4-2018

Who We Are and How We Vote: Individual Difference Factors in Politics

Abby Joens-Witherow
DePauw University

Recommended Citation

Who We Are and How We Vote: Individual Difference Factors in Politics

Abby Joens-Witherow

DePauw University Honor Scholar Program

Class of 2018

Sponsor: Scott Ross

First Reader: Kevin Moore

Second Reader: Salil Benegal

Abstract

The current research focuses on the relationships between individual differences and political preferences, particularly conservatism as measured by the Social and Economic Conservatism Scale (Everett, 2013). I conducted a survey using the crowdsourcing platform Mechanical Turk that assessed individuals in terms of demographics, the Big Five Aspect Scales, Moral Foundations, Social Dominance Orientation, Right Wing Authoritarianism, and opinions about the 2016 presidential candidates (Hillary Clinton & Donald Trump). Through hierarchal multiple regression, I was able to find correlations among openness to experience (-) and conscientiousness (+) with conservatism in terms of the Big Five. I found that binding moral foundations (authority/respect, ingroup/loyalty, purity/sanctity) predicted conservatism, while individualizing moral foundations (harm/care, fairness/reciprocity) were negatively correlated. RWA and SDO were among the strongest predictors of conservatism. Finally, positive perceptions of Donald Trump predicted conservatism at the end of the HMR. Overall, a detailed profile of conservative individuals emerged, allowing a glimpse into the fundamental differences between conservatives and liberals.

Who We Are and How We Vote: Individual Difference Factors in Politics

The 2016 Presidential Election was one of the most turbulent elections in history. Both candidates brought along their own controversy, and their very different views polarized the American political scene further than ever before. Personality has long been said to have strong associations with political attitudes, and many researchers have examined the correlations of Big Five Traits and political affiliation (Jonason, 2014; Carney, Jost, Gosling, & Potter, 2008). Other researchers have examined the correlations between specific moral attitudes, fear, and political orientation (van Leeuwen, Koenig, Graham, & Park, 2013; van Leeuwen & Park, 2008). The combination of these individual differences along with leadership perceptions of the 2016 presidential candidates can offer detailed profiles of both Trump and Clinton voters.

The present study aimed to examine factors contributing to political conservatism and voting for Donald Trump in the 2016 Election. Many people were surprised by the outcome of the election, which leads one to question what contributed to individuals choosing to vote for Donald Trump. In general, what contributes to support for the exclusive and derogatory rhetoric used by Donald Trump during his campaign? Since Donald Trump ran on the Republican ticket, his platform was based strongly on conservative views, and most of his voters identified as Republican, ideology is also an important factor to examine.

The personality traits and beliefs among different individuals contribute to very diverse voter profiles. The aim of the current research was to provide an in-depth analysis of conservative voters, and specifically, Donald Trump voters. In a political climate characterized by hate and exclusionary policies, heavily endorsed by conservative individuals, it is relevant to understand the root of their support. My focus was on the vote originally, but I found that I was better able to predict conservative ideology than

voting for Donald Trump using my independent variables. The research took a different turn, but overall, the goal of better explaining conservative attitudes was achieved. The basis for my research and hypotheses is discussed below.

Present Research and Hypotheses

The Big Five Aspects of Personality and Politics

In recent years, the Big Five personality traits have been researched and theorized as the most important aspects of individuals' personality. Gerber, Huber, Doherty, and Dowling (2012) define the Big Five as: (1) Extraversion (associated with gregariousness and self-confidence); (2) Agreeableness (associated with harmonious relations with others); (3) Conscientiousness (associated with dutifulness and adherence to social norms); (4) Emotional Stability (associated with low levels of negative emotions, e.g., low anxiety); and (5) Openness to Experience (associated with intellectual curiosity and aesthetic appreciation" (656). These personality traits are thought to influence the ways that individuals act in many situations and how they respond to certain stimuli.

These personality traits are also theorized to affect individuals' partisan identification and the strength of such identification. Gerber et al. conducted a nationwide survey that assessed individuals' in terms of the Big Five traits and their political identities. They found that three traits (extraversion, agreeableness, and openness) significantly predicted political ideology and party identification, especially the strength of partisan identity. They first found that openness was associated with liberal individuals but was also associated with decreased strength of partisan identification. Individuals higher in openness felt less of a need to identify with a political party. In contrast, agreeableness and extraversion were associated with increased strength of identification with a political party.

They did not find causal evidence that ideology causes party identification; however, they suggested that conservative ideology predicted Republican party identification and that liberal ideology predicted Republican ideology. Their belief was that the ideology was mediating the relationship between the Big Five traits and party identification. Despite the lac of focus on the individual Big Five traits as predictors of ideology, Gerber et al. emphasize the idea that the traits emphasize political behavior. The traits influence the strength of a person's political attitudes and whether or not he or she will act upon them by supporting a major political party. This information is important going forward, as I expect personality to have a significant impact on individuals' political attitudes and behavior.

Jonason (2014) instead examined the correlations of Big Five traits, the Dark Triad (narcissism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism). and political liberalism and conservatism. He administered a survey similar to the current research to a Mechanical Turk sample and to college students. In the college student sample, he used the Big Five Inventory (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998) and the Dark Triad Dirty Dozen (Jonason & Weber, 2010) to measure individuals' personalities. To measure political orientation, he asked participants to self-identify as extremely conservative, somewhat conservative, in the middle, somewhat liberal, or extremely liberal.

However, in a second study conducted with Mechanical Turk participants, he used different measures. He utilized the Short Dark Triad (Jones & Paulhus, 2014) and the HEXACO-PI-R (Ashton & Lee, 2009) to measure individual differences in personality. The HEXACO-PI-R assesses Honesty/Humility, Emotionality, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, and Openness. To measure political orientation, the researcher used six items to assess individual conservatism or liberalism where people

were asked how much they agreed with statements asking if they were politically, financially, and socially liberal or conservative.

Overall, he found that liberalism was positively correlated with openness. In contrast, he found that narcissism, extraversion, psychopathy, conscientiousness, and honesty were associated with conservatism. Additionally, Machiavellianism was correlated with low rates of political liberalism. The current research focuses on the Big Five alone, rather than the Big Five and the Dark Triad; however, understanding the correlations previously found with the Dark Triad traits and conservatism are relevant in the context of the morality and traits that will be discussed later.

More researchers have focused on the Big Five Traits individually and how they contribute to politics (Carney, Jost, Gosling, & Potter, 2008). They attempted to create a core set of personality traits that could help to distinguish between liberals and conservatives. Based on research before them, they hypothesized that openness to experience would be associated with a politically liberal individual. In contrast, they hypothesized that conscientiousness would be higher among conservatives. They used theoretical explanations to explain why these traits are associated with particular mindsets.

First, they provided an explanation for openness in liberals. Liberal tend to favor social change and equality, which motivates them to utilize creativity, novelty, and rebellious. They also believed that the motivations of conservatives to maintain the world's hierarchal structure and social stability could explain the tendency of conservative individuals to be higher in conscientiousness.

They conducted two studies, and the first study was focused on building general personality profiles for liberals and conservatives. They gathered personality information

from almost 20,000 individuals and also assessed their political orientation using a single item measure of liberal and conservatism. Using regression, they used the scores on each of the Big Five personality traits to predict political orientation. They obtained strong support for the hypothesis that openness to experience is a strong predictor for political liberalism and that lack thereof predicts conservative. They were also able to support the hypothesis that high and low levels of conscientiousness were related to political conservative and liberalism, respectively. However, they did not find significant evidence that the other three Big Five Traits (extraversion, agreeableness, and emotional stability) are able to predict political orientation.

Hypotheses related to the Big Five and politics. Based on the present research, I was able to make several hypotheses regarding the Big Five Traits and political orientation. I expected that overall personality profiles would be significantly different among liberals and conservatives. Based on Jonason and Carney et al.'s research, I was able to reasonably predict that increased openness to experience would predict being politically liberal. I also hypothesized that low levels of openness to experience would predict conservatism. In terms of conscientiousness, I predicted that low levels of conscientiousness would be associated with political liberalism, and high levels of conscientiousness would predict conservatism.

Carney et al.'s explanation for this trend is especially relevant in the current political climate. As a candidate and later as a president, Donald Trump deemphasized the importance of justice and equality and immigration, which allows even stronger prediction that non-supporters would identify as more open to experience than his supporters. He also placed value on the United States' current hierarchal structure and the value of the richest citizens through tax reforms, rhetoric opposing public assistance, and

anti-immigration policy, which lends support to the hypothesis that Donald Trump

supporters, oftentimes conservatives, would be more likely to measure high in

conscientiousness. Overall, I hypothesized that at least two of the Big Five factors

(openness to experience and conscientiousness) would offer predictive value for

individuals' political orientation.

Moral Foundations Theory and Politics

Many researchers have focused on the relationships between Moral Foundations

Theory and politics. Moral Foundations Theory was created to answer important

questions about the differences in morality in individuals and in cultures (Graham et al.,

2013). The creation of the theory divides morality into five distinct foundations:

harm/care, fairness/reciprocity, ingroup/loyalty, authority/respect, and purity/sanctity.

Individuals place more or less value on each of these foundations, and it drives their

personality and behavior. Researchers have examined the predictive ability of moral

foundations in understanding political opinions and behavior.

Researchers have found that traditionally, conservative people and liberal people

rely on different moral foundations (Graham, Haidt, & Nosek, 2009). This particular

research focused on individuals' that identified as either liberal or conservative and their

responses to four different moral questionnaires. Through conducting the four different

investigations, they found very different moralilty profiles for the two groups of people.

They found that liberal morality was more concerned with harm and fairness, which is

generalizable to the types of policies that a liberal individual would support. For example,

liberals traditionally support welfare and equal opportunity and condemn discrimination.

In contrast, conservative morality was more evenly distributed across the five moral

foundations; they did not value one foundation significantly more than others. The

authors imply that these differences help explain the fundamental differences in ideology and behavior of liberals and conservatives.

