

| Country | Leader | Party | Acronym | Populism Category | Ideology Category |
|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|----------------------|--------------------|
| | Saša Radulović | Enough is | DJB | Moderately pluralist | Right Liberal |
| South Africa | Julius Malema | Economic Freedom Fighters | EFF | Strongly populist | Left Conservative |
| | Jacob Zuma | African National Congress | ANC | Moderately populist | Left Conservative |
| | John Steenhuisen | Democratic Alliance | DA | Moderately pluralist | Right Liberal |
| Turkey | Recep Erdoğan | The Justice and Development Party | AKP | Strongly populist | Right Conservative |
| | Selahattin Demirtaş | Peoples' Democratic Party | HDP | Strongly pluralist | Left Liberal |
| | Kemal Kılıçdaroğlu | Republican People's Party | SHP/CHP | Moderately pluralist | Left Liberal |
| UK | Nigel Farage | UK Independence Party | UKIP | Strongly populist | Right Conservative |

Continued on next page

Table 4 – *Continued from previous page*

| Country | Leader | Party | Acronym | Populism Category | Ideology Category |
|---------|----------------|-------------------------|---------|----------------------|--------------------|
| USA | Jeremy Corbyn | Cor-Labour Party | Lab | Moderately populist | Left Conservative |
| | Boris Johnson | John-Conservative Party | CON | Moderately populist | Right Conservative |
| | Donald Trump | Republican Party | GOP | Strongly populist | Right Conservative |
| | Hilary Clinton | Clin-Democratic Party | Dem | Moderately pluralist | Left Liberal |

Table 4: Information about political leaders present in the YouTube video dataset, the parties they are affiliated with, party or coalition acronyms from the GPS dataset, and populism and ideology categories from the GPS dataset (TYPE_POPULISM and TYPE_VALUES variables)

E Supplementary: Ideological differences

We examined differences in the expression of negative emotions and neutrality of expression between different ideological groups according to the GPS variable Type_Values,

| | Negative emotions | | | Neutral expression | | |
|------------------------|-------------------|-------|-------|--------------------|-------|--------|
| | t | p | d | t | p | d |
| Right - Left | 1.447 | 0.151 | 0.203 | -2.135 | 0.034 | -0.304 |
| Conservative - Liberal | 1.715 | 0.088 | 0.214 | -1.474 | 0.142 | -0.207 |

Table 5: Results of the t-test for differences in mean negative emotions score and mean neutral expression between political leaders belonging to parties differing on Right VS Left and Conservative VS Liberal values according to the GPS dataset

which combines two categorizations of political parties: economic values (Left = pro-state or Right = pro-market) and social values (Liberal or Conservative). The results of independent samples t-test are shown in the Table 5.

F Supplementary: Image annotation

For the image annotation study, 514 frames were randomly selected from the sample of all frames extracted from the videos in the main study. Image annotation was performed in RStudio (Posit team 2024) using a Shiny (Chang et al. 2024) application built using a customized version of the taipan R package (Kobakian & O’Hara-Wild 2018). Figure 10 shows the main interface of the application used by coders. Responses from each of the 5 coders were exported from the application as CSV files.

After aggregating the results from all human coders, a majority vote principle was applied to obtain the final label. This means that at least three out of five coders had to apply the same label out of the four labels given (“No face”, “Positive”, “Negative”, “Neutral”) to the image in order for that label to be taken as the output




Figure 10: Taipan interface showing the image from the sample (top left), short instructions (bottom left), and the questions about the image along with navigation buttons (top right).

of the human annotation process. In the case of the machine learning output, we took the highest (sum) score to obtain the final label: “Positive”, “Negative” or “Neutral”. If all scores had missing values in the case of the machine learning output, we assigned a “No face” label to that image.

Agreement between pairs of human coders and between any individual coder and machine learning output is not highly relevant to the aim of the study, however we show values of pairwise Cohen’s Kappa on Figure 11 to illustrate the difficulty of the task and the absence of high levels of agreement between human coders.

In summary, when considering a 4-label problem where human labels are obtained by a majority vote, we have 458 cases with 55.2% agreement, Cohen’s Kappa of 0.31 and F1 score of 0.502. Table 6 provides additional information. The highest accuracy is recorded in the case of negative emotions and the lowest accuracy is in the case




Figure 11: Pairwise Cohen’s Kappa values for agreement between pairs of human coders or pairs of human coders and the ML model.

| Human \ ML | Positive | Neutral | Negative | No Face |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Positive | 0.5 | 0.25 | 0.23 | 0.02 |
| Neutral | 0.13 | 0.49 | 0.30 | 0.08 |
| Negative | 0.17 | 0.2 | 0.59 | 0.04 |
| No Face | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.29 | 0.59 |
| <i>Precision</i> | <i>0.26</i> | <i>0.50</i> | <i>0.72</i> | <i>0.48</i> |
| <i>Recall</i> | <i>0.5</i> | <i>0.49</i> | <i>0.59</i> | <i>0.59</i> |

Table 6: Confusion matrix with row-wise ratios, precision and recall values for agreement between the majority vote of human coders and the ML model output.

| Human \ ML | Positive | Neutral | Negative |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Positive | 0.51 | 0.26 | 0.23 |
| Neutral | 0.13 | 0.6 | 0.27 |
| Negative | 0.18 | 0.2 | 0.62 |
| <i>Precision</i> | <i>0.27</i> | <i>0.49</i> | <i>0.80</i> |
| <i>Recall</i> | <i>0.51</i> | <i>0.6</i> | <i>0.62</i> |

Table 7: Confusion matrix with row-wise ratios, precision and recall values for agreement between the majority vote of human coders and the ML model output in cases where there is agreement about a face being clearly visible (present)

of positive emotions. This is likely due to the imbalance within emotion labels on which the ML model is trained.

Table 7 shows values for a subset of cases where the majority of humans and the ML model agree that there is a face clearly visible (present) in the image (3-label problem). Here, we have 365 cases with 59.83% agreement, Cohen’s Kappa of 0.32 and F1 score of 0.53.