Visual Personalization in the 2019 EU Election Campaign

Carlson, Tom; Håkansson, Nicklas

Please cite the original version:
Carlson, T., & Håkansson, N. (2022). Visual Personalization in the 2019 EU Election Campaign. In E. Novelli, B. Johansson, & D. Wring (Eds.), *The 2019 European Electoral Campaign: In the Time of Populism and Social Media* (pp. 63-82). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-98993-4_4

CHAPTER 3

Visual Personalization in the 2019 EU Election Campaign

Tom Carlson and Nicklas Håkansson

Introduction

Although we habitually think of political campaigning as an arena of words, visual imagery is also an important part of the story. Throughout campaigns, posters, spots and social media are filled with images of politicians, voters, and political symbols (e.g. Schill 2012; Towner 2017). Political strategists believe that visual imagery affects voters and this assumption has been supported by research, showing that images are more quickly processed than words and are crucial for how political messages are perceived and interpreted (e.g. Brader 2006; Lindholm et al. 2021). The widespread display of images of politicians is also an aspect of the personalization of politics. During campaigns, parties frequently display images of politicians, which are visually portrayed to shape perceptions of their character and personality (e.g. Rahat and Zamir 2018; Russmann et al. 2019).

The visual personalization of politics might be particularly important in election campaigns for the European Parliament when it comes to raising voter interest and involvement. As noted by Gattermann and de Vreese (2017) and Gattermann and Marquart (2020), in a situation where voters experience EU political processes as distant and abstract, the visual presence of political candidates and leaders in campaigns provides a human face to EU politics, thus making it more accessible and interesting. Moreover, in second-order and low-information elections (as EU elections), which do not attract extensive media coverage or voter interest, the visual imagery of politicians may function as heuristic information short-cuts for voters when it comes to making judgements about the character of leaders as well as numerous candidates, of whom many voters may not be very familiar (e.g. Banducci et al. 2008).

Against this background, this chapter describes and analyzes the level of visual personalization as well as variations in the visual styles of politicians during the 2019 EU election campaign. Regarding the visual style – how the politicians are visually portrayed – we focus on the

politicians' facial expressions and clothing, which are two central visual cues that aid them in building a positive image and signal to the voters to trust them and vote for them. Empirically, we investigate differences and similarities in visual personalization and visual styles across different media channels, European regions, and ideological party groups. Furthermore, we explore potential gender differences in the visual portrayal of politicians.

Background and Context

In this chapter, we firstly study the degree of *visual personalization*, which we measure as the extent to which images of politicians appear in campaign media. The personalization of politics, which makes individual politicians prominent in politics (e.g. Cross et al. 2018), has accentuated the visual presence of party leaders and political candidates in a range of campaign channels; posters (Steffan and Venema 2019; Vliegenthart 2012), spots (Holtz-Bacha et al. 2012), and social media (Farkas and Bene 2021; Poulakidakos and Giannouli 2019; Russmann et al. 2019). As already noted, the nature of European politics and the second-order character of EU elections arguably make visual personalization strategically important in EU election campaigns. Additionally, the EU elections are about electing individuals as representatives in the Parliament, which motivates parties to make their candidates known among the electorate. There are also strong incentives for party leaders and leading political figures other than the candidates themselves to appear in EU campaigns. The EU itself has also contributed in the direction of placing emphasis on leading political figures in the promotion of the 'Spitzenkandidat principle', i.e., the pre-election nomination of a party's preferred candidate for Commission President (Borrell et al. 2017; Hobolt 2014).

Secondly, we study the *visual style* of politicians in the campaign media. The visual cues in focus here – facial expressions and dress – have a significant communicative potential to shape how voters perceive the character and personality of politicians figuring in campaigns (see Carpinella and Johnson 2016; Dumitrescu 2016; Spezio et al. 2012). Regarding the choice of attire, politics in the Western world has traditionally kept to a rather strict dress code, although deviating from the formal 'suit-and-tie' norm may be part of political strategies (Bjerling 2012: 190–192; Oh 2019). Grabe and Bucy (2009: 104–107) differentiate between the visual framing of the 'ideal candidate' stressing statesmanship by, inter alia, depicting the politician dressed in formal attire (suit and tie, office wear) and the visual framing of the 'populist campaigner'

that conveys the image of ordinariness, by 'subverting the formality of proper political attire', for example by appearing without a jacket or in casual clothing.

Facial expressions are also obvious aspects of the visual appearance of politicians and are associated with trustworthiness and personal ethos. Just as dress is concerned, whether a politician puts a friendly smile on his/her face, or appears serious and/or concerned, is something the individual can adapt to the situation and can thus be subject to strategic considerations. A smiling face may be 'likeable', all other things aside, as smiling/friendly expressions tend to elicit positive emotions and are associated with friendliness and happiness (e.g. Koo 2020; Sülflow and Maurer 2019). Conversely, a neutral or serious expression, signalling power, dominance, and leadership, is more in line with the solemnity associated with politics and statesmanship (e.g. Dumitrescu 2016; Englis 1994).