Other researchers have built on the correlations between moral foundations and politics by focusing on specific policies. Low and Wui (2015) conducted research on the ability of moral foundations to predict individual people's attitudes towards people of a lower socioeconomic status. They used the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (Graham et al., 2011) and a questionnaire assessing people's general opinions towards the poor and found that moral foundations significantly predicted whether a person would be supportive or non-supportive of poor people. Each of the five moral foundations were found to be better predictors of attitudes towards the poor than political affiliation. Through dominance regression, they found that harm was the strongest predictor, meaning that a person with a moral focus on harm and care of others was likely to support poor people.

Because of the traditional moral profile of liberals found by Graham et al. (2009), Low and Wui's findings offer empirical evidence that the moral foundations of liberals guide their focus on supporting those of a lower socioeconomic status. The disconnect between liberal and conservative policy regarding welfare can be explained by the different moral focuses of the two groups of people.

Other opinions and policy decisions have also been shown to be driven by moral foundations. Harm/care and fairness/reciprocity were found to be strong and positive predictors for people to be willing to act on climate change (Dickinson, McLeod, & Allred, 2016). Their research also reaffirmed the idea that liberals are more likely to show strong morality foundations of harm/care and fairness/reciprocity, which reinforces the current stance that many liberals have regarding the importance of mitigating climate change. Additionally, they found that purity/sanctity, authority/respect, and

ingroup/loyalty were strongly valued by the conservatives that were surveyed. This finding further explains the different moral profiles of liberals and conservatives.

Furthermore, research has also been conducted on the tendencies towards homonegativity and correlations with moral foundations. By combining the moral foundations into two groups, binding and individualizing moral foundations, researchers found that binding foundations could serve as significant predictors for homophobia and opposition to policies that serve to bring equality to homosexuals (Rosik, Dinges, & Saavedra, 2013). The binding moral foundations consist of authority/respect, purity/sanctity, and ingroup/loyalty. Individualizing foundations are harm/care and fairness/reciprocity. The higher an individuals' moral emphasis on the individualizing foundations, the more likely he or she was to view homosexuals positively.

Because of the conservative's moral focus on the binding foundations, such research helps to analyze the current disconnect between many conservatives and equal rights for homosexuals. The lack of focus on equality and fairness for all people has divided conservatives and liberals further. The policy preferences of both groups and the understood connection between the moral foundations has also been shown to impact who individuals vote for in elections.

In case of the 2012 Presidential Election, individuals' moral foundations were shown to be significant predictors of voting behavior (Franks & Scherr, 2015). Even after using regression to control for significant demographic variables, the researchers found significance among the moral foundations. They too divided the foundations into the individualizing moral foundations (harm and fairness) and the binding moral foundations (loyalty, authority, and purity). They found that the individualizing foundations, typical of liberals (Graham et al., 2009), predicted voting for Barack Obama. In contrast, the binding moral foundations predicted voting for the conservative candidate, Mitt Romney.

Hypotheses related to moral foundations and politics. The common notion that conservatives and liberals have different moral profiles justifies several hypotheses within my research. I administered the Moral Foundations Questionnaire, several measures of political ideology and beliefs, and vote choice in the 2016 election. Based on present research, I was able to hypothesize that moral foundations would be a significant predictor for political ideology, voting for either Hillary Clinton or Donald Trump, and individuals' opinions of both candidates.

Based on the rhetoric of Donald Trump that emphasized the ingroup and demonized immigrants, Muslims, and other perceived "outsiders", I hypothesized that people valuing the ingroup/loyalty foundation would identify as conservative, would have voted for Donald Trump, and would have positive opinions of him. While the 2012 election was less controversial and polarized than 2016, Franks and Scherr's research offered justification to hypothesize that all three binding foundations would predict conservatism, a positive Trump view, and voting for Trump as well.

On the other side of the political spectrum, I expected that the individualizing moral foundations would predict individual identities such as liberal, voting for Hillary Clinton, and holding a positive opinion of her. Consequently, I hypothesized that a moral focus on fairness and reciprocity, along with harm and care, would also predict a negative view of Donald Trump due to his platform emphasizing the superiority of wealthy whites.

Overall, I predicted that there would be a very different moral profile for conservatives versus liberals. The two groups seem to place opposing emphasis on the moral foundations, which itself should predict very different policy preferences and voting patterns.

Social Dominance Orientation and Politics

Like moral foundations, social dominance orientation has often been researched in conjunction with political ideology and policy preferences. In an early study, Pratto, Sidanius, Stallwood, and Malle (1994) examined the predictive ability of social dominance orientation for political and economic conservatism. They also measured SDO's relationship with many other variables, including social policy attitudes like social welfare, civil rights, environmental policy, military policy, and punitive policies.

They expected that political conservatism would correlate positively with social dominance orientation; people measuring high on the scale would support continued social hierarchy and also identity more often as strong conservatives. They found that the general preference for group domination predicted a higher tendency to favor discriminatory policies. They found high correlations between social dominance orientation and political and economic conservatism. However, they believed that SDO had a significant power to predict attitude above and beyond political-economic conservatism. They controlled for conservatism in their analyses and still found that SDO was able to predict attitudes.

A very important finding from this study focused on the ability of SDO to predict out-group discrimination. Those higher in SDO were more likely to discriminate against out-groups because of a threat against their own group and a desire to dominate others. The 2016 Election was characterized by domination and a tendency to group people into either the in-group or the out-group. Donald Trump motivated his voters by emphasizing their part in keeping America great and by demeaning out-groups, like immigrants and certain religious groups. His campaign effectively called upon individuals' social dominance orientation; his voter base was interested in preserving its place as the dominant members of society.

Cohrs and Asbrock (2009) built upon the idea that social dominance orientation can predict prejudice. They focused on both SDO and right-wing authoritarianism and the preidictive capabilities that each variable would have on levels of ethnic prejudice. The focus on group superiority and protecting that superiority led them to hypothesize that higher social dominance orientation would lead to increased ethnic prejudice. The fear of instability inflicted by the prevalence of other ethnic groups would affect the way that individuals high in social dominance orientation thought about groups other than their own.

Across two studies, they first found that SDO and right wing authoritarianism (RWA) offered different predictive capabilities. This alone provides justification to use both scales in my own research. They found that SDO offered a very general explanation for prejudice againstother ethnic groups. Their findings are consistent with the assertion that individuals high in SDO are protective of their place in society and are fundamentally in support of continued social hierarchy, a hierarchy that leaves ethnic minorities at the bottom.

Consequently, the relationship between SDO and certain social opinions may offer some explanation for Donald Trump's presidential win. He was able to mobilize individuals high in SDO who feared for their place in society by emphasizing his goals of alienation of immigrant and religious groups in and outside of the United States. His platform was built upon the dominance of white people, particularly white men. Therefore, SDO may prove to be a strong predictor for voting for Donald Trump and for conservative political perferences.

Hypotheses based on social dominance orientation and politics. Present research has focused mainly on the attitudes associated with social dominance orientation. While the current study aims to explain attitudes, it also aims to explain

behavior. Past researchers have found that high SDO can predict preference for discriminatory policies; from those findings, I hypothesized that individuals high in SDO would be more likely to have voted for Trump. I also made the conjecture that high SDO would also be a strong predictor for higher levels of social and economic conservatism via the Social and Economic Conservatism Scale. Because of the high correlations already found between conservatism and social dominance orientation, I strongly believed that SDO would provide a better understanding of Trump voters and their political beliefs.

Right Wing Authoritarianism and Politics

Right wing authoritarianism (RWA) has been found to strongly positively correlate with both social dominance orientation and conservatism. RWA has been conceptualized and measured in three traits: authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, and conventionalism (Duckitt, Bizumic, Kraus, & Heled, 2010). Duckitt et al. broadened these traits to be understood as authoritarianism, conservatism, and traditionalism. Through five different surveys, they found that RWA predicted sociopolitical attitudes and ideology far more strongly than other personality measures, including the original unidimensional measure for right wing authoritarianism. Their research confirms that RWA is more than just one trait, and using all three traits associated with the RWA scale to predict political views and behavior is beneficial.

Researchers have further examined the personality traits associated with RWA in conjunction with the Big Five Aspects of Personality. Because the Big Five has also been heavily researched as a predictor for political ideology, such research builds upon the understanding of personality's impact on political preferences. Nicol and De France (2016) conducted a survey to find the correaltions among RWA and the Big Five. They found that high levels of conscientiousness and low levels of openness were correlated

with the facets of RWA. This builds upon research earlier mentioned; conscientiousness

is commonly associated with conservatism and oepnnes with liberalism. Adding RWA

into the folds allows for a deeper understanding of the underlying personality traits that

predict political opinions and behavior. The intercorrelations among the different

variables being measured suggest that I will find strong predictive capability for political

conservatism and vote choice in the 2016 Presidential Election.

      Additionally, RWA has been shown to predict fear of the ingroup (Shaffer &

Duckitt, 2013). The researchers were focused on both RWA and SDO and found that

both had roots in fear, which is a commonly held belief in the field. Fear is often thought

to lead to higher levels of both RWA and SDO. They administered a survey that asked

participants to rate their level of fear to 93 different stimuli and that measured their RWA

and SDO.

      The main finding was that threats to the ingroup strongly predicted RWA. This

conclusion has strong implications, especially in the context of the 2016 Presidential

Election. As earlier mentioned, Donald Trump built his campaign by mobilizing fear in

the electorate. His voters seemed to fear losing their dominance in society to out-groups,

like immigrants, and thus supported his stringent policy suggestions and hateful speech.

As a result, I believed that RWA (along with SDO) may be some of the strongest

predictors of both conservatism and voting for Donald Trump.

      Hypotheses related to RWA and politics. Based on the field's support for a link

between RWA and conservatism, I was able to make very simple hypotheses about RWA

and political views and behavior. I conjectured that RWA would predict high levels of

conservatism based on the Social and Economic Conservatism Scale. I also hypothesized

that RWA would predict voting for Donald Trump in the 2016 Presidential Election.

RWA has a strong basis in fear, and it seemed that the election's results were built upon

fear. Because of the strong intercorrelations among SDO and RWA, I also believed that they would be among the strongest predictors for conservatism and voting for Donald Trump.

Current Study

Methods

Participants

This study was conducted with approval from DePauw University's Institutional Review Board. Participants ($N = 238$) were recruited using the crowdsourcing platform Mechanical Turk. 110 males, 126 females, and two non-binary individuals participated for a payment of three dollars. Participants were at least 18 years old, and their mean age was 36 years.

