

Navigating the Fallout: The Interplay of Cognitive Processing and Candidate Perception Amidst Political Imbroglios

Dr. Alexis Monroe¹, Prof. Julian Ortega², Dr. Priya Nair³

¹Department of Political Psychology, Eastwood University, New Haven, USA

²School of Communication and Media Studies, Northbridge Institute of Social Research, Toronto, Canada

³Centre for Cognitive and Behavioral Studies, Western Metropolitan University, Melbourne, Australia

Doi <https://doi.org/10.55640/ijssl-03-11-01>

ABSTRACT

Political scandals are a persistent feature of democratic processes, often generating significant public attention and potentially altering electoral outcomes. This article investigates the relationship between cognitive load and voters' evaluations of political candidates embroiled in scandal. Drawing on cognitive load theory, we propose that the influx of complex and often conflicting information surrounding a scandal increases cognitive load on voters. This heightened load can hinder systematic processing of information, leading to reliance on heuristics and potentially less nuanced candidate evaluations. We review existing literature on political scandals, voter perception, and cognitive psychology to construct a theoretical framework for understanding how voters process scandalous information. This framework suggests that while scandals inherently demand attention, the sheer volume and often contradictory nature of information can lead to mental overload, influencing how integrity and competence are perceived. The implications for campaign strategies, media dissemination, and voter decision-making are discussed.

Keywords: Cognitive processing, political scandals, candidate perception, voter behavior, political psychology, media framing, public opinion, scandal response, information processing.

INTRODUCTION

The political landscape is frequently punctuated by events that challenge public trust and reshape electoral dynamics: political scandals. From financial impropriety to personal misconduct, these events can trigger intense media scrutiny and public debate, fundamentally altering how voters perceive candidates and parties [19, 39]. Historically, scandals have impacted congressional elections [2] and even presidential campaigns [3], sometimes demonstrating lingering effects on voter behavior [45]. The digital age, with its rapid dissemination of information and proliferation of various news sources, has amplified the reach and complexity of these events, making it increasingly challenging for citizens to process and evaluate the torrent of incoming data [60, 48].

While some research suggests that voters may "forgive and forget" certain transgressions, especially for well-established figures [52], others indicate that scandals can lead to significant shifts in public opinion, particularly concerning a candidate's morality and competence [11, 14, 21]. The way voters process this information is critical to understanding the ultimate impact of a scandal. Traditional models of candidate evaluation often

differentiate between memory-based and online processing [35, 36, 38]. In memory-based processing, voters recall information from memory to form judgments, while online processing involves updating evaluations as new information is received [35]. However, the sheer volume and complexity of information surrounding a scandal may overwhelm these cognitive mechanisms, introducing the concept of cognitive load.

Cognitive load theory posits that individuals have a limited capacity for processing information [55, 56]. When information exceeds this capacity, it can hinder learning, decision-making, and even problem-solving [42, 57, 58]. In the context of political scandals, the constant stream of allegations, denials, counter-allegations, and media narratives, often presented in fragmented and emotionally charged ways, can significantly increase the cognitive demands placed on voters. This heightened cognitive load might force voters to abandon systematic, effortful processing in favor of simpler, less effortful heuristics [50, 42]. For instance, instead of deeply analyzing the specifics of an accusation, voters might rely on party affiliation as a cue [41], or succumb to the recency effect of information [37].

This article aims to explore the relationship between cognitive load and candidate evaluation in the context of scandal-ridden campaigns. We hypothesize that increased cognitive load, induced by the multifaceted nature of scandal-related information, will lead to a greater reliance on cognitive shortcuts and potentially less accurate or more polarized evaluations of candidates. Understanding this dynamic is crucial for comprehending contemporary voter behavior and the implications for political communication and democratic accountability.

METHODS

This article primarily synthesizes existing literature from political science, communication studies, and cognitive psychology to build a theoretical framework. Given the nature of this conceptual review, a traditional experimental or survey-based methodology is not employed. Instead, we perform a systematic review and integration of relevant scholarly works to establish the theoretical underpinnings and identify key variables and relationships.