Our empirical analysis of the visual personalization in the 2019 EU election campaign across the member states aims not only to describe the degree of visual personalization and the prevalence of visual styles; we will also explore how four factors may be associated with visual personalization strategies.

First, as previous research has shown that the use of visual appeals and cues may differ across *media channels* (Borrell et al. 2017; Carlson et al. 2017), we will compare how the level and styles of visual personalization vary across posters, spots, and social media.

Second, variations between different *supranational regions* in the EU (e.g. Northern vs. Southern Europe) can be expected to exist, as they may be exponents of differing political cultures that bring about different approaches to visual campaigning (e.g. Carlson et al. 2017; Pérez 2017). For example, informal clothing and appearances that signal affinity with 'ordinary people' and 'folksiness', are likely to be culturally bound and valued more in some political cultures (Krogstad 2017). Moreover, some findings show that the presence of smiling politicians in visual imagery may vary cross-culturally (Horiuchi et al. 2012).

Third, the willingness to visually personalize campaigns will be explored on the level of party groups based on *party ideological differences* (see Borrell et al. 2017; Carlson et al. 2017; Haim and Jungblut 2021). For example, populist parties may deliberately build personal images of their politicians in campaign imagery that are in contrast with those of political elites.

Fourth, focus will be placed on *gender* as a potential factor influencing visual styles of personalization. Regarding facial expressions, some research shows that female candidates are more likely to smile than their male counterparts in campaign imagery (Bystrom 2020: 3; Carlson 2001; Koo 2020). Concerning political attire, Oh (2019) states that 'the suit' has globally been standardized as the fashion for female politicians, as it connotes power and masculinity. There might be a stronger demand for female politicians to adhere to stricter dress codes to be accepted in a traditionally male domain such as politics (Oh 2019: 376). In the US, Bystrom (2020: 3) notes that female candidates have been more likely to dress formally in campaign advertising than male candidates. On the other hand, it has been argued that female politicians nowadays have a broader – less constrained – choice than their male counterparts regarding dress codes (Campus 2013: 84).

Previous Research

Only a small number of cross-national studies abound regarding visual appearances of politicians in EU election campaigns. Concerning the 2009 EU elections, Holtz-Bacha et al. (2012) reported varying degrees of personalization, defined as the visual presence of party representatives, in spots in France, Germany, Sweden and the UK. Similarly, Kaid et al. (2011: 101–102) showed that candidate presence in spots varied greatly between parties and countries (33 to 100 percent) that same election year. In the 2014 EU elections, 74 percent of the spots and 52 percent of the posters in the national campaigns featured politicians, however again with great variation across countries and party families (Borrell et al. 2017). Right-leaning parties were more prone to show their politicians in their advertising than were far-left and green parties (Borrell et al. 2017; Carlson et al. 2017).

Regarding facial displays, Novelli (2017) reports that the smiling leader – rather than the neutral or more serious – was the typical politician in the posters in the 2009 and 2014 EU elections. According to Borrell et al. (2017), posters were more likely to feature smiling politicians (48 percent) than were spots in the 2014 EU elections (26 percent). Haim and Jungblut (2021), using computational content analysis of visual candidate imagery in the 2019 EU elections, found that the self-depiction of happy smiling facial expressions in the social networking sites of the candidates varied significantly across the 28 EU countries.

Concerning outfits, Novelli (2017: 99–100) found that formal attire dominated among depicted politicians in the 2014 EU election campaign, although parties to the left and green parties (particularly in Northern Europe) were more prone to show politicians with informal wear. Similarly, Borrell et al. (2017) observed that formal dress was the most common attire of politicians depicted in spots (50 percent of the spots) as well as in posters (48 percent) in the 2014 EU elections. Carlson et al. (2017) examined which factors predict the presence of formally dressed politicians with non-smiling facial expressions in campaign media across the member states in the 2014 EU elections. They found that this kind of imagery was more likely to appear in spots than in posters, in campaigns by populistic Eurosceptic parties, and in Eastern Europe. Green parties were less likely to depict their politicians in such a way. Finally, to the best of our knowledge, there are no studies examining how gender is associated with strategical choices of facial expressions and attire in campaign media across Europe.

Results

The empirical focus is directed at the national 2019 EU election campaigns conducted by the political parties in EU-28, thus excluding campaign material issued by individual candidates themselves. In the EEMC data set 2019, the number of campaign items that were coded for the visual presence of politicians (yes/no) is as follows: posters, $N = 582$; spots, $N = 293$; social media content, $N = 7,891$.[1] The latter category falls into three subcategories, all of which have been published on the official party Facebook channels: images ($N = 1,155$), videos ($N = 3,343$), and webcards ($N = 3,393$).