Procedure

After giving informed consent, participants completed a survey titled 'Personality and Politics' that was administered through Google Forms; they were expected to finish the survey in one sitting. They were also expected to complete the survey in 45 minutes to one hour. The survey included questions about the individuals' voting behavior; general political preferences; their personalities; their leadership perceptions of both Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton; their attitudes towards specific social issues; and their identities in terms of race, religion, and gender. Once participants completed the survey, they were debriefed about the true purpose of the study, which was to examine key parts of their personality and beliefs that could predict both voting behavior in the 2016 Presidential Election and general political preferences.

Measures

Demographic Information

Participants responded to general demographic questions such as age, gender, income, and age. Because of the stark divisions based on these factors in CNN exit poll data from the 2016 Presidential Election, these questions were necessary components of data collection (CNN, 2016). The full list of demographic questions is provided in Appendix A.

Political Policy Preferences

Based on the CNN exit polls from the 2016 election, there were many salient differences in terms of opinions between Trump and Clinton voters (CNN, 2016). I took some of the most divided questions from the exit polls and added them to the survey. The questions ranged from general questions about Trump and Hillary to politicized questions regarding social and racial policy. I expected that they would produce important information about differences in the two voter pools from the election. A full list of the questions that were taken from the CNN exit poll can be found in Appendix B.

Political Affiliation

To measure the individuals' political party affiliation (Democrat or Republican), I used the Pew Research Center's Political Party Quiz. The quiz's questions were used in a national survey conducted by the Pew Research Center, which is a nonpartisan fact tank based out of Washington DC (Pew Research Center, 2017). The nonpartisan nature of the quiz makes it an attractive choice to measured political affiliation in a nonbiased manner. The quiz includes 11 questions with two answer choices that generally provide polarized answers between the two parties. The questions assess participants' views on corporations, US involvement in foreign policy, American health care, gay marriage, the size and scope of the government, immigration, environmental regulations, abortion, terrorism, diversity, and economics.

I also included a simple measure of levels of Democrat and Republican party identity in the survey. On a 7-point Likert scale, I asked individuals whether they considered themselves to be strong Republicans, not very strong Republicans, Republican leaning Independents, Independents, Democrat leaning Independents, not very strong Democrats, or very strong Democrats.

Social and Economic Conservatism Scale (SECS)

The Social and Economic Conservatism Scale (Everett, 2013) is a concise and multi-item scale that measures the most prominent aspects of conservatism. It was developed and validated by Everett in response to an emerging interest in the correlations between conservatism and many areas of psychology and biology. The overall reliability for the 12-item scale is considerably high, with a Cronbach's alpha of .88. Through factor analysis, Everett excluded two items, one being opinions on taxes and the other being immigration. However, I chose to include the two items, using the original 14-item scale both because of the December 2017 tax reform bill and its controversy (Wall Street Journal, 2017) and President Donald Trump's immigration rhetoric. Both items will likely provide very different responses from Trump and Clinton voters.

The SECS asked respondents to indicate the extent to which they felt either positively or negatively towards a specific issue by writing a number between 0 and 100. A score of 0 indicated greater negativity, and a score of 100 indicated greater positivity. The issues addressed in the SECS are: abortion, limited government, military and national security, religion, welfare benefits, gun ownership, traditional marriage, traditional values, fiscal responsibility, business, the family unit, patriotism, immigration, and taxes. Abortion and welfare benefits were reverse scored; negative ratings on these two items were associated with higher levels of conservatism. The full scale can be found in Appendix C.

Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ-30)

The Moral Foundations Questionnaire (Graham, Haidt, & Nosek, 2008) was created in order attempt to explain the morality differences between liberals and conservatives. The questionnaire includes five subscales that assess the moral values of individuals. The subscales along with their reliabilities in terms of Cronbach's alpha are as follows: Harm (.69), Fairness (.65), Ingroup (.71), Authority (.74), and Purity (.84). The moral foundations of Conservatives and Liberals are notably different (Graham, Nosek, Haidt, Iyer, Koleva, & Ditto, 2012); this scale was important to include because the differences between parties are large, and morals have a strong influence on political tendencies and consequently voting behavior.

The MFQ-30 is divided into two sets of questions labeled Part 1 and Part 2 with 16 items in each part. Part 1 says, "When you decide whether something is wrong, to what extent are the following considerations relevant to your thinking? Please rate each statement using this scale: (0) = not at all relevant (this consideration has nothing to do with my judgments of right and wrong), (1) = not very relevant, (2) = slightly relevant, (3) = somewhat relevant, (4) = very relevant, and (5) = extremely relevant (this is one of the most important factors when I judge right or wrong)". The complete list of statements is found in Appendix C. Part 2 says, "Please read the following sentences and indicate your agreement or disagreement: (0) = strongly disagree, (1) = moderately disagree, (2) = slightly disagree, (3) = slightly agree, (4) = moderately agree, and (5) = strongly agree". The full list of the 16 items is found in Appendix D.

Leadership Perception

The measure for leadership perception was added to the survey separately for Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. It was adapted from a version of the Perceived Leadership Integrity Scale (Craig & Gustafon, 1998) to fit the purposes of the study. The

30-item scale was reduced to 15 items by eliminating particularly negative items (i.e. "is

a hypocrite", "is vindictive") and items that were inapplicable to a politician and better

suited for a corporate employee. The instructions for completing the scale were: "The

following items concern your perceptions of another person's behavior. Choose

responses to indicate how well each item describes the person you are rating: (1) = not at

all, (2) = barely, (3) = somewhat, (4) = well". Participants completed ratings for both

Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. The full list of the remaining items is found in

Appendix E.

Big Five Aspect Scales (BFAS)

To measure the Big Five, I used the Big Five Aspect Scales (DeYoung, Quilty, &

Peterson, 2007). The BFAS measures each of the five factors and their aspects

(Neuroticism: Withdrawal/Volatility; Agreeableness: Compassion/Politeness;

Extraversion: Enthusiasm/Assertiveness; Conscientiousness: Industriousness/Orderliness;

and Openness: Intellect/Openness). The instructions given for completing the BFAS are

as follows: "Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not describe you. For

example, do you agree that you seldom feel blue, compared to most other people? Please

fill in the number that best indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with each

statement listed below. Be as honest as possible, but rely on your initial feeling and do

not think too much about each item: (1) = strongly disagree, (2), (3) = neither agree nor

disagree, (4), (5) = strongly agree". The full list of the 100-item scale is found in

Appendix F.

Right Wing Authoritarianism (RWA)

Right Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) has been conceptualized as a broad range of

personality traits related to authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, and

conventionalism (Duckitt, Bizumic, Krauss, & Heled, 2010). RWA has been

continuously shown to predict conservative attitudes and behaviors. Authoritarian

submission, one of the subscales, is often referred to as conservatism. To measure RWA,

I used Duckitt et al.'s 2010 scale that accounted for the three aforementioned subscales.

Individuals were instructed to "show how much you disagree or agree with the following

statements, 1 meaning you strongly disagree with the statement and 7 meaning you

strongly agree with the statement". The full scale is located in Appendix G.

Social Dominance Orientation (SDO)

Social dominance orientation (SDO) refers to levels of one's preference for

inequality among social groups (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). It has been

shown to correlate positively with policies designed to maintain hierarchy and

discrimination in society and conservatism. To measure SDO, I used Ho et al.'s SDO7

scale.

Individuals taking the survey were instructed to "show how much you favor or

oppose each idea below by selecting a number from one to seven on the scale below"

(Hoe et al., 2015, 1). Participants responded to 16 survey items that were divided into

four subscales: pro-trait dominance, con-trait dominance, pro-trait egalitarianism, and

con-trait egalitarianism. The full scale can be found in Appendix H.

Results

Demographics

To show the diversity of the sample, I included descriptive statistics for baic

demographic varaibles in Tables 1-5. Table 1 shows the gender breakdown for the

sample. There were 110 males, 126 females, and two non-binary individuals included in

the sample. Table 2 shows the race and ethnicity breakdown for the sample. 188

participants were white, 21 participants were black, 13 participants were Latino/Hispanic,

12 identified as Asian, 3 identified as other, and one did not disclose. Table 3 is a

breakdown of individuals and whether or not they voted in the 2016 Presidential Election.

32 individuals did not vote, and 206 voted. Table 4 shows the vote breakdown; 128

individuals voted for Hillary Clinton, 58 voted for Donald Trump, and 52 either did not

vote or voted for another candidate. Age and income were also measured, and the average

age was about 36 years old with a range from 19-70 years old. The code for measuring

class was 1 = lower class, 2 = lower middle class, 3 = middle class, 4 = upper middle

class, and 5 = upper class. The mean number was 2.35, which suggests that the sample

consisted mostly of individuals that were lower middle to middle class. Descriptive

statistics for age and income are shown in Table 5.

Table 1: Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	110	46.2
Female	126	52.9
Non-binary	2	0.8

Table 2: Race and Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Frequency	Percent
White	188	79
Black	21	8.8
Latino/Hispanic	13	5.5
Asian	12	5
Other	3	1.3

Table 3: Voted in 2016 Presidential Election

Voted?	Frequency	Percent
Yes	206	86.6
No	32	13.4

Table 4: Candidate Voted for in 2016 Presidential Election

Candidate	Frequency	Percent
Hillary Clinton	128	53.8
Donald Trump	58	24.4
Neither/Did not vote	52	21.8

Table 5: Age and Income Descriptive Statistics

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age	238	19	70	36.24	11.136
Income	238	1	5	2.35	0.852

Beyond the general demographic variables reported above, I also collected data regarding the makeup of the sample when it came to commonly polarized political issues. These tables help to understand what individuals believe when it comes to issues that were central in the 2016 Presidential Election, as determined by the CNN Exit Polls. The questions asked can be found in Appendix B. Table 6 shows individuals' opinion on Donald Trump's treatment of women. Table 7 reports individuals' opinions about the United States criminal justice system. In Table 8, individuals' general opinion of the government is reported. Finally, Table 9 reports individual opinions of illegal immigration and the common government responses.

Table 6: Does Trump's treatment of women bother you?

	Frequency	Percent
No	64	26.9
Yes	174	73.1

Table 7: Does the country's criminal justice system…?

