

Riled Up about Running for Office: Examining the Impact of Emotions on Political Ambition

Jamil S. Scott
Department of Government
Georgetown University
jamil.scott@georgetown.edu

Jonathan Collins
Department of Education
Brown University
jonathan_collins@brown.edu

Abstract

After the 2016 presidential election, there has been a wave of increased interest in running for office that has been anecdotally associated with anger and fear about the election outcome. Although there is a growing literature that seeks to understand how emotion matters for political action, particularly as it pertains to voting behavior, we do not know how emotions factor into one's interest in running for office. In this study, we use data from the Collaborative Multiracial Post-Election Survey to examine the relationship between political ambition and feelings surrounding the 2016 election season. In accordance with previous literature, we expect that resources still matter for political participation, but that emotions like anger and fear will also have an impact on political behavior.

Keywords: political ambition, affect, political participation, Black politics

Introduction

In the wake of the 2016 presidential election, there has been an increase in political engagement. Not only have people taken to the streets to protest in record numbers (*Crowd Counting Consortium* 2017), but they are also running for office (Dittmar 2018). Across the country, cities and states elected the first Black officeholders for positions at the state and local level in 2017 (Owens 2017) and the 2018 election cycle has proven to be a memorable year for diversifying the ranks of elected officials (Haltiwanger and Bostock 2018).

This wave of increased political participation during the Trump era is interesting and worthy of further explanation, particularly as it pertains to Black candidate emergence because minority officeholders are underrepresented at all levels of political office. While the literature has provided explanations for the reasons why potential candidates do not seek political office (Fox and Lawless 2011b; Kanthak and Woon 2015; Sigelman et al. 1995; Johnson, Oppenheimer, and Selin 2012;

Highton 2004), we are still learning the reasons why they do. The current moment presents an important opportunity to understand what spurs to run for political office, particularly among Blacks, and how the current political context contributes to this phenomena.

It is no secret that President Trump's political candidacy and presidency has produced a mix of emotions in the American public. Recent works suggest that negative emotions about the Trump presidency has led to increased political engagement (Lawless and Fox 2018). This relationship is not unexpected given that scholars have long asserted that there is a relationship between emotions and political behavior (see Marcus 2000). While studies on affect might explain voting behavior and even protest, few studies have sought to understand the relationship between affect and political ambition (a desire to run for office), although (see Lawless and Fox 2018). We seek to understand the relationship between negative affect and political ambition for Black people. That is, is the negative affect in the age of Trump leading Black people to consider running for office?

In this work, we seek to contribute to the political ambition literature as well as the literature on political participation. We assert here that in line with previous work about political ambition, running for office is a form of political participation, albeit a more extreme form (Hennings 2011; Scott 2018; Fox and Lawless 2005, 2011b). Given this characterization of political ambition expression, we might expect that emotions too can influence one's decision to run for office. We take a cue from the literature that treats emotion as a mediator for political participation (Valentino, Gregorowicz, and Groenendyk 2009; Valentino et al. 2011; Banks, White, and McKenzie 2018) and seek to examine the relationship between negative feelings about politics and political ambition. We provide empirical evidence of this relationship using data from the 2016 Collaborative Multiracial Post-Election Survey (CMPS). Because the CMPS oversamples Black participants, we leverage this opportunity to make inferences about political ambition among Black people and rethink some of the standing conceptions about who considers running for office. We find that anger is positively associated with the consideration of running for office for among Black people. Moreover, the relationship between political ambition and anger operates above and beyond other negative and positive emotions.

Role of Emotions in Politics

Attention to the role of emotions in politics has led to a rich literature in which feelings have been linked to a number of political attitudes and behaviors (Marcus 2000). We might think of emotions

as being a reaction to an individual's appraisal of a situation (Smith and Ellsworth 1985) as scholars in this area of study assert that all political phenomena elicit some form of an affective (emotion based) response (Lodge and Taber 2005; Abelson et al. 1982; Fazio et al. 1986). Early studies found that these emotions largely loaded onto two dimensions, negative and positive emotions (Abelson et al. 1982; Marcus 1988; Marcus and MacKuen 1993). In particular, scholars have focused on negative emotions, like anger and fear or anxiety^[1], as well as positive emotions, like hope or enthusiasm.^[2]

Negative and positive emotions account for different ways of dealing with one's political environment - a disruption of political behaviors and practices versus reinforcing the same (Marcus, Neuman, and MacKuen 2000). There is still some discussion about whether anger and anxiety have distinct impacts on political behavior (see Valentino et al. 2011). While both involve an individual's assessment of threat in the political environment, anger extends from a knowledge of who is causing the threat and some idea of how to deal with it (Lerner and Keltner 2000; Smith and Kirby 2004). On the other hand, fear extends from a lack of certainty about the source of threat and a sense of no control (Lerner and Keltner 2000; Smith and Kirby 2004).

