

# Computational emotion analysis with multimodal LLMs

## Current evidence on an emerging methodological opportunity

Hauke Licht\*

University of Innsbruck

2025-12-03

### Abstract

Emotions are central to politics and analyzing their role in political communication has a long tradition. As research increasingly leverages audio-visual materials to analyze the display of emotions, the emergence of multimodal generative AI promises great advances. However, we lack evidence about the effectiveness of multimodal AI in emotion analysis. This paper addresses this gap by evaluating current multimodal large language models (mLLMs) in video-based analysis of emotional arousal in two complementary data sets of human-labeled video recordings. I find that under ideal circumstances, mLLMs' emotional arousal ratings are highly reliable and show little to no indication of demographic bias. However, in recordings of speakers in real-world parliamentary debates, mLLMs' arousal ratings fail to deliver on this promise with potential negative consequences for downstream statistical inferences. This study therefore underscores the need for continued, thorough evaluation of emerging generative AI methods in political analysis and contributes a suitable replicable framework.

Word count: 9316

---

\*[hauke.licht@uibk.ac.at](mailto:hauke.licht@uibk.ac.at)

# 1 Introduction

Large pre-trained generative language models (LLMs) are revolutionizing computational applications in political science and neighboring fields. Among the many potential applications of LLMs (Chopra and Haaland 2023; Halterman 2025; e.g., Palmer and Spirling 2024; Wuttkke et al. 2025), a large and growing body of research assesses LLMs’ capabilities in text annotation and labeling through *in-context learning* (Brown et al. 2020). In these applications, an LLM is prompted with task instructions and asked to return a response that is then treated as an annotation of the given input text. This allows automated measurement of a wide range of social science constructs and limits the need for costly and time-consuming human annotation for model fine-tuning or training. For example, researchers have applied in-context learning to let LLMs classify texts into pre-defined categories (Bavaresco et al. 2025; e.g., Gilardi, Alizadeh, and Kubli 2023), score texts on pre-defined scales (Benoit et al. 2025; Licht et al. 2025; Mens and Gallego 2024; O’Hagan and Schein 2023), or extract entity mentions from texts (Kasner et al. 2025).

However, researchers increasingly recognize that political communication is not only about *what* is being said but also about *how* it is said (Boussalis et al. 2021; Cochrane et al. 2022; e.g., Dietrich, Hayes, and O’Brien 2019; Rittmann, Ringwald, and Nyhuis 2025). Viewed from this perspective, focusing only on text as data limits our understanding of political communication and its effects. Instead, we should also consider audio-visual materials in computational analysis.

This paper bridges these literatures by investigating the current in-context learning capabilities of *multimodal* LLMs (mLLMs) (e.g., Google 2024; Viveiros et al. 2025; Xu et al. 2025). Like purely text-based LLMs, mLLMs are trained to follow instructions and generate textual responses. Yet, unlike their text-based counterparts, they can process a mix of input modalities including text, audio, images, and videos. mLLMs thus allow using textual instructions to guide their analysis and annotation of audio-visual inputs. In-context learning with mLLMs, therefore, promises conceptually guided measurements for *multimodal* inputs.

Seeing the rapid progress in LLM development and applications, it is timely to ask to what extent current *multimodal* LLMs can be used for data annotation and measurement in

political communication research. To scrutinize this potential, I assess the in-context learning capabilities of mLLMs in emotion analysis, which involves several challenging tasks that often require nuanced understanding of both what is said and how it is expressed. In particular, I focus on measuring the emotional arousal or intensity of a speech. Unlike sentiment, that can often be reliably inferred from text alone, arousal manifests in audio-visual cues such as vocal tone, facial expressions, and body language (Boussalis, Coan, Holman, and Müller 2021; Cochrane et al. 2022; cf. Dietrich, Hayes, and O’Brien 2019; Rittmann, Ringwald, and Nyhuis 2025). This makes its measurement particularly well-suited for multimodal analysis.

I focus on two families of open-weights mLLM: Qwen Omni (Xu et al. 2025) and TowerVideo (Viveiros et al. 2025), and compare them to the Google’s Gemini 2.5 Flash model (Google 2024). I evaluate these in two complementary video data sets that each come with pre-existing sets of high-quality human arousal ratings. The first data set, RAVDESS (Livingstone and Russo 2018), contains short recordings of speech actors that were instructed to act specific emotions with pre-defined levels of intensity. Created under laboratory conditions, videos in this datasets present a “most likely” scenario for reliable video-based emotion intensity scoring with mLLMs. In contrast, the second data set I use, contributed by Cochrane et al. (2022), contains short segments of speeches recorded in the Canadian *House of Commons*. These videos present a much more challenging, yet practically more realistic test case for evaluating mLLMs in-context learning capabilities in emotion analysis.

My analyses show that under ideal circumstances, Gemini 2.5 Flash as well as Qwen 2.5 Omni 7B’s arousal ratings of video recordings approach human annotator’s level of measurement reliability. Further, they show little to no systematic demographic bias in their arousal ratings in terms of speakers’ gender. However, when deployed to measure the arousal of speakers in real-world political debates, all examined mLLMs fail to deliver on this promise. Their arousal measurements correlate only rather moderately to very weakly with average human ratings. Their measurements exhibit demographic bias in terms of speakers’ gender and age. Moreover, neither computational strategies for mitigating acoustic and visual background noises in videos, nor audio only-based in-context with a larger mLLMs substantially improves the alignment of mLLMs’ outputs with average human ratings. And even in sentiment scoring, where mLLMs fare better in video-based analysis, their performance lags

markedly behind that of their text-based base LLMs.

This paper therefore makes four contributions. First, it demonstrate how multimodal LLMs can be applied to central measurement tasks in political communication through video-based in context learning, using emotion intensity analysis as a case study. Second, it contributes a replicable framework and data for systematically assessing mLLMs’ performance in video-based emotional arousal analysis. Third, it applies this framework and data to empirically scrutinizes in-context learning capabilities of currently leading mLLMs under ideal and real-world conditions, respectively. Fourth, the evidence presented in this paper enriches our understanding of the current potential and limitations of mLLMs in political communication research. Overall, this paper thus provides guidance and a note of caution for researchers interested in leveraging mLLMs for data annotation and measurement in political communication research.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Emotions in political communication

Research on emotions in politics offers two complementary perspectives on the role of emotions in elite communication. First, emotion acts as a *mechanism* in shaping the perception, persuasions, and mobilization of audiences. Second, emotion constitutes a central *content* of political communication – what politicians express and the emotions they (may intend to) evoke.

From the perspective of its effects, emotions in elite communication matter because they influence how messages are perceived and processed by audiences. Classical models of political decision-making highlight that affective responses are central to political cognition and behavior (Bakker, Schumacher, and Rooduijn 2021; Lodge and Taber 2005, 2013). Political stimuli, such as topics and issues, symbols and labels, or parties and their leaders activate affective evaluations in citizens that shape how they process information and form attitudes. Accordingly, virtually all political objects carry affective tags in memory, which bias later reasoning and choice.

For example, research on vocal and visual cues demonstrates that these aspects of delivery have measurable political effects. A lower vocal pitch is associated with perceptions of authority and leadership (Anderson and Klofstad 2012; Cinar and Kıbrıs 2024; Klofstad 2016; Klofstad, Anderson, and Peters 2012). Facial expressions and gestures likewise affect candidate evaluations by signaling confidence or dominance (Druckman 2003; Dumitrescu, Gidengil, and Stolle 2015). At the same time, emotional neutrality can signal credibility: when legislators discuss issues within their domain of expertise, they tend to downplay visible emotionality to project competence (Boussalis, Coan, and Holman 2023).

Emotions also shape how audiences perceive and respond to political messages. Empirical work links specific emotions to different forms of political engagement (Brader 2005; Valentino et al. 2011). Emotional appeals can therefore affect both the *strength* and the *direction* of citizens’ responses. Moreover, physiological measures of arousal have been shown to predict attitude change independently of self-reported discrete emotions (Bakker, Schumacher, and Rooduijn 2021), indicating that nonverbal affective cues exert influence beyond conscious awareness.

The perspective viewing emotions as a content of political communication relates these insights to factors that shape how political elites use and display emotions. Generally, politicians express emotions in what they say, how they say it, and how they look while saying it. Accordingly, political communication involves the display and expression of emotions across verbal, vocal, and visual modalities (Boussalis, Coan, and Holman 2023; Dietrich, Hayes, and O’Brien 2019; Osnabrügge, Hobolt, and Rodon 2021; Rask and Hjorth 2025; Rittmann, Ringwald, and Nyhuis 2025).

However, this “supply” of emotions can serve both expressive and strategic purposes: it reflects internal states but also functions as a resource for persuasion and impression management. On the one hand, displayed emotions might be unintentional cues arising from physiological activation that speakers cannot easily suppress – such as subtle increases in vocal pitch or muscle tension when aroused (Dietrich, Enos, and Sen 2019; Dietrich, Hayes, and O’Brien 2019). These cues may reveal genuine emotional engagement and have been described as ‘honest indicators’ of internal affect (Ekman et al. 1991 cited in Dietrich, Enos, and Sen 2019).

On the other hand, research also suggest that emotional expression in politics can follow a strategic calculus: politicians choose when to appear passionate and when to appear composed. For example, speakers deliberately modulate tone, posture, and facial expression to emphasize points, signal opposition and conflict, or connect with audiences (Arnold and Küpfer 2025; Osnabrügge, Hobolt, and Rodon 2021; Rask and Hjorth 2025; Rittmann, Nyhuis, and Ringwald 2025). Emotive delivery can be adapted to increase visibility and media uptake in high-profile settings such as parliamentary question periods or televised debates (Dietrich, Schultz, and Jaquith 2018; Gennaro and Ash 2024; Osnabrügge, Hobolt, and Rodon 2021; Rittmann, Ringwald, and Nyhuis 2025). Yet, in highly visible debates, politicians often display heightened arousal to signal conflict and capture audience attention (Rask and Hjorth 2025; Rittmann, Ringwald, and Nyhuis 2025).

Viewed together, these perspectives highlight that emotions in political communication matter for understanding audience reactions as well as elite behavior. And given their multimodal nature, emotions in politics requires attention not only to verbal content but also to vocal and visual delivery. Accordingly, researchers have developed computational methods for emotion analysis.

## 2.2 Emotion analysis

Emotion analysis refers broadly to the detection, classification, or quantification of emotional states expressed or perceived in communication with computational methods. In practice, researchers operationalize emotion either through discrete emotion categories (e.g., anger, fear, joy, cf. Widmann and Wich 2022) or through continuous dimensions. The dimensional approach locates emotions within a two-dimensional space of valence and arousal (Russell 1980; Schlosberg 1954; cf. Cochrane et al. 2022). While valence captures whether an emotion is pleasant or unpleasant, arousal represents the activation level of that emotion. In communication, valence (also referred to as “sentiment” or “polarity”) reflects the negative of positive evaluative tone of a message, while arousal (or “activation”) captures how intense the emotions expressed in a speech are, ranging between subdued and animated.

The multi-modality of emotion expression makes it a particularly rich target for empirical analysis. Much research has relied on textual data, using methods such as sentiment

dictionaries or word embeddings to measure the polarity in political text (Gennaro and Ash 2022; Osnabrügge, Hobolt, and Rodon 2021; Proksch et al. 2019; Rheault et al. 2016). These text-based approaches capture evaluative tone (valence) but overlook nonverbal cues that, for example, convey emotional intensity (Cochrane et al. 2022; Dietrich, Hayes, and O’Brien 2019), which might bias downstream inferences (Damann, Knox, and Lucas 2025).

To overcome these limitations, researchers have increasingly turned to audio and visual modalities. Audio-based studies extract acoustic features – especially pitch – to estimate emotional arousal as an indicator of emotional intensity, preference strength, or conflict (Dietrich, Enos, and Sen 2019; Dietrich, Hayes, and O’Brien 2019; Rask and Hjorth 2025). Image-based approaches use computer vision to detect facial expressions and body posture, identifying basic emotions like joy, anger, or sadness in photographs or video frames (Boussalis, Coan, Holman, and Müller 2021; Boussalis and Coan 2021; Joo, Bucy, and Seidel 2019; Rittmann 2024; Torres 2024). Video-based research integrates these channels, analyzing facial and vocal expressions in motion to, for example, estimate emotion dynamics during debates or in campaign ads (Rheault and Borwein 2019; Tarr, Hwang, and Imai 2022).