	Frequency	Percent
Treat blacks unfairly	172	72.3
Treat all fairly	66	27.7

Table 8: What is your opinion of the government?

	Frequency	Percent
The government should do more	165	69.3
The government should do less	73	30.7

Table 9: Illegal immigrants working in the US should be…

	Frequency	Percent
Should be offered legal status	163	68.5
Deported	75	31.5

Opinions of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump

One major index of opinion that I developed for Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump is based on three items that I grouped together into one scale based on their intercorrelations. That index included the questions assessing perceptions of qualifications, temperament, and overall opinions. The questions used were: "Is Hillary Clinton/Donald Trump qualified to serve as president?"; "Does Hillary Clinton/Donald Trump have the temperament to be president?"; and "What is your overall opinion of Hillary Clinton/Donald Trump?" (see Tables 10 and 11 for the inter-correlations among these items).

Table 10: Overall Opinion of Hillary Clinton (Intercorrelations)

		HillaryOpin	HillaryQual	HillaryTemp
HillaryOpin	Pearson Correlation	1	.458**	.512**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0	0
	N	238	238	238
HillaryQual	Pearson Correlation	.458**	1	.705**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0		0
	N	238	238	238
HillaryTemp	Pearson Correlation	.512**	.705**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0	
	N	238	238	238

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Table 11: Overall Opinion of Donald Trump (Intercorrelations)

		TrumpOpin	TrumpQual	TrumpTemp
TrumpOpin	Pearson Correlation	1	.670**	.791**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0	0
	N	238	238	238
TrumpQual	Pearson Correlation	.670**	1	.635**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0		0
	N	238	238	238
TrumpTemp	Pearson Correlation	.791**	.635**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0	
	N	238	238	238

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Conservatism

One of the major outcome or criterion variables in the current study is

conservatism. I originally hoped to focus on predicting voting for Donald Trump;

however, none of the variables significantly predicted the vote. Therefore, I chose to

focus on conservatism instead. I used a newer and more sensitive index of social and

economic conservatism (SECS; Everett, 2013). As aforementioned, the entire scale can

be found in Appendix C. To demonstrate internal validity of this index in measuring

conservatism in this study, I examined the relationships between this scale and other

measures of political affiliation (see Table 12). The SECS was very strongly correlated

with PID and PID2 and demonstrated a patterns of correlations consistent with the

construct validity of the SECS as a measure of conversatism. Earlier research has not

used this scale to assess conservatism; however, I believed that its very wide range of

levels of conservative would allow for better statistical analysis.

"PID" in Table 12 asked participants to answer: "Do you typically identify as a

Democrat, Republican, or neither?" Neither was coded as 0, Democrat was coded as 1,

and Republican was coded as 3. Higher numbers represented identification as

Republican.

The variable labeled as "PID2" in Table 12 was the question: "Generally

speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent,

or what?" Individuals answered either very strong democrat, not very strong democrat,

democrat leaning independent, independent, republic leaning independent, not very

strong republican, and very strong republican. They were coded from 1 to 7, respectively,

meaning that higher numbers indicated higher levels of republican/conservative identity.

While the SECS largely measures conservative ideology, the strong

intercorrelations among measures of partisan identity and this measure of conservatism

suggested that they are very similar among individuals. For that reason, I focused my

analyses on the SECS, rather than all three measures. They are strong enough related that

I believed that using the SECS as my dependent variable would offer complete enough

analysis.

Table 12: Intercorrelations Among the SECS and Partisan Identity Measures

		SECSTOT14	PID	PID2
SECSTOT14	Pearson Correlation	1	.294**	.662**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0	0
	N	238	238	238
PID	Pearson Correlation	.294**	1	.284**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0		0
	N	238	238	238
PID2	Pearson Correlation	.662**	.284**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0	
	N	238	238	238

**Correlations are significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Hierarchal Regression

In order to examine the large number of variables in this dataset, simultaneously,

hierarchical multiple regression was used, in which blocks of common variables (e.g.,

personality traits, or moral foundations subscales) were entered at one time, in the context

of other blocks. Hierarchical multiple regression allows the investigator to examine the

unique and additive effects of a variable or set of variables, after controlling for the

effects of other variables. The dependent variable was levels of Social and Economic

Conservatism as measured by the SECS (Everett, 2013).

In this case, demographic variables were included in the first block, followed by

other important sets of variables. I used the BFAS to measure the 5 salient traits of

agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, openness to experience, and extraversion.

I measured morality through the MFQ and the five moral foundations of harm/care,

fairness/reciprocity, ingroup/loyalty, purity/sanctity, and authority/respect. Next, I

measured personality constructs found to strongly related to conservatism, which were

social dominance orientation and right wing authoritarianism. Because of their high

intercorrelations, I grouped SDO and RWA into one scale for more efficient analyses.

The intercorrelations can be found in Appendix I. I was particularly interested in the SDO

facets that traditionally predict conservatism and were correlated with RWA, which were

anti-egalitarianism and dominance, so I only included those facets in my analyses.

Finally, I used the indexes of opinion for both Hillary and Trump and the leadership

perception questionnaire found in Appendix E. For each of the aforementioned variables,

the correlation matrices are available in Appendices J-M.

  Demographics. When HMR was applied to the demographic variables, age,

gender, race (white/non-white), and income were included in the first block. The

resulting equation was significant ($F(4, 230) = 6.41$, $p<.001$) and had a multiple R of .32

($R2 = .10$). Only age and income were significant predictors of SECS conservatism in

this first block. The older individuals were, the more conservative they were according to

the SECS. In terms of income, the lower that individuals measured their income to be, the

less conservative they were. Simple correlations among these demographic variables and

the SECS are given in Table 13.

Table 13: Correlations of Demographic Variables and Social and Economic

Conservatism

		SECSTOT14	Age	Gender	WhiteNon	Income
SECSTOT14	Pearson Correlation	1	.240**	0.042	-0.014	.216**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0	0.525	0.832	0.001
	N	238	238	236	237	238
Age	Pearson Correlation	.240**	1	-0.013	-.252**	0.096
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0		0.846	0	0.141
	N	238	238	236	237	238
Gender	Pearson Correlation	0.042	-0.013	1	0.095	-0.069
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.525	0.846		0.149	0.295
	N	236	236	236	235	236
WhiteNon	Pearson Correlation	-0.014	-.252**	0.095	1	-0.014
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.832	0	0.149		0.828
	N	237	237	235	237	237
Income	Pearson Correlation	.216**	0.096	-0.069	-0.014	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.001	0.141	0.295	0.828	
	N	238	238	236	237	238

**Correlations are significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Big Five Aspect Scales. Because I was particularly interested in the role of personality in political conservatism, the BFAS personality scales were entered in the second block to predict SECS conservatism. The resulting equation was significant and had a multiple R of .45, with an R2 change value of .11 (F Change (10, 220) = 2.90, p < .005). Here, age and income remained significant (p < .05) when included with the BFAS, where Orderliness (+) remained a significant predictor and Intellect (-), Openness (-), and Volatility (-) showed clear trends (p < .10).

These findings are consistent with previous research and my hypothesis that higher levels of conscientiousness would predict higher levels of conservatism. Orderliness is an aspect of conscientiousness, offering support to the original hypothesis. Additionally, I predicted that lower levels of openness to experience would predict higher levels of conservatism, which is supported with lower levels of intellect and openness,

two aspects of openness to experience. However, I found unexpected results, with

neuroticism's aspect of volatility showing a negative correlation with conservatism. The

resulting Hierarchal Multiple Regression with correlations including the Big Five Aspects

block can be found in Table 15.

Table 14: HMR Including Big Five Aspects

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	24.629	6.62		3.721	0
	Age	0.396	0.107	0.24	3.704	0
	Gender	1.698	2.31	0.046	0.735	0.463
	WhiteNon	2.417	2.944	0.053	0.821	0.413
	Income	4.096	1.356	0.19	3.021	0.003
2	(Constant)	54.679	17.911		3.053	0.003
	Age	0.392	0.107	0.238	3.666	0
	Gender	2.482	2.347	0.068	1.058	0.291
	WhiteNon	0.705	2.905	0.016	0.243	0.808
	Income	2.949	1.372	0.137	2.149	0.033
	WITHDRWL	-0.306	2.423	-0.015	-0.126	0.899
	VOLATILITY	-0.346	0.204	-0.17	-1.693	0.092
	ENTHUSIASM	0.074	0.187	0.037	0.396	0.693
	ASSERTIVENESS	0.268	0.195	0.129	1.379	0.169
	INTELLECT	-0.459	0.24	-0.175	-1.911	0.057
	OPENNESS	-0.364	0.203	-0.152	-1.798	0.074
	COMPASSION	-0.068	0.235	-0.03	-0.287	0.774
	POLITENESS	-0.182	0.285	-0.057	-0.641	0.522
	INDUSTRIOUSNESS	-0.082	0.259	-0.032	-0.318	0.751
	ORDERLINESS	0.48	0.188	0.187	2.552	0.011

Moral Foundations. In addition, morality as measured by the Moral Foundations

Questionnaire has been shown to predict political views. Consequently, I included the

five moral foundation scales in the next block. When these were included, the resulting

equation was significant where R increased to .74 (R^2 = .55), with an R^2 change value of

.34 (F Change (5, 215) = 32.07, $p < .001$). When the MFQ scales were included, age

remained significant (p < .05) with gender showing a clear trend (p < .10); however, the

MFQ scales largely eclipsed the effects of personality as measured by the BFAS

as only Volatility remained as a trend (p < .10). The correlations between the five moral

foundations and social and economic conservatism as measured by the SECS are found in

Table 15. Low emphasis on morality related to fairness/reciprocity and harm/care

predicted higher levels of conservative, which is consistent with my hypothesis that the

individualizing moral foundations would be negatively correlated with high levels of

conservatism. Additionally, I hypothesized that the binding moral foundations

(ingroup/loyalty, authority/respect, and purity/sanctity) would predict conservatism. The

results support this prediction, as all three binding foundations were positively correlated

with conservatism. Morality had strong predictive value in this block of the HMR.