Political Participation and Anger as a Trigger

While the emotion aroused by political stimuli plays an important role here, what is also important are the political next steps that citizens are willing to take because of what they feel. The literature suggests that fear triggers information seeking (MacKuen et al. 2010; Marcus and MacKuen 1993; Albertson and Gadarian 2015), while anger triggers political participation (Weber 2013; Valentino, Gregorowicz, and Groenendyk 2009; Valentino et al. 2011; Banks, White, and McKenzie 2018). Findings about the association between political participation and anger are indeed interesting because these studies not only find a significant effect, but also define political participation in a number of ways - such as wearing a campaign, being willing to protest, working for a campaign, attending a rally, and voting. Because previous work has defined political participation broadly, this gives us some indication of how far the relationship between anger and political participation might go if we think of participatory acts on a continuum - from most to least costly.

There is a large literature on who participates and why they decide to do it. There are indeed

differences across groups in political behavior, with individuals with greater resources being advantaged (Leighley 1990; Nie et. al 1988; Verba et. al 1993). However, Black political behavior has proven to be distinct. When socioeconomic factors are taken into account, civic participation among Black people is in some cases higher than that of other groups (Bobo and Gilliam 1990; Verba, Schlozman and Brady; Brown 2014). Furthermore, there is some evidence that we see these patterns of engagement over time (Harris et al 2005).

Supply side explanations of candidate emergence

The literature on candidate emergence (who decides to run for political office) has made great strides in identifying individuals who are considering running for office or those with political ambition (Fox and Lawless 2004, 2005). However, much of what we know comes from our knowledge of the observed cases of who tends to run (Moncrief, Squire, and Jewell 2001; Fox and Lawless 2004, 2005; Sanbonmatsu, Carroll, and Walsh 2009) or who is in a position to run (Broockman et al. 2014; Maestas et al. 2006; Sanbonmatsu 2006; Crowder-Meyer 2013; Sweet- Cushman 2018). While these studies have provided meaningful information that has allowed us to understand candidate emergence among the populations we know, we are still learning the factors that contribute to who even thinks about running, although (see Bonneau and Kanthak 2018; Schneider et al. 2016). Furthermore, much of this literature does not consider Black political candidacy, although (see Holman and Schneider 2018; Shah 2014). The fundamental question here is what leads someone to consider running for office? Because the desire to run for office may not translate into an actual outcome (Fox and Lawless 2011a), this is an important question to understand the universe of political ambition in the Black population.

Expectations and Hypotheses

Many studies of political participation rely on the classic work of Verba et al. (1995), this includes work on political ambition (Hennings 2011; Scott 2018; Fox and Lawless 2005, 2011b). In it the authors present the civic volunteerism model, which suggests that people who are active in politics are those who have capacity (time, money, and civic skills), motivation (political interest, information and efficacy), and are encouraged to participate. There is already some evidence that anger is still a meaningful indicator of some acts of participation in the presence of Verba, Schlozman and Brady's civic volunteerism indicators (see Valentino et al. 2011) and the civic

volunteerism model guides who is considered likely to run. Thus, this model allows us to think about meaningful ways of identifying individuals with political ambition.

We argue that if negative emotions influence other forms of participation, then we should see emotions playing a role in political ambition among Black people. Furthermore, negative emotions are not operating alone here because the components of the civic volunteerism model (capacity, motivation, and encouragement) are still necessary precedents of political participation. That is, we expect an individual to at least be interested in politics before they even think about wanting to run for office (see Fox and Lawless 2004). Moreover, we make no claims here about the likelihood that Black people with political ambition will actually run for political office. We recognize that office seeking requires more than desire; it also requires time, effort, money and political opportunity (see Dittmar 2015; Sanbonmatsu 2015; Doherty, Dowling, and Miller, n.d.; Crowder-Meyer 2013; Fox and Lawless 2005). Given that there is some evidence that Black people are less likely to have political ambition (Fox and Lawless 2005), the importance of this work lies in the ability to tell a clear story about who among Black people might we expect to be politically ambitious.

In addition, because a negative emotion - anger to be specific- matters here, we argue that the 2016 Presidential Election was a stimulus for anger among Black people and that this will be reflected among the participants in our sample. Much of the conversation in the literature has been devoted to understanding how white people may have felt threatened during the 2016 election and how this may have influenced vote choice (see Mutz 2018; Hooghe and Dassonneville 2018; Setzler and Yanus 2018; MacWilliams 2016). Inherent in our argument is the idea that Black people may have also felt threatened during this time - particularly after the election. The expression of negative emotions are preceded by threat (Marcus, Neuman, and MacKuen 2000) and because we theorize that Black people are both able to recognize the source of threat (The Trump presidency) as well as a meaningful course of action (political participation), participants in our sample will likely experience anger.

Given this, we expect that:

H₁: Anger will be positively related to political ambition (consideration of running for office)

H₂: Anger will be more likely to be associated with political ambition than other negative emotions (fear and sadness).

H3: Anger will be more likely to be associated with political ambition than positive emotions.

Research Design

To understand the relationship between anger and political ambition, we rely on the 2016 Collaborative Multiracial Post-Election Survey (CMPS). This survey features an overall sample of 10,145 participants with an oversample of racial and ethnic groups. We focus on the subset of African Americans, a sub-sample of 3,154 participants. The sample of African Americans in the CMPS is almost 7 times larger than that in the American National Election Studies (ANES) ($n = 468$), a data source used routinely in the study of American political behavior.^[3] Furthermore, the size of the Black sub-sample allows for more precise measurement, especially when exploring a relatively low propensity political behavior like political ambition. In sum, the CMPS simply provides a unique opportunity to study African American political ambition in a monumental political moment.