## **2.3 Measuring the intensity of emotions in political speech**

Arousal is of particular interest for the analysis of political communication because it reflects the intensity with which emotions are expressed and displayed. Unlike valence – which can often be reliably inferred from text alone (Atteveldt, Velden, and Boukes 2021; Rheault, Beelen, Cochrane, and Hirst 2016) – arousal is tightly linked to nonverbal cues such as tone, pitch, facial expression, and body movement (Cochrane et al. 2022; Dietrich, Hayes, and O’Brien 2019; Rask and Hjorth 2025; Rittmann 2024; Rittmann, Ringwald, and Nyhuis 2025).

Measuring the intensity of expressed emotions in political speech raises problems of scalability, reliability, and validity. Human ratings of videos provide rich contextual judgment but are costly and may vary across raters (Cochrane et al. 2022; Mohammad et al. 2018; Rittmann, Ringwald, and Nyhuis 2025). Automated approaches therefore aim to approximate measurement of arousal obtain through manual analysis while offering greater scalability (Bagdon et al. 2024; Rheault and Borwein 2019; Rittmann, Ringwald, and Nyhuis

2025).

Further, evidence by Cochrane et al. (2022) indicates that speech transcripts alone do not reliably convey emotional intensity compared to audio-visual materials. In their study, Cochrane et al. (2022) have distributed short segments of speeches held during *Question Time* debates in the Canadian *House of Commons* for emotional valence and arousal rating to two groups of coders. The first group of annotators rated<sup>1</sup> speeches based on their transcripts, whereas the other based on speeches video recordings.<sup>2</sup> Their data reveal two interesting patterns for arousal measurement. First, comparing inter-rater agreement level across annotation modalities (text vs. video) and emotion dimensions (sentiment vs. arousal) suggests that in human annotation, text transcripts are better suited as annotation modality than videos in the case of sentiment measurement but *less* suited in the case of arousal measurement. Table 1 summarizes this patterns by reporting the *average fixed raters* intra-class correlation (ICC) coefficient (ICC3k, see McGraw and Wong 1996) for transcript and video-based sentiment and arousal ratings, respectively, computed from averages of coders’ repeated ratings (see 1) per speech segment, dimension, and annotation modality, to estimate reliability.<sup>3</sup>

**Table 1:** Inter-coder agreement in text transcript- and video-based ratings of valence/sentiment and arousal/intensity according to the average fixed raters intra-class correlation (ICC3k) coefficient.

	Text ratings	Video ratings
Sentiment	0.937 [0.930, 0.940]	0.832 [0.790, 0.870]
Arousal	0.728 [0.700, 0.760]	0.831 [0.790, 0.870]

Second, and more strikingly, the data by Cochrane et al. (2022) indicates that while

<sup>1</sup>Cochrane et al. (2022) let coders rate some speech segments multiple times at different points in time to be able to compute intra-coder reliability. I average a such multiple ratings for each speech segment before computing cross-coder average speech segment-level scores, as further described below.

<sup>2</sup>The level of inter-rater reliability is overall moderate to high (Cicchetti 1994) in their data (see Table 1). This conclusion holds when computing the ICC3k only in the subset of examples used for LLM scoring evaluation (Table A2) and when using another multi-annotator reliability metric for interval/ordinal scaled annotations (Krippendorff’s  $\alpha$ , Table A3).

<sup>3</sup>I focus on the average of the given annotators’ ratings – in contrast to agreement between pairs of coders, like as Cochrane et al. (2022) – because I am want to assess the reliability of the specific set of ratings produced by the fixed set of annotators (see McGraw and Wong 1996) and I will use average annotators ratings in my analyses below.



human coders judge the sentiment of speeches similarly when coding transcripts and videos, their text and video based arousal ratings essentially measure different constructs. As shown in Figure A2, cross-rater average sentiment ratings based on transcripts and video recordings are strongly positively correlated (Pearson’s  $r = 0.711$ ), average arousal ratings are only very weakly correlated between annotation modalities (Pearson’s  $r = 0.119$ ).<sup>4</sup> Given how much audio-visual cues contribute to arousal perception, this finding underscores the limitations of text-based analysis for capturing emotional intensity in political speech. The evidence by Cochrane et al. (2022) thus underscores that valid measurement of the intensity of emotions expressed in political speech requires multimodal approaches that integrate verbal, vocal, and visual cues.

## 2.4 The promise of multimodal LLMs

However, current methods for automatically measuring emotional arousal face several limitations. Uni-modal methods like using vocal pitch (Dietrich, Hayes, and O’Brien 2019; Rask and Hjorth 2025) or facial expression analysis (Boussalis and Coan 2021; Rittmann 2024) can only capture a subset of relevant cues. Current multimodal approaches that integrate audio and visual information, in contrast, typically rely on supervised (deep) learning and therefore require domain-specific training data (Rheault and Borwein 2019; Rittmann, Ringwald, and Nyhuis 2025; Tarr, Hwang, and Imai 2022; cf. Arnold and Küpfer 2025).

The emergence of *multimodal large language models* (mLLMs) allows a methodological shift – similar to what we are currently experiencing in the field of computational *text* analysis. Unlike traditional machine learning systems, mLLMs can be instructed with natural-language prompts to perform a variety of annotation tasks *in context*, that is, without task-specific fine-tuning. The in-context learning paradigm (Brown et al. 2020) therefore promises to substantially lower barriers to multimodal research. In particular, this promise arguably opens new possibilities for emotion analysis: rather than inferring arousal from fixed feature

---

<sup>4</sup>Cochrane et al. (2022) document this by computing ICC estimates between the sentiment and arousal ratings of pairs of annotators that coded speeches based on different annotation modalities (text vs. video). They find overall moderate levels of cross-modality inter-coder agreement in the sentiment ratings. But in the arousal ratings, a rating of a speech tends to differ strongly between transcript and video annotation. Cochrane et al. (2022, 104) conclude that ‘[there] is no approximately acceptable level of inter-coder reliability between the [arousal] scores of any text coder and any video coder.’

mappings, researchers can specify theoretically grounded definitions of emotional intensity directly in the prompt and let the model perform the measurement.

### 3 Empirical Strategy

This paper builds on the promise of in-context learning with mLLMs for emotion analysis by evaluating them in the measurement of speakers’ emotional arousal based on video recordings. In particular, I use zero- and few-shot in-context learning to generate arousal ratings for video recordings and compare these ratings to corresponding ratings assigned by groups of human coders to assess measurement reliability. Further, I examine mLLM’s ratings for demographic biases and assess whether using mLLMs’ ratings as measurements in downstream regression analysis would yield similar substantive conclusions as using human ratings.

#### 3.1 Data

I use two complementary data sets with human-labeled emotional intensity in video recordings. First, the RAVDESS data set created by Livingstone and Russo (2018) that contains video recordings of speech actors that have been rated by multiple human annotators in terms of emotional intensity. Second, the data set created by Cochrane et al. (2022) discussed in Section 2 that contains sentiment and arousal ratings by multiple human coders for short segments of parliamentary speeches recorded in the Canadian *House of Commons*.

##### The RAVDESS data

The RAVDESS data contains 1248 short videos.<sup>5</sup> These videos are recordings of 24 different actors (12 male, 12 female). To create a video recording, Livingstone and Russo (2018) instructed a given actor to speak one of two syntactically matched statements<sup>6</sup> in a “Neutral” emotional state or one of seven different emotions<sup>7</sup> with either normal or strong intensity. Actors then performed the given statement, expressing the matching emotional state through

---

<sup>5</sup>The RAVDESS data set also contains a *song* module but I only use the *speech* module here.

<sup>6</sup>‘Dogs’ (“Dogs are sitting by the door”) and ‘Kids’ (“Kids are talking by the door”)

<sup>7</sup>Angry, Disgust, Fearful, Happy, Neutral, Sad, and Surprise.

vocalization and facial display. Livingstone and Russo (2018) recorded two trials per actor, statement, emotion category, and intensity level.


To validate the quality of these recordings, Livingstone and Russo (2018) distributed each recording to ten annotators, who were tasked to rate the intensity of the displayed emotions on a 1–5 scale. These ratings exhibit high levels of measurement reliability according to the *average random rater* intra-class correlation (ICC1k) coefficient estimate of 0.74 Livingstone and Russo (2018, Table 5) report (cf. Cicchetti 1994). I use the cross-coder averages of recordings’ emotion intensity ratings as a benchmark in my analysis.

### **The Cochrane et al. (2022) data**

The second labeled data set analyzed in this paper stems from the study conducted by Cochrane et al. (2022) already discussed in Section 2. In particular, I use the arousal ratings Cochrane et al. (2022) collected from their video coders for evaluating mLLMs’ emotion analysis capabilities and present analyses based on text and video coders’ sentiment ratings in Section 4.2. To obtain the transcripts and video recording of the speech segment covered in their study, I have first attempted to download the video recordings of the all 635 English-language speech segments. This succeeded for 595 speech segments. Next, I have averaged each video coders’ repeated arousal ratings of a given speech segment. I have then averaged these averages at the speech segment level, which yields high-reliability measurements according to the ICC estimates reported in Table 1 and Table A1. I have rescaled these measures to the range 1–9 to allow direct comparison of LLM scores (described further below).

The arousal ratings in the data by Cochrane et al. (2022) ideally complement the RAVDESS data. The focus on arousal as a central dimension of expressed emotions in Cochrane et al. (2022) matches the focus on emotional intensity in the RAVDESS data, as these are essentially the same construct. However, instead of recording actors’ carefully scripted and curated display of emotions created in a controlled laboratory environment, the recordings in the Cochrane et al. (2022) data are videos of speeches held by politicians in the context of lively parliamentary debates. Figure 1 illustrates that this means that the focal speaker may not face the camera, their posture may change throughout the recording,

and there may be other people and objects in the background. This is because in “talking parliaments” (Weber cited in Palonen 2018), speakers often speak where they sit so that the camera is often not frontally capturing them, which contrasts with video recordings from, for example, the German *Bundestag* (Rittmann 2024). Further, the audio track of the recording linked in the caption of Figure 1 highlights that live recordings feature ambient sounds and background noises that may confound indicators of emotional arousal in the focal speaker’s voice.



**Figure 1:** Example of two frames of a video recording in the Cochrane et al. (2022) data. (original video link)

## Data splits


I have split both data sets into train, validation, and test splits blocking by speaker<sup>8</sup> to allow for few-shot in-context learning and out-of-sample evaluation. I use the test splits for ICL inference and evaluation, the train splits for exemplars sampling in few-shot ICL, and set aside the remaining recordings for future studies examining, for example, fine-tuning approaches. This results in 624 test and 312 train examples in the RAVDESS data and 314 test and 145 train examples in the Cochrane et al. (2022) data.

Figure 2 shows the distributions of the video recording-level average emotion intensity respectively arousal ratings in the test splits I use for mLLM evaluation. For the RAVDESS

---

<sup>8</sup>Blocking the data splitting by speaker means that all the recordings of a given speaker are either in the train, validation, or test split and ensures that we assess out-of-sample performance even when using few-shot exemplars from the train split when assessing the performance of in-context learning in test split examples.

data, I further group the data by the intensity level actors were instructed to apply when performing their lines. On the 1–5 scale, average annotators’ ratings center around 3.5 and 4.1 for recordings with normal and strong instructed intensity, respectively, while ratings are similarly dispersed in both conditions. In the Cochrane et al. (2022) data, arousal scores are concentrated in the range between 4 and 6.5 on the 1–9 scale, indicating that most speech segments are rated as moderate in terms of arousal. Yet, the distribution still covers most of the scale range, indicating that the data contains speech segments rated as low, moderate, and high in arousal.



(a) RAVDESS data. The shading of the histograms indicates whether actors were instructed to perform with normal or strong intensity.

(b) Cochrane et al. (2022) data

**Figure 2:** Distribution of recording-level cross-coder averages emotional arousal/intensity ratings in the test splits of RAVDESS and Cochrane et al. (2022) data sets.