The Results section is structured as follows. First, we examine the aggregated level of visual personalization in the 2019 EU elections. Second, we present results regarding the visual styles of politicians, focusing on facial expressions and dress. Apart from descriptive results, we conduct an explanatory analysis to investigate how four factors – media channel, European region, party ideology, and gender – are associated with levels and styles of visual personalization.

---

[1] Newspaper advertisements are excluded from the analyses due to their small number in the data set ($N = 79$).

Level and Objects of Visual Personalization

The first question we delve into is the frequency of politicians' visual presence in the campaign. How common are depictions of politicians in the various campaign channels, and what kind of politicians are present?

Table 3.1 shows that politicians have a high visual presence in all campaign media, but particularly in Facebook images and videos where politicians are portrayed in an overwhelming majority of the cases. Politicians are also highly visible in spots, and, to a slightly lesser degree, in posters.

[TABLE 3.1 ABOUT HERE]

In comparison with the 2014 EU election campaign (Borrell et al. 2017), the level of visual personalization has increased regarding posters, from 52 percent in 2014 to 72 percent, and concerning spots, from 74 percent to 81 percent.

Moving on to the question regarding *which* politicians appear, Table 3.2 reveals that the images almost exclusively show domestic politicians.

[TABLE 3.2 ABOUT HERE]

Very few foreign politicians were displayed in the campaigns of the national parties. Although generally an expected finding, it can be related to the issue of the *Spitzenkandidaten* and the efforts to make EU elections more European and to raise electoral interest in them. Only in Germany, the Netherlands (both 35 percent) and Belgium (31 percent) did the top candidates constitute any substantial share of the politicians on visual display. In at least the two first countries, the pictured *Spitzenkandidaten* were their own nationals (Manfred Weber and Frans Timmermans, respectively). In five countries (Cyprus, Denmark, Ireland, Lithuania, and Slovakia), none of these top candidates appeared whatsoever. Thus, the *Spitzenkandidaten* are if not invisible, so clearly marginal in their visual campaign presence. In this respect, our results are very much in line with those of Borrell et al. (2017) in their study of the 2014 EU election campaign.

Moreover, Table 3.2 demonstrates that a vast majority of the portrayed politicians are representatives from the party's own camp: their own candidates or leaders, or other protagonists ('friends'). Their share ranges from 84 percent (spots) to 99 percent (posters). Thus, political opponents are only focused on to a limited extent, although spots are most likely among the channels to feature political opponents.

Regarding the kind of politicians from the parties' own camps that are given main visual roles in the campaigns, Table 3.3 shows that the *candidates* are in a majority in all channels, and in the posters in particular (79 percent). *Party leaders* are also frequently depicted in the visual material, above all in the spots where they appear almost as often (47 percent) as the candidates (51 percent). Other politicians than candidates and party leaders only rarely appear in the leading roles in posters, spots and social media content.

[TABLE 3.3 ABOUT HERE]

In order to more specifically examine factors that may be associated with visual personalization, we conducted a logistic regression analysis. The dependent variable, 'visual presence', measures whether or not a politician is pictured in the material (0 = no; 1 = yes) and is regressed on three predictors: *media channel* (reference category: social media content), *European regions* (Eastern Europe, Southern Europe, and North Western Europe, with Continental Europe as the omitted reference category)[2] and *ideological affiliations of the parties*. Similar to Haim and Jungblut (2021: 62), we departed from the European party groups in the European Parliament in creating the predictor *ideological affiliation*: 1) Left (parties whose European parliamentarians are affiliated with the European United Left/Nordic Green Left); 2) Social Democrat (Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats); 3) Green (Greens – European Free Alliance); 4) Centre (Renew Europe); 5) Right (European People's Party and European Conservatives and Reformists); 6) Far-right/right-wing populist (Identity

---

[2] In the EEMC data set 2019, the EU was divided into four regions as follows: Eastern Europe (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia); Southern Europe (Croatia, Cyprus, Italy, Malta, Spain, Greece, Portugal, Slovenia); North Western Europe (Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Ireland Latvia, Lithuania, Sweden, the UK); Continental Europe (Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands).

and Democracy). The reference category is parties whose members of the European Parliament are not affiliated with any party group.

Table 3.4 presents the model. The results are considered significant at $p < .05$. The overall explanatory power of the model is low (pseudo $R^2 = .04$), but it identifies some patterns as to the three examined drivers of visual personalization in the campaigns.