Table 15: HMR Including Moral Foundations Block

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	24.629	6.62		3.721	0
	Age	0.396	0.107	0.24	3.704	0
	Gender	1.698	2.31	0.046	0.735	0.463
	WhiteNon	2.417	2.944	0.053	0.821	0.413
	Income	4.096	1.356	0.19	3.021	0.003
2	(Constant)	54.679	17.911		3.053	0.003
	Age	0.392	0.107	0.238	3.666	0
	Gender	2.482	2.347	0.068	1.058	0.291
	WhiteNon	0.705	2.905	0.016	0.243	0.808
	Income	2.949	1.372	0.137	2.149	0.033
	WITHDRWL	-0.306	2.423	-0.015	-0.126	0.899
	VOLATILITY	-0.346	0.204	-0.17	-1.693	0.092
	ENTHUSIASM	0.074	0.187	0.037	0.396	0.693
	ASSERTIVENESS	0.268	0.195	0.129	1.379	0.169
	INTELLECT	-0.459	0.24	-0.175	-1.911	0.057
	OPENNESS	-0.364	0.203	-0.152	-1.798	0.074
	COMPASSION	-0.068	0.235	-0.03	-0.287	0.774
	POLITENESS	-0.182	0.285	-0.057	-0.641	0.522
	INDUSTRIOUSNESS	-0.082	0.259	-0.032	-0.318	0.751
	ORDERLINESS	0.48	0.188	0.187	2.552	0.011
3	(Constant)	39.52	14.2		2.783	0.006
	Age	0.283	0.083	0.171	3.407	0.001
	Gender	3.317	1.815	0.09	1.827	0.069
	WhiteNon	0.782	2.253	0.017	0.347	0.729
	Income	0.899	1.07	0.042	0.84	0.402
	WITHDRWL	1.113	1.89	0.055	0.589	0.557
	VOLATILITY	-0.281	0.161	-0.138	-1.746	0.082
	ENTHUSIASM	-0.115	0.146	-0.058	-0.787	0.432
	ASSERTIVENESS	0.134	0.152	0.064	0.883	0.378
	INTELLECT	0.049	0.192	0.019	0.254	0.8
	OPENNESS	-0.054	0.158	-0.022	-0.34	0.734
	COMPASSION	-0.138	0.188	-0.062	-0.737	0.462
	POLITENESS	0.02	0.228	0.006	0.087	0.931
	INDUSTRIOUSNESS	-0.088	0.199	-0.034	-0.442	0.659
	ORDERLINESS	0.137	0.148	0.053	0.926	0.356
	HarmCare	-2.434	1.428	-0.12	-1.705	0.09
	FairnessReciprocity	-3.371	1.506	-0.135	-2.238	0.026
	InGroupLoyalty	3.368	1.342	0.2	2.509	0.013
	AuthorityRespect	3.394	1.44	0.203	2.357	0.019
	PuritySanctity	4.465	1.004	0.328	4.449	0

Social dominance orientation, right wing authoritarianism, and politics. In addition, two very popular personality constructs that often correlate with conservatism, the Right Wing Authoritarian Scale and Social Dominance Orientation Scale were included for examination in the next block. I hypothesized that the effects of these scales would eclipse much of the variance that the MFQ provided in predicting SECS conservatism, not unlike how the MFQ eclipsed variance in more basic personality constructs (i.e., the BFAS). I used only the total scores for the RWA and SDO measures because there were high correlations among the RWA subscales and SDO subscales (see Appendix I for reference).

Once RWA and SDO were included, the resulting equation was significant. R increased to .81 (R2=.66) with an R2 change value of .11 (F Change (2, 213) = 34.96, p < .001). In terms of demographics, age and income remained significant (p<.05). However, the significance of the moral foundations was eclipsed by RWA primarily and SDO secondarily. The resulting HMR including an SDO and RWA block is found in Table 16. As predicted, higher levels of both social dominance orientation and right wing authoritarianism predicted identification as conservative.

Table 16: HMR Including SDO and RWA

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficien	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	24.629	6.62		3.721	0
	Age	0.396	0.107	0.24	3.704	0
	Gender	1.698	2.31	0.046	0.735	0.463
	WhiteNon	2.417	2.944	0.053	0.821	0.413
	Income	4.096	1.356	0.19	3.021	0.003
2	(Constant)	54.679	17.911		3.053	0.003
	Age	0.392	0.107	0.238	3.666	0
	Gender	2.482	2.347	0.068	1.058	0.291
	WhiteNon	0.705	2.905	0.016	0.243	0.808
	Income	2.949	1.372	0.137	2.149	0.033
	WITHDRWL	-0.306	2.423	-0.015	-0.126	0.899
	VOLATILITY	-0.346	0.204	-0.17	-1.693	0.092
	ENTHUSIASM	0.074	0.187	0.037	0.396	0.693
	ASSERTIVENESS	0.268	0.195	0.129	1.379	0.169
	INTELLECT	-0.459	0.24	-0.175	-1.911	0.057
	OPENNESS	-0.364	0.203	-0.152	-1.798	0.074
	COMPASSION	-0.068	0.235	-0.03	-0.287	0.774
	POLITENESS	-0.182	0.285	-0.057	-0.641	0.522
	INDUSTRIOUSN	-0.082	0.259	-0.032	-0.318	0.751
	ORDERLINESS	0.48	0.188	0.187	2.552	0.011
3	(Constant)	39.52	14.2		2.783	0.006
	Age	0.283	0.083	0.171	3.407	0.001
	Gender	3.317	1.815	0.09	1.827	0.069
	WhiteNon	0.782	2.253	0.017	0.347	0.729
	Income	0.899	1.07	0.042	0.84	0.402
	WITHDRWL	1.113	1.89	0.055	0.589	0.557
	VOLATILITY	-0.281	0.161	-0.138	-1.746	0.082
	ENTHUSIASM	-0.115	0.146	-0.058	-0.787	0.432
	ASSERTIVENESS	0.134	0.152	0.064	0.883	0.378
	INTELLECT	0.049	0.192	0.019	0.254	0.8
	OPENNESS	-0.054	0.158	-0.022	-0.34	0.734
	COMPASSION	-0.138	0.188	-0.062	-0.737	0.462
	POLITENESS	0.02	0.228	0.006	0.087	0.931
	INDUSTRIOUSN	-0.088	0.199	-0.034	-0.442	0.659
	ORDERLINESS	0.137	0.148	0.053	0.926	0.356
	HarmCare	-2.434	1.428	-0.12	-1.705	0.09
	FairnessReciproc	-3.371	1.506	-0.135	-2.238	0.026
	InGroupLoyalty	3.368	1.342	0.2	2.509	0.013
	AuthorityRespect	3.394	1.44	0.203	2.357	0.019
	PuritySanctity	4.465	1.004	0.328	4.449	0
4	(Constant)	1.268	13.866		0.091	0.927
	Age	0.177	0.074	0.107	2.401	0.017
	Gender	0.077	1.63	0.002	0.048	0.962
	WhiteNon	0.762	1.978	0.017	0.386	0.7
	Income	2.506	0.953	0.116	2.629	0.009
	WITHDRWL	1.339	1.649	0.066	0.812	0.418
	VOLATILITY	-0.278	0.141	-0.137	-1.977	0.049
	ENTHUSIASM	-0.063	0.129	-0.032	-0.491	0.624
	ASSERTIVENESS	0.068	0.133	0.033	0.511	0.61
	INTELLECT	0.183	0.168	0.07	1.088	0.278
	OPENNESS	0.013	0.138	0.005	0.095	0.924
	COMPASSION	-0.223	0.164	-0.1	-1.356	0.177
	POLITENESS	0.182	0.201	0.057	0.907	0.365
	INDUSTRIOUSN	-0.068	0.174	-0.027	-0.392	0.695
	ORDERLINESS	0.087	0.129	0.034	0.671	0.503
	HarmCare	-0.797	1.26	-0.039	-0.633	0.528
	FairnessReciproc	0.002	1.452	0	0.002	0.999
	InGroupLoyalty	1.854	1.189	0.11	1.56	0.12
	AuthorityRespect	-0.675	1.347	-0.04	-0.502	0.616
	PuritySanctity	1.051	0.967	0.077	1.087	0.278
	RWATOT	8.398	1.073	0.593	7.827	0
	SDOTOT	1.969	0.764	0.144	2.576	0.011

Opinions of candidates and influence on political preferences. Because of the controversy surrounding the 2016 candidates, I chose to include an aggregate measure of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton's temperament, qualifications, and individuals' general opinion of them. I predicted that individuals' responses to this variable would significantl predict conservatism or lack thereof. I added this in addition to a perceived leadership scale for each candidate.

When this latter set of four variables specifically focused on candidates Trump and Clinton was added to the HRM equation, the resulting equation was significant. R increased to .87 (R^2 = .75) with an R^2 change value of .09 (F change $(4,209)$ = 19.35, p < .001). The resulting HMR is included in Table 17 below. Income and age remained significant as predictors, as well as higher levels of right wing authoritarianism. The aggregate measures for overall opinions of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton predicted high levels of conservatism and lower levels of conservatism, respectively.

Overall, I found that I was able to very significantly predict conservatism based on opinions of the candidates. Conservatives were very likely to support and favor Donald Trump. While I could not significantly predict voting for Donald Trump, I was able to use opinions about the candidates to predict political ideology, which allows me to make similar generalizations. Such findings help me to offer detailed profiles of Trump voters and conservatives in general.