## 3.2 Models

Video-based in-context learning requires mLLMs that can process temporally aligned audio-visual input sequences. I evaluate both closed- and open-weights mLLMs that meet this requirement.

In the case of open-weights mLLMs, I focus on models in the Qwen 2.5 Omni (Xu et al. 2025) and TowerVideo (Viveiros et al. 2025) families. Released in mid and late-2025, respec-

tively, these models are the first open-weights multimodal LLMs capable of processing videos as temporally aligned audio-visual input sequences. Architectural innovations like cross-modal self-attention, time-aligned multimodal RoPE (TMRoPE), and time-interleaving (Xu et al. 2025) facilitate a form of implicit alignment in the multimodal representations of video inputs that allow for the integration of fine-grained nonverbal signals such as pitch shifts or facial and body movements in a temporal context.<sup>9</sup> Further, and more generally, the use of open-source models has the additional advantage that it can facilitate reproducibility.

These features set them apart from audio- and image-only models that can process either audio or images (e.g., video frames) as well as more closely related video-text-to-text and “any-to-any” mLLMs that process videos without accounting for videos’ audio tracks (e.g., LLaVA, Janus, Video-R1, cf. Kumar 2025).

In the case of closed-weights models, I focus on Google’s Gemini series, which is advertised as being capable of “video understanding” (Google 2025). While the closed-source models of commercial providers like Google often lead in terms of performance, they also often lack in transparency and limit reproducibility (Barrie, Palmer, and Spirling 2025). As a point in case, Gemini’s developer documentation says very little about whether this model actually process video as aligned audio-visual sequences instead of, for example, textual summaries of videos’ visual and/or audio content.

Although designed primarily for general multimodal understanding, the examined mLLMs could enable in-context learning for emotion annotation tasks. Crucially, these video-based mLLMs generate textual responses like any ordinary text-only decoder model. This means that we can apply the same techniques for converting their textual responses into annotations of video inputs that we apply when parsing the response of a text-only LLM. I leverage this feature to elicit emotion arousal ratings as described next.

### 3.3 Task

I replicate the emotional intensity and arousal rating task in the RAVDESS and Cochrane et al. data sets with multimodal LLMs by instructing a given model to rate a video record-

---

<sup>9</sup>Another attractive feature of TowerVideo models is their relatively broad multilingual support compared to the focus on English and Chinese in Qwen Omni models (cf. Baden et al. 2021; Licht and Lind 2023).

ing in terms of emotional intensity on a pre-defined integer scale.<sup>10</sup> In particular, I use a short prompt template that outlines the task, defines the construct (emotional arousal) and rating scale, describes its extreme poles, and specifies the response format. The prompt templates, shown in Prompt 1 and 2 in the supporting information, are closely aligned with the original coding instructions provided to human coders and follow best practices in prompt engineering, like providing a construct definition and step-by-step instructions.<sup>11</sup>

I then apply video-based in-context learning (ICL) by inputting the prompt text and a given video recording as a user message and generating the model’s response. The instruction-following mLLM’s response is a single token corresponding to an integer number<sup>12</sup> among the available scale point options on the specified rating scale (e.g., “4” on the 1–5 scale). Licht et al. (2025) show that LLMs direct scalar responses in rating tasks can be bunched around arbitrary values. As this finding replicates in models’ outputs in my analyses, I follow their token probability weighting approach (Ornstein, Blasingame, and Truscott 2025; see also Wang, Zhang, and Choi 2025) to compute real-valued scalar LLM responses that are weighted by the generation probabilities of the tokens corresponding to the available scale points.<sup>13</sup>

In the RAVDESS data, I instruct mLLMs to rate each video recording on a 1–5 scale in terms of the intensity of the expressed emotion on a scale from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high), paralleling the original human annotation task. In the Cochrane et al. (2022) data, I use a 1–9 scale, deviating from the 0–10 scale originally used by Cochrane et al. (2022), as the underlying Qwen 2.5 tokenizer has no token for the response option “10”<sup>14</sup> and using

---

<sup>10</sup>I instruct mLLMs to respond with integer numbers instead of allowing decimal numbers because (a) this parallels human raters’ task and (b) there are no native representations for decimal numbers in LLMs’ vocabularies.

<sup>11</sup>I do not report results for different prompts, however, for computational reasons.

<sup>12</sup>I instruct mLLMs to respond with integer numbers instead of allowing decimal numbers because (a) this parallels human raters’ task and (b) there are no native representations for decimal numbers in LLMs’ vocabularies.

<sup>13</sup>For example, assume an LLM is tasked to rate a speech segment on a 1–5 scale and it responds with “4” and the underlying prompt-conditional generation probabilities for the tokens representing the scale point options 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 are 0.05, 0.15, 0.25, 0.4, 0.15. Then we obtain a token probability-weighted score of 3.45.

<sup>14</sup>The Qwen 2.5 tokenizer tokenizes “10” into two tokens (“1” and “0”). This makes it impossible to compute a token probability-weighted response in a single decoding pass because the joint generation probability of tokens “1” and “0” cannot be computed unless the model’s first generated token is “1”, which is only one of ten valid first tokens choices for the 0-10 scale (cf. Licht et al. 2025).

the scale 1-9 avoids the computational complications associated with this problem.

### Few-shot inference

In the zero-shot ICL setting, I only provide the model with the task instruction and the focal video input. However, providing labeled examples at inference time can improve generative LLMs’ in-context learning performance in annotation tasks by demonstrating the desired relation between inputs and responses and the response format. Accordingly, I run experiments with three and five exemplars sampled from the respective data sets’ train splits in addition to the zero-shot inference experiments described above.<sup>15</sup> I integrate few-shot exemplars as turns of user input (video plus short task summary) and assistant response in the conversation history after the task instruction and before the to-be-rated video. As the assistant’s response in these exemplars, I use the cross-coder average arousal/intensity score recorded for the given exemplar, rounding to integer values to match the described response format.

### Reproducibility

I run all examined open-weights mLLMs on local hardware<sup>16</sup> with “greedy decoding” using the `transformers` (Wolf et al. 2020) library. This means that at each decoding step, the model selects the token with the highest generation probability as the next token in the response sequence. Holding constant the computation environment and batch, this makes model behavior deterministic. Inference with Gemini 2.5 Flash was run through Google’s Verex AI API, where I set the temperature parameter to 0 to approximate greedy decoding as closely as possible given the closed-weights nature of the model. A more detailed discussion of the measures I have taken to ensure reproducibility (in line with Barrie, Palmer, and Spirling 2025) can be found in Section C of the supporting information.

---

<sup>15</sup>To demonstrate the given model the range of possible input–score pairs, I have selected so-called “anchor” exemplars placed on about equidistant locations along the empirical range spanned by train set examples’ scores. For instance, in 3-shot inference, this means that exemplars feature one high-, one moderate, and one low-scoring exemplar.

<sup>16</sup>For video-based inference with open-weights mLLMs with 3B parameters or less, I use a NVIDIA RTX 4090 GPU with 24GB of VRAM. For larger mLLM, I use two NVIDIA RTX 4090 GPUs with model parallelism managed by the `accelerate` library (Gugger et al. 2022).



## Bias analysis

These quantitative evaluation metrics summarize models’ overall scoring performance relative to human ratings. But models’ rating behavior might be unduely influenced by demographic characteristics of the speakers in the video recordings. I therefore examine whether mLLMs’ arousal ratings exhibit demographic biases by comparing their scoring performance across different speaker demographic groups. In the RAVDESS data, I compare mLLMs’ scoring performance for male and female actors. In the Cochrane et al. (2022) data, I compare mLLMs’ scoring performance by speaker gender and age group.


## Downstream analysis implications

Measuring a quantity of interest is only the first step in applied quantitative political science research. Accordingly, I follow recent literature that scrutinizes LLMs as annotators by assessing how using in-context learning measurements affects substantive conclusions drawn from downstream statistical analysis (Baumann et al. 2025; Egami et al. 2024; TeBlunthuis, Hase, and Chan 2024; cf. Knox, Lucas, and Cho 2022). I address this question in the Cochrane et al. data by assessing how the arousal of speeches differs between government and opposition speakers. Opposition and government speakers have similarly strong incentives to use emotions in their questions and replies during *Question Time*. Regressing the average human arousal rating of a speech on whether the speaker belongs to the government or opposition side shows *no* statistically significant difference between these groups (see Figure 7). I therefore assess whether using an mLLM’s arousal scores as outcome in this regression leads to the same conclusions.

# 4 Results

## 4.1 Results in the RAVDESS data

Figure 3 reports the performance of mLLMs in scoring the intensity of emotion in videos recorded in the RAVDESS data test split. Gemini 2.5 Flash achieves the strongest results. In zero-shot inference, the probability-weighted scores computed from its rating responses




**Figure 3:** Video-based emotion intensity scoring performance of mLLMs in the RAVDESS dataset. Performance shown on y-axis measured in terms of correlation ( $\rho$ ,  $r$ ) and the root mean squared error (RMSE) using averaged scores computed from human coders’ ratings as a reference, where higher (lower) values in  $\rho$  and  $r$  (RMSE) indicate better performance. Bars’ height corresponds to average values in 120 bootstrapped estimates and vertical black lines at bars’ tip indicate their 90% confidence intervals. x-axis values indicate the number of few-shot ICL examples (0, 3, or 5) and plot panel columns model type and size. *Note:* Now results for TowerVideo-9B for 5-shot inference reported due to its context window size limitation.

reach a Pearson’s correlation of 0.690 and an RMSE of 0.784 on the 1–5 scale. It is important to consider attenuation to contextualizing these numbers, however, because observed correlations of models’ scores with the human rating-based reference values underestimates the “true” correlations of models’ scores with speeches’ unobserved intensity values due to annotation noise (Schmidt and Hunter 1999). Adjusting for attenuation,<sup>17</sup> Gemini 2.5 Flash

<sup>17</sup>Following Schmidt and Hunter (1999), I assume that the observed correlation is an attenuated estimate of the true correlation due to the measurement error in the reference scores that are averaged from human raters’ noisy annotations. In particular,  $r_{\text{obs}} = r_{\text{true}} \sqrt{\rho_{\text{humans}} \rho_{\text{model}}}$ . As the model’s responses are (close

achieves a correlation of 0.793 in zero-shot inference, which is slightly higher than the estimated reliability of arousal measurements obtained by averaging multiple human raters’ annotations according to the ICC estimates Livingstone and Russo (2018, Table 5) report.

Among open-weights models, Qwen 2.5 Omni (7B) performs best in 3-shot inference, which strikes a good balance between correlation and average prediction error (RMSE). For example, comparing the probability-weighted scores computed from the rating responses of Qwen 2.5 Omni (7B) to the human rating-based reference scores results in a correlation of 0.609 and an RMSE of 0.691 points on the 1–5 scale when using three exemplars.<sup>18</sup> Adjusted for attenuation, this corresponds to a correlation of 0.708, which is slightly below the estimated reliability of average human ratings.



**Figure 4:** Relationship between video-based 3-shot emotion intensity scores of mLLMs and human coders’ average ratings in the RAVDESS dataset. *Note:* Correlation values reported here deviate from those in Figure 3 because the latter are bootstrapped average estimates in contrast to point estimates shown here.

Figure 4 shows the relation between models’ scores and the reference scores based on 3-shot ICL. The scatter plots illustrate what, for example, a correlation of 0.649 means in terms of measurement error. It also shows that the distribution of mLLM and reference scores are overall strongly aligned for the Gemini 2.5 Flash and the Qwen 2.5 Omni models. Moreover, Figure D1 shows that, like the averaged human ratings, Gemini 2.5 Flash and

to) deterministic given fixed inputs and greedy decoding (i.e., no sampling/zero temperature),  $\rho_{\text{model}} \approx 1$ . Therefore,  $r_{\text{true}} = r_{\text{obs}}/\sqrt{\rho_{\text{humans}}}$ . Note, however, that setting  $\rho_{\text{model}} < 1$  would *increase*  $r_{\text{true}}$  – so my approach is conservative.

<sup>18</sup>It is notable, however, that while RMSE improves with the number of few-shot examples, correlation does not. Visual inspection of the relation between predicted and reference scores in Figure 4 shows that this is because few-shot inference calibrates the model’s responses to the distribution of the data demonstrated in the anchoring exemplars. In zero-shot ICL, Qwen 2.5 Omni (7B) tends to underestimate emotion intensity despite stronger correlation with the reference score. In contrast, in 3-shot inference the distributions of mLLM scores is much more similar to the reference score distribution.