[TABLE 3.4 ABOUT HERE]

First, the model confirms some variation due to the media channel; spots are, net of other factors, slightly more likely to depict politicians than are posters and social media content. Second, the campaign content produced by parties in Continental Europe is, all else equal, less likely to show politicians than is the corresponding content from the other European regions. Most notably, for campaign content produced by parties in Southern Europe, the odds of displaying politicians are 2.1 times greater relative to the reference group. Third, as for the political groups, the far-right/right-wing populist parties are the ones that stand out as most apt to depict politicians in their campaigns, with an odds ratio of 2.4 when compared to the reference group. The traditional right as well as Social Democrats also show stronger tendencies to present politicians visually, while parties to the left are less likely to do so.

Visual Styles

In this section, we present the results regarding how the depicted politicians in the campaign material are portrayed according to the following visual cues; facial expressions and dress. We examine how these visual cues vary across media channels, European regions, parties, as well as gender of the politicians. Here, we focus only on politicians representing the parties ('domestic' and 'friends' categories; see Table 3.2 above), which in practice means candidates running for election and party leaders.

The politicians' facial expressions and attire were coded only for posters, Facebook webcards and Facebook images, not for spots and Facebook videos. Thus, the findings concern *graphical* visual styles of personalization in two media channels in the 2019 campaign; posters and social

media. Table 3.5 displays the frequencies of facial expressions and clothing in images depicting politicians in the three media types.

[TABLE 3.5 ABOUT HERE]

First, Table 3.5 demonstrates that displaying friendly smiling politicians was clearly the norm in the visual campaign content. This applies across the examined media types, even if the share of Facebook images depicting smiling politicians is somewhat lower, which is because the campaign-related images on Facebook more often contained politicians with several different facial expressions. Neutral facial displays were the second-most common images and with similar proportions across the three media types. The share of imagery with worried/angry expressions is somewhat larger in the Facebook material than in the posters although the difference is marginal. Second, as to clothing, the traditional power-dress of politics, the formal suit (business wear for men with jacket and tie; office wear for women), is still a common dress code for the politicians in the imagery, although it is not shown in the majority of the three content types. A more relaxed dress code, semi-formal clothing, is seen in approximately one-third of the imagery containing politicians, independent of media type. Images of politicians clad in causal outfits are less common and appear in similar degrees in the different media types.

To facilitate comparisons across European regions, party groups and gender, we dichotomized the variables as follows. Facial expressions were recoded as either smiling or non-smiling where blank/neutral and worried/angry expressions were collapsed into the latter category (cases displaying several expressions were deleted). Similarly, the dress of the depicted politicians was recoded as either formal or informal (collapsing the categories semi-formal and casual, and deleting more-than-one-outfit cases). A cross-tabulation of these variables results in four visual portrayal styles whose frequencies in the campaign media are reported in Table 3.6.

[TABLE 3.6 ABOUT HERE]

Table 3.6 shows that the presence of smiling politicians dressed in informal clothes was most common in the campaign imagery and that, in comparison, imagery signalling power and authority by displaying politicians in formal attire and with serious facial expressions was

relatively unusual. These findings were similar in all media types. Are there, then, any systematic differences between imagery displaying male and female politicians respectively, concerning facial expressions, dress, and portrayal styles? Table 3.7 answers this question. The two social media types (Facebook webcards and images) are collapsed to a single social media category.

[TABLE 3.7 ABOUT HERE]

Regarding facial expressions, the result in Table 3.7 corroborates the findings in earlier studies that female politicians are more likely to smile than their male counterparts. The 'gender gap of smiles' is roughly the same across the two media channels (posters: +11 percentage units; social media: +13 units). Concerning the strategic choice to not dress formally, the gender difference is marked. Whereas the posters and the social media content showing male politicians is roughly equally distributed between formal and informal clothing, a clear majority of the material depicting female politicians shows them in informal outfits. As to the portrayal style, the combination of formal dress and serious expressions is more frequent in the content displaying male politicians, whereas the informal and smiling politician is more frequently displayed in the material showing female politicians, although this style is also quite common in visuals where male politicians are present.

Table 3.8 presents logistic regression models for three dependent variables regarding facial expressions and clothing: 1) whether the politicians in the visual campaign material are smiling; 2) whether the politicians appearing in the material are dressed in informal wear; 3) whether the politicians in the material are wearing informal attire and have a smiling facial expression. The variables were binary coded as 0 = no and 1 = yes and were regressed on the same factors as in the earlier regression, i.e. media channel, European regions, and ideological party affiliation. The gender of the politician(s) depicted in the material is added as a predictor, which makes it possible to examine the independent impact of gender on the visual style of politicians.