Table 17: HMR Including Opinions about Candidates Clinton and Trump

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	24.629	6.62		3.72	0
	Age	0.396	0.107	0.24	3.7	0
	Gender	1.698	2.31	0.046	0.74	0.46
	WhiteNon	2.417	2.944	0.053	0.82	0.41
	Income	4.096	1.356	0.19	3.02	0
2	(Constant)	54.679	17.911		3.05	0
	Age	0.392	0.107	0.238	3.67	0
	Gender	2.482	2.347	0.068	1.06	0.29
	WhiteNon	0.705	2.905	0.016	0.24	0.81
	Income	2.949	1.372	0.137	2.15	0.03
	WITHDRWL	-0.306	2.423	-0.015	-0.13	0.9
	VOLATILITY	-0.346	0.204	-0.17	-1.69	0.09
	ENTHUSIASM	0.074	0.187	0.037	0.4	0.69
	ASSERTIVENESS	0.268	0.195	0.129	1.38	0.17
	INTELLECT	-0.459	0.24	-0.175	-1.91	0.06
	OPENNESS	-0.364	0.203	-0.152	-1.8	0.07
	COMPASSION	-0.068	0.235	-0.03	-0.29	0.77
	POLITENESS	-0.182	0.285	-0.057	-0.64	0.52
	INDUSTRIOUSN	-0.082	0.259	-0.032	-0.32	0.75
	ORDERLINESS	0.48	0.188	0.187	2.55	0.01
3	(Constant)	39.52	14.2		2.78	0.01
	Age	0.283	0.083	0.171	3.41	0
	Gender	3.317	1.815	0.09	1.83	0.07
	WhiteNon	0.782	2.253	0.017	0.35	0.73
	Income	0.899	1.07	0.042	0.84	0.4
	WITHDRWL	1.113	1.89	0.055	0.59	0.56
	VOLATILITY	-0.281	0.161	-0.138	-1.75	0.08
	ENTHUSIASM	-0.115	0.146	-0.058	-0.79	0.43
	ASSERTIVENESS	0.134	0.152	0.064	0.88	0.38
	INTELLECT	0.049	0.192	0.019	0.25	0.8
	OPENNESS	-0.054	0.158	-0.022	-0.34	0.73
	COMPASSION	-0.138	0.188	-0.062	-0.74	0.46
	POLITENESS	0.02	0.228	0.006	0.09	0.93
	INDUSTRIOUSN	-0.088	0.199	-0.034	-0.44	0.66
	ORDERLINESS	0.137	0.148	0.053	0.93	0.36
	HarmCare	-2.434	1.428	-0.12	-1.71	0.09
	FairnessReciproc	-3.371	1.506	-0.135	-2.24	0.03
	InGroupLoyalty	3.368	1.342	0.2	2.51	0.01
	AuthorityRespect	3.394	1.44	0.203	2.36	0.02
	PuritySanctity	4.465	1.004	0.328	4.45	0
4	(Constant)	1.268	13.866		0.09	0.93
	Age	0.177	0.074	0.107	2.4	0.02
	Gender	0.077	1.63	0.002	0.05	0.96
	WhiteNon	0.762	1.978	0.017	0.39	0.7
	Income	2.506	0.953	0.116	2.63	0.01
	WITHDRWL	1.339	1.649	0.066	0.81	0.42
	VOLATILITY	-0.278	0.141	-0.137	-1.98	0.05
	ENTHUSIASM	-0.063	0.129	-0.032	-0.49	0.62
	ASSERTIVENESS	0.068	0.133	0.033	0.51	0.61
	INTELLECT	0.183	0.168	0.07	1.09	0.28
	OPENNESS	0.013	0.138	0.005	0.1	0.92
	COMPASSION	-0.223	0.164	-0.1	-1.36	0.18
	POLITENESS	0.182	0.201	0.057	0.91	0.37
	INDUSTRIOUSN	-0.068	0.174	-0.027	-0.39	0.7
	ORDERLINESS	0.087	0.129	0.034	0.67	0.5
	HarmCare	-0.797	1.26	-0.039	-0.63	0.53
	FairnessReciproc	0.002	1.452	0	0	1
	InGroupLoyalty	1.854	1.189	0.11	1.56	0.12
	AuthorityRespect	-0.675	1.347	-0.04	-0.5	0.62
	PuritySanctity	1.051	0.967	0.077	1.09	0.28
	RWATOT	8.398	1.073	0.593	7.83	0
	SDOTOT	1.969	0.764	0.144	2.58	0.01
5	(Constant)	11.59	12.452		0.93	0.35
	Age	0.12	0.064	0.073	1.87	0.06
	Gender	0.158	1.415	0.004	0.11	0.91
	WhiteNon	2.451	1.729	0.054	1.42	0.16
	Income	2.677	0.825	0.124	3.24	0
	WITHDRWL	0.517	1.43	0.026	0.36	0.72
	VOLATILITY	-0.125	0.123	-0.062	-1.02	0.31
	ENTHUSIASM	-0.054	0.114	-0.027	-0.48	0.63
	ASSERTIVENESS	0.144	0.116	0.069	1.23	0.22
	INTELLECT	-0.02	0.148	-0.007	-0.13	0.89
	OPENNESS	-0.01	0.12	-0.004	-0.08	0.93
	COMPASSION	-0.098	0.144	-0.044	-0.68	0.5
	POLITENESS	0.22	0.176	0.069	1.25	0.21
	INDUSTRIOUSN	0.005	0.152	0.002	0.03	0.97
	ORDERLINESS	0.1	0.113	0.039	0.89	0.38
	HarmCare	-0.386	1.089	-0.019	-0.35	0.72
	FairnessReciproc	-0.762	1.263	-0.03	-0.6	0.55
	InGroupLoyalty	0.882	1.036	0.052	0.85	0.4
	AuthorityRespect	1.149	1.188	0.069	0.97	0.33
	PuritySanctity	0.585	0.841	0.043	0.7	0.49
	RWATOT	5.562	1.001	0.393	5.56	0
	SDOTOT	0.502	0.69	0.037	0.73	0.47
	TrumpOpQualTe	13.242	2.474	0.265	5.35	0
	HllaryOpQualTer	-1.571	2.208	-0.034	-0.71	0.48
	TrumpleadTOT	0.498	1.128	0.021	0.44	0.66
	HillaryLeadTOT	-3.931	1.15	-0.166	-3.42	0

Limitations

The main limitations of the current study arise from sample size. First, the sample was not as large as originally hoped for. This led to a less diverse sample. As seen in many of the descriptive statistics, the sample was far more liberal than conservative. This is problematic, as I was mainly focused on the personality traits associated with conservatism. Mechanical Turk has been shown to be more liberal (Clifford, Jewell, & Waggoner, 2015), so in the future, it could be beneficial to recruit from other platforms.

Consequently, the small sample size may have had an effect on my ability to predict the vote. Very few of my participants voted for Donald Trump (less than 25%), so it may have been necessary to have a larger sample size in order to gauge the differences between Trump and Hillary voters. Overall, the measures used in the current study were valid, but sample size had a large impact on results.

Discussion

In general, I was unable to predict individuals' votes in the 2016 Election. However, I was able to very strongly predict levels of conservatism in participants. My predictions regarding individual differences and their contributions to conservative identities were supported for the most part. While certain traits and differences were stronger predictors, I found the expected correlations between specific variables and conservatism.

For the Big Five Aspects, I was able to support my hypotheses about the individual traits in the Big Five. Openness to experience was associated with lower levels of conservatism, which I expected. Being an open-minded individual is typically associated with an openness to change and an openness to accepting others, regardless of race, religion, etc. This is not a common trait among conservatives, and this was especially evident in the 2016 Election. The United States was built upon immigration;

yet, conservatives are less open to accepting non-whites in society and are also close-minded about non-white contributions to society.

I also was able to support the hypothesis that conscientiousness is correlated with conservatism and that it can predict higher levels of conservatism. The conscientiousness aspect of orderliness was positively correlated with conservatism, which was expected. Conservatives are very focused on maintaining order in society and able not open to change.

As for the moral foundations, my predictions were supported, despite other factors eclipsing the effects of the foundations throughout the hierarchy. As aforementioned, the individualizing moral foundations of harm/care and fairness/reciprocity are commonly associated with liberal individuals. I found negative correlations among these foundations with conservatism. Conservatives traditionally care less about the welfare of all human beings, which predicts such interactions between the individualizing foundations and conservatism.

The binding moral foundations of authority/respect, ingroup/loyalty, and purity/sanctity were positively correlated with conservatism, which is logical considering the ideological views of many conservatives. Conservatives are extremely loyal to their ingroup and are also extremely focused on respect for elders and governmental authority. Additionally, the beliefs about abortion and other purity-related policy that are traditional for conservatives predicts a higher emphasis on purity/sanctity.

As predicted, RWA and SDO were extremely significant predictors of conservative ideology. There has been a lot of research done supporting these as predictors of conservatism, but my focus was on how well they could predict conservatism in comparison to other variables. When included in the hierarchy, they were among the strongest predictors of conservatism. Both emphasize a focus on dominance

and the priorities of the in-group, which have been stated as factors of importance to conservatives. In the context of the 2016 Election, these variables offer good explanation for choosing to stick to the conservative ticket and vote for Donald Trump. His emphasis on preserving the white superiority typical of America likely motivated individuals to vote for him. RWA remained significant at the very end of the hierarchy, which suggests that it is very closely related to being socially and economically conservative.

This leads to the final variable that I examined, which was the general opinions and leadership perceptions of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. Positive perception of Donald Trump was a strong predictor for conservatism, which suggests that his voter base was very conservative and that the predictors for conservatism can apply to Trump voters as well. Viewing Donald Trump in a positive light was a stronger predictor than most other variables in the regression, implying that being a Donald Trump voter is predictive of conservatism, which is correlated with many personality traits as shown in this research.

While the current study had limitations, I believe that I was able to create a strong personality profile for conservative individuals, and through my own analysis and reasoning, Trump voters. Based on the research, conservative individuals are overall less open to new experiences; more focused on morality related to purity, ingroup loyalty, and respect; more oriented towards maintaining social hierarchy and traditional values; and have a strong belief that Donald Trump was qualified and even-tempered enough to serve as president.

References

Carney, D. R., Jost, J. T., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2008). The Secret Lives of Liberals
and Conservatives: Personality Profiles, Interaction Styles, and the Things They
Leave Behind. *Political Psychology, 29,* 807-840.

Clifford, S., Jewell, R. M., & Waggoner, P. D. (2015). Are samples drawn from
Mechanical Turk valid for research on political ideology? *Research and Politics,
Oct-Dec*, 1-9.

Cohrs, J. C. & Asbrock, F. (2009). Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance
orientation and prejudice against threatening and competitive ethnic groups.
European Journal of Social Psychology, 39, 270-289

DeYoung, C. G., Quilty, L. C., Peterson, J. B. (2007). Between Facets and Domains: 10
Aspects of the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93,* 880-
896.

Duckitt, J., Bizumic, B., Krauss, S. W., & Heled, E. (2010). A Tripartite Approach to
Right-wing Authoritarianism: the Authoritarianism-Conservatism-Traditionalism
Model. *Political Psychology, 31*, 685-715.

