

The predictive value of motive imagery on political decision-making

Miguel Slijkerman

3926214

7950 words

In psychology it has long been understood that decision making has a motivational aspect. Individual preference is a powerful force in the democratic process but the motivational basis of political decision making is still relatively unclear. Based on Atkinson's expectancy value model, the influence of motive usage and expectancy on the expected influence of political candidates is analyzed in three studies. It is expected that candidates are rated higher on motives that they promote and that a higher expectancy value results in higher ratings as well. Results show partial support for the hypotheses. Limitations and future directions are discussed.

Introduction

Democracy is one of the most wide-spread and influential forms of government in the world. In a democracy, the government is supposed to try (to varying degrees of success) to represent the preferences of its population (Page & Shapiro, 1983; Soroka & Wlezien, 2010). In most democracies, the population votes for candidates that best represent their personal preferences (Sen, 1995). While contemporary democracies have become increasingly complex, voting and the population's individual preferences are still the driving force of the system. Considering that we live in an age in which democratic decisions on a national level can have serious international consequences (the departure of the United Kingdom from the European Union is a recent example), it has never been more important to study what makes up people's individual preferences.

Preferences can be defined as relatively stable evaluative judgments in the sense of liking or disliking a stimulus, or preferring it or not over other objects or stimuli (Scherer, 2005). They are a situation-based rankings derived from attitudes towards objects or stimuli, denoting which object is perceived as having the best attributes for a given situation (Druckman & Lupia, 2000). Preferences themselves do not actively select actions, however. The force that drives humans to take action on their preferences is motivation. Motivation is

defined as an internal force that energizes for action and determines the direction of the action (Pardee, 1990). Motivation is a force that determines whether to approach or avoid stimuli based on the positive or negative effect that is expected of interacting with it (Elliot & Covington, 2001). Of course, motivation does not always result in action. There are several factors involved in whether or not motivation manifests in action.

According to Atkinson (1957), motivation will result in action depending on three variables. The first of these is motive. Motive is the expression of a particular need in humans. An example of this would be an innate need for social harmony with other people, a need for affiliation. This need for affiliation will be strong for some people, who desire a lot of positive interaction with others, while for others this is less important for their general happiness. In this example, a person from the first group would have a high affiliation motive score, so they would be more attentive to, and sooner act upon a possibility to achieve social harmony than someone from the second group. It is important to note that motives are not necessarily conscious or deliberated.

The second variable Atkinson describes is incentive value. Incentive value represents the perceived size of the positive or negative effect if the taken action is successful. If someone truly believes that their vote will affect the government's policies, the incentive value they have for voting is much higher than when someone thinks their vote will have no effect at all. If the incentive value is higher, an action becomes more likely. The person that believes their vote is important will probably go and vote, while the person who believes it has no effect is probably not willing to invest the time and energy.

Atkinson's third and final variable is expectancy value. Expectancy value represents the perceived likelihood of the considered action having the desired effect. Although the incentive value of buying a lottery ticket is very high for most people, as they would like to win a big cash prize, not everyone buys lottery tickets. This is because the expectancy value

of buying a lottery ticket is incredibly low. The chance of receiving the desired cash price can be one in hundreds of thousands, which makes the action of buying a lottery ticket less likely.

To conclude, motivation manifests in action when the combination of an innate need, the expected value of success of the action, and the perceived likelihood of success of the action reach a threshold. In this paper three studies are compiled which investigate the influence of two of these factors, motive strength and expectancy value, on political decision making. By examining the ways in which motivation drives action and preference it is attempted to gain a deeper understanding of the psychology involved in political decision making. Understanding of people's motivations in political decision making might help in explaining phenomena like the resurgence of populism in the aftermath of the recent economic crisis (Kriesi & Pappas, 2015). On a more fundamental level, it might also serve to explain the role motives play in active decision making situations like voting or selecting political representatives.

Although these are lofty goals, it is not simple to view the effects of motive strength and expectancy value in isolation, especially on a topic like politics. Many people in Western democracies have set ideas about their political orientation. They can identify themselves as left- or right-winged and have specific attitudes towards varying politicians and political parties. Furthermore, political decision making is highly affected by affective and confirmation biases. People are routinely more attentive to information confirming their existing positive or negative views on policies, politicians and parties, while taking longer or even failing to process information that is incongruent with their existing views (Redlawsk, 2002). Through these confounding factors it is very hard to get a clean measurement of the underlying motives of these explicit political attitudes. However, not all motives are explicit. To reduce the noise of bias and prior political affiliations, the motives manipulated in the studies are two implicit ones, need for achievement and need for affiliation.