[TABLE 3.8 ABOUT HERE]

A first note regarding the models in Table 3.8 is that the explained variance is rather low, in particular concerning facial expression (pseudo R^2 = .09), indicating that other factors than gender, party and regions are at play here. The models reveal some differences between the

two channels, albeit rather small. Most notably, politicians are more likely to smile on posters, as compared to webcards and images posted on Facebook. Regarding European regions, Eastern European politicians stand out as much less likely to appear informally dressed in the campaign images, compared to the reference category. They are also clearly less likely to be smiling in the campaign material. Apart from the Eastern European region, there are small insignificant regional differences regarding all dependent variables.

Concerning ideological party affiliation, there are some notable patterns. The traditional right, but also Social Democrat representatives, are those most likely to appear in formal dress in the campaign imagery. Informal dress, signalling ordinariness, is favoured above all by left leaning politicians and, to a lesser extent, politicians representing green parties. In the campaign content, facial expressions vary less among politicians of different ideological camps than dress. Still, smiling faces are less often seen in content picturing representatives of the (traditional) right. Moreover, images of formally dressed politicians that are not smiling are significantly more likely to be published in the campaigns by parties of the traditional right and by Social Democrats. Finally, gender is clearly a significant factor behind both facial expressions and formality of dress. All else being equal, women are more likely to smile in the campaign content, and they are also more likely to be informally dressed in the campaign output, compared to their male counterparts.

Discussion and Conclusion

Although predominantly party oriented rather than candidate centred, some circumstances lead us to expect that EU election campaigns would be personalized: the need to get candidates in second-order elections known to the public, as well as the efforts made by the EU to highlight candidates for the executive are two of them. Our study measured the *level of visual personalization* in the 2019 EU election campaign by investigating the extent to which images of politicians appear in various campaign channels. The results clearly show that individual politicians have a prominent visual presence in the campaign. Insofar as we can compare our findings with those of previous EU elections, we conclude that there is still a higher degree of visual personalization in 2019 when compared to 2014. Voters see more of politicians in the campaign media now than previously, but mostly they encounter individual candidates and

leaders from the domestic parties, and rarely any pan-European political figures. Just like in 2014, the so-called *Spitzenkandidaten* had a very low profile in the national campaigns.

Regarding *visual styles* of politicians, we found that although formal dress (suit-and-tie for men/business attire for women) is still common, this is generally no longer the norm. The most common visual style among politicians in the 2019 EU elections can best be described as the informal, smiling one.

Furthermore, we introduced a number of potentially impacting factors, for which we can compare our results. Concerning different *media channels*, what is most striking are the similarities between them. Social media have provided new opportunities for parties to package their messages in new ways. Although parties use these channels extensively in the 2019 campaign – the sheer number of Facebook posts combined outnumbers the total number of posters and spots by ten to one – both their level and style of visual personalization is, by and large, similar to that of the more traditional channels, posters and spots. When politicians appear in Facebook images or webcards, they dress in the same way and show similar facial expressions as when appearing on posters. In that respect, the social media visual portrayals of politicians in the campaign do not express a renewal of the campaigns. However, the social media accounts of political candidates and leaders, rather than of parties, should be analyzed to draw any strong conclusions about the impact of social media on the visual styles of politicians.

With due caution to the rather low explained variance of the regression models, we also identified how other factors than media channel are associated with visual personalization in the 2019 EU campaign. Regarding visual personalization at the level of *European regions* as well as among *parties with different ideological leanings*, there are some differences. More formal and less smiling politicians from Eastern Europe being one of them. The same tendency is seen for politicians from parties of the traditional right as well as Social Democrats, possibly indicating that informal styles may be more attractive to fringe parties challenging traditional styles. However, the 'populist campaigner' style, with casual wear and efforts to look like 'ordinary people' rather than elite politicians, is not significantly associated with the European populist right parties. Instead, this style can be associated with left leaning, and to some extent, Green parties. However, these differences do not form clear-cut interpretable patterns; variation

among countries within the four European regions is likely great, and the same goes for party variation within the party groups.

Concerning *gender*, there are some noteworthy findings, too. One is that smiling faces are more common among female politicians than among male ones in the campaign imagery. Another is that female politicians are more often informally dressed than their male counterparts. An interpretation is that women in today's campaigns, across Europe, do not necessarily need to adhere to strict formal norms to appear trustworthy in a traditionally male domain. However, according to our findings, men also appear in less formal wear rather often. Possibly, though, women have more leeway than men in terms of dressing informally in ways that are not breaching the norms as much as with men.

All in all, the increased visual personalization in the 2019 EU election campaign, and the strong focus on national politicians in the imagery, can be seen as a rational strategy by the national parties to increase voter interest and engagement in a second-order election. Similarly, just as it may be rational for some parties to disseminate images of their politicians that evoke impressions of political trustworthiness, it may be rational for others to visually shape impressions of personal trustworthiness by stressing the ordinariness and friendliness of their politicians, thereby reducing the distance between the voters and politics in EU elections.