Qwen 2.5 Omni 7B’s arousal ratings recover the average intensity difference between videos in the “Normal” and “Strong” conditions Livingstone and Russo (2018) have applied to create the videos in the RAVDESS data.<sup>19</sup> This can be viewed as an important validity check.

This contrasts with the performance of the Qwen 2.5 Omni (3B) and the Tower Video models. The Qwen 2.5 Omni (3B) and TowerVideo (9B) models performs slightly worse than Qwen 2.5 Omni (7B). But at least in the case of Qwen 2.5 Omni (3B), performance approaches that achieved in the best setup with Qwen 2.5 Omni 7B as the number of few-shot exemplars is increased. In contrast, in 3-shot inference TowerVideo models’ scores fail to calibrate to the distribution of the reference scores and focus on a very narrow range of values. Additional analysis not reported here suggest that this is because of overconfidence in TowerVideo models’ responses (see Figure 4). Further, TowerVideo models’ comparatively poor performance in few-shot inference could also be due to their poor handling of long contexts arising as exemplars’ videos quickly exhaust the context window.

Overall, the evidence in the RAVDESS data suggests that the closed-weights Gemini 2.5 Flash achieves strong performance in scoring emotion intensity in videos and, while lagging slightly behind, the best-performing open-weights model (Qwen 2.5 Omni 7B) comes close to this benchmark. However, we also learn that the choice of open-weights mLLM and its size matters for performance as does the use of few-shot exemplars to calibrate the model’s responses to the distribution of the data.

Besides overall performance, a key question in computational emotion analysis is whether a model’s measurements are biased with respect to the demographic characteristics of the individuals in the data. I assess this question by computing the evaluation metrics reported above separately for the recordings of male and female voice actors in my test set of the RAVDESS data. Figure D2 reports the results of this analysis, showing that the 3-shot arousal scorings of Gemini 2.5 Flash and Qwen 2.5 Omni (7B) exhibit little to no systematic

---

<sup>19</sup>Figure D1 shows that (i) videos in the “Neutral” emotion condition are rated relatively low in both human and mLLM scores, (ii) videos in the “Strong” intensity condition tend to be rated as more intense than videos in the “Normal” intensity condition by humans as well as the mLLM, and in line with patterns in the average human ratings, (iii) for some emotion categories (e.g., anger, fear, happiness), this difference between mLLMs’ ratings of videos in the “Normal” and “Strong” conditions is more pronounced than in other emotion categories (e.g., Disgust).

gender bias. This contrasts with the behavior of TowerVideo 9B, which performs more poorly in scoring the arousal of male voice actors relative to human coders’ average ratings.

The results in the RAVDESS data presented Figure 3 arguably justify cautious optimism regarding the multimodal emotion analysis capabilities of Gemini 2.5 Flash and Qwen 2.5 Omni (7B). However, it is important to emphasize again that the videos recorded in the RAVDESS data were created under controlled laboratory conditions. I therefore turn next to evaluating these models video-based emotion analysis capabilities “in the wild,” namely in real-world parliamentary question time speech recordings.

## 4.2 Results in the Cochrane et al. (2022) data


Figure 5 reports the video-based arousal scoring performance of mLLMs evaluated in reference scores computed by averaging human coders’ ratings of videos in the Cochrane et al. (2022) data. It shows that the closed-weights Gemini 2.5 Flash as well as the open-weights mLLMs examined perform poorly – in absolute as well as relative terms. Correlations with the human rating-based reference scores are overall very low in absolute terms and adjusting for attenuation does not change this conclusion.<sup>20</sup> And independent from model type, model size, and the number of few-shot exemplars, these mLLMs’ video-based arousal scoring performance is low in this data compared to the more encouraging results obtained in the RAVDESS data. Importantly, this sobering finding holds also for Gemini 2.5 Flash and Qwen 2.5 Omni (7B), which achieved promising performances in the RAVDESS data.

The only exception are RMSE estimates for Gemini 2.5 Flash, Qwen 2.5 Omni models in few-shot inference, and for TowerVideo (9B), which suggest that the mLLMs make on average relatively minor scoring errors. But viewed together with the low correlation depicted in Figure 6, this comparatively low RMSE reflects that the mLLMs’ video-based arousal scores are overall close to the mean of the human ratings, which minimizes the RMSE but does not yield a meaningful ranking of the videos according to their arousal level.

How do mLLMs’ fare in terms of demographic bias in arousal scoring in the Cochrane


---

<sup>20</sup>Given ICC3k estimates for video-based arousal ratings and 0.831 (see Table 1) the unattenuated Pearson’s  $r$  metric estimate for Gemini 2.5 Flash in 3-shot video-based ICL is 0.472 and 0.353 for Qwen 2.5 Omni (7B) in zero-shot video-based ICL.




**Figure 5:** Results of evaluating video-based arousal scoring with mLLMs in test splits of the Cochrane et al. (2022) data. Performance shown on y-axis measured in terms of correlation ( $\rho$ ,  $r$ ) and the root mean squared error (RMSE) using averaged scores computed from human coders’ ratings as a reference, where higher (lower) values in  $\rho$  and  $r$  (RMSE) indicate better performance. Bars’ height corresponds to average values in 120 bootstrapped estimates and vertical black lines at bars’ tip indicate their 90% confidence intervals. x-axis values indicate the number of few-shot ICL examples (0, 3, or 5), and plot panel columns mLLM type and size. *Note:* Now results for TowerVideo-9B for 5-shot inference reported due to its context window size limitation.

et al. (2022) data? Computing the evaluation metrics reported above separately for the recordings of speakers of different genders and in different age groups reveals systematic variation in performance across these demographics. The scorings of Gemini 2.5 Flash and the 7B and 9B variants of Qwen 2.5 Omni and TowerVideo, respectively, are systematically less aligned with the human rating-based reference scores for female speakers compared to male speakers (see Figure D3). Moreover, Gemini 2.5 Flash and TowerVideo 9B tend to perform worse in measuring the arousal of younger speakers (age group 24–45) compared to



**Figure 6:** Scatter plots showing the relationship between human annotation-based reference scores and mLLMs’ arousal scoring in 3-shot video-based ICL. The x-axis indicates the average human rating; the y-axis shows the score predicted by the mLLM. Correlation reported in terms of Pearson’s  $r$ . *Note:* Correlation values reported here deviate from those in Figure 5 because the latter are bootstrapped average estimates in contrast to point estimates shown here.

older speakers (see Figure D4). Thus, besides achieving relatively poor overall performance in arousal scoring in real-world speech recordings compared to the clinically sterile videos in the RAVDESS data, mLLMs also exhibit demographic bias in their scoring performance in the Cochrane et al. (2022) data.



**Figure 7:** OLS coefficient estimates of difference between opposition and government speakers’ arousal in the Cochrane et al. (2022) data when measured with avg. human rating or mLLM scores, respectively. Coefficients estimates are shown on the x-axis and y-axis values indicate whether arousal was measured using avg. human rating or mLLM scores’ from video-based 3-shot ICL. Error bars indicate 90% and 95% confidence intervals around coefficients’ point estimates. Positive (negative) coefficient values indicate higher (lower) arousal scores for opposition speakers compared to government speakers.

What do these differences between measurements based on human rating and mLLM scoring imply for downstream inferences? I address this question by assessing how speeches’ arousal differs between government and opposition speakers through linear regression model-

ing. In particular, I compare the OLS coefficient estimates of the mean arousal difference between opposition and government speakers using either human rating-based reference scores or mLLMs’ scores from 3-shot video-based ICL as outcome variable.

Figure 7 shows that regressions using the average arousal rating of human raters as outcome in the regression finds a slightly negative but statistically insignificant difference between government and opposition speakers’ arousal. Only the regression that uses the scores of Qwen 2.5 Omni (7B) as outcome variable leads to a substantively identical conclusion. Using the other mLLMs’ scores as outcome variables yields either (insignificant) coefficient estimates of a much smaller magnitude (Qwen 2.5 Omni 3B and TowerVideo 9B) or it results in a positive coefficient estimate that is even statistically significant at the 5% level in the case of TowerVideo (2B).

This findings suggests that the overall calibration of an mLLM’s scores might not always guarantee substantively similar conclusions in downstream regression analyses as when using outcome measures based on human annotation. In particular, despite Gemini 2.5 Flash and Qwen 2.5 Omni (7B) are – in relative terms – the two best performing models in this data, the regressions based on their scores yield coefficient estimates of a similar magnitude but with opposed signs.

## Discussion and potential explanations

Viewed together, Figure 5 and Figure 7 allow drawing a nuanced conclusion. First, quantitative evaluation clearly show that mLLM’s emotional arousal scores obtained through in-context learning in real-world parliamentary speech data aligned at best moderately with the human rating-based references scores. Second, comparing the mLLMs’ video-based arousal scoring performance by speaker’s demographic characteristics reveals systematic variation in performance across these groups. This conclusion contrasts with my findings based on the RAVDESS data, that arguably justified a cautious optimism regarding mLLMs’ reliability in emotion intensity scoring.

Third, the simple regression analysis of differences in government and opposition speakers’ arousal presented in Figure 7 suggest that these discrepancies between measurements can impact substantive conclusion drawn from downstream analysis. Further, it is impor-



tant to note that the differences between average human ratings and mLLM scores shown in Figure 6 might cause greater problems when modeling more complex relationships than the bivariate relation examined here.

This raises the question of what might explain the mLLMs’ overall poor performance in video-based emotional arousal analysis in the Cochrane et al. (2022) data in contrast to the promising results obtained in the RAVDESS data. I explore two plausible explanations in the supporting information and briefly summarize my findings below:


1. **Signal-to-noise ratio:** It is possible that the comparatively low signal-to-noise ratio in real-world parliamentary speech recordings (due to background movements and noise) hampers the mLLMs’ ability to accurately score emotional arousal from video recordings. However, my analyses in Section D.2 show that mitigating the influence of such nuisances in the videos does *not* improve mLLM’s scoring performance, suggesting that while data quality issues do *not* (fully) account for the mLLMs’ poor performance.
2. **Model capacity:** It is possible that the mLLMs under study lack the necessary capacity to effectively leverage the audio-visual information in the videos for emotional arousal scoring. To explore this possibility, I draw on a comparison in audio-based arousal scoring to compare the performance of a larger audio-based LLM with 24B parameters in Section D.2. However, this analysis does *not* support the hypothesis that simply increasing Qwen 2.5 Omni models’ size would remedy their poor performance in video-based arousal scoring.

## Comparison to results in sentiment scoring

Is mLLMs’ poor arousal performance in real-world parliamentary speech videos a peculiarity of this dimension of emotion? To address this question, I replicate the video-based ICL arousal scoring experiments reported above for sentiment scoring (see 3).

This analysis is enabled by the fact that the Cochrane et al. data also contains human coders’ sentiment ratings of speeches’ video recordings. Further, as Cochrane et al. (2022) have also collected sentiment ratings based on speeches transcripts and given that the average sentiment ratings computed from these annotator groups’ ratings correlate strongly positively ( $r = 0.72$ , see Figure A2), we can further contrast Gemini 2.5 Flash and the Qwen 2.5

Omni mLLMs’ video-based ICL sentiment scoring performance with the text-based ICL performance of these models’ base LLMs.<sup>21</sup>



**Figure 8:** Comparison of video- and text-based sentiment scoring with Gemini 2.5 Flash and Qwen 2.5 models in video recordings and their transcripts, respectively, contained in the test split of the Cochrane et al. data. Bars’ height indicates performance measured in terms of correlation ( $\rho$ ,  $r$ ) and the root mean squared error (RMSE) using averaged scores computed from human coders’ ratings as a reference, where higher (lower) values in  $\rho$  and  $r$  (RMSE) indicate better performance. x-axis values indicate the number of few-shot ICL examples (0, 3, or 5); plot panel columns model size. Bars put model’s performance side by side. Brackets plotted above pairs of bars report the relative (percentage point) performance difference of video-based ICL relative to text-based ICL such that negative values show that video-based ICL results in a worse score on the given metric.