In 1953, McClelland and colleagues presented nAch, the achievement motive. McClelland had started research into implicit motives after noticing the discrepancy between what people said and what they did. The achievement motive was the first implicit motive to be documented. It is characterized as an unconscious need in people to strive for excellence and surpass themselves. People with a strong need for achievement get a lot of satisfaction from improving at tasks, and feel a lot of negative affect on failure of doing so. Particularly interesting about nAch was that it is independent from people's explicit, self-reported need for achievement (McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, & Lowell, 1953; McClelland, Koestner, & Weinberger, 1989), but in general is more positively correlated to actual achievement-oriented behavior than self-reported need for achievement (for a meta-analysis see Spangler, 1992).

The second used motive is need for affiliation. Need for affiliation is characterized by a desire for social harmony, a need to get on well with the people around you. People with a strong need for affiliation get a lot of satisfaction from close and loving relationships with the people around them, and feel a lot of negative affect on instances of social rejection or hostility. Need for affiliation is also an implicit motivation, developed in the tradition of McClelland. It was conceptualized by Winter (1994), combining traits of the earlier researched affiliative motive (Heyns, Veroff, & Atkinson, 1958) and intimacy motive (McAdams, 1980).

The third implicit motive that has received a lot of documentation is the power motive. The power motive is characterized by a desire to influence the people and world at large. People with a strong need for power get a lot of satisfaction on having impact on others or the world around them, and feel a lot of negative affect following social defeats (Schultheiss, Rosch, Rawolle, Kordik, & Graham, 2010). Need for power is unsuitable to the studies in this paper as political language is inevitably already satiated with power imagery. Politicians are

in the business of influencing the world around them, which makes it very hard to control the amount of power imagery in political language.

Implicit motives have a few characteristics that make them a good fit for researching the influence of motive on political decision making. Firstly, as mentioned before, implicit motives are nonconscious. The measure used to assess implicit motives, the Picture Story Exercise, is a task in which the participants are asked to write stories based on pictures. The stories are later coded for motive imagery. Due to the (to the participant) abstract nature of this task, effects of bias and social desirability are drastically reduced. Secondly, it is easy to prime implicit motives. Activating implicit motives can be done by providing anything motive-related, which can be as simple as the usage of motive-related words (e.g. efficient for achievement, friendly for affiliation). As long as there is any information that might point towards a possibility for affiliation, people with a strong need for affiliation will be more attentive to and more likely to take action on the information (McClelland, 1989). This allows for strictly controlled experiments where minor differences between the trials (switching out words) are sufficient manipulation to view the effect of using different motives.

Thirdly, implicit motives have been shown to affect political decision making in earlier research. Winter (1987) compared the motive profiles of US presidents to the motive profile of the society at the time they were elected. Presidential appeal, defined as electoral success, correlated significantly with the congruence between candidate and society motive profile. More recently, a collection of studies (Stoeckart, Strick, Kakebeeke, Bijleveld, & Aarts, in pub.) highlighted the influence of implicit motives on the democratic process. Stoeckart et al. show that a strong implicit affiliation or achievement motive in a person predicts higher evaluations for candidates who promise to strive for outcomes that match that specific motive (improving the nation for achievement, making the nation socially harmonious for affiliation).

Furthermore, in one of the studies by Stoeckart et al. it was shown that the preference for candidates who promised motive-related outcomes held true even when the candidate described themselves using personality traits of the other motive. For example, an achievement candidate in this study would still promise to improve the country (achievement), but would also describe himself as a friendly (affiliation) person. Participants still evaluated the candidates who promised motive-aligned results higher than those who claimed motive-aligned personality traits. This result brings us back to expectancy value. Although in these cases the motive strength was equal (as many affiliation-related words were used as achievement-related words), the difference lies partly in expectancy value. Candidates who promise in their speech to strive for motive-adherent outcomes provide more information towards the likelihood of this desired outcome than candidates who describe themselves as having a motive-adherent personality in their speech. While someone may assume that a person with an achievement-oriented personality will eventually take achievement-oriented actions, it does not offer the concrete assurance that the promises of the outcome candidates do.

In the studies detailed in this paper expectancy value is manipulated in a similar way. The participants were asked to rate the expected effect of fictional political candidates on achievement- and affiliation-related factors. The actual rated materials were speeches that were presumably written by these candidates. Half of the speeches contained achievement imagery (in the form of achievement-related words) while the other half contained affiliation imagery (in the form of affiliation-related words). Besides this, the speeches were also split by expectancy value. In half of the speeches motive language was used to describe the candidates themselves, while in the other half motive language was used to describe what actions the candidates were planning to take if they were to be elected. The candidates who described their future actions in motive-related terms will from now on be called utility candidates,

because they offer concrete utility to the voter. Utility candidates represent higher expectancy value than their counterparts, who will from this point on be called trait candidates, as they describe themselves with motive-related traits.

To summarize, in the following studies the expected influence of presidential candidates is rated according to motive use in speech (achievement or affiliation), expectancy value in speech (trait or utility), and the participants' implicit achievement and affiliation motive scores. According to the theory laid out, it is expected that candidates will be rated as more influential when (1) the candidate promotes the same motive that is being assessed, (2) the candidate's speech contains utility-based language and (3) the candidate promotes a motive which the rater has a high implicit motive score on. Study 1 starts with testing the basic assumptions underlying the theory.