Our approach involved:

1. **Literature Search:** Identifying key academic articles and books focusing on political scandals, voter behavior, candidate evaluation, cognitive load theory, and information processing. Search terms included "political scandal," "voter perception," "candidate evaluation," "cognitive load," "information processing," "heuristics," and "political psychology."
2. **Theoretical Integration:** Drawing connections between the disparate fields. Specifically, we examined how principles of cognitive load theory [34, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59] can be applied to the unique information environment created by political scandals, and how this relates to established models of political judgment [6, 7, 35, 36, 38, 61, 62].
3. **Hypothesis Formulation:** Developing testable propositions regarding the impact of cognitive load on candidate evaluation during scandals.
4. **Discussion of Implications:** Exploring the practical consequences of our theoretical framework for political campaigns, media, and the electorate.

While we do not present new empirical data, the theoretical framework developed herein provides a basis for future empirical research, which could utilize experimental designs to manipulate cognitive load and observe its effects on candidate evaluation [15].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The review of the literature strongly suggests that political scandals are inherently complex information environments that can significantly increase cognitive load on voters. This increased load, in turn, influences candidate evaluation

through several mechanisms.

1. The Nature of Scandal Information and Cognitive Load: Political scandals are rarely straightforward. They often involve multiple actors, conflicting narratives, legal intricacies, and ethical dilemmas [13, 20]. For example, the Trump-Russia scandal involved numerous allegations and counter-allegations, creating a highly complex information landscape [13, 51]. Similarly, reports of Donald Trump's business dealings [36, 54] and personal conduct [23] generated a constant stream of news that was difficult for the average voter to fully process. This constant barrage of information, often presented with varying degrees of credibility and partisan framing [8, 17, 49], can quickly overwhelm an individual's working memory capacity, which is known to be limited [40]. As such, voters are often faced with an "on-line" deluge of information that can be challenging to synthesize [35].

The very act of monitoring a scandal, particularly in the age of 24/7 news cycles and social media [53, 50], contributes to cognitive overload. Voters are exposed to a mix of factual reporting, speculation, partisan attacks, and attempts at disinformation [5, 9]. This constant stream of information can lead to mental fatigue and a decreased ability to engage in deep, effortful processing, making it difficult to distinguish between credible and unreliable sources [47].

2. Cognitive Load and Heuristic Processing: When cognitive load is high, individuals are more likely to resort to heuristics, or mental shortcuts, to make judgments [50, 42]. In the context of political scandals, this can manifest in several ways:

- **Partisan Biases:** Voters with strong partisan affiliations may rely on their party identity as a primary heuristic, dismissing negative information about their preferred candidate or party, and readily accepting negative information about the opposition [8, 17, 41]. This "collision with collusion" phenomenon was observed in partisan reactions to the Trump-Russia scandal [13].
- **Affective Heuristics:** The emotional valence of scandal information can also serve as a heuristic. Voters may form judgments based on their immediate emotional reactions to a candidate or scandal, rather than a thorough evaluation of the facts [25].
- **Source Credibility Shortcuts:** Instead of critically evaluating the content of a news report, voters might simply rely on the perceived credibility of the news source, which itself can be influenced by partisan leanings [49].
- **Morality vs. Competence:** Scandals often raise questions about a candidate's morality and competence [11, 14, 21]. Under high cognitive load, voters might simplify their evaluation, focusing on one

dimension (e.g., morality) at the expense of the other, or defaulting to pre-existing impressions. For example, some research suggests that perceived sexism can shape voter responses to scandal [1].

3. Impact on Candidate Evaluation: The shift towards heuristic processing under high cognitive load can have profound effects on candidate evaluation:

- **Reduced Nuance:** Voters may form less nuanced judgments, categorizing candidates as "good" or "bad" based on limited information or emotional responses, rather than a comprehensive understanding of the alleged misconduct and its implications.
- **Increased Polarization:** When voters rely on partisan heuristics, scandals can exacerbate political polarization, as individuals double down on their support for their party's candidates and intensify their opposition to the opposing party [43].
- **Focus on Salient, Easily Processed Information:** Under cognitive strain, voters may attend to the most salient or easily digestible aspects of a scandal, potentially overlooking more complex or nuanced details. For example, a sensational headline might carry more weight than a detailed investigative report.
- **Difficulty in Updating Beliefs:** Once initial judgments are formed under high cognitive load, they may be resistant to change, even in the face of contradictory evidence, as the effort required to update beliefs is too high [61, 62]. This can explain why some scandals, despite extensive coverage, do not always lead to significant shifts in support [27, 44].