Figure 8 presents the results of this analysis (numbers reported also in Table D3). First,

<sup>21</sup>For Qwen 2.5 Omni models, I use their Qwen 2.5 Instruct base LLMs as reference in this analysis.

it shows that the video-based sentiment ratings of the examined mLLMs align overall better with the human video coding-based reference scores than their arousal ratings (cf. Figure 5). For Qwen 2.5 Omni models, this is in parts because in this applications, few-shot ICL systematically improves performances. In 5-shot inference, Gemini 2.5 Flash achieves a correlation of about 0.599 and Qwen 2.5 Omni a correlation of about 0.558; and adjusting for attenuation increases these estimate to 0.657 and 0.612, respectively. These correlations are very close to those obtained in arousal scoring in the RAVDESS data with the same models (cf. Figure 3).

However, the direct comparison to text-based sentiment scoring with these mLLMs’ base LLMs (Qwen 2.5 Instruct 3B and 7B in case of Qwen 2.5 Omni models) shows that, holding constant model size and few-shot setup, the mLLMs’ video-based sentiment scoring performance is still notably lower than in text-based scoring. This contrasts to some extent with the findings in human annotations presented in Table 1. Here, text-based sentiment rating prove relatively more reliable than video-based rating (ICCK3 estimates are 0.937 vs. 0.832) at overall high absolute levels of inter-rater agreement. In contrast, the mLLMs’ video-based sentiment ratings are substantially less aligned with the human coding-based reference scores than their base LLMs’ text-based ratings. For example, after adjusting for attenuation, the correlation of Gemini 2.5 Flash’s video-based sentiment ratings with the human video coding-based reference scores in 5-shot ICL is 0.657 whereas the correlation of its text-based sentiment ratings with the human text coding-based reference scores is 0.929. The ‘reliability gap’ between video-based and text-based ratings is thus about 2.5 times as large for in-context learning (adj. Pearson’s  $r$  0.929 vs. 0.657) as in human annotation (ICC3k 0.937 vs. 0.832).

## 5 Discussion and Conclusion

This study provides the first systematic assessment of multimodal large language models’ (mLLMs) ability to measure emotional arousal in political speech recordings through in-context learning. Political scientists are already beginning to use mLLMs for multimodal annotation tasks, often motivated by the promises of scalable and valid measurement. It

is thus essential to understand what currently available models can and cannot do, and to establish transparent procedures for evaluating future claims of progress. The framework, data, and results presented in this paper make a first step towards this cumulative assessment.

Building on two complementary datasets and a replicable evaluation framework, I show that current mLLMs can perform well in videos if they are recorded in controlled laboratory conditions. Yet the same models fail to translate these capabilities into comparable performance under the more challenging circumstances presented by real-world political debate recordings. Here, models’ arousal scoring correlate at best moderately with human ratings and show systematic demographic performance variation. Further, the downstream regression analyses in the the Cochrane et al. (2022) data highlight a potential consequence of this misalignment: Substituting model-based scores for human ratings can alter the magnitude, direction, or statistical significance of regression estimates and the substantive conclusions drawn from them (Baumann et al. 2025; cf. Egami, Hinck, Stewart, and Wei 2024). And what is more, even in sentiment scoring, for which both text and video-based human coding yields reliable measurements (Cochrane et al. 2022), mLLMs perform comparably worse video-based inference than in text-based inference, suggesting that the multimodal dimension introduces additional challenges that current models address only insufficiently. Taken together, the findings underscore a central message: Neither the performance of mLLMs on laboratory benchmarks, nor the performance of LLMs in text-based inference translates straightforwardly to reliable measurement in complex, real-world multimodal political content.

For applied researchers, the findings warrant caution in adopting mLLMs for multimodal emotion measurement in political science. They show current mLLMs should only be treated as reliable drop-in replacements for human coders or for text-based inference in multimodal political research if there is direct evidence of their validity in the specific application context.

At the same time, it is important to emphasize that the results presented in this study are only a snapshot of the current state of mLLM development. Multimodal generative models are evolving rapidly and further architectural improvements may substantially enhance their capacity to process audio-visual information. This perspective also offers a more optimistic reading of my study: mLLMs have opened the door to conceptually guided few-shot

multimodal measurement in political analysis. That current models fall short to deliver on this promise in real-world political communication materials should therefore only drive further efforts to understand and overcome the underlying challenges. The strong likelihood that models’ capabilities will improve does not diminish but strengthen the relevance of this study, as I establishes a methodological baseline and a replicable evaluation framework for future research.

In particular, my study raises several important questions for future research. First, what factors hampers current mLLMs in video-based emotion measurement in real-world political speech recordings? Evidence presented in the supporting information suggests that neither improving the signal-to-noise ratio nor increasing model size suffices to overcome the underlying challenges. But more attention could be devoted to understanding how specific acoustic properties (e.g., background noise, overlapping speech) or visual properties (e.g., camera angle, speaker movement) affect model performance.

Second, are the sobering findings I present for real-world political speech scoring limited to scalar measurement tasks like valence or arousal rating? Future research could focus on detecting the expression of discrete emotions or over-time change in emotion trajectories within speeches. Fortunately, the human-coded video materials collected by Boussalis, Coan, Holman, and Müller (2021), Tarr, Hwang, and Imai (2022), Rittmann, Ringwald, and Nyhuis (2025), and others are a rich resource for such investigations.

Third, the growing relevance of short-form political content, such as TikTok videos, Instagram reels, or YouTube shots, may poses a distinct set of challenges. Their formats involve rapid editing, visual filters, background music, and deliberately stylized affect. Hence, their style may therefore differ critically from the realistic use case examined here: short video recordings of parliamentary speeches. Understanding how models handle — or fail to handle — these formats will be crucial.

## 6 References

Anderson, Rindy C., and Casey A. Klofstad. 2012. “Preference for leaders with masculine voices holds in the case of feminine leadership roles.” *PLOS ONE* 7(12): e51216.

- DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0051216.
- Arnold, Christian, and Andreas Küpfer. 2025. "Alignment helps make the most of multi-modal data." DOI:10.48550/arXiv.2405.08454.
- Atteveldt, Wouter van, Mariken A. C. G. van der Velden, and Mark Boukes. 2021. "The validity of sentiment analysis: Comparing manual annotation, crowd-coding, dictionary approaches, and machine learning algorithms." *Communication Methods and Measures* 15(2): 121–140. DOI:10.1080/19312458.2020.1869198.
- Baden, Christian et al. 2021. "Three gaps in computational text analysis methods for social sciences: A research agenda." *Communication Methods and Measures* 16(1): 1–8. DOI:10.1080/19312458.2021.2015574.
- Bagdon, Christopher et al. 2024. "'You are an expert annotator': Automatic best–worst-scaling annotations for emotion intensity modeling." In *Proceedings of the 2024 conference of the north american chapter of the association for computational linguistics: Human language technologies (volume 1: Long papers)*, eds. Kevin Duh, Helena Gomez, and Steven Bethard. Mexico City, Mexico: Association for Computational Linguistics, p. 7924–7936. DOI:10.18653/v1/2024.naacl-long.439.
- Bakker, Bert N., Gijs Schumacher, and Matthijs Rooduijn. 2021. "Hot politics? Affective responses to political rhetoric." *American Political Science Review* 115(1): 150–164. DOI:10.1017/S0003055420000519.
- Barrie, Christopher, Alexis Palmer, and Arthur Spirling. 2025. "Replication for language models." Working Paper. Working Paper. [https://arthurspirling.org/documents/BarriePalmerSpirling\\_TrustMeBro.pdf](https://arthurspirling.org/documents/BarriePalmerSpirling_TrustMeBro.pdf).
- Baumann, Joachim et al. 2025. "Large language model hacking: Quantifying the hidden risks of using LLMs for text annotation." DOI:10.48550/arXiv.2509.08825.
- Bavaresco, Anna et al. 2025. "LLMs instead of human judges? A large scale empirical study across 20 NLP evaluation tasks." In *Proceedings of the 63rd annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics (volume 2: Short papers)*, eds. Wanxiang Che et al. Vienna, Austria: Association for Computational Linguistics, p. 238–255. DOI:10.18653/v1/2025.acl-short.20.
- Benoit, Kenneth et al. 2025. "Using large language models to analyze political texts through natural language understanding." [https://kenbenoit.net/pdfs/Benoit\\_et\\_al\\_2025\\_AJPS.pdf](https://kenbenoit.net/pdfs/Benoit_et_al_2025_AJPS.pdf).
- Boussalis, Constantine et al. 2021. "Gender, candidate emotional expression, and voter reactions during televised debates." *American Political Science Review* 115(4): 1242–1257. DOI:10.1017/S0003055421000666.
- Boussalis, Constantine, and Travis G. Coan. 2021. "Facing the electorate: Computational approaches to the study of nonverbal communication and voter impression formation." *Political Communication* 38(1): 75–97. DOI:10.1080/10584609.2020.1784327.
- Boussalis, Constantine, Travis G Coan, and Mirya R Holman. 2023. "Emotion and ex-

- pertise: Political elites’ multimodal communication of issue importance on social media.” Conference Paper prepared fro COMPTExT 2023. Conference Paper prepared fro {COMPTExT} 2023.
- 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. DOI:10.1111/j.0092-5853.2005.00130.x.
- Brown, Tom B. et al. 2020. “Language models are few-shot learners.” DOI:10.48550/arXiv.2005.14165.
- Chopra, Felix, and Ingar Haaland. 2023. “Conducting qualitative interviews with AI.” DOI:10.2139/ssrn.4572954.
- Cicchetti, Domenic V. 1994. “Guidelines, criteria, and rules of thumb for evaluating normed and standardized assessment instruments in psychology.” *Psychological assessment* 6(4): 284.
- Cinar, Asli Ceren, and Özgür Kıbrıs. 2024. “Persistence of voice pitch bias against policy differences.” *Political Science Research and Methods* 12(3): 591–605. DOI:10.1017/psrm.2023.51.
- Cochrane, Christopher et al. 2022. “The automatic analysis of emotion in political speech based on transcripts.” *Political Communication* 39(1): 98–121. DOI:10.1080/10584609.2021.1952497.
- Damann, Taylor J, Dean Knox, and Christopher Lucas. 2025. “A framework for studying causal effects of speech style: Application to US presidential campaigns.” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*: qnaf059. DOI:10.1093/jrssa/qnaf059.
- Dietrich, Bryce J., Ryan D. Enos, and Maya Sen. 2019. “Emotional arousal predicts voting on the u.s. Supreme court.” *Political Analysis* 27(2): 237–243. DOI:10.1017/pan.2018.47.
- Dietrich, Bryce J., Matthew Hayes, and Diana Z. O’Brien. 2019. “Pitch perfect: Vocal pitch and the emotional intensity of congressional speech.” *American Political Science Review* 113(4): 941–962. DOI:10.1017/S0003055419000467.
- Dietrich, Bryce J., D. Schultz, and Tracey Jaquith. 2018. “This floor speech will be televised : Understanding the factors that influence when floor speeches appear on cable television .” <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/This-Floor-Speech-Will-Be-Televised-%3A-Understanding-Dietrich-Schultz/0b18e9c130373667fcee378df9b452301c3d84d7>.
- Druckman, James N. 2003. “The power of television images: The first kennedy-nixon debate revisited.” *The Journal of Politics* 65(2): 559–571. DOI:10.1111/1468-2508.t01-1-00015.
- Dumitrescu, Delia, Elisabeth Gidengil, and Dietlind Stolle. 2015. “Candidate confidence and electoral appeal: An experimental study of the effect of nonverbal confidence on voter evaluations.” *Political Science Research and Methods* 3(1): 43–52. DOI:10.1017/psrm.2014.16.
- Egami, Naoki et al. 2024. “Using imperfect surrogates for downstream inference: Design-based supervised learning for social science applications of large language models.” In