Study 1

Study 1 investigated whether usage of affiliation/achievement motives in written speeches by presidential candidates would result in the candidate being rated higher on that same motive. Secondly, the study investigated whether candidates using utility-based language in their speeches would be rated higher than candidates using trait-based language, especially when the motive of speech and question align. The speeches used were written specifically for these studies. All speeches were gender neutral. Each speech consisted of four separate two-line political or electoral statements. There were thirty universal speeches that were coded differently for each condition. The lines in achievement conditions contained words that are associated with the achievement motive (e.g., productive, efficient, professional). Likewise, the lines in affiliation conditions contained affiliation cues (e.g., friendly, brotherly, sympathetic). In trait conditions the candidates used their respective motive describing one of their own traits ("I am an efficient person", "You know me as a friendly politician", etc.). In the utility conditions, the candidate's lines offered direct utility to

the voter (“If I’m elected, I will make this country more efficient”, “My policy will be based on friendliness”, etc.). Each two-line segment of each speech contained one instance of usage of its condition (affiliation/trait, achievement/utility, etc.).

Participants and design. The first study was conducted on 21 participants ($M_{age} = 20.86$, $SD = 1.74$), of which 12 were female. The participants of this study were primarily students from higher vocational education and university students. The study used a 2x2x2 within-subjects design. The independent variables were speech motive (achievement or affiliation), expectancy value (trait- or utility-based language) and question motive (achievement or affiliation). The dependent variables were achievement- and affiliation-rating.

Procedure. After starting the experiment the participants were instructed that they would be rating the expected effect of presidential candidates on the country they were running in if they were to be elected. They were told that the used speeches were excerpts from different political speeches of the same politician in a foreign country. This was done to obstruct the use of any prior knowledge about the candidates or parties involved, however imaginary. Following these instructions was a practice round so the participants could become accustomed to the format. After this practice round the participants had the possibility to return to the start of the instructions. The speeches used in the practice round were neutral in regards to the conditions of the main task.

The main task consisted of thirty speeches and subsequent ratings. Each round, one speech was presented that was drawn randomly from its condition’s pool. The first two-line segment was shown immediately. The second, third and fourth followed after the participant had time to read the one before (timings based on an average reading speed of 220 words per minute). When the third line appeared, the first would disappear, and the same went for the fourth and second. After the speech had been read, it disappeared from the screen. The

participants were asked to evaluate the expected influence on the country of the candidate if he/she were to be elected on six 5-point Likert scales (1 = “Not at all”, 5 = “Very much”). Three of these Likert scales asked the participant to rate the expected influence of the candidate’s election on affiliation-related factors (social, friendly and convivial) while the other three were ratings on achievement-related factors (excellent, ambitious and successful). The sequence of questions was randomized on every trial. Following the main task were some short sets of questions to establish the participants’ political interest and orientation, demographics and feedback on the study. Finally the participants were shortly debriefed.

Results. It was hypothesized that when the speech was achievement-oriented, the candidate would be rated higher on achievement questions. Likewise, affiliation-oriented speeches were expected to be rated higher on affiliation questions. Furthermore, it was hypothesized that in these two conditions, where speech and question motive align, candidates who used utility-based language in their speeches would receive higher ratings. The hypotheses were tested using a multivariate general linear model (GLM) procedure in SPSS. An interaction effect was found on speech motive and question motive, $F(1, 20) = 169.717, p = .000, \eta_p^2 = .895$. As hypothesized, the motive of the speech (achievement or affiliation) predicted higher ratings on questions about this same motive. Paired sample t-tests were conducted to compare the ratings of achievement/affiliation speeches in achievement/affiliation question conditions. Achievement speeches led to higher ratings on achievement questions ($M = 3.785, SD = .407$) than on affiliation questions ($M = 2.584, SD = .416$); $t(20) = 12.170, p = .000$. Affiliation speeches led to the reverse pattern, being rated higher on affiliation questions ($M = 3.813, SD = .525$) than on achievement questions ($M = 3.167, SD = .383$); $t(20) = 7.922, p = .000$.

Expectancy value had an interaction effect with speech and question motive, $F(1,20) = 7.850, p = .011$. However, not quite as expected, the main differences seemed to be between

the scores of affiliation questions on achievement speeches and achievement questions on affiliation speeches. As shown in Table 1, in both of the non-aligned conditions utility-based speeches scored higher than trait-based speeches. In the motive-aligned conditions, these differences were far smaller. In the achievement speech/question condition, utility ($M = 3.735$) was rated slightly lower than trait ($M = 3.834$). In the affiliation speech/question condition, utility ($M = 3.823$) was rated slightly higher than trait ($M = 3.803$). These results suggest that opposite to expectations, utility speeches lead to higher ratings when the motive of speech and question do not align. In the motive-aligned conditions where utility was expected to have the most effect the differences between trait and utility were both very small and not necessarily in favor of utility candidates.