We take advantage of the fact that the CMPS is one of the few surveys that both asks its participants about more mainstream forms of political participation, such as voting, and asks its participants about whether they have thought about running for office. We tap into political ambition using a relatively straightforward survey question: "Have you ever thought about running for about running for political office?" The instrument provides respondents with the following response options: "Yes, I have seriously considered it," "Yes, it has crossed my mind once or twice," "No, I have never thought about it." While the distribution of the responses skew toward the "No" response (87.6%), there is still interesting variation: "Yes, I have seriously considered - 1.3%," "Yes, it has crossed my mind - 11.1%." This variation is consistent with that of other racial and ethnic groups^[4], and in comparison, only whites demonstrate a higher rate of ambition (86.4% provided a "no" response while 12.5% said it "crossed their minds," and 1% reported to have "seriously considered" running for office). So, we take particular interest in the variation amongst African Americans, and we do so by reconstructing these responses as a continuous variable, ranging between 0 and 1, in which we assign 0 for "No" responses, 0.5 for "crossed my mind" responses, and 1 for African Americans who have "seriously considered" running for office.^[5]

From a theoretical lens, we are primarily concerned with the extent to which ambition is related to affective emotion, particularly negative affective emotion. Therefore, we include three separate measures of specific negative affective emotions: anger, fear, and sadness. In the hope of better illuminating the impact of negative emotions, we also include - as additional control measures - positive affective emotions (pride and hope) as well. Specifically, the instrument asks respondents: “During the Presidential election how often did you feel (insert affective emotion)?” Respondents are provided the response options: “All the time,” “Often,” “Sometimes,” or “Never.” We treat the emotion indicators as continuous variables - ranging from 0 (never experiencing an emotion) to 1 (always experiencing that emotion). The benefit of the CMPS emotion measures is that they ask respondents to trace affect directly to the 2016 Presidential Election, which is the political moment we believe to be central to the way in which affect manifests into political ambition.

In Table 1, we consider the descriptive statistics associated with each emotion surrounding the Presidential election for participants in our sample.^[6] For Black Respondents, we see that anger is the emotion experienced most, followed by sadness and hope. This emotion expression is consistent with that of other groups - Whites and and Latinos similarly expressed anger as the most prominent emotion associated with the 2016 election (84.41% and 81.01% respectively). The fact that anger is the emotion that was most prominently associated with electoral cycle gives some credence to our theory and nods to the literature about the importance of negative affect for political participation.

Table 1. Black Participants Responses about Emotions Experienced During 2016 Election

	Mean	SD	% Experiencing
Negative Emotions			
<i>Anger</i>	0.49	0.34	78.69%
<i>Fear</i>	0.36	0.35	61.54%
<i>Sadness</i>	0.44	0.34	74.95%

Positive Emotions			
<i>Hope</i>	0.39	0.32	73.49%
<i>Pride</i>	0.27	0.32	52.16%

In addition to measures of emotion, we also include, as controls, factors that become standard predictors of African-American and American political behavior. For the former, we include measures of linked fate (how close do respondents feel to the group as a whole), church attendance, and group membership. For the latter, we incorporate measures for political mobilization (having been contacted to vote), political interest, party identification, ideology, income, and education. We also include age and gender as controls. We have keen interest in how age and gender perform given the gender-based discriminatory narrative and disengaged apathetic youth narrative that surrounded the 2016 Presidential election. Given how both narratives intersect with the motivation for a negative affective response to the election, we expect these two control variables to be of noteworthy attention as well. Lastly, we also include measure of political figure favorability (Donald Trump, Hillary Clinton, Barack Obama, and Michelle Obama). We include the favorability measures in order to capture if anger is a function of the political environment or focused toward elites. There is already some evidence that political ambition can be fostered based on elite role models (see Bonneau and Kanthak 2018) and it may also be the case that political ambition can be spurred by elite antipathy. We measure favorability toward elites continuously with a measure ranging from 0 to 1, with 0 as very favorable and 1 as very unfavorable. In order to measure the extent to which these various factors - negative emotional affect in particular - are related to the political ambition among African Americans, we make of a couple of statistical techniques. For most of our models, we treat the dependent variable, having considered running for office, as continuous. This modeling choice allows us to make use of ordinary least squares (OLS) regression, which we use primarily for the sake of clarity. However, we recognize that political ambition is not common among the mass public, thus the dependent variable is skewed. To account for this we, estimate the model using the negative

binomial regression technique, and find largely the same results in terms of statistical significance.^[7]

In addition, we are considerate of the fact that political ambition can be and is often modeled as a dichotomous choice (having thought about running for office or not). We account for this by modeling political ambition in a logistic regression model. We largely find the same results in terms of the variables that are significantly related to political ambition.^[8] The next section displays our models estimates and offers an interpretation.