- Proceedings of the 37th international conference on neural information processing systems*, NIPS '23, Red Hook, NY, USA: Curran Associates Inc., p. 68589–68601.
- Gennaro, Gloria, and Elliott Ash. 2022. “Emotion and reason in political language.” *The Economic Journal* 132(643): 1037–1059. DOI:10.1093/ej/ueab104.
- Gennaro, Gloria, and Elliott Ash. 2024. “Televised debates and emotional appeals in politics: Evidence from c-SPAN.”
- Gilardi, Fabrizio, Meysam Alizadeh, and Maël Kubli. 2023. “ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 120(30): e2305016120. DOI:10.1073/pnas.2305016120.
- Google. 2024. “Gemini 2.5 flash.” <https://ai.google.dev/gemini-api/docs>.
- Google. 2025. “Video understanding | gemini API. Google AI for developers.” <https://ai.google.dev/gemini-api/docs/video-understanding>.
- Gugger, Sylvain et al. 2022. “Accelerate: Training and inference at scale made simple, efficient and adaptable.” <https://github.com/huggingface/accelerate>.
- Halterman, Andrew. 2025. “Synthetically generated text for supervised text analysis.” *Political Analysis* 33(3): 181–194. DOI:10.1017/pan.2024.31.
- Joo, Jungseock, Erik P. Bucy, and Claudia Seidel. 2019. “Automated coding of televised leader displays: Detecting nonverbal political behavior with computer vision and deep learning.” *International Journal of Communication* 13: 23–23. <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/10725>.
- Kasner, Zdeněk et al. 2025. “Large language models as span annotators.” DOI:10.48550/arXiv.2504.08697.
- Klofstad, Casey A. 2016. “Candidate voice pitch influences election outcomes.” *Political Psychology* 37(5): 725–738. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44132921>.
- Klofstad, Casey A., Rindy C. Anderson, and Susan Peters. 2012. “Sounds like a winner: Voice pitch influences perception of leadership capacity in both men and women.” *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 279(1738): 2698–2704. DOI:10.1098/rspb.2012.0311.
- Knox, Dean, Christopher Lucas, and Wendy K. Tam Cho. 2022. “Testing causal theories with learned proxies.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 25: 419–441. DOI:10.1146/annurev-polisci-051120-111443.
- Kumar, Yogesh. 2025. “VideoLLM benchmarks and evaluation: A survey.” DOI:10.48550/arXiv.2505.03829.
- Licht, Hauke et al. 2025. “Measuring scalar constructs in social science with LLMs.” In *Proceedings of the 2025 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, eds. Christos Christodoulopoulos et al. Suzhou, China: Association for Computational Linguistics, p. 32132–32159. DOI:10.18653/v1/2025.emnlp-main.1635.
- Licht, Hauke, and Fabienne Lind. 2023. “Going cross-lingual: A guide to multilingual text analysis.” *Computational Communication Research* 5(2): 1. DOI:10.5117/CCR2023.2.2.LICH.
- Livingstone, Steven R., and Frank A. Russo. 2018. “The ryerson audio-visual database of emotional speech and song (RAVDESS): A dynamic, multimodal set of facial



- and vocal expressions in north american english.” *PLOS ONE* 13(5): e0196391. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0196391.
- 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. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2005.00426.x.
- Lodge, Milton, and Charles S. Taber. 2013. *The rationalizing voter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI:10.1017/CBO9781139032490.
- McGraw, Kenneth O., and S. P. Wong. 1996. “Forming inferences about some intraclass correlation coefficients.” *Psychological Methods* 1(1): 30–46.
- Mens, Gaël Le, and Aina Gallego. 2024. “Scaling political texts with large language models: Asking a chatbot might be all you need.” DOI:10.48550/arXiv.2311.16639.
- Mohammad, Saif et al. 2018. “SemEval-2018 task 1: Affect in tweets.” In *Proceedings of the 12th international workshop on semantic evaluation*, eds. Marianna Apidianaki et al. New Orleans, Louisiana: Association for Computational Linguistics, p. 1–17. DOI:10.18653/v1/S18-1001.
- O’Hagan, Sean, and Aaron Schein. 2023. “Measurement in the age of LLMs: An application to ideological scaling.” <http://arxiv.org/abs/2312.09203>.
- Ornstein, Joseph T., Elise N. Blasingame, and Jake S. Truscott. 2025. “How to train your stochastic parrot: Large language models for political texts.” *Political Science Research and Methods* 13(2): 264–281. DOI:10.1017/psrm.2024.64.
- Osnabrügge, Moritz, Sara B. Hobolt, and Toni Rodon. 2021. “Playing to the gallery: Emotive rhetoric in parliaments.” *American Political Science Review* 115(3): 885–899. DOI:10.1017/S0003055421000356.
- Palmer, Alexis K, and Arthur Spirling. 2024. “Large language models can argue in convincing and novel ways about politics: Evidence from experiments and human judgement.”
- Palonen, Kari. 2018. “A comparison between three ideal types of parliamentary politics: Representation, legislation and deliberation.” *Parliaments, Estates and Representation* 38(1): 6–20. DOI:10.1080/02606755.2018.1427325.
- Proksch, Sven-Oliver et al. 2019. “Multilingual sentiment analysis: A new approach to measuring conflict in legislative speeches.” *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 44(1): 97–131. DOI:10.1111/lsq.12218.
- Rask, Mathias, and Frederik Hjorth. 2025. “Partisan conflict in nonverbal communication.” *Political Science Research and Methods* forthcoming.
- Rheault, Ludovic et al. 2016. “Measuring emotion in parliamentary debates with automated textual analysis.” *PloS one* 11(12): e0168843.
- Rheault, Ludovic, and Sophie Borwein. 2019. “Multimodal techniques for the study of affect in political videos.” Conference paper prepared for the 2019 PolMeth Conference. Conference paper prepared for the 2019 {PolMeth} Conference.
- Rittmann, Oliver. 2024. “A measurement framework for computationally analyzing politi-

- cians’ body language.” DOI:10.31219/osf.io/9wynp.
- Rittmann, Oliver, Dominic Nyhuis, and Tobias Ringwald. 2025. “Gendered patterns of parliamentary attention.” *The Journal of Politics*. DOI:10.1086/739055.
- Rittmann, Oliver, Tobias Ringwald, and Dominic Nyhuis. 2025. “Public opinion and emphatic legislative speech: Evidence from an automated video analysis.” *British Journal of Political Science*.
- Russell, James A. 1980. “A circumplex model of affect.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 39(6): 1161–1178.
- Schlosberg, Harold. 1954. “Three dimensions of emotion.” *Psychological Review* 61(2): 81–88.
- Schmidt, Frank L., and John E. Hunter. 1999. “Theory testing and measurement error.” *Intelligence* 27(3): 183–198. DOI:10.1016/S0160-2896(99)00024-0.
- Tarr, Alexander, June Hwang, and Kosuke Imai. 2022. “Automated coding of political campaign advertisement videos: An empirical validation study.” *Political Analysis*: 1–21. DOI:10.1017/pan.2022.26.
- TeBlunthuis, Nathan, Valerie Hase, and Chung-Hong Chan. 2024. “Misclassification in automated content analysis causes bias in regression. Can we fix it? Yes we can!” *Communication Methods and Measures* 0(0): 1–22. DOI:10.1080/19312458.2023.2293713.
- Torres, Michelle. 2024. “A framework for the unsupervised and semi-supervised analysis of visual frames.” *Political Analysis* 32(2): 199–220. DOI:10.1017/pan.2023.32.
- Valentino, Nicholas A. et al. 2011. “Election night’s alright for fighting: The role of emotions in political participation.” *The Journal of Politics* 73(1): 156–170. DOI:10.1017/S0022381610000939.
- Viveiros, André G. et al. 2025. “TowerVision: Understanding and improving multilinguality in vision-language models.” DOI:10.48550/arXiv.2510.21849.
- Wang, Victor, Michael JQ Zhang, and Eunsol Choi. 2025. “Improving LLM-as-a-judge inference with the judgment distribution.” In *Findings of the association for computational linguistics: EMNLP 2025*, eds. Christos Christodoulopoulos et al. Suzhou, China: Association for Computational Linguistics, p. 23173–23199. DOI:10.18653/v1/2025.findings-emnlp.1259.
- Widmann, Tobias, and Maximilian Wich. 2022. “Creating and comparing dictionary, word embedding, and transformer-based models to measure discrete emotions in german political text.” *Political Analysis*: 1–16. DOI:10.1017/pan.2022.15.
- Wolf, Thomas et al. 2020. “Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing.” <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.emnlp-demos.6>.
- Wuttke, Alexander et al. 2025. “AI conversational interviewing: Transforming surveys with LLMs as adaptive interviewers.” In *Proceedings of the 9th joint SIGHUM workshop on computational linguistics for cultural heritage, social sciences, humanities and literature (LaTeCH-CLfL 2025)*, eds. Anna Kazantseva et al. Albuquerque, New Mexico: Associa-

tion for Computational Linguistics, p. 179–204. DOI:10.18653/v1/2025.latechclfl-1.17.  
Xu, Jin et al. 2025. “Qwen2.5-omni technical report.” DOI:10.48550/arXiv.2503.20215.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Computational emotion analysis with  
multimodal LLMs

<b>A Data</b>	<b>2</b>
A.1 Cochrane et al. (2022) data . . . . .	2
<b>B Prompts</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>C Reproducibility</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>D Results</b>	<b>9</b>
D.1 Scoring in the RAVDESS data . . . . .	9
D.2 Scoring in the Cochrane et al. (2022) data . . . . .	11

# A Data

## A.1 Cochrane et al. (2022) data

### Additional inter-coder reliability estimates

The  $k$ -coders *average* ICC metrics ICC1k, ICC2k and ICC3k estimate the reliability of  $k$  annotators when working as a group. Put simply, they estimate how well the mean of  $k$  raters' scores would agree with the 'true' score. In contrast, ICC1, ICC2 and ICC3 represent estimates of annotators individual reliabilities.

ICC3k measures consistency given that raters identities is fixed and part of the measurement process. This is arguably the appropriate metric for measurement quality evaluation in my study, because I use the given set of annotations to compute cross-coder average scores within annotation modality and emotion dimension. Table A2 reports the ICCk3 estimates for the ratings of examples in the test split I have created from the Cochrane et al. (2022) data. It shows that these estimates are similar to those reported for the full data set in Table 1 in the paper.

Further, Table A2 shows that one arrives at a similar conclusion when computing the Krippendorff's  $\alpha$  reliability metric for the interval-scaled within-coder averaged ratings of examples in the test split.

In contrast, assessing ICC1k is adequate when the annotation panel is very unbalanced so that which annotator annotates which item varies a lot and, hence, one treats raters as a random factor. The ICC2k, in turn, is appropriate when assumes that raters are exchangeable one wants to know how reliable annotations would be with a new set of coders. Despite these conceptual differences, Table A1 shows that my conclusion regarding the overall high reliability of the cross-coder average text- and video-based sentiment and arousal scores holds also when examining the ICC1k and ICC2k metrics.

### Cross-modality correlations of average human ratings

Figure A2 shows scatter plots and Pearson's correlation coefficients for sentiment and arousal measurements computed as average human ratings of speeches' videos and transcripts, re-

**Table A1:** Inter-coder agreement in text transcript- and video-based ratings of valence/sentiment and arousal/intensity according to the average intra-class correlation (ICCk2 and ICCk2) coefficient.

	ICC1k		ICC2k	
	text	video	text	video
Sentiment	0.936 [0.930, 0.940]	0.814 [0.770, 0.850]	0.936 [0.930, 0.940]	0.817 [0.760, 0.860]
Arousal	0.635 [0.590, 0.670]	0.802 [0.750, 0.840]	0.666 [0.520, 0.760]	0.807 [0.730, 0.860]


**Table A2:** Inter-coder agreement in text transcript- and video-based ratings of valence/sentiment and arousal/intensity in subset of examples used for LLM scoring evaluation according to the average fixed raters intra-class correlation (ICCk3) coefficient.

	Text ratings	Video ratings
Sentiment	0.925 [0.910, 0.940]	0.815 [0.730, 0.880]
Arousal	0.686 [0.620, 0.740]	0.839 [0.770, 0.890]


**Table A3:** Inter-coder agreement in text transcript- and video-based ratings of valence/sentiment and arousal/intensity according to the Krippendorff’s  $\alpha$  coefficient.

	Text ratings	Video ratings
Sentiment	0.828	0.556
Arousal	0.368	0.525

spectively. It shows that while for sentiment, average text- and video-based ratings are strongly positively correlated (Pearson’s  $r = 0.711$ ), for arousal, average text- and video-based ratings are only very weakly correlated (Pearson’s  $r = 0.119$ ). This suggests that video- and text-based arousal ratings essentially measure different constructs.