Although not directly impactful for the hypotheses, it was noted that both speech motive, $F(1,20) = 27.980, p = .000$, and question motive, $F(1,20) = 24.247, p = .000$, separately also led to a main effect on the ratings. Achievement speeches ($M = 3.184, SD = .343$) scored significantly lower on average than affiliation speeches ($M = 3.490, SD = .420$). Achievement questions ($M = 3.476, SD = .346$) were rated higher on average than affiliation questions ($M = 3.198, SD = .416$). These results suggest that the participants thought that candidates that used affiliation speeches would be more impactful than candidates that used achievement speeches and that candidates overall were expected to be more effective in making their country more achievement-oriented than affiliation-oriented.

Table 1

Mean and Standard Deviation of Conditions by Expectancy Value, Speech Motive and Question Motive

Expectancy	Speech motive	Question motive	M	SD
Utility	Achievement	Achievement	3.735	.402
Utility	Achievement	Affiliation	2.702	.473
Utility	Affiliation	Achievement	3.268	.416
Utility	Affiliation	Affiliation	3.802	.538
Trait	Achievement	Achievement	3.835	.504
Trait	Achievement	Affiliation	2.464	.439
Trait	Affiliation	Achievement	3.066	.430
Trait	Affiliation	Affiliation	3.823	.581

Discussion. Although this first study was originally intended as a simple pilot, the results did not support the hypotheses. While the motive of the speech did positively affect ratings on the same motive, expectancy value seemed to have its greatest effect in conditions where the speech motive did not align with the question motive. This posed a problem for proceeding with the research as one of the fundamental assumptions made did not seem to hold up in the first study. Candidates that used utility-based language in their speeches were expected to be especially effective when they were rated on the same motive they used in their speech. By offering concrete utility to the voter in their speeches the candidates should have higher expectancy value on this motive. In non-aligned conditions, this expectancy value was not expected to have as much merit, as it provides utility towards a different goal than is asked for. This is in direct contradiction to the results of the first study. Even disregarding that

the larger effects were found on non-aligned conditions, trait speeches were rated higher than utility speeches in the aligned achievement condition, and in the aligned affiliation condition the difference was minimal.

A possible explanation to these results is that the interaction between speech and question motive was strong enough to trigger a ceiling effect on the expectancy value differences. Because the scores in the aligned conditions were already so high in comparison to the nonaligned conditions, the potentially weaker effect of expectancy value may have been lost in the analysis. This would also serve to explain why the nonaligned conditions did have significantly higher ratings for utility candidates, as the ceiling effect would not apply in these conditions. To test this proposition it was decided to measure the effect of expectancy value within single motives by making the participants rate a trait and utility candidate against each other.

Study 2

The second study investigated whether utility-based language in written speeches by presidential candidates would result in them being rated more likely to have an impact on their countries after election when directly compared to candidates who use trait-based language. It was expected that candidates that utilized utility-based language would be rated higher than candidates who utilized trait-based language, and even more so when the motive of the trial matched the motive of the rating. The same pool of speeches was used as in the first study. The main difference with the first study was that instead of the speeches being rated separately, two speeches were paired up for each trial and rated competitively. All pairs were within the same motive (affiliation or achievement) but one was always utility-based, while the other was always trait-based. Another change was that instead of six questions containing motive-related terms, each trial now contained two questions which asked for a rating on the actual construct of achievement or affiliation. The construct parameters were

explained both in the instructions and at the answering of the corresponding questions.

Through these changes it was attempted to shift more focus onto expectancy value and to get a more direct rating on the motives.

Participants and Design. The second study was conducted on 37 participants ($M_{age} = 21.70$, $SD = 5.14$), of which 25 were female. Once again, the participants were mainly students of higher vocational education and university students. The study used a repeated measures design. The dependent variables were expected influence of elected candidates on achievement and affiliation in their country. The independent variables were trial motive (achievement or affiliation), expectancy value (trait- or utility-based language) and question motive (achievement or affiliation).

Procedure. The second study followed generally the same line as the first study, but alterations were made to the instructions and trials. In the instructions it was now stated that the participants would be viewing two speeches per trial. The two speeches were by different politicians of foreign nations and the participants were expected to rate which candidate they expected to have more effect on achievement or affiliation in the country if they were to be elected. Following this, the constructs of achievement and affiliation were explained in a short bullet-point list. Achievement was characterized as (1) performing well, (2) being successful, (3) enjoying becoming/being good at something, (4) trying to perform better and (5) achieving or surpassing a certain standard of excellence. Affiliation was characterized as (1) harmonious contact between different people, (2) friendliness, (3) enjoying social contact, (4) obtaining and sustaining social contact and (5) obtaining and sustaining conviviality. The instructions were once again followed by a practice trial and the possibility to return to the beginning of the instructions.