Table 2. Modeling Whether Blacks Consider Running for Office Using Elite Evaluations and Affect

Affect-Anger	0.043***	0.046***	0.033	0.037***	0.037***	0.070***
	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.021)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.015)
Affect-Fear	0.017	0.018	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.017
	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)
Affect-Sadness	0.003	-0.002	-0.0002	-0.001	-0.001	0.005
	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)
Affect-Proud	0.018					
	(0.012)					
Affect-Hope	0.018					
	(0.012)					
Trump Favorability		-0.025**				
		(0.012)				
Clinton Favorability		0.035**				
		(0.013)				

B. Obama Favorability		0.001				
		(0.025)				
M. Obama Favorability		-0.006				
		(0.026)				
Linked Fate	0.017	0.014*	0.014*	0.014*	0.014**	0.015*
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Group Membership	0.049***	0.047***	0.049***	0.038***	0.049***	0.080***
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.008)
Church Attendance	-0.007	-0.003	-0.004	-0.004	-0.004	-0.004
	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)
Political Mobilization	-0.008	-0.008	-0.009	-0.010	-0.009	-0.010
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.007)
Political Interest	0.061***	0.067***	0.061***	0.067***	0.067***	0.067***
	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.017)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)
Party	-0.011	0.003	-0.012	-0.012	-0.011	-0.011
	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)
Ideology	-0.014	-0.009	-0.014	-0.013	-0.014	-0.013
	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)
Income	-0.002	-0.005	-0.003	-0.003	-0.003	-0.003
	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)
Education	-0.025*	-0.026*	-0.028**	-0.028**	-0.028**	-0.026*

	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)
Age	-0.001***	-0.001**	-0.001***	-0.001***	-0.001***	-0.001***
	(0.002)	(0.0002)	(0.0002)	(0.0002)	(0.0002)	(0.0002)
Gender	-0.039***	-0.037***	-0.039***	-0.039***	-0.039***	-0.013
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.011)
Anger: Political Interest			0.014			
			(0.029)			
Anger: Group Membership				0.022		
				(0.023)		
Anger: Age					0.001	
					(0.001)	
Anger: Gender						-0.056***
						(0.019)
Constant	0.056***					
	(0.015)					
Observations	3,154	3,154	3,154	3,154	3,154	3,154
R-squared	0.057	0.060	0.056	0.057	0.057	0.059

Is African-American Ambition Related to Negative Affect?

We test the expectation that African-American political ambition will be, at least in part, related to feelings of negative affect that are attached to the 2016 Presidential Election. We undertake

this task sequentially using six models, which we display in Table 2. All of these models were estimated using ordinary least squares.

In the first model, column 1, we test the impact of anger on political ambition in the presence of other forms of both positive and negative affect, as well as controls. In the presence of feelings of fear, sadness, pride, and hope, anger emerges as the most robust predictor (0.043 and significant at the 99% confidence level). Therefore, the first column suggest that negative affective emotion, feelings of anger in particular, are strongly associated with African-American political ambition post-Election. We also note here the significance of group membership, political interest, and gender. Because we expected that the civic volunteerism model would be in operation, along with affect, it makes sense that group membership and political interest would be significant predictors of political ambition. Political interest is an important predictor of engaging in political activity, thus in such a rare activity like wanting to run for office, we would expect that being interested in politics would play an important role here. Furthermore, given the literature on who tends to participate, we might expect that is the people who have the time and skills (indicative of participating in social and political groups) that would have the capacity to run for office. While political interest and group membership have significant and positive coefficients, age and gender have significant and negative coefficients. This suggests that young Black people are less likely to think about running for office, which is indicative of the argument put forth by Shames (2017) that young people are turned off by politics. Finally, the literature on gender and politics has long suggested that women are less likely to consider running for office.

In the second model, column 2, we consider the impact of feelings of favorability toward specific political figures: Republican-Party-nominee-turned-President-of-the-United States Donald Trump, Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton, First African American President Barack Obama, and First African American First Lady Michelle Obama. Again, the logic here is that negative affect may be confounded by affinity (or distaste) towards certain political elites, and we want to account for that possibility. We, again, find evidence that negative emotion, particularly anger, is robustly associated with African American political ambition. We find a similar estimate (0.046 per unit shift in anger) and statistical robustness (99% confidence level) as in the previous model. We note here that coefficient for Trump favorability is negatively related to political ambition, while Clinton favorability is positively related to political ambition. The significant and positive coefficient for

favoring Hillary Clinton speaks directly to the work of Bonneau and Kanthak (2018) whose work suggests that the presence of Clinton as a presidential candidate was meaningful for interest in running for office. The negative and significant coefficient for President Trump speaks to the popular narrative around why some people decided to run and has some support from the work of Lawless and Fox (2018). Overall, what is most important for our purposes is that anger about the 2016 presidential election remains a powerful predictor of political ambition, even in the presence of affect toward particular political elites.