This framework aligns with the concept of "deliberation's blindness," where under high cognitive load, individuals may perform better on certain tasks by relying on implicit processes rather than explicit deliberation [34]. In the context of scandals, this might mean that voters, overwhelmed by details, rely on gut feelings or broad impressions of a candidate's character rather than a systematic assessment of their actions [36].

CONCLUSION

The pervasive nature of political scandals in modern campaigns, coupled with the increasing complexity of the information environment, suggests that understanding cognitive load is paramount to comprehending voter behavior. When faced with a scandal, voters are not simply passive recipients of information; they are active processors, albeit with limited cognitive resources. The theoretical framework presented here posits that the heightened cognitive load induced by scandal-ridden campaigns can significantly alter how voters evaluate candidates, promoting reliance on heuristics and potentially leading to less nuanced and more polarized judgments.

Future empirical research should investigate these relationships directly. Experimental designs manipulating cognitive load (e.g., through time pressure or concurrent tasks) while exposing participants to information about political scandals could provide valuable insights [15, 50]. Such studies could explore how different types of scandals (e.g., personal vs. financial), different media presentations, and individual differences in need for cognition [6] influence the impact of cognitive load on candidate evaluation.

The implications of this understanding are significant for political campaigns, media organizations, and the electorate. Campaigns may strategically attempt to increase or decrease cognitive load on voters depending on their objectives, for instance, by overwhelming the opposition with multiple, complex allegations or by simplifying their own candidate's message. Media outlets, aware of the cognitive constraints on their audience, might consider how they present complex scandal information to facilitate better comprehension and reduce the likelihood of oversimplification or reliance on harmful heuristics. Ultimately, for voters, recognizing the potential for cognitive overload during scandal-ridden campaigns can encourage a more critical and reflective approach to information consumption, fostering more informed and independent candidate evaluations in an increasingly chaotic political landscape.

REFERENCES

1. Barnes, T. D., Beaulieu, E., & Saxton, G. (2018). Sex and corruption: How sexism shapes voters' responses to scandal. *Politics, Groups, and Identities*, 8(1), 103–121.
2. Basinger, S. J. (2013). Scandals and congressional elections in the post-Watergate era. *Political Research Quarterly*, 66(2), 385–398.
3. Basinger, S. J., & Rottinghaus, B. (2012). Skeletons in White House closets: A discussion of modern presidential scandals. *Political Science Quarterly*, 127(2), 213–239.
4. Beilock, S. L., & DeCaro, M. S. (2007). From poor performance to success under stress: Working memory, strategy selection, and mathematical problem solving under pressure. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 33(6), 983–998.
5. Bump, P. (October 2, 2018). The coverup uncovered: How team Trump tried to bury or confuse the Stormy Daniels story. *The Washington Post*.
6. Cacioppo, J. T., & Petty, R. E. (1982). The need for cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42(1), 116–131.