The main task consisted of fifteen trials. In each trial two speeches were shown sequentially with the same line and time structure as in the first study. The two speeches

within a trial were always both either affiliation- or achievement-oriented. One of the two was always a speech using trait-based language, while the other used utility-based language. The order of trait and utility speeches within the trial was randomized. The first speech was always labeled ‘candidate A’ while the second one was labeled ‘candidate B’. After the speeches were shown, the participants had to rate which candidate they thought had a bigger chance of making the country more achievement/affiliation-oriented on election. This was done on two 9-point Likert scales (1 = “Mostly candidate A”, 9 = “Mostly candidate B”). The Likert scales were presented separately from each other and the construct parameters were presented together with the Likert that asked for that construct. While the questions in the first study were randomized in order, in the second study the achievement rating was always first, followed by the affiliation rating. Following the main task were some short sets of questions to establish political interest and orientation, demographics and feedback on the study. Finally the participants were shortly debriefed.

Results. It was hypothesized that candidates that used utility-based language in their speeches would be rated as more influential than trait-based candidates if the motive of question and trial aligned. The hypothesis was tested using a multivariate general linear model (GLM) procedure in SPSS. For purpose of the analysis, “Candidate A” is always the trait candidate and “Candidate B” is always the utility candidate, meaning that scores below 5 indicate a preference for trait candidates while scores above 5 indicate a preference for utility candidates. A main effect was found on trial motive, $F(1,35) = 6.392, p = .016$, indicating that affiliation candidates ($M = 4.955, SD = .347$) had a bigger expected effect when using trait-based language, while achievement candidates ($M = 5.171, SD = .362$) had a bigger expected effect when using utility-based language. A paired samples t-test was conducted to view this effect in isolation, $t(36) = 2.528, p = .016$. These results indicate that on average affiliation candidates were expected to have slightly more influence when they used trait-based

language, while achievement candidates were expected to have more influence when they used utility-based language.

An interaction effect was found on trial and question motive, $F(1,35) = 5.698, p = .022$. Achievement questions following affiliation trials were scored more towards trait ($M = 4.757, SD = .779$) than the other conditions. These conditions, achievement trial/achievement question ($M = 5.302, SD = .743$), achievement trial/affiliation question ($M = 5.041, SD = .652$) and affiliation trial/affiliation question ($M = 5.153, SD = .577$) were on average rated slightly towards candidates who used utility-based language. These results suggest that utility candidates are expected to have a bigger effect when the question and candidate motive align, and when achievement candidates are rated on affiliation. However, utility is not always superior. When achievement ratings are made after affiliation speeches, candidates using trait-based language are preferred over candidates using utility-based language.

Discussion. Utility candidates were rated higher in three of the four conditions, including both motive-aligned conditions. Thus, as hypothesized, a speech containing higher expectancy value leads to higher ratings for the candidate in motive-aligned conditions. Candidates who offer concrete utility to the voter are expected to be more effective overall in influencing the country in matters pertaining to their shown motives. Utility candidates are also expected to be more effective when achievement candidates are rated on affiliation. Trait candidates were expected to have more influence in one condition, achievement question after affiliation trial. This is remarkable, especially considering the opposite result from the first study. In the first study, the biggest difference between trait and utility candidates was found in the affiliation speech/achievement question condition, in favor of the utility candidates. The effect that was measured in the second study on this condition is strong enough to cause affiliation trials to average a preference for trait candidates. Nevertheless, now that the

expected effect of trial and question motive has been found in study 2, it became possible to move on to the final study and add the participants' personal implicit motives to the equation.

Study 3

The first study established that the use of motives in speeches results in the candidates being rated as having more expected influence on these motives if they were to be elected, but failed to establish the expected dominance of utility in motive-aligned conditions. The second study did show that candidates who use a higher expectancy value in their speeches (utility) are rated higher than candidates who use a lower expectancy value (trait) if they are rated on the motive they advocate. The third study investigated whether the strength of implicit motives of the participant affects their preference and vote for candidates using trait- or utility-based language, and achievement or affiliation motive in their speeches. Both implicit and explicit measures of motives were assessed in this study and a vote was added to the speech evaluation task.

It was expected that a participant with a strong implicit motive would show a greater preference for utility candidates when rating them on the same motive. For example, a person with a strong implicit need for achievement should be more attentive to the expectancy value in the utility-speeches of achievement candidates, since it provides direct information towards an innately desired end state. The candidate does not only provide achievement imagery, they claim they will promote achievement-related goals if they are elected. Trait candidates offer no such expectancy value. While trait candidates may use achievement-oriented language, they use it to describe themselves and draw no direct connection to their eventual actions as president. While someone may assume that a candidate who describes themselves as achievement-oriented will do achievement-oriented things if they were to be elected, this assumption provides far less information towards the desired end state than the speeches from the candidates who use utility-based language.