Everett JAC (2013). The 12 Item Social and Economic Conservatism Scale (SECS).
PLoS ONE 8(12): e82131. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0082131

Franks, A. S. & Scherr, K. C. (2015). Using Moral Foundations to Predict Voting
Behavior: Regression Models from the 2012 U.S. Presidential Election. *Analyses
of Social Issue and Public Policy, 15*, 213-232.

Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and Conservatives Rely on
Different Moral Foundations. *Personality Processes and Individual Differences,
96*, 1029-1046.

Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., Ditto, P. (2011). Mapping the

Moral Domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*, 366-385.

Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., & Dowling, C. M. (2012). Personality and the

Strength and Direction of Partisan Identification. *Political Behavior*, *34*, 653-688.

Henry, P. J. & Sears, D. O. (2002). The Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale. *Political*

Psychology, 23, 253-283.

Ho, A. K., Sidanius, J., Kteily, N., Sheehy-Skeffington, J, Pratto, F., Henkel, K. E., Foels,

R., & Stewart, A. L. (2015). The nature of social dominance orientation:

Theorizing and measuring preferences for intergroup inequality using the new

SDO7 scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 109*, 1003-1028.

Jonason, P. K. (2014). Personality and politics. *Personality and Individual Differences,*

71, 181-184.

Low, M., & Wui, M. G. L. (2015). Moral Foundations and Attitudes Towards the Poor.

Current Psychiatry, 35, 650-656.

Nicol, A. A. M. & De France, K. (2016). The Big Five's relation with the facets of Right-

Wing Authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientation. *Personality and*

Individual Differences, 98, 320-323.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social Dominance

Orientation: A Personality Variable Predicting Social and Political Attitudes.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67, 741-763.

Reysen, S., Puryear, C., Katzarska-Miller, I., Kamble, S. V., & Vithoji, N. (2014). Socio-

structural intergroup characteristics and group-based emotions in three countries.

International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 43, 239-252.

Shaffer, B. & Duckitt, J. (2013). The dimensional structure of people's fears, threats, and

    concern and their relationship with right-wing authoritarianism and social

    dominance orientation. *International Journal of Psychology, 48*, 6-17.

van Leeuwen, F., Koenig, B. L., Graham, J., & Park, J. H. (2013). Moral concerns across

    the United States: associations with life-history variables, pathogen prevalence,

    urbanization, cognitive ability, and social class. *Evolution and Human Behavior,*

    35, 464-471.

van Leeuwen, F. & Park, J. H. (2008). Perceptions of social dangers, moral foundations,

    and political orientation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 47,* 169-173.

Appendix A

1. How old are you? ___

2. With which race do you most strongly identify? ___

3. What is your gender?

    - Female

    - Male

    - Prefer not to say

    - Non-binary

4. With which income bracket do you most strongly identify?

    - Lower class

    - Lower middle class

    - Middle Class

    - Upper Middle Class

    - Upper class

Appendix B

Political Items from CNN Exit Polls 2016

1. Did you vote in the 2016 Presidential Election?
    - Yes
    - No
2. Who did you vote for in the 2016 Presidential Election?
    - Hillary Clinton
    - Donald Trump
    - Other
    - Didn't vote
3. Did you vote in the 2012 Presidential Election?
    - Yes
    - No
4. Who did you vote for in the 2012 Presidential Election?
    - Barack Obama
    - Mitt Romney
    - Other
    - Didn't vote
5. Did you vote in the 2008 Presidential Election?
    - Yes
    - No
6. Who did you vote for in the 2008 Presidential Election?
    - Barack Obama
    - John McCain
    - Other
    - Didn't vote
7. Do you typically identify as a Democrat, Republican, or neither?
    - Democrat
    - Republican
    - Neither
8. What is your opinion of Donald Trump?
    - Favorable
    - Unfavorable
9. What is your opinion of Hillary Clinton?
    - Favorable
    - Unfavorable
10. Was Hillary Clinton qualified to serve as president?
    - Yes
    - No
11. Is Donald Trump qualified to serve as president?
    - Yes
    - No
12. Which candidate quality mattered the most to you when voting?
    - Cares about me
    - Can bring change
    - Right experience

- Good judgment

13. Does Donald Trump have the temperament to be president?
    - Yes
    - No

14. Does Hillary Clinton have the temperament to be president?
    - Yes
    - No

15. Does Donald Trump's treatment of women bother you?
    - Yes
    - No

16. Does the country's criminal justice system…?
    - Treat all fairly
    - Treat blacks unfairly

17. What is your opinion of the government?
    - The government should do more
    - The government should do less

18. Were you born a US citizen?
    - Yes
    - No

19. Are you a born-again or Evangelical Christian?
    - Yes
    - No

20. With what religion do you identify?
    - Protestant
    - Catholic
    - Mormon
    - Other Christian
    - Jewish
    - Muslim
    - Other religion

21. What is your race?
    - White
    - Black
    - Hispanic or Latino
    - Asian/Pacific Islander
    - Native American
    - Other

22. Illegal immigrants working in the US should be…
    - Offered legal status
    - Deported to home country

Appendix C

Social and Economic Conservatism Scale

Please indicate the extent to which you feel positive or negative towards each issue by writing a number between 0 and 100. Scores of 0 indicate greater negativity, and scores of 100 indicate greater positivity. Scores of 50 indicate that you feel neutral about the issue.

1. Abortion
2. Limited government
3. Military and national security
4. Religion
5. Welfare benefits
6. Gun ownership
7. Traditional marriage
8. Traditional values
9. Fiscal responsibility
10. Business
11. The family unit
12. Patriotism
13. Immigration
14. Taxes

Appendix D

Moral Foundations Questionnaire

Part 1. When you decide whether something is right or wrong, to what extent are the following considerations relevant to your thinking? Please rate each statement using this scale:

[0] = not at all relevant (This consideration has nothing to do with my judgments of right and wrong)
    [1] = not very relevant
      [2] = slightly relevant
        [3] = somewhat relevant
         [4] = very relevant
           [5] = extremely relevant (This is one of the most important factors when I judge right and wrong)

_____1. Whether or not someone suffered emotionally
_____2. Whether or not some people were treated differently than others
_____3. Whether or not someone's action showed love for his or her country
_____4. Whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for authority
_____5. Whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency
_____6. Whether or not someone was good at math
_____7. Whether or not someone cared for someone weak or vulnerable
_____8. Whether or not someone acted unfairly
_____9. Whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group
_____10. Whether or not someone conformed to the traditions of society
_____11. Whether or not someone did something disgusting
_____12. Whether or not someone was cruel
_____13. Whether or not someone was denied his or her rights
_____14. Whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty
_____15. Whether or not an action caused chaos or disorder
_____16. Whether or not someone acted in a way that God would approve of

Part 2. Please read the following sentences and indicate your agreement or disagreement:

[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

_____17. Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue.
_____18. When the government makes laws, the number one principle should be ensuring that everyone is treated fairly.
_____19. I am proud of my country's history.
_____20. Respect for authority is something all children need to learn.
_____21. People should not do things that are disgusting, even if no one is harmed.

_____22. It is better to do good than to do bad.

_____23. One of the worst things a person could do is hurt a defenseless animal.

_____24. Justice is the most important requirement for a society.

_____25. People should be loyal to their family members, even when they have done something wrong.

_____26. Men and women each have different roles to play in society.

_____27. I would call some acts wrong on the grounds that they are unnatural.

_____28. It can never be right to kill a human being.

_____29. I think it's morally wrong that rich children inherit a lot of money while poor children inherit nothing.

_____30. It is more important to be a team player than to express oneself.

_____31. If I were a soldier and disagreed with my commanding officer's orders, I would obey anyway because that is my duty.

_____32. Chastity is an important and valuable virtue.

Appendix E

Leadership Perception Scale for Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton

Instructions: The following items concern your perceptions of another person's behavior. Circle responses to indicate how well each item describes the person you are rating.

Key: 1 = Not at all   2 = Barely   3 = Somewhat   4 = Well

1. Puts his or her personal interests ahead of the organization
2. Would risk other people to protect himself or herself in work matter
3. Deliberately fuels conflict between other people
4. Would deliberately exaggerate people's mistakes to make them look bad to others
5. Would treat some people better if they were of the other sex or belonged to a different ethnic group
6. Can be trusted with confidential information
7. Is not interested in tasks that don't bring personal glory or recognition
8. Would allow someone else to be blamed for his or her mistake
9. Would make trouble for someone who got on his or her bad side
10. Would deliberately distort what other people say
11. Would try to take credit for other people's ideas
12. Likes to bend the rules
13. Would spread rumors or gossip to try to hurt people or the organization
14. Shows unfair favoritism toward some people
15. Has high moral standards

Appendix F

BFAS

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not describe you. For example, do you agree that you seldom feel blue, compared to most other people? Please fill in the number that best indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement listed below. Be as honest as possible, but rely on your initial feeling and do not think too much about each item.

Use the following scale:

1 - - - - - - - - 2 - - - - - - - - - 3 - - - - - - - - - 4 - - - - - - - 5
Strongly   **Neither Agree**   **Strongly**
Disagree   **Nor Disagree**   **Agree**

1. ___ Seldom feel blue.

2. ___ Am not interested in other people's problems.

3. ___ Carry out my plans.

4. ___ Make friends easily.

5. ___ Am quick to understand things.

6. ___ Get angry easily.

7. ___ Respect authority.

8. ___ Leave my belongings around.

9. ___ Take charge.

10. ___ Enjoy the beauty of nature.

11. ___ Am filled with doubts about things.

12. ___ Feel others' emotions.

13. ___ Waste my time.

14. ___ Am hard to get to know.

15. ___ Have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.

16. ___ Rarely get irritated.

17. ___ Believe that I am better than others.

18. ___ Like order.

19. ___ Have a strong personality.

20. ___ Believe in the importance of art.

21. ___ Feel comfortable with myself.

22. ___ Inquire about others' well-being.

23. ___ Find it difficult to get down to work.

24. ___ Keep others at a distance.

25. ___ Can handle a lot of information.

26. ___ Get upset easily.

27. ___ Hate to seem pushy.

28. ___ Keep things tidy.

29. ___ Lack the talent for influencing people.

30. ___ Love to reflect on things.

31. ___ Feel threatened easily.