7. Campbell, A., Converse, P., Miller, W., & Stokes, D. (1960). *The American voter unabridged edition*. University of Chicago Press.
8. Cobb, M. D., & Taylor, A. J. (2015). An absence of malice: The limited utility of campaigning against party corruption. *American Politics Research*, 43(6), 923–951.
9. Coppins, M. (February 10, 2020). The billion-dollar disinformation campaign to reelect the president. *The Atlantic*.
10. Crawford, N. (2018). Of suspicious minds: Race, scandal, and the DC mayoralty. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 41(5), 679–699.
11. Cwalina, W., & Falkowski, A. (2016). Morality and competence in shaping the images of political leaders. *Journal of Political Marketing*, 15(2–3), 220–239.
12. Dancey, L. (2012). The consequences of political cynicism: How cynicism shapes citizens' reactions to political scandals. *Political Behavior*, 34(3), 411–423.
13. Darr, J. P., Kalmoe, N. P., Searles, K., Sui, M., Pingree, R. J., Watson, B. K., Bryanov, K., & Santia, M. (2019). Collision with collusion: Partisan reaction to the Trump-Russia scandal. *Perspectives on Politics*, 17(3), 772–787.
14. Dewberry, D. R. (2015). *The American political scandal: Free speech, public discourse, and democracy*. Rowman & Littlefield.
15. Dimock, M. A., & Jacobson, G. C. (1995). Checks and choices: The house bank scandal's impact on voters in 1992. *The Journal of Politics*, 57(4), 1143–1159.
16. Drezner, D. W. (February, 18, 2020). The power of Michael Bloomberg. *The Washington Post*.
17. Druckman, J., & Kam, C. (2011). Students as experimental participants. In J. Druckman, D. Greene, J. Kuklinski, & A. Lupia (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of experimental political science* (pp. 41–57). Cambridge University Press.
18. Duduciuc, A. (2012). Morality versus competence in social perception of political candidates. *Sfera Politicii*, 20(5), 68–74.
19. Entman, R. M. (2012). *Scandal and silence: Media responses to presidential misconduct*. Polity Press.
20. Esser, F., & Hartung, U. (2004). Nazis, pollution, and no sex: Political scandals as a reflection of political culture in Germany. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47(8), 1040–1071.
21. Evans, G., & Anderson, R. (2006). The political conditioning of economic perceptions. *The Journal of Politics*, 68(1), 194–207.
22. Fahrenthold, D. A. (November 8, 2016). Trump recorded having extremely lewd conversation about women in 2005. *The Washington Post*.
23. Hamel, B. T., & Miller, M. G. (2018). How voters punish and donors protect legislators embroiled in scandal. *Political Research Quarterly*, 72(1), 117–131.
24. Hoffman, J. A., von Helversen, B., & Rieskamp, J. (2013). Deliberation's blindsight: How cognitive load can improve judgments. *Psychological Science*, 24(5), 869–879.
25. How popular/unpopular is Donald Trump? (December 26, 2019). FiveThirtyEight.
26. Kalyuga, S. (2011). Cognitive load theory: How many types of load does it really need? *Educational Psychology Review*, 23(1), 1–19.
27. Kalyuga, S., & Liu, T. (2015). Guest editorial: Managing cognitive load in technology-based learning environments. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 18(4), 1–8.
28. Kim, Y. M., & Garrett, K. (2011). On-line and memory-based: Revisiting the relationship between candidate evaluation processing models. *Political Behavior*, 34(2), 345–368.
29. Lau, R. R., Kleinberg, M. S., & Ditonto, T. M. (2018). Measuring voter decision strategies in political behavior and public opinion research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 82(S1), 911–936.
30. Lipton, E., & Craig, S. (November 14, 2016). Donald Trump's far-flung holdings raise potential for conflicts of interests. *The New York Times*.
31. Lodge, M., McGraw, K. M., & Stroh, P. (1989). An impression-driven model of candidate evaluation. *American Political Science Review*, 83(2), 309–326.
32. Lovelace, J., . B. (October 31, 2020). Trump campaign rallies led to more than 30,000 coronavirus cases, Stanford researchers say. *CNBC*.
33. Mackuen, M. B., Erikson, R. S., & Stimson, J. A. (1992). Peasants or bankers? The American electorate and the U.S. economy. *The American Political Science Review*, 86(3), 597–611.
34. Mario, N. E. (2010). *The Politics of disgrace: The role of political scandal in America politics*. Carolina Academic Press.
35. McDermott, M. L., Schwartz, D., & Vallejo, S. (2015). Talking the talk but not walking the walk: Public reactions to hypocrisy in political scandal. *American Politics Research*, 43(6), 952–974.
36. McGraw, K. M., Lodge, M., & Stroh, P. (1990). On-line processing in candidate evaluation: The effects of issue order, issue importance, and sophistication. *Political Behavior*, 12(1), 41–58.
37. Miller, G. A. (1956). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our ability to process information. *Psychological Review*, 63(2), 81–97.
38. Mitchell, A., Gottfried, J., Shearer, E., & Barthel, M. (February 4, 2016). The 2016 presidential campaign: A news event that's hard to miss. Pew Research Center.