In models three through six, we consider the malleability of anger about the presidential election in relation to other variables that we have shown to be significant predictors of political ambition. In particular, whether there is a significant and interactive relationship between anger and political interest, anger and group membership, anger and age, and finally anger and gender. In model 3, column 3, we examine the interaction between political interest and anger and its affect on political ambition. We find that political interest remains a positive and significant predictor of political ambition, but anger is no longer significant nor is the interaction term. We take this to mean that anger is a predictor, but not a necessary predictor for Blacks to consider running for office. It is political interest that ultimately still plays a major role in political engagement. We also note the presence of a positive and significant indicator of linked fate, which suggests that there is some association between feeling connected to other Black people as whole and the consideration of public office. In model 4, column 4, we examine the interaction effect between group membership and anger. The interaction term is not significant, but the constituent terms for anger and group membership are significant and positively associated with political ambition. Again, we take this to mean that anger is a predictor of political ambition, but not a necessary predictor.

Finally, in models 5 and 6 (column 5 and 6 respectively), we consider the interaction of anger and age as well as anger and gender. While the interaction term that includes age is not significant, the interaction term for gender and anger is, although in the negative direction. In model 5, anger is no longer a significant predictor of anger in the presence of the interaction term but is positive and significant in model 6. Because we consider both anger and age to be continuous variables as part of our modeling strategy, we might interpret the non-significant effect here to mean that the slope of anger on political ambition does not change as age increases. Age remains negatively related to wanting to run for office. Because the interaction term for gender and anger is significant, we might

take this to mean that, on average, it is Black men whose political ambition is impacted by anger. Black women are still less likely to consider running for office - even while angry.

Table 3. Modeling Relationship Between Anger and Other Forms of Political Participation

	Turnout		Participation Scale
	Logistic Regression	Avg. Marginal Effects	OLS
Affect-Anger	0.450***	0.063**	0.042***
	(0.183)	(0.025)	(0.012)
Affect-Fear	-0.155		0.023*
	(0.180)		(0.012)
Affect-Sadness	0.091		0.017
	(0.186)		(0.013)
Affect-Pride	0.768***	0.107***	0.034***
	(0.159)	(0.022)	(0.010)
Linked Fate	0.018		0.027***
	(0.106)		(0.007)
Group Membership	-0.012		0.203***
	(0.129)		(0.008)
Church Attendance	-0.094		0.031***
	(0.134)		(0.009)
Political Mobilization	0.271**	0.038**	0.074***

	(0.113)	(0.016)	(0.007)
Political Interest	1.660***	0.231***	0.135***
	(0.176)	(0.023)	(0.012)
Party	1.870***	0.260***	-0.030**
	(0.179)	(0.023)	(0.012)
Ideology	0.587***	0.082***	0.038***
	(0.195)	(0.027)	(0.013)
Income	0.979***	0.136***	0.036***
	(0.171)	(0.023)	(0.011)
Education	2.310	0.322***	0.053***
	(0.210)	(0.027)	(0.014)
Age	0.065***	0.009***	0.0003
	(0.004)	(0.0004)	(0.0002)
Gender	0.488***	0.068***	-0.015**
	(0.102)	(0.014)	(0.007)
Observations	3,154		3,154
R-squared			0.368
Log Likelihood	-1,339.305		

Inherent in our theory about political ambition is the idea that it is just another form of political participation in which anger can be a significant predictor, as shown in previous work. While there are studies that have examined how anger impacts political participation among African Americans in particular (see Banks, White, and McKenzie 2018), albeit experimentally, we take the opportunity to reinforce this work by leveraging the over sample of Blacks in the CMPS. We engage in this analysis in Table 3. In column one, we examine Black voter turnout using a logistic regression model and in column two we examine other forms of participation as a scale using an OLS model.^[9]

Our analysis here is in line with our theory and previous findings. Political interest is a significant and positive predictor of both turnout and other political activities as is anger, which was our expectation. While we note that the models here engage actual behavior versus and a thought process, we take heart in the fact that negative affect - in particular (anger) still plays a role. We also see here that pride is a significant predictor of these activities (though in the presence of anger) and suggest that future work might consider this dynamic. All together, these findings add further support to the growing literature that considers how affect matters for political engagement. We acknowledge that there are other interesting factors at play, however. As expected, African- Americans with more political ambition also seem to be the individuals: involved with groups, interested in politics, and subscribing to the idea that the fate of other African Americans is inextricably linked to their own. Perhaps more interestingly age is negatively associated with ambition; younger African-Americans are more likely to have considered running for office. However, a more unexpected outcome - given the heightened sexism of the 2016 Presidential Election campaign - is how African-American males remain more likely to show political ambition. Alongside these factors, we provide evidence that negative affective emotion also adds to the larger conversation on what is motivating African Americans to consider seeking political office.

There are limitations to this study. As a cross-sectional analysis, it provides a snapshot of African-American ambition in only one political moment (although we believe it to be a very significant one), but an ideal project would demonstrate how these factors perform over time. In particular, an extended study would look to utilize a panel-style survey that could capture the extent to which ambition rises in conjunction with anger and other forms of negative affective emotion.

An extended study could also incorporate physiologically-based measures of anger to generate a measure more accurate than the self-reported measure used here. Still, this analysis adds to other recent studies in stressing the necessity for more work at the intersection of affect and African American political behavior.