Besides implicit motives, explicit motives were also measured in this third study. It was expected that explicit motive measures would not have an effect on ratings and votes. Implicit and explicit motives measures have shown to be statistically independent (Schultheiss, Yankova, Dirlikov, & Shad, 2009). The speeches used in the experiment differ only on factors that are related to implicit motives, not in actual content. If statistical independence and validity of the measures are assumed, there should be no effect from explicit motive measures on the ratings.

Implicit motives were measured using the Picture Story Exercise (PSE). The PSE is a task in which the participants are shown six pictures. They are asked to write a story about each of these pictures, in which they are asked to explain who the people in the picture are, what kind of situation they are in and to what happened before and after the picture was taken. The participants have two to four minutes to write each story. The stories written by the participants are scored for achievement, affiliation and power using Winter's scoring system (1994). For each of the three motives, Winter defined a specific subset of situations that are scored for the motive. For achievement, the overarching theme is a standard of excellence. The five instances which are scored are: (1) adjectives that positively evaluate performance, (2) goals or performances that are described in ways which suggest positive evaluation, (3) mention of winning or competing with others, (4) failure, doing badly, or other lack of excellence and (5) unique accomplishment.

Affiliation is scored in instances that show indication for a desire or enjoyment of social harmony. The instances in which affiliation are scored are: (1) expression of positive, friendly, or intimate feelings towards other persons, nations, etc., (2) sadness or other negative feelings about separation or disruption of a friendly relationship, or wanting to restore it, (3) affiliative, companionate activities and (4) friendly nurturant acts.

Power is scored in instances that show indication of any impact on other people, institutions, countries etc. These include: (1) strong, forceful actions which inherently have impact on other people or the world at large, (2) control or regulation, (3) attempts to influence, persuade, convince, make or prove a point, (4) giving help, advice or support that is not explicitly solicited, (5) impressing others or the world at large: mention of (or concern about) fame, prestige, reputation and (6) any strong (positive or negative) emotional reaction in one person (group, nation, etc.) to the act of another person.

Each instance of scoring in a story adds one point to the complete score of a participant on the implicit motive in question. The scores are corrected for word count by computing standardized residuals through regression of word count on the separate scores. These standardized residuals are used as the indicators of the implicit motives. PSE scores have been shown to be independent from explicit motive measures and to provide a good measure of implicit motives overall (McClelland, Koestner, & Weinberger, 1989; Schultheiss et al., 2009), even though internal consistency between pictures is usually low (Reuman, 1982; Schultheiss, Liening, & Shad, 2008; Schultheiss, Pang, Robins, & Fraley, 2007).

The explicit measure of the motives was taken using the achievement, affiliation and power questions of the Personality Research Form (Jackson, 1974). The PRF contains twelve questions for each of the three main motives, which are statements about the participants themselves that have to be rated on a 7 point Likert scale (1 = "Does not apply at all", 7 = "Very applicable"). Examples of PRF statements include: "Loyalty to friends is very important to me", for affiliation, "I feel confident when directing other people", for power, and "People always say I'm a hard worker", for achievement. The internal consistency of the PRF scales varied across motives, but was generally acceptable. The affiliation scale had the lowest internal consistency ($\alpha = .627$), which is slightly low, but the consistency of the power ($\alpha = .850$) and achievement ($\alpha = .766$) scales was acceptable.

Participants and design. The third study was conducted on 53 participants ($M_{age} = 23.25$, $SD = 4.174$), of which 28 females. The recruited participants were primarily higher vocational and university students. The study had a repeated measures design. The dependent variables were ratings of expected candidate influence on affiliation or achievement in the country and trait or utility vote. The independent variables were trial motive (achievement or affiliation), expectancy value (trait- and utility-based language), and question motive (achievement or affiliation). Participant implicit motives (achievement, affiliation, power) and participant explicit motives (achievement, affiliation, power) were used as covariates.

Procedure. After the participants started the experiment, they first received instruction on the PSE. It was explained that they would be writing stories about pictures and to fill in as much information about them. The story did not have to be realistic and could follow any format the participant likes. At the end of the instructions, the participants had the possibility to return to the beginning. The PSE pictures were shown for ten seconds. After this they disappeared and a text box appeared in which the participants could write their story. Above the box there were several reminders of the kind of questions the story should answer (“What happened? Who are these people?”, “What happened before this?”, “What do these people think and feel? What do they want?”, “What happened after this?”). The participants could continue to the next trial after two minutes and they could spend a maximum of four minutes on each story. After the six pictures and stories, the participants moved on to the main task.

The main task from the third study was largely alike to the main task from the second study. The most important adaption was that at the end of each trial a vote had been added. The vote screen consisted of a question (“Who would you rather vote for, candidate A or candidate B?”) and two black square boxes with “A” and “B” on them. On clicking a box, the letter shortly flashed blue to show the participant their vote was registered. Besides the vote,

two flat seconds were added to the reading time of every speech as a response to the participants' commentary in Studies 1 and 2 that the speeches went too fast at times.