References

Banducci, S. A., Karp, J. A., Thrasher, M., & Rallings, C. (2008). Ballot photographs as cues in low-information elections. *Political Psychology*, *29*(6), 903–917.

Bjerling, J. (2012). *The personalisation of Swedish politics*: *Party leaders in the election coverage 1979–2010*. Doctoral thesis. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg.

Borrell, A., Dakhlia, J., & Holtz-Bacha, C. (2017). Candidate-oriented but no European Spitzenkandidaten: The role of candidates in political advertising. In C. Holtz-Bacha, E. Novelli, & K. Rafter (Eds.), *Political advertising in the 2014 European Parliament elections* (pp. 169–189). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brader, T. (2006). *Campaigning for hearts and minds*: *How emotional appeals in political ads work*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bystrom, D. G. (2020). Gender and political communication. In K. Ross, I. Bachmann, V. Cardo, S. Moorti, & M. Scarcelli (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of gender, media, and communication*. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119429128.iegmc206

Campus, D. (2013). *Women political leaders and the media*. Cham: Springer.

Carlson, T. (2001). Gender and political advertising across cultures: A comparison of male and female political advertising in Finland and the US. *European Journal of Communi*cation, *16*(2), 131–154.

Carlson, T., Johansson, B., & Vigsø, O. (2017). Persuading beyond words: Visual appeals in the 2014 European election campaign. In C. Holtz-Bacha, E. Novelli, & K. Rafter (Eds.), *Political advertising in the 2014 European Parliament election*s (pp. 191–214). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Carpinella, C. M., & Johnson, K. L. (2016). Visual political communication: The impact of facial cues from social constituencies to personal pocketbooks. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *10*(5), 281–297.

Cross, W. P., Katz, R. S., & Pruysers, S., (Eds.) (2018). *The personalization of democratic politics and the challenge for political parties*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Dumitrescu, D. (2016). Nonverbal communication in politics: A review of research developments, 2005–2015. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *60*(14), 1656–1675.

Englis, B. G. (1994). The role of affect in political advertising: Voter emotional responses to the nonverbal behavior of politicians. In E. M. Clark, T. C. Brock, & D. W. Stewart (Eds.), *Attention, attitude, and affect in response to advertising* (pp. 223–247). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Farkas, X., & Bene, M. (2021). Images, politicians, and social media: Patterns and effects of politicians' image-based political communication strategies on social media. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, *26*(1), 119–142.

Gattermann, K., & De Vreese, C. H. (2017). The role of candidate evaluations in the 2014 European Parliament elections: Towards the personalization of voting behaviour?. *European Union Politics*, *18*(3), 447–468.

Gattermann, K., & Marquart, F. (2020). Do Spitzenkandidaten really make a difference? An experiment on the effectiveness of personalized European Parliament election campaigns. *European Union Politics*, *21*(4), 612–633.

Grabe, M. E., & Bucy, E. P. (2009). *Image bite politics*: *News and the visual framing of elections*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Haim, M., & Jungblut, M. (2021). Politicians' self-depiction and their news portrayal: Evidence from 28 countries using visual computational analysis. *Political Communication*, *38*(1–2), 55–74.

Hobolt, S. B. (2014). A vote for the President? The role of Spitzenkandidaten in the 2014 European Parliament elections. *Journal of European Public Policy*, *21*(10), 1528–1540.

Holtz-Bacha, C., Johansson, B., Leidenberger, J., Maarek, P. J., & Merkle, S. (2012). Advertising for Europe: TV ads during the 2009 European election campaign in four countries. *Nordicom Review*, *33*(2), 77–92.

Horiuchi, Y., Komatsu, T., & Nakaya, F. (2012), Should candidates smile to win elections? An application of automated face recognition technology. *Political Psychology*, *33*(6), 925–933.

Kaid, L. L., Adam, S., Maier, M., Balzer, M., Berganza, R., Jalali, C., et al. (2011). Televised advertising in the 2009 European Parliamentary elections: Comparing campaign strategies and videostyles. In M. Maier, J. Strömbäck, & L. L. Kaid (Eds.), *Political communication in European Parliamentary elections* (pp. 91–110). Farnham, UK: Ashgate.

Koo, S. (2020). Leading or cheer-leading? The gender gap in political smiles. *Politics & Gender*. doi:10.1017/S1743923X20000379

Krogstad, A. (2017). A political history of visual display. *The Poster*, *4*(1–2), 7–29.

Lindholm, J., Carlson, T., & Högväg, J. (2021). See me, like me! Exploring viewers' visual attention to and trait perceptions of party leaders on Instagram. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, *26*(1), 167–187.

Novelli, E. (2017). Themes, styles, and tendencies of the European poster: Analysis of the 2009 and 2014 European election campaigns. In C. Holtz-Bacha, & B. Johansson (Eds.), *Election posters around the globe*: *Political campaigning in the public space* (pp. 91–114). Cham: Springer.