**Figure A1:** Distribution of speech segment-level cross-coder averages of human ratings in the test set for text- and video-based sentiment/valence and arousal/activation annotations.



**Figure A2:** Correlation between speech segment-level averages of human coders' transcript (text) and video-based sentiment and arousal ratings. Measures compute by averaging annotators ratings within coding dimension and annotation modality.

## B Prompts

**Prompt 1:** Prompt template for emotional intensity rating in RAVDESS data (Jinja2 prompt template)

```
Below you are presented with the {{modalities}} recording of a person speaking.

Your task is to rate the intensity of the emotions expressed by the speaker in the
recording on a scale from {{low}} (low/weak) to {{high}} (high/strong).

## Clarifications

Emotion intensity refers to the degree or strength of emotional arousal,
activation, or intensity in the speech. It captures whether the speech is animated
or subdued, independently of whether it is positive or negative in sentiment.

## Your task

Rate the emotion intensity of the speech on a scale from {{low}} (low/weak) to
{{high}} (high/strong) based on the {{modalities}} recording shown below.

- Return your rating as an integer value in the range {{low}} to {{high}}.
- Only return your rating and nothing else.

## Input ({{modalities}})
```



**Prompt 2:** Prompt template for emotional arousal rating in Cochrane et al. (2022) data (Jinja2 prompt template)

```
Below you are presented with the {{modalities}} of a short excerpt of a parliamentary speech.

Your task is to rate the level of emotional arousal of the speech on a scale from {{low}} (very subdued) to {{high}} (very aroused).

## Clarifications

Emotional arousal refers to the degree of emotional activation or intensity in the speech. It captures whether the speech is animated or subdued, independently of whether it is positive or negative in sentiment.

Emotional arousal varies from very subdued to very aroused.

- Very subdued (={{low}}) speech is calm, low-energy, or emotionally flat -- for example, conveying contentment or depression.
- Very aroused (={{high}}) speech is animated, intense, or highly expressive -- for example, expressing anger, excitement, or outrage.

## Your task

Rate the level of emotional arousal of the speech on a scale from {{low}} (very subdued) to {{high}} (very aroused) based on the speech's {{modalities}} shown below.
{% if multimodal %}
- Focus your analyses on the main speaker's speech and ignore background noises and movements.{% endif %}
- Return your rating as an integer value in the range {{low}} to {{high}}.
- Only return your rating and nothing else.

## Inputs ({{modalities}})
```

**Prompt 3:** Prompt template for emotional valence (“sentiment”) rating in Cochrane et al. (2022) data (Jinja2 prompt template)

```
Below you are presented with the {{modalities}} of a short excerpt of a parliamentary
speech.

Your task is to rate the **emotional valence** of the speech on a scale from {{low}}
(very negative) to {{high}} (very positive).

## Clarifications

**Emotional valence** refers to the overall polarity of the emotions expressed in the
speech -- that is, whether the speaker conveys a generally negative or positive
emotional stance.

It varies from very negative to very positive.

- Very negative (={{low}}) speech conveys emotions such as anger, frustration,
  disappointment, or criticism.
- Very positive (={{high}}) speech conveys emotions such as enthusiasm, approval,
  optimism, or praise.

## Your task

Rate the emotional valence of the speech on a scale from {{low}} (very negative) to
{{high}} (very positive) based on the speech's {{modalities}} shown below.
{% if multimodal %}
- Focus your analyses on the main speaker's speech and ignore background noises and
  movements.{% endif %}
- Return your rating as an integer value in the range {{low}} to {{high}}.
- Only return your rating and nothing else.

## Inputs ({{modalities}})
```

## C Reproducibility

Barrie, Palmer, and Spirling (2025) discuss how using large language models in political science research can complicate reproducibility and they propose best practices to address these challenges. Below, I summarize how I have addressed these recommendations:


- *Prefer and prioritize open-weight, locally versioned models:* I follow this recommendation by including the open-weights Qwen 2.5 Omni and TowerVideo mLLMs in my analyses. In particular, I have recorded the concrete revisions of these models, allowing to download the exact model checkpoints used in my analyses.
- *Use closed/proprietary models only when justified:* I include the closed-weights Gemini 2.5 Flash model to explore the current frontier of video-based in-context learning with mLLMs for emotion analysis.
- *Work in an “anti-fragile” way:* I rely on local GPU inference with “greedy decoding”. This means that at each decoding step, the model selects the token with the highest generation probability as the next token in the response sequence. In this deterministic setup, parameters that govern randomness in generation (e.g., temperature, or top-k sampling) have no effect. In open-weights models, the only remaining source of nondeterminism is hardware-level nondeterminism, which I have minimized by fixing the computation environment and batch. In the case of the closed-weights Gemini 2.5 Flash, the best one can do is to pass the temperature parameter to 0 and a random seed when calling the model through Google’s Verex AI API.
- *Replicate your own LM annotations over time and report variance:* Given my reliance on greedy decoding and local inference in a fixed computation environment, there is no need to re-run annotations multiple times to assess variance in open-weight models’ outputs. For the closed-weights Gemini 2.5 Flash model, I observe an average standard deviation of less than 0.2 points on the 1–9 scale in a sample of examples in the Cochrane et al. (2022) data.
- *Provide uncertainty assessments for LM-generated labels:* I estimate confidence bounds on the performance metric estimates in my analysis.

## D Results

### D.1 Scoring in the RAVDESS data


**Table D1:** Performance of mLLMs in video-based emotion intensity scoring in the RAVDESS data by model type and size and number of few-shot exemplars (0, 3, or 5). Performance measured in terms of correlation ( $\rho$ ,  $r$ ) and the root mean squared error (RMSE) evaluated against average scores in human coders’ video-based ratings. Higher (lower) values in  $\rho$  and  $r$  (RMSE) indicate better performance. Reported values are averages of 120 bootstrapped estimates and their standard deviation.

model	Pearson’s $r$			Spearman’s $\rho$			RMSE		
	0-shot	3-shot	5-shot	0-shot	3-shot	5-shot	0-shot	3-shot	5-shot
gemini-2.5-flash	0.690±0.021	0.667±0.023	0.662±0.022	0.682±0.020	0.651±0.023	0.646±0.022	0.784±0.023	0.744±0.022	0.801±0.023
qwen2.5-omni-7b	0.644±0.026	0.609±0.025	0.587±0.025	0.617±0.023	0.598±0.024	0.574±0.023	1.980±0.019	0.691±0.016	0.660±0.020
qwen2.5-omni-3b	0.476±0.031	0.516±0.030	0.525±0.030	0.481±0.028	0.522±0.027	0.534±0.027	1.125±0.017	0.705±0.014	0.631±0.014
towervideo-9b	0.484±0.029	0.401±0.030	-/-	0.431±0.028	0.388±0.028	-/-	1.040±0.017	0.933±0.019	-/-
towervideo-2b	0.329±0.040	0.272±0.037	0.100±0.040	0.305±0.040	0.184±0.037	0.079±0.039	0.562±0.015	0.596±0.016	2.004±0.021



**Figure D1:** Distribution of video-based emotion intensity scores by emotion category, emotion intensity stimuli level, and scoring method (averaged human ratings or mLLM).

## D.2 Scoring in the Cochrane et al. (2022) data



**Figure D2:** Video-based emotion intensity scoring performance of mLLMs in 3-shot inference in the RAVDESS data by speaker gender. Performance shown on x-axis measured in terms of correlation ( $\rho$ ,  $r$ ) and the root mean squared error (RMSE) using averaged scores computed from human coders' ratings as a reference, where higher (lower) values in  $\rho$  and  $r$  (RMSE) indicate better performance. Plotted points corresponds to average values in 120 bootstrapped estimates and horizontal black lines indicate their 90% confidence intervals.


**Table D2:** Performance of mLLMs in video-based arousal scoring of speech segment recordings in the Cochrane et al. (2022) data by model type and model size and the number of few-shot exemplars (0, 3, or 5). Performance measured in terms of correlation ( $\rho$ ,  $r$ ) and the root mean squared error (RMSE) using averaged scores computed from human coders’ ratings as a reference. Higher (lower) values in  $\rho$  and  $r$  (RMSE) indicate better performance.

model	Pearson’s $r$			Spearman’s $\rho$			RMSE		
	0-shot	3-shot	5-shot	0-shot	3-shot	5-shot	0-shot	3-shot	5-shot
gemini-2.5-flash	0.411±0.046	0.430±0.046	0.430±0.048	0.334±0.048	0.392±0.051	0.383±0.051	1.331±0.058	1.327±0.051	1.219±0.054
qwen2.5-omni-7b	0.328±0.051	0.298±0.054	0.314±0.055	0.318±0.054	0.279±0.057	0.283±0.056	2.020±0.055	1.191±0.052	1.309±0.059
qwen2.5-omni-3b	0.326±0.054	0.237±0.054	0.228±0.054	0.309±0.056	0.201±0.059	0.232±0.060	1.135±0.053	1.120±0.052	1.085±0.049
towervideo-9b	0.258±0.050	0.201±0.058	-/-	0.226±0.047	0.231±0.062	-/-	1.388±0.049	0.984±0.050	-/-
towervideo-2b	0.112±0.058	0.144±0.053	-0.082±0.054	0.138±0.056	0.125±0.048	-0.062±0.057	1.922±0.053	0.978±0.051	3.174±0.060




**Table D3:** Comparison of video- and text-based sentiment scoring with Qwen 2.5 Omni and Qwen 2.5 Instruct models in video recordings and their transcripts, respectively, contained in the test split of the Cochrane et al. data. Bars’ height indicates performance measured in terms of correlation ( $\rho$ ,  $r$ ) and the root mean squared error (RMSE) using averaged scores computed from human coders’ ratings as a reference, where higher (lower) values in  $\rho$  and  $r$  (RMSE) indicate better performance. x-axis values indicate the number of few-shot ICL examples (0, 3, or 5); plot panel columns model size. Bars put model’s performance side by side. Brackets plotted above pairs of bars report the relative (percentage point) performance difference of video-based ICL relative to text-based ICL such that negative values show that video-based ICL results in a worse score on the given metric.

Model	Shots	Pearson’s $r$			Spearman’s $\rho$			RMSE		
		text	video	$\Delta$	text	video	$\Delta$	text	video	$\Delta$
Gemini 2.5 Flash	0-shot	0.869±0.016	0.599±0.038	-31%	0.875±0.016	0.599±0.032	-32%	1.455±0.054	1.609±0.048	-10%
	3-shot	0.898±0.013	0.570±0.046	-37%	0.904±0.012	0.567±0.044	-37%	0.828±0.041	1.356±0.061	-39%
	5-shot	0.899±0.014	0.573±0.047	-36%	0.900±0.012	0.583±0.044	-35%	0.913±0.042	1.299±0.053	-30%
Qwen 2.5 (7B)	0-shot	0.774±0.024	0.405±0.050	-48%	0.792±0.018	0.391±0.046	-51%	1.024±0.035	1.262±0.047	-19%
	3-shot	0.784±0.028	0.549±0.041	-30%	0.785±0.023	0.540±0.040	-31%	1.252±0.046	1.375±0.050	-9%
	5-shot	0.812±0.024	0.558±0.042	-31%	0.785±0.027	0.522±0.042	-34%	1.471±0.077	1.532±0.052	-4%
Qwen 2.5 (3B)	0-shot	0.715±0.031	0.446±0.048	-38%	0.763±0.028	0.427±0.044	-44%	1.963±0.075	1.521±0.050	+23%
	3-shot	0.787±0.025	0.531±0.041	-33%	0.785±0.022	0.513±0.038	-35%	1.111±0.049	1.262±0.045	-12%
	5-shot	0.810±0.026	0.562±0.040	-31%	0.815±0.024	0.555±0.037	-32%	1.178±0.064	1.175±0.049	±0%



**Figure D3:** Video-based emotion intensity scoring performance of mLLMs in 5-shot inference in the RAVDESS data by speaker gender. Performance shown on x-axis measured in terms of correlation ( $\rho$ ,  $r$ ) and the root mean squared error (RMSE) using averaged scores computed from human coders' ratings as a reference, where higher (lower) values in  $\rho$  and  $r$  (RMSE) indicate better performance. Plotted points corresponds to average values in 120 bootstrapped estimates and horizontal black lines indicate their 90% confidence intervals. *Note:* Results for TowerVideo-9B are based on 3-shot inference due to context window size limitations.