Conclusion

All together, our work further bolster the relationship between political participation and negative affect. In particular, we make the case here that running for office is on the spectrum of political participation and that individuals in our sample may consider this act as meaningful form of political participation. We indeed find evidence that there is a significant relationship between the consideration of running for office and anger. Our findings not only provide evidence of the relationship between political ambition and anger, but puts the candidate emergence literature in conversation with the emotion in politics literature. While there is no guarantee that any of the participants in the sample will run for office, it is important to note that individuals in the population have thought about running. This suggests that there are latent candidates, specifically Black latent candidates, that we are missing in our discussion of political ambition.

Furthermore, the fact that the CMPS asked the political ambition question gave us a great deal of leverage to speak to political interest in running for office. As we might expect, it is not an extremely large portion of the population who has considered political office. Running for office is an extreme act and to consider doing it is costly. The relationship between negative affect and political ambition though is important and worthy of further explanation. Because anger matters, it would suggest that political ambition might require a catalyst - at least for some. The fact that being angry, particularly about the 2016 election, creates a desire for action, might have some import for some of the minority candidates who decided to run in the most recent election cycle. This creates the question of how many latent Black candidates need some form of threat to think about political office and what causes these candidates to take the next step. It would serve us to think more about this relationship between negative affect and political ambition amongst other groups in the future to understand if these same patterns exist.

References

Abelson, Robert P, Donald R Kinder, Mark D Peters, and Susan T Fiske. 1982. "Affective and

semantic components in political person perception.” *Journal of personality and social psychology* 42 (4): 619.

Albertson, Bethany, and Shana Kushner Gadarian. 2015. *Anxious politics: Democratic citizenship in a threatening world*. Cambridge University Press.

Banks, Antoine J, Ismail K White, and Brian D McKenzie. 2018. “Black Politics: How Anger Influences the Political Actions Blacks Pursue to Reduce Racial Inequality.” *Political Behavior*: 1–27.

Bonneau, Chris W, and Kristin Kanthak. 2018. “Stronger together: political ambition and the presentation of women running for office.” *Politics, Groups, and Identities*: 1–19.

Brader, Ted. 2005. “Striking a responsive chord: How political ads motivate and persuade voters by appealing to emotions.” *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (2): 388–405.

Broockman, David, Nicholas Carnes, Melody Crowder-Meyer, and Christopher Skovron. 2014. “Who’s a Good Candidate? How Party Gatekeepers Evaluate Potential Nominees.” In *The Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington DC*.

Crowder-Meyer, Melody. 2013. “Gendered recruitment without trying: how local party recruiters affect women’s representation.” *Politics & Gender* 9 (4): 390–413.

Dittmar, Kelly. 2015. “Encouragement is not enough: Addressing social and structural barriers to female recruitment.” *Politics & Gender* 11 (4): 759–765.

Doherty, David, Conor M Dowling, and Michael G Miller. n.d. “Do Local Party Chairs Think Women and Minority Candidates Can Win? Evidence from a Conjoint Experiment.”

Fazio, Russell H, David M Sanbonmatsu, Martha C Powell, and Frank R Kardes. 1986. “On the automatic activation of attitudes.” *Journal of personality and social psychology* 50 (2): 229.

Fox, Richard L, and Jennifer L Lawless. 2004. “Entering the arena? Gender and the decision to run for office.” *American Journal of Political Science* 48 (2): 264–280.

. 2005. “To run or not to run for office: Explaining nascent political ambition.” *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (3): 642–659.

- . 2011a. "Gaining and losing interest in running for public office: the concept of dynamic political ambition." *The Journal of Politics* 73 (02): 443–462.
- . 2011b. "Gendered perceptions and political candidacies: A central barrier to women's equality in electoral politics." *American Journal of Political Science* 55 (1): 59–73.
- Haltiwanger, John, and Bill Bostock. 2018. "Diversity wins: All the people who made history in the 2018 midterm elections." November.
- Hennings, Valerie M. 2011. "Civic selves: Gender, candidate training programs, and envisioning political participation." PhD diss., University of Wisconsin–Madison.
- Highton, Benjamin. 2004. "White voters and African American candidates for congress." *Political Behavior* 26 (1): 1–25.
- Holman, Mirya R, and Monica C Schneider. 2018. "Gender, race, and political ambition: how inter- sectionality and frames influence interest in political office." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 6 (2): 264–280.
- Hooghe, Marc, and Ruth Dassonneville. 2018. "Explaining the Trump vote: The effect of racist resentment and anti-immigrant sentiments." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51 (3): 528–534.
- Huddy, Leonie, Stanley Feldman, Charles Taber, and Gallya Lahav. 2005. "Threat, anxiety, and support of antiterrorism policies." *American journal of political science* 49 (3): 593–608.
- Johnson, Gbemende, Bruce I Oppenheimer, and Jennifer L Selin. 2012. "The House as a Stepping Stone to the Senate: Why Do So Few African American House Members Run?" *American Journal of Political Science* 56 (2): 387–399.
- Kanthak, Kristin, and Jonathan Woon. 2015. "Women don't run? Election aversion and candidate entry." *American Journal of Political Science* 59 (3): 595–612.
- Lawless, Jennifer L, and Richard L Fox. 2018. "A Trump Effect? Women and the 2018 Midterm Elections." In *The Forum*, 16:569–590. 4. De Gruyter.
- Lerner, Jennifer S, and Dacher Keltner. 2000. "Beyond valence: Toward a model of emotion-