Oh, Y. (2019). Fashion in politics: What makes Korean female politicians wear 'the suit' not 'a dress'?. *International Journal of Fashion Design, Technology and Education*, *12*(3), 374–384.

Pérez, F. S. (2017). Representations of the European project. In C. Holtz-Bacha, E. Novelli, & K. Rafter (Eds.), *Political advertising in the 2014 European Parliament election*s (pp. 39–56). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Poulakidakos, S., & Giannouli, I. (2019). Greek political leaders on Instagram: Between 'soft' and 'hard' personalization. In A. Veneti, D. Jackson, & D. Lilleker (Eds.), *Visual political communication* (pp. 187–206). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rahat, G., & Zamir, S. (2018). Personalized politics online. In W. P. Cross, R. S. Katz, & S. Pruysers (Eds.), *The personalization of democratic politics and the challenge for political parties* (pp. 103–124). London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Russmann, U., Svensson, J., & Larsson, A. O. (2019). Political parties and their pictures: Visual communication on Instagram in Swedish and Norwegian election campaigns. In A. Veneti, D. Jackson, & D. Lilleker (Eds.), *Visual political communication* (pp. 119–144). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schill, D. (2012). The visual image and the political image: A review of visual communication research in the field of political communication. *Review of Communication*, *12*(2), 118–142.

Spezio, M. L., Loesch, L., Gosselin, F., Mattes, K., & Alvarez, R.M. (2012). Thin-slice decisions do not need faces to be predictive of election outcomes. *Political Psychology*, *33*(3), 331–341.

Steffan, D., & Venema, N. (2019). Personalised, de-ideologised and negative? A longitudinal analysis of campaign posters for German Bundestag elections, 1949–2017. *European Journal of Communication*, *34*(3), 267–285.

Sülflow, M., & Maurer, M. (2019). The power of smiling: How politicians' displays of happiness affect viewers' gaze behavior and political judgments. In A. Veneti, D. Jackson, & D. Lilleker (Eds.), *Visual political communication* (pp. 207–224). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Towner, T. L. (2017). The infographic election: The role of visual content on social media in the 2016 presidential campaign. In D. Shill, & J. A. Hendricks (Eds.), *The presidency and social media* (pp. 236–262). New York: Routledge.

Vliegenthart, R. (2012). The professionalization of political communication? A longitudinal analysis of Dutch election campaign posters. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *56*(2), 135–150.

Table 3.1. Visual presence of politicians in the campaign media during the 2019 EU election campaign (percent).

			Social Media Content		
Are Politicians Present?	*Posters*	*Spots*	*Webcards*	*Videos*	*Images*
Yes	72	81	56	86	97
No	28	19	44	14	3
%	100	100	100	100	100
N	582	293	3,393	3,343	1,155

Source: EEMC dataset 2019.

Table 3.2. Types of politicians present in the campaign media during the 2019 EU election campaign (percent).

			Social Media Content		
Present Politicians	*Posters*	*Spots*	*Webcards*	*Videos*	*Images*
Domestic	93	91	93	92	87
Foreign	3	0	4	4	7
Combination	4	9	3	4	6
%	100	100	100	100	100
N	417	237	1,889	2,859	1,063
Friends	99	84	89	89	92
Opponents	1	11	8	5	4
Combination	0	5	3	6	4
%	100	100	100	100	100
N	417	237	1,889	2,859	1,063

Source: EEMC dataset 2019.

Table 3.3. Main role of the depicted domestic politicians of 'the own camp' in the campaign media during the 2019 EU election campaign (percent).

| Main Role | Posters | Spots | Social Media Content | | |
			Webcards	Videos	Images
Candidate	79	51	61	57	52
Party Leader	19	47	31	33	39
Prime Minister	1	2	2	1	3
Member of Political Institution	1	0	6	9	6
%	100	100	100	100	100
N	379	186	1,515	2,261	817

Note: 'Main role' refers to those individuals who occupy the most prominent place in the analyzed unit. Source: EEMC dataset 2019.

Table 3.4. Predicting the visual presence of politicians in the campaign content during the 2019 EU election campaign (*b*-values).

Predictors	*B*	*S.E.*	*p*	Odds Ratio
Media Channel				
Posters	.11	.10	.30	1.11
Spots	.36	.15	.02	1.44
European Region				
Eastern	.18	.07	.02	1.19
Southern	.75	.08	.00	2.12
North Western	.48	.08	.00	1.62
Ideological Party Affiliation				
Left	−.52	.13	.00	.60
Social Democrat	.31	.12	.01	1.36
Green	−.04	.14	.80	.97
Centre	.23	.13	.07	1.26
Right	.31	.11	.01	1.36
Far Right/Right-Wing Populist	.87	.15	.00	2.39
Constant	.49	.12	.00	1.63

Note: Likelihood ratio: χ^2 (11, $N = 8{,}415$) = 255.16, $p < .001$. Pseudo R^2 (Nagelkerke) = .04. Reference categories: Media: Social media content; Region: Continental Europe; Party group: parties whose members of the European Parliament are not affiliated with any party group. Source: EEMC dataset 2019.