39. Mitchell, D. (2014). Here today, gone tomorrow? Assessing how timing and repetition of scandal information affects candidate evaluations. *Political Psychology*, 35(5), 679–701.
40. Nicholson, S. P., & Hansford, T. G. (2014). Partisans in robes: Party cues and public acceptance of supreme court decisions. *American Journal of Political Science*, 58(3), 620–636.
41. Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2019). *Cultural backlash: Trump, Brexit, and authoritarian populism*. Cambridge University Press.
42. Pereira, M. M., & Waterbury, N. W. (2019). Do voters discount political scandals over time? *Political Research Quarterly*, 72(4), 584–595.
43. Peterson, D. A. M., & Vonnahme, B. M. (2014). Aww, shucky ducky: Voter response to accusations of Herman Cain's 'inappropriate behavior.'. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 47(2), 372–378.
44. Praino, R., Stockemer, D., & Moscardelli, V. G. (2013). The lingering effects of scandals in congressional elections: Incumbents, challengers, and voters. *Social Science Quarterly*, 94(4), 1045–1061.
45. Puglisi, R., & Snyder, J. M. (2011). Newspaper coverage of political scandals. *Journal of Politics*, 73(3), 931–950.
46. Rainie, L., Anderson, J., & Albright, J. (March 29, 2017). The future of free speech, trolls, anonymity and fake news online. Pew Research Center.
47. Rieskamp, J., & Hoffrage, U. (2008). Inferences under time pressure: How opportunity costs affect strategy selection. *Acta Psychologica*, 127(2), 258–276.
48. Romano, M. K. (2014). Television news coverage of congressional scandals. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 47(2), 386–390.
49. Samuels, B. (January 29, 2019). Trump, Putin talked at G20 without US translator, note-taker: Report. *The Hill*.
50. Saxton, G. W., & Barnes, T. D. (2020). Sex and ideology: Liberal and conservative responses to scandal. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*, 1–12.
51. Social media fact sheet. (June 12, 2019). *Pew Research Center*.
52. Sonner, M. W., & Wilcox, C. (1999). Forgiving and forgetting: Public support for Bill Clinton during the Lewinsky scandal. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 32(10), 554–557.
53. Summers, J. (October 20 2020). Timeline: How Trump has downplayed the coronavirus pandemic. *NPR*.
54. Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285.
55. Sweller, J., van Merreinboer, J. J. G., & Paas, F. G. W. C. (1998). Cognitive architecture and instructional design. *Educational Psychology Review*, 10(3), 251–296.
56. Teachout, Z. (November 17, 2016). Trump's foreign business ties may violate the constitution. *The New York Times*.
57. Thompson, J. B. (2000). *Political scandal: Power and visibility in the media age*. Polity Press.
58. Uscinski, J. E., Klofstad, C., & Atkinson, M. (2016). What drives conspiratorial beliefs? The role of informational cues and predispositions. *Political Research Quarterly*, 69(1), 57–71.
59. van Gog, T., Paas, F., & Sweller, J. (2010). Cognitive load theory: Advances in research on worked examples, animations, and cognitive load measurements. *Educational Psychology Review*, 22(4), 375–378.
60. Vavreck, L., Spiliotes, C. J., & Fowler, L. L. (2002). The effects of retail politics in the New Hampshire primary. *American Journal of Political Science*, 46(3), 595–610.
61. Vivyan, N., Wagner, M., & Tarlov, J. (2012). Representative misconduct, voter perceptions, and accountability: Evidence from the 2009 house of commons expenses scandal. *Electoral Studies*, 31(4), 750–763.
62. von Sikorski, C. (2018). Political scandals as a democratic challenge: The aftermath of political scandals: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Communication*, 12(25), 109–3133.
63. von Sikorski, C., & Knoll, J. (2018). All at once or bit by bit? How the serialization of news affects recipients' attitudes toward politicians involved in scandals. *International Journal of Communication*, 12(19), 1389–1407.
64. Wlezien, C. (2015). The myopic voter: The economy and U.S. presidential elections. *Electoral Studies*, 39, 195–204.
65. Wu, T. (September 1, 2017). Is the first amendment obsolete? Knight First Amendment Institute.
66. Zaller, J. (1990). *The nature and origins of mass opinion*. Cambridge University Press.
67. Zaller, J. (1998). Monica Lewinsky's contribution to political science. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 31(2), 182–189.
68. Zaller, J., & Feldman, S. (1990). A simple theory of the survey response: Answering questions versus revealing preferences. *American Journal of Political Science*, 36(3), 579–616.