After the main task the PRF was taken. The PRF was conducted after the main task so the participants would not be primed to explicit motives during the main task or PSE. Since the PRF asks specifically for the participant to mark statements about themselves, doing this before the main task could also lead to the participants making different decisions out of a perceived need to be consistent with the earlier task. The PSE has no such problems because it is an open exercise in which the participant fills in most of the information. The pictures themselves are relatively neutral. The PRF instructions stated beforehand that the participants would be rating statements about their own personality on a 7-point Likert scale. Each statement was presented separately with only the statement itself and the Likert scale on the screen. The order of the statements was randomized. Following the PRF were some short sets of questions to establish the participants' political interest and orientation, demographics and feedback on the study. Afterwards, there followed a short debriefing for the participants.

Results. It was hypothesized that participants with a high implicit motive score for achievement or affiliation would have a stronger preference for utility candidates who used that same motive in their speech. It was also hypothesized that the participant's explicit motives would have no effect on the votes or ratings. First, a multivariate general linear model (GLM) procedure was used to separately view the effects of trial and question motive on the ratings. For the ratings, the same transformed scores were used as in the second study. Scores below five denote preference for trait candidates, while scores above five denote preference for utility candidates. The only significant effect found was a main effect on trial motive, $F(1,52) = 8.856, p = .004$. Affiliation trials ($M = 5.230$) were scored slightly in favor of utility candidates, while achievement trials ($M = 4.994$) were rated practically evenly between trait and utility candidates. Participants' implicit motive scores were entered separately in the same

model as covariates. In all three of these analyses, no effect was found that was close to significance. Implicit motive values of achievement, affiliation and power did not interact with trial or question motive in any way, indicating that implicit motives do not have any effect on the expectancy value preference of the participants. The explicit motive scores of the PRF were also separately added into the GLM as covariates. As with the implicit motive values, no effect of any significance was found, indicating that explicit motives do not have any effect on the expectancy value preference of the participants.

To analyze whether the PSE and PRF scores had any effect on the votes, the votes were regressed on the achievement and affiliation motives in the achievement and affiliation trials. There were no significant correlations between any of the implicit/explicit motive scores and either of the vote conditions, indicating that neither implicit nor explicit motives had any influence on the voting preference of participants. To conclude, these results indicate that neither explicit nor implicit motives affected the expectancy value preference of the participants.

Discussion. The goal of the studies in this paper was to investigate whether the usage of implicit motives and different forms of expectancy value influence the expected effect of a presidential candidate on their country. In this, the studies have been partially successful. The first and second study did establish that the usage of motives-oriented language in speeches leads to the candidates being expected as more influential in that area, and that candidates who have a higher form of expectancy value (utility) in their speeches are preferred over candidates who have lower expectancy value in their speeches (trait), although the evidence for this last point was somewhat mixed. However, the third study failed to reproduce the expected interaction effect between trial and question motive on candidate ratings that was found in the first and second study. Furthermore, neither the implicit or explicit motive measures had any effect on the ratings or correlations with the vote preference. Since the

effects between speech/trial and question motive were not replicated in the third study, it is hard to say whether implicit motives would have had an effect if the procedure had resembled that of the earlier studies.

Considering this, it is probably unwise to discard the theory underlying the interaction between the participants' implicit motives and motive usage of politicians out of hand. While no effect was proven, there was no possibility for this due to the underlying assumptions not being valid in the third study. Especially when taking into consideration the recent results of the similar studies by Stoeckart et al. (2016), the failure seems to lie somewhere in Study 3. Why the expected interaction between trial motive and expectancy value was not found in Study 3 is unclear. The procedure of Study 3 closely resembled the procedure of Study 2, which had significant (yet not fully expected) results on the interaction between expectancy value and trial motive. The elements that were added to Study 3, the PSE and vote in trials, seem unlikely to distort the main task (the PRF was conducted after the main task and thus does not have to be considered).

If these studies were to be repeated, it would be advisable to use a smaller, but more varied and coherent, pool of speeches. The short, basic speeches used in these studies are fine for the exploratory purposes these studies served, but the fragmented and repetitive nature of the speeches does not lend itself to generalization regarding actual political speeches. Rather, the implications of these studies are better applied to more general language patterns of politicians, instead of specifically on written speeches, since the source material is too dissimilar. The suggestion of a smaller pool of more varied speeches could help in making the results of the study applicable to more specific situations, like actual speeches or written statements by politicians.