- specific influences on judgement and choice.” *Cognition & emotion* 14 (4): 473–493.
- Lodge, Milton, and Charles S Taber. 2005. “The automaticity of affect for political leaders, groups, and issues: An experimental test of the hot cognition hypothesis.” *Political Psychology* 26 (3): 455–482.
- MacKuen, Michael, Jennifer Wolak, Luke Keele, and George E Marcus. 2010. “Civic engagements: Resolute partisanship or reflective deliberation.” *American Journal of Political Science* 54 (2): 440–458.
- MacWilliams, Matthew C. 2016. “Who decides when the party doesn’t? Authoritarian voters and the rise of Donald Trump.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 49 (4): 716–721.
- Maestas, Cherie D, Sarah Fulton, L Sandy Maisel, and Walter J Stone. 2006. “When to risk it? Institutions, ambitions, and the decision to run for the US House.” *American Political Science Review* 100 (2): 195–208.
- Marcus, George E. 1988. “The structure of emotional response: 1984 presidential candidates.” *American Political Science Review* 82 (3): 737–761.
- . 2000. “Emotions in politics.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 3 (1): 221–250.
- Marcus, George E, and Michael B MacKuen. 1993. “Anxiety, enthusiasm, and the vote: The emotional underpinnings of learning and involvement during presidential campaigns.” *American Political Science Review* 87 (3): 672–685.
- Marcus, George E, W Russell Neuman, and Michael MacKuen. 2000. *Affective intelligence and political judgment*. University of Chicago Press.
- Moncrief, Gary F, Peverill Squire, and Malcolm E Jewell. 2001. *Who runs for the legislature?* Prentice Hall.
- Mutz, Diana C. 2018. “Status threat, not economic hardship, explains the 2016 presidential vote.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115 (19): E4330–E4339.
- Sanbonmatsu, Kira. 2006. “State Elections: Where Do Women Run? Where Do Women Win?” *Gender and Elections: Shaping the Future of American Politics*: 189–214.

- . 2015. "Electing women of color: The role of campaign trainings." *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* 36 (2): 137–160.
- Sanbonmatsu, Kira, Susan J Carroll, and Debbie Walsh. 2009. "Poised to run: Women's pathways to the state legislatures." *Center for American Women and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University*.
- Schneider, Monica C, Mirya R Holman, Amanda B Diekman, and Thomas McAndrew. 2016. "Power, conflict, and community: How gendered views of political power influence women's political ambition." *Political Psychology* 37 (4): 515–531.
- Scott, Jamil S. 2018. "Ambition Is Not Enough: Explaining Candidate Emergence in State Level Politics." PhD diss., Michigan State University.
- Setzler, Mark, and Alixandra B Yanus. 2018. "Why Did Women Vote for Donald Trump?" *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51 (3): 523–527.
- Shah, Paru. 2014. "It takes a Black candidate: A supply-side theory of minority representation." *Political Research Quarterly* 67 (2): 266–279.
- Shames, Shauna L. 2017. *Out of the running: Why millennials reject political careers and why it matters*. NYU Press.
- Sigelman, Carol K, Lee Sigelman, Barbara J Walkosz, and Michael Nitz. 1995. "Black candidates, white voters: Understanding racial bias in political perceptions." *American Journal of Political Science*: 243–265.
- Smith, Craig A, and Phoebe C Ellsworth. 1985. "Patterns of cognitive appraisal in emotion." *Journal of personality and social psychology* 48 (4): 813.
- Smith, Craig A, and Leslie D Kirby. 2004. "Appraisal as a pervasive determinant of anger."
- Sweet-Cushman, Jennie. 2018. "Where does the pipeline get leaky? The progressive ambition of school board members and personal and political network recruitment." *Politics, Groups, and Identities*: 1–24.
- Valentino, Nicholas A, Ted Brader, Eric W Groenendyk, Krysha Gregorowicz, and Vincent L Hutchings. 2011. "Election night's alright for fighting: The role of emotions in political

participation.” *The Journal of Politics* 73 (1): 156–170.

Valentino, Nicholas A, Krysha Gregorowicz, and Eric W Groenendyk. 2009. “Efficacy, emotions and the habit of participation.” *Political Behavior* 31 (3): 307.

Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, Henry E Brady, and Henry E Brady. 1995. *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Vol. 4. Cambridge Univ Press.

Weber, Christopher. 2013. “Emotions, campaigns, and political participation.” *Political Research Quarterly* 66 (2): 414–428.