**Figure D4:** Video-based emotion intensity scoring performance of mLLMs in 5-shot inference in the RAVDESS data by speaker age group. Performance shown on x-axis measured in terms of correlation ( $\rho$ ,  $r$ ) and the root mean squared error (RMSE) using averaged scores computed from human coders' ratings as a reference, where higher (lower) values in  $\rho$  and  $r$  (RMSE) indicate better performance. Plotted points corresponds to average values in 120 bootstrapped estimates and horizontal black lines indicate their 90% confidence intervals. *Note:* Results for TowerVideo-9B are based on 3-shot inference due to context window size limitations.

## Exploring potential explanations

### Explanation 1: Too much noise, too little signal

The promise of multimodality for computational analyses lies in adding nuance through acoustic and visual signals. However, this potential added value can also be a challenge:

acoustic and visual background noises and movements may dilute the relevant signal. This problem of a lower signal-to-noise ratio may explain why the Qwen 2.5 Omni models are relatively reliable emotion intensity scorers in the ‘clinically sterile’ RAVDESS data (see Section 4.1) but fail to deliver on this promise in the more messy real-world parliamentary speech recordings in Cochrane et al.’s data.

What might be such diluting factors? In the context of parliamentary debates, a nuisance in applicants focusing on speakers’ display of emotionality are ambient sounds in the form of background chatter, interjections, and interruptions.<sup>22</sup> Similarly, in the Canadian *House of Commons*, speakers often speak standing where they sit. This means that in the background of the video recordings in Cochrane et al. data, there are often multiple other individuals, who might move and display various facial expressions.

Given the goal of analyzing the sentiment and level of emotional arousal in the *speaker’s* speech, reliable human annotators should ignore these factors and so should an mLLM. Accordingly, the relatively poor scoring performance of the mLLMs could be explained by their failure to discount accustic and visual background noises appropriately.

To assess whether this failure to discount visual and acoustic background noises negatively impacts mLLMs’ emotion scoring performance, I have repeated the arousal scoring experiments reported above with a subset of 150 videos in the test set I have pre-processed to remove these nuisance factors as best as possible. In particular, I have applied a noise filter to the videos’ audio tracks that helps to focus a speaker’s voice while suppressing background noises. To remove visual background noise, I have applied a background masking strategy that relies on a pre-trained vLLM pre-trained for object detection that changes all pixels in a frame that are *not* part of the speakers body to white. This background image masking is illustrated in Figure Figure D5, which shows the same video frames from an example video before and after masking.

---

<sup>22</sup>This is likely especially true for Westminster-style “talking” parliaments (cf. Weber cited in Palonen, 2018) like the Canadian *House of Commons* and Question Time sessions as those focused in Cochrane et al. data (cf. Osnabrügge et al.).



(a) original video frame



(b) masked video frame

**Figure D5:** Example of a video frame in the Cochrane et al. (2022) data before and after masking background imagery.

**Table D4:** Comparison of video-based arousal scoring with Qwen 2.5 Omni mLLMs in original videos in the Cochrane et al. (2022) data and their ‘cleaned’ versions. The table compares models’ performance in the same set of videos depending on whether acoustic and visual background noises have been ‘cleaned’ from the videos, controlling for model size (3B vs. 7B parameters) and the number of few-shot ICL examples (0, 3, or 5). Performance measured in terms of correlation ( $\rho$ ,  $r$ ) and the root mean squared error (RMSE) using averaged scores computed from human coders’ ratings as a reference. Higher (lower) values in  $\rho$  and  $r$  (RMSE) indicate better performance. The difference between results, measured in percentage point change, is reported as Delta such that positive (negative) values indicate that ICL in cleaned (original) videos yields a better score on the given metric.

Model size	Shots	Pearson’s $r$			Spearman’s $\rho$			RMSE		
		original	cleaned	$\Delta$	original	cleaned	$\Delta$	original	cleaned	$\Delta$
3B	0-shot	0.416±0.079	0.348±0.081	-16%	0.400±0.072	0.316±0.082	-21%	1.098±0.083	1.013±0.080	+8%
	3-shot	0.324±0.082	0.292±0.087	-10%	0.260±0.089	0.249±0.080	-4%	1.083±0.089	1.084±0.077	±0%
	5-shot	0.325±0.075	0.256±0.081	-21%	0.301±0.084	0.215±0.076	-28%	1.044±0.079	1.170±0.074	-11%
7B	0-shot	0.355±0.092	0.402±0.084	+12%	0.331±0.090	0.383±0.087	+14%	2.065±0.076	2.352±0.082	-12%
	3-shot	0.469±0.074	0.511±0.080	+8%	0.481±0.067	0.479±0.079	±0%	0.951±0.058	1.073±0.087	-11%

The results of this comparison, reported in Table D4, provide no support for the hypothesis that acoustic and visual background noise are hindering the mLLMs emotion scoring performance. For most setups (model sizes and few-shot settings), the described video data cleaning procedure leads to no systematic improvements in the correlation with and/or error magnitude relative to the human video coding-based reference scores. It may be that a better background noise removal procedure could change this finding. However, my evidence suggest that there are additional reasons why the Qwen 2.5 Omni models struggle in arousal scoring in the real-world parliamentary speech data under consideration whereas they perform comparatively well in the artificially sterile examples in the RAVDESS data. For example, future research could examine whether the body and head posture matters for mLLMs’ reliability in video-based ICL emotion analysis.

## **Explanation 2: Model capacity**

The results of the main experiments as well as the findings regarding the limited positive effect of addressing the potential signal-to-noise issues on mLLMs’ arousal scoring performance point to a second potential explanation: The Qwen 2.5 Omni models may simply lack the necessary instruction-following capabilities to perform well in in-context learning annotation tasks and emotion scoring in particular. This explanation seems plausible considering that Qwen 2.5 Omni is the first open-weights mLLM that fully supports video-based processing. Still being in a relatively early development stage, it could be too premature to judge their instruction-following capabilities in video-based ICL.

I scrutinize this hypothesis by drawing a parallel to audio-based ICL. In particular, I evaluate two sizes of another open-weights mLLM developed by Mistral AI for audio-text-to-text generation: The 3B parameter Voxtral Mini and the 24B parameter Voxtral small models (using the 2507 checkpoints). I assess these audio-based mLLMs’ arousal scoring performance and compare them to the small and large Qwen 2.5 Omni mLLMs’ *audio*-based arousal scoring performance. Table D5 shows for Qwen 2.5 Omni that using audios instead of videos (audio + video frames) as inputs for ICL emotion scoring overall results in relative performance decreases. These performance decreases are particularly pronounced in the correlation metric estimates for arousal scoring and especially the larger 3B parameter Qwen

2.5 Omni variant. Nevertheless, using Qwen 2.5 Omni models' *audio*-based ICL performance as a comparison baseline in this analysis because holding constant the inference modality allows assessing whether larger fully audio-visual mLLM might perform better in video-based ICL emotion scoring.

**Table D5:** Comparison of video- and audio-based ICL in sentiment and arousal scoring with Qwen 2.5 Omni mLLMs in the Cochrane et al. (2022) data. The table compares models’ performance between inference modes (audio vs. video) by emotion dimension, model size (3B vs. 7B parameters), and the number of few-shot ICL examples (0, 3, or 5). Performance measured in terms of correlation ( $\rho$ ,  $r$ ) and the root mean squared error (RMSE) using averaged scores computed from human coders’ ratings as a reference. Higher (lower) values in  $\rho$  and  $r$  (RMSE) indicate better performance. The difference between results, measured in percentage point change, is reported as Delta such that positive (negative) values indicate that audio-based (video-based) ICL yields a better score on the given metric than video-based (audio-based) ICL.

Model size	Shots	Pearson’s $r$			Spearman’s $\rho$			RMSE		
		video	audio	$\Delta$	video	audio	$\Delta$	video	audio	$\Delta$
3B	0-shot	0.326 $\pm$ 0.054	0.220 $\pm$ 0.051	-32%	0.309 $\pm$ 0.056	0.193 $\pm$ 0.055	-37%	1.135 $\pm$ 0.053	1.768 $\pm$ 0.056	-36%
	3-shot	0.237 $\pm$ 0.054	0.156 $\pm$ 0.054	-34%	0.201 $\pm$ 0.059	0.131 $\pm$ 0.059	-35%	1.120 $\pm$ 0.052	1.564 $\pm$ 0.062	-28%
	5-shot	0.228 $\pm$ 0.054	0.144 $\pm$ 0.052	-37%	0.232 $\pm$ 0.060	0.114 $\pm$ 0.055	-51%	1.085 $\pm$ 0.049	1.335 $\pm$ 0.060	-19%
7B	0-shot	0.328 $\pm$ 0.051	0.294 $\pm$ 0.054	-10%	0.318 $\pm$ 0.054	0.298 $\pm$ 0.065	-6%	2.020 $\pm$ 0.055	2.865 $\pm$ 0.055	-29%
	3-shot	0.298 $\pm$ 0.054	0.245 $\pm$ 0.052	-18%	0.279 $\pm$ 0.057	0.223 $\pm$ 0.055	-20%	1.191 $\pm$ 0.052	1.274 $\pm$ 0.055	-7%
	5-shot	0.314 $\pm$ 0.055	0.233 $\pm$ 0.050	-26%	0.283 $\pm$ 0.056	0.180 $\pm$ 0.049	-36%	1.309 $\pm$ 0.059	1.421 $\pm$ 0.060	-8%



**Table D6:** Comparison of audio-based arousal scoring with Qwen 2.5 Omni and Voxtral mLLMs in audio tracks of video recordings contained in the test split of the Cochrane et al. (2022) data. The table compares performance between model types by model size and the number of few-shot ICL examples (0, 3, or 5). Model size ‘small’ refers to models’ 3B parameter versions; ‘large’ to Qwen 2.5 Omni’s 7B version and the 24B parameter Voxtral Small. Performance measured in terms of correlation ( $\rho$ ,  $r$ ) and the root mean squared error (RMSE) using averaged scores computed from human coders’ ratings as a reference. Higher (lower) values in  $\rho$  and  $r$  (RMSE) indicate better performance. The difference between results, measured in percentage point change, is reported as Delta such that positive (negative) values indicate that the given Voxtral (Qwen 2.5 Omni) model achieves a better score on the given metric.

Model size	Shots	Pearson’s $r$			Spearman’s $\rho$			RMSE		
		Qwen Omni	Voxtral	$\Delta$	Qwen Omni	Voxtral	$\Delta$	Qwen Omni	Voxtral	$\Delta$
small	0-shot	0.220±0.051	0.154±0.061	-30%	0.193±0.055	0.189±0.080	-3%	1.768±0.056	1.626±0.050	+8%
	3-shot	0.156±0.054	0.194±0.054	+20%	0.131±0.059	0.203±0.072	+35%	1.564±0.062	2.245±0.059	-30%
	5-shot	0.144±0.052	0.176±0.054	+18%	0.114±0.055	0.153±0.066	+26%	1.335±0.060	1.976±0.057	-32%
large	0-shot	0.294±0.054	0.273±0.045	-7%	0.298±0.065	0.258±0.059	-13%	2.865±0.055	1.030±0.055	+64%
	3-shot	0.245±0.052	0.243±0.052	-1%	0.223±0.055	0.219±0.058	-2%	1.274±0.055	1.688±0.051	-24%
	5-shot	0.233±0.050	0.235±0.051	+1%	0.180±0.049	0.204±0.054	+12%	1.421±0.060	1.609±0.053	-12%

The hypothesis that it is lacking model capacity that explains the poor performance in emotion scoring of the relatively small-sized Qwen 2.5 Omni models is *not* supported by the results presented in Table D6. Correlations with references scores computed from video coders' ratings are low in both model types and relative differences in the correlation and RMSE metrics between the Qwen and Voxtral models show no systematic pattern. This challenges the hypothesizes that larger model version would necessarily yield better results.