What the studies did affirm is that the language used by political candidates does affect the perception of the effect they will have when elected. In the first study both

achievement and affiliation candidates were rated much higher when evaluated on the motive used in their speech. This held true even when the candidates offered very low expectancy value, using the motive-related words only to describe themselves. Even though these trait candidates offered little content about their planned actions in their speeches, the participants still rated them much higher on expected influence. This result has interesting implications for the democratic process. Apparently, just by using certain words a lot, a politician can influence how they are perceived by the public. A modern take on Winter's (1987) analysis of motive imagery in political speeches and politician's appeal might help in clarifying this effect.

To conclude, motive usage and expectancy value do affect the expected influence that politicians will have. Usage of motive-related words in particular greatly affects how influential political candidates are perceived on the appropriate motive, resulting in much higher ratings. The exact effect of expectancy value is not completely clear yet. While Study 2 did affirm that candidates who have higher expectancy value are expected to be more effective when they are rated on the motive they promote, there was also a surprisingly strong effect in the opposite direction from one of the non-aligned conditions, challenging the idea that higher expectancy value is always superior. Due to the underlying assumptions failing in the third study, it was impossible to view the effects of implicit and explicit motives of the participants on expected candidate influence. However the studies are far from failures, as they have opened a lot of interesting paths of inquiry for new research both in political sciences and psychology.

References

- Atkinson, J. W. (1957). Motivational determinants of risk-taking behavior. *Psychological Review*, 64(6p1), 359-372.
- Druckman, J. N., & Lupia, A. (2000). Preference formation. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 3(1), 1-24.
- Heyns, R. W., Veroff, J., & Atkinson, J. W. (1958). A scoring manual for the affiliation motive. In J. W. Atkinson (Ed.), *Motives in fantasy, action, and society* (pp. 205–218). Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand.
- Jackson, D. N. (1974). *Personality research form manual*. Research psychologists press.
- Kriesi, H., & Pappas, T. S. (Eds.). (2015). *European populism in the shadow of the great recession*. Ecpr Press.
- McAdams, D. P. (1980). A thematic coding system for the intimacy motive. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 14, 413–432.
- McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. A., & Lowell, E. L. (1953). *The Achievement Motive*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- McClelland, D. C., Koestner, R., & Weinberger, J. (1989). How do self-attributed and implicit motives differ?. *Psychological review*, 96(4), 690.
- Page, B. I., & Shapiro, R. Y. (1983). Effects of public opinion on policy. *American Political Science Review*, 77, 175–190.
- Pardee, R. L. (1990). *Motivation Theories of Maslow, Herzberg, McGregor & McClelland. A Literature Review of Selected Theories Dealing with Job Satisfaction and Motivation*. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED316767>.
- Redlawsk, D. P. (2002). Hot cognition or cool consideration? Testing the effects of motivated reasoning on political decision making. *The Journal of Politics*, 64(4), 1021-1044.

- Reuman, D. A. (1982). Ipsative behavioral variability and the quality of thematic apperceptive measurement of the achievement motive. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43*(5), 1098-1110.
- Scherer, K. R. (2005). What are emotions? And how can they be measured?. *Social Science Information, 44*(4), 695-729.
- Schultheiss, O. C., Lienen, S. H., & Schad, D. (2008). The reliability of a Picture Story Exercise measure of implicit motives: Estimates of internal consistency, retest reliability, and ipsative stability. *Journal of Research in Personality, 42*(6), 1560-1571.
- Schultheiss, O. C., Pang, J. S., Robins, R. W., & Fraley, R. C. (2007). Measuring implicit motives. *Handbook of research methods in personality psychology, 324-326*.
- Schultheiss, O. C., Rösch, A. G., Rawolle, M., Kordik, A., & Graham, S. (2010). Implicit motives: Current topics and future directions. In T. C. Urdan & S. A. Karabenick (Eds.), *The decade ahead: Theoretical Perspectives on Motivation and Achievement (Advances in motivation and achievement, Vol 16 Part A)*, pp. 199-233. Bingley: Emerald.
- Schultheiss, O. C., Yankova, D., Dirlikov, B., & Schad, D. J. (2009). Are implicit and explicit motive measures statistically independent? A fair and balanced test using the Picture Story Exercise and a cue-and response-matched questionnaire measure. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 91*(1), 72-81.
- Sen, A. (1995). Rationality and social choice. *The American Economic Review, 85*, 1-24.
- Spangler, W. D. (1992). Validity of questionnaire and TAT measures of need for achievement: Two meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(1), 140-154.
- Stoeckart, P. F., Strick, M., Kakebeeke, M., Bijleveld, E., & Aarts, H. (2016). *Implicit Motives Take Part in the Democratic Process*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Soroka, S. N., & Wlezien, C. (2010). *Degrees of democracy: Politics, public opinion, and policy*. Cambridge University Press, 1-21.

Winter, D. G. (1987). Leader appeal, leader performance, and the motive profiles of leaders and followers: A study of American presidents and elections. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1), 196-202.

Winter, D. G. (1994). *Manual for scoring motive imagery in running text (Version 4.2)*.

Department of Psychology, University of Michigan. Ann Arbor.