Appendix

Table A1. Comparison of CMPS Black Sub-Sample to ANES Black Sub-Sample

	CMPS (N = 3154)	ANES (N = 468)
Democrat	68%	71%
Republican	4%	5%
Independent	21%	20%
Median Age	40	42
Male	31%	45%
Female	69%	56%
Registered to Vote	64%	87%

Table A2. Participants Responses about Emotions Experienced During 2016 Election by Racial Group

		Mean	SD	% Experiencing

Whites	Negative Emotions			
	Anger	0.50	0.31	84%
	Fear	0.36	0.32	65%
	Sadness	0.43	0.32	77%
	Positive Emotions			
	Hope	0.39	0.33	77%
	Pride	0.30	0.31	60%
Blacks	Negative Emotions			
	Anger	0.49	0.34	79%
	Fear	0.36	0.35	62%
	Sadness	0.44	0.34	75%
	Positive Emotions			
	Hope	0.39	0.32	73%
	Pride	0.27	0.32	52%
Latinos	Negative Emotions			
	Anger	0.50	0.33	81%
	Fear	0.38	0.35	64%
	Sadness	0.43	0.33	74%
	Positive Emotions			
Hope	0.41	0.31	78%	

	Pride	0.31	0.32	60%
Asians	Negative Emotions			
	Anger	0.41	0.31	76%
	Fear	0.40	0.31	62%
	Sadness	0.44	0.34	75%
	Positive Emotions			
	Hope	0.39	0.29	78%
	Pride	0.28	0.29	59%

Table A3. Participants Responses about Political Ambition

		Percent
Blacks	<i>Yes, I have seriously considered it</i>	1%
	<i>Yes, it has cross my mind once or twice</i>	11%
	<i>No, I have never thought about it</i>	88%
Whites	<i>Yes, I have seriously considered it</i>	1%
	<i>Yes, it has cross my mind once or twice</i>	13%
	<i>No, I have never thought about it</i>	86%
Latinos	<i>Yes, I have seriously considered it</i>	2%
	<i>Yes, it has cross my mind once or twice</i>	11%
	<i>No, I have never thought about it</i>	87%
Asians	<i>Yes, I have seriously considered it</i> 0.6%	1%
	<i>Yes, it has cross my mind once or twice</i> 7.4%	7%
	<i>No, I have never thought about it</i> 92%	92%

Table A4. Modeling Whether Blacks Consider Running for Office with Dichotomous Dependent Variable

	Logistic Regression	Avg. Marginal Effects
Affect-Anger	0.646***	0.059***
	(0.211)	(0.019)
Affect-Fear	0.200	
	(0.206)	
Affect-Sadness	0.074	
	(0.225)	
Affect-Pride	0.022	
	(0.179)	
Linked Fate	0.313**	0.028**
	(0.136)	(0.012)
Group Membership	0.662***	0.060***
	(0.129)	(0.012)
Church Attendance	-0.092	
	(0.159)	
Political Mobilization	-0.098	
	(0.131)	
Political Interest	1.418***	0.129***
	(0.225)	(0.021)

Party	-0.180	
	(0.200)	
Ideology	-0.453**	-0.041**
	(0.230)	(0.020)
Income	0.009	
	(0.197)	
Education	-0.389	
	(0.230)	
Age	-0.015**	-0.001***
	(0.004)	(0.0004)
Gender	-0.728***	-0.066***
	(0.121)	(0.010)
Observations	3,154	
Log Likelihood	-1,053,853	

Table A5. Modeling Whether Blacks Consider Running for Office with Negative Binomial Model

Affect-Anger	0.653***
	(0.258)

Affect-Fear	0.204
	(0.252)
Affect-Sadness	0.016
	(0.276)
Affect-Pride	0.176
	(0.213)
Linked Fate	0.289*
	(0.171)
Group Membership	0.576***
	(0.156)
Church Attendance	-0.095
	(0.194)
Political Mobilization	-0.138
	(0.161)
Political Interest	1.137***
	(0.279)
Party	-0.129
	(0.243)
Ideology	-0.268
	(0.279)

Income	0.008
	(0.242)
Education	-0.391
	(0.300)
Age	-0.011**
	(0.005)
Gender	-0.602***
	(0.149)
Observations	3,154
Log Likelihood	-681.501

[1] Anxiety is often used in the literature as an umbrella term to capture feelings of worry and fear (see Huddy et al. 2005).

[2] Hope and excitement are often used synonymously to capture positive emotions (see Brader 2005; Marcus, Neuman, and MacKuen 2000).

[3] In the Appendix (Table A1), we provide further detail of how the CMPS sub-sample of African Americans compares to the sub-sample in the ANES.

[4] We go into further detail about how political ambition manifests across racial groups in the Appendix. See Table A3.

[5] We also consider an alternative model in the Appendix (Table A4 which specifies the dependent variable as dichotomous with all instances of "No" as 0 and all instances of "Yes" as 1. We find that anger is a significant predictor in the logit model. The average marginal effect of anger on political ambition is positive and significant as well. This means that a one unit increase in anger leads to about a 6% increase in the probability that a Black person would think about running for office.

[6] We consider the descriptive statistics associated with emotions surrounding the Presidential

election for all participants in the CMPS in the Appendix (Table A2.)

[7] This model is included in the appendix as Table A5.

[8] This model is included in the appendix as Table A4.

[9]

This scale includes indicators of engaging in the following activities: signing a petition, attending a protest or rally, attending a community meeting, working for a campaign or political party, wearing a campaign button or sticker, contacting an elected official, and working to solve an issue in one's city or neighborhood.