Table 3.5. Facial expressions and dress of politicians depicted in posters and social media during the 2019 EU election campaign (percent).

| | Posters | *Social Media Content* | |
		Webcards	*Images*
Facial Expression			
Smiling/Friendly	63	61	49
Worried/Angry	2	8	9
Blank/Neutral	28	28	27
Funny	0	0	3
More than one expression	7	3	12
%	100	100	100
N	386	1,568	852
Dress			
Formal	43	44	32
Semi-formal	32	36	37
Casual	16	16	21
More than one outfit	9	4	10
%	100	100	100
N	386	1,568	852

Source: EEMC dataset 2019.

Table 3.6. Portrayal styles of politicians depicted in posters and social media content during the 2019 EU election campaign (percent).

Portrayal Style	Posters	Social Media Content	
		Webcards	Images
Formal & Non-Smiling	16	22	17
Formal & Smiling	30	24	18
Informal & Non-Smiling	16	16	26
Informal & Smiling	38	38	39
%	100	100	100
N	342	1,481	688

Source: EEMC dataset 2019.

Table 3.7. Facial expressions, dress and portrayal styles in imagery containing either male or female politicians in posters and social media content during the 2019 European election campaign (percent).

	Posters		Social Media	
	Female Politicians	*Male Politicians*	*Female Politicians*	*Male Politicians*
Facial Expression				
Smiling	73	62	68	55
Non-Smiling	27	38	32	45
%	100	100	100	100
N	84	200	577	1,348
Dress				
Formal	25	55	33	47
Informal	75	45	67	53
%	100	100	100	100
N	87	202	577	1,390
Portrayal Style				
Formal & Non-Smiling	9	23	12	25
Formal & Smiling	18	31	22	23
Informal & Non-Smiling	19	15	20	20
Informal & Smiling	54	31	46	32
%	100	100	100	100
N	83	200	569	1,337

Source: EEMC dataset 2019.

Table 3.8. Predicting visual style of depicted politicians in campaign material during the 2019 European election campaign (b-values).

Predictors	Smiling			Informal			Smiling & Informal		
	B (S.E.)	*p*	OR	*B (S.E.)*	*p*	OR	*B (S.E.)*	*p*	OR
Media									
Posters	.52 (.15)	.00	1.69	.12 (.14)	.42	1.12	.31 (.15)	.04	1.36
European Region									
East	−.39 (.15)	.01	.68	−.81 (.15)	.00	.44	−.32 (.16)	.04	.72
South	.11 (.14)	.45	1.12	−.28 (.15)	.06	.76	.06 (.15)	.68	1.06
North Western	.25 (.14)	.08	1.29	−.25 (.15)	.09	.78	−.00 (.14)	.99	1.00
Party Ideological Affiliation									
Left	.07 (.28)	.81	1.07	1.96 (.42)	.00	7.11	.46 (.27)	.09	1.59
Social Democrat	−.01 (.23)	.96	.99	−.68 (.23)	.01	.51	−.81 (.22)	.00	.45
Green	−.31 (.27)	.24	.73	.90 (.31)	.01	2.46	−.02 (.26)	.94	.98
Centre	.39 (.27)	.15	1.47	−.39 (.26)	.13	.68	−.21 (.25)	.41	.81
Right	−.62 (.22)	.01	.54	−1.17 (.22)	.00	.31	−1.30 (.22)	.00	.27
Far Right/Right-Wing Populist	.42 (.26)	.11	1.52	−.10 (.26)	.70	.91	.13 (.25)	.60	1.14
Gender (Female)	.39 (.11)	.00	1.47	.43 (.11)	.00	1.53	.46 (.11)	.00	1.59
Constant	.41 (.25)	.10	1.50	.97 (.25)	.00	2.71	−.09 (.24)	.71	.91

Note: OR = Odds Ratio. Likelihood ratio: Smiling: χ^2 (11, $N = 2,185$) = 147.39, $p < .001$. Informal: χ^2 (11, $N = 2,232$) = 374.27, $p < .001$. Smiling & Informal: χ^2 (11, $N = 2,165$) = 237.94, $p < .001$. Pseudo R^2 (Nagelkerke): Smiling = .09; Informal = .21; Smiling & Informal = .14. Reference categories: Media: Social media content; Region: Continental Europe; Party group: parties whose European Parliament members are not affiliated with any party group. Gender: Male. Source: EEMC dataset 2019.