32. ___ Can't be bothered with other's needs.

33. ___ Mess things up.

34. ___ Reveal little about myself.

35. ___ Like to solve complex problems.

36. ___ Keep my emotions under control.

37. ___ Take advantage of others.

38. ___ Follow a schedule.

39. ___ Know how to captivate people.

40. ___ Get deeply immersed in music.

41. ___ Rarely feel depressed.

42. ___ Sympathize with others' feelings.

43. ___ Finish what I start.

44. ___ Warm up quickly to others.

45. ___ Avoid philosophical discussions.

46. ___ Change my mood a lot.

47. ___ Avoid imposing my will on others.

48. ___ Am not bothered by messy people.

49. ___ Wait for others to lead the way.

50. ___ Do not like poetry.

51. ___ Worry about things.

52. ___ Am indifferent to the feelings of others.

53. ___ Don't put my mind on the task at hand.

54. ___ Rarely get caught up in the excitement.

55. ___ Avoid difficult reading material.

56. ___ Rarely lose my composure.

57. ___ Rarely put people under pressure.

58. ___ Want everything to be "just right."

59. ___ See myself as a good leader.

60. ___ Seldom notice the emotional aspects of paintings and pictures.

61. ___ Am easily discouraged.

62. ___ Take no time for others.

63. ___ Get things done quickly.

64. ___ Am not a very enthusiastic person.

65. ___ Have a rich vocabulary.

66. ___ Am a person whose moods go up and down easily.

67. ___ Insult people.

68. ___ Am not bothered by disorder.

69. ___ Can talk others into doing things.

70. ___ Need a creative outlet.

71. ___ Am not embarrassed easily.

72. ___ Take an interest in other people's lives.

73. ___ Always know what I am doing.

74. ___ Show my feelings when I'm happy.

75. ___ Think quickly.

76. ___ Am not easily annoyed.

77. ___ Seek conflict.

78. ___ Dislike routine.

79. ___ Hold back my opinions.

80. ___ Seldom get lost in thought.

81. ___ Become overwhelmed by events.

82. ___ Don't have a soft side.

83. ___ Postpone decisions.

84. ___ Have a lot of fun.

85. ___ Learn things slowly.

86. ___ Get easily agitated.

87. ___ Love a good fight.

88. ___ See that rules are observed.

89. ___ Am the first to act.

90. ___ Seldom daydream.

91. ___ Am afraid of many things.

92. ___ Like to do things for others.

93. ___ Am easily distracted.

94. ___ Laugh a lot.

95. ___ Formulate ideas clearly.

96. ___ Can be stirred up easily.

97. ___ Am out for my own personal gain.

98. ___ Want every detail taken care of.

99. ___ Do not have an assertive personality.

100. ___ See beauty in things that others might not notice

Appendix G

Instructions: Show how much you favor or oppose each idea below by selecting a number from 1 to 7 on the scale below. You can work quickly; your first feeling is generally best.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Oppose, Somewhat Oppose, Slightly Oppose, Neutral, Slightly Favor, Somewhat Favor, Strongly Favor

Pro-trait dominance:
1. Some groups of people must be kept in their place.
2. It's probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom. 3. An ideal society requires some groups to be on top and others to be on the bottom.
4. Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.

Con-trait dominance:
5. Groups at the bottom are just as deserving as groups at the top.
6. No one group should dominate in society.
7. Groups at the bottom should not have to stay in their place.
8. Group dominance is a poor principle.

Pro-trait anti-egalitarianism:
9. We should not push for group equality.
10. We shouldn't try to guarantee that every group has the same quality of life.
11. It is unjust to try to make groups equal.
12. Group equality should not be our primary goal.

Con-trait anti-egalitarianism:
13. We should work to give all groups an equal chance to succeed.
14. We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.
15. No matter how much effort it takes, we ought to strive to ensure that all groups have the same chance in life.
16. Group equality should be our ideal.

Appendix H

Show how much you disagree or agree with the following statements, 1 meaning you strongly disagree with the statement and 7 meaning you strongly agree with the statement.

Conservatism (Authoritarian Submission)

1. It's great that so many young people today are prepared to defy authority (R).
2. What our country needs most is discipline, with everyone following our leaders in unity.
3. Students at high schools and at university must be encouraged to challenge, criticize, and confront established authorities (R).
4. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
5. Our country will be great if we show respect for authority and obey our leaders.
6. People should be ready to protest against and challenge laws they don't agree with (R).
7. People should be allowed to make speeches and write books urging the overthrow of the government (R).
8. The more people there are that are prepared to criticize the authorities, challenge and protest against the government, the better it is for society (R).
9. People should stop teaching children to obey authority (R).
10. The real keys to the "good life" are respect for authority and obedience to those who are in charge.
11. The authorities should be obeyed because they are in the best position to know what is good for our country.
12. Our leaders should be obeyed without question.

Traditionalism

1. Nobody should stick to the "straight and narrow." Instead people should break loose and try out lots of different ideas and experiences (R).
2. The "old-fashioned ways" and "old-fashioned values" still show the best way to live.
3. God's laws about abortion, pornography, and marriage must be strictly followed before it's too late.
4. There is absolutely nothing wrong with nudist camps (R).
5. This country will flourish if young people stop experimenting with drugs, alcohol, and sex, and pay more attention to family values.
6. There is nothing wrong with premarital sexual intercourse (R).
7. Traditional values, customs, and morality have a lot wrong with them (R).
8. Everyone should have their own lifestyle, religious beliefs, and sexual preferences, even if it makes them different from everyone else (R).
9. The radical and sinful ways of living and behaving of many young people may one day destroy our society.
10. Trashy magazines and radical literature in our communities are poisoning the minds of our young people.
11. It is important that we preserve our traditional values and moral standards.
12. People should pay less attention to the bible and the other old-fashioned forms of religious guidance, and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral (R).

Authoritarianism (Authoritarian Aggression)

1. Strong, tough government will harm not help our country (R).

2. Being kind to loafers or criminals will only encourage them to take advantage of your weakness, so it's best to use a firm, tough hand when dealing with them.
3. Our society does NOT need tougher government and stricter laws (R).
4. The facts of crime and the recent public disorders show we have to crack down harder on troublemakers, if we are going to preserve law and order.
5. Our prisons are a shocking disgrace. Criminals are unfortunate people who deserve much better care, instead of so much punishment (R).
6. The way things are going in this country, it's going to take a lot of "strong medicine" to straighten out the troublemakers, criminals, and perverts.
7. We should smash all the negative elements that are causing trouble in our society.
8. The situation in our country is getting so serious, the strongest methods would be justified if they eliminated the troublemakers and got us back to our true path.
9. People who say our laws should be enforced more strictly and harshly are wrong. We need greater tolerance and more lenient treatment for lawbreakers (R).
10. The courts are right in being easy on drug offenders. Punishment would not do any good in cases like these (R).
11. What our country really needs is a tough, harsh dose of law and order.
12. Capital punishment is barbaric and never justified (R).

Appendix I

Intercorrelations of Social Dominance Orientation and Right Wing

Authoritarianism

		SDOdominance	SDOantiegal	RWAauthsubmi	RWAtradition	RWAauthaggr
SDOdominance	Pearson Correlation	1	.794**	.343**	.404**	.409**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0	0	0	0
	N	238	238	238	238	238
SDOantiegal	Pearson Correlation	.794**	1	.350**	.427**	.380**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0		0	0	0
	N	238	238	238	238	238
RWAauthsubmi	Pearson Correlation	.343**	.350**	1	.776**	.820**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0		0	0
	N	238	238	238	238	238
RWAtradition	Pearson Correlation	.404**	.427**	.776**	1	.741**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0	0		0
	N	238	238	238	238	238
RWAauthaggr	Pearson Correlation	.409**	.380**	.820**	.741**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0	0	0	
	N	238	238	238	238	238

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Appendix J

Intercorrelations Among the Big Five Aspect Scales

		WITHDRWL	VOLATILITY	ENTHUSIASM	ASSERTIVENESS	INTELLECT	OPENNESS	COMPASSION	POLITENESS	INDUSTRIOUS	ORDERLINESS
WITHDRWL	Pearson Correlation	1	.718**	-.463**	-.426**	-.481**	0.058	-.152*	-.158*	-.658**	0.006
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0	0	0	0	0.371	0.019	0.014	0	0.93
	N	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238
VOLATILITY	Pearson Correlation	.718**	1	-.322**	-.165*	-.419**	0.006	-.174**	-.368**	-.497**	0.007
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0		0	0.011	0	0.928	0.007	0	0	0.915
	N	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238
ENTHUSIASM	Pearson Correlation	-.463**	-.322**	1	.520**	.314**	.251**	.615**	.177**	.408**	.148*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0		0	0	0	0	0.006	0	0.022
	N	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238
ASSERTIVENE	Pearson Correlation	-.426**	-.165*	.520**	1	.507**	.290**	.335**	-.209**	.431**	.183**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0.011	0		0	0	0	0.001	0	0.005
	N	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238
INTELLECT	Pearson Correlation	-.481**	-.419**	.314**	.507**	1	.437**	.351**	.144*	.530**	0.067
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0	0	0		0	0	0.026	0	0.302
	N	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238
OPENNESS	Pearson Correlation	0.058	0.006	.251**	.290**	.437**	1	.542**	.162*	0.117	.156*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.371	0.928	0	0	0		0	0.012	0.071	0.016
	N	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238
COMPASSION	Pearson Correlation	-.152*	-.174**	.615**	.335**	.351**	.542**	1	.460**	.264**	0.09
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.019	0.007	0	0	0	0		0	0	0.169
	N	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238
POLITENESS	Pearson Correlation	-.158*	-.368**	.177**	-.209**	.144*	.162*	.460**	1	.303**	.134*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.014	0	0.006	0.001	0.026	0.012	0		0	0.039
	N	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238
INDUSTRIOUS	Pearson Correlation	-.658**	-.497**	.408**	.431**	.530**	0.117	.264**	.303**	1	.381**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0	0	0	0	0.071	0	0		0
	N	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238
ORDERLINESS	Pearson Correlation	0.006	0.007	.148*	.183**	0.067	.156*	0.09	.134*	.381**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.93	0.915	0.022	0.005	0.302	0.016	0.169	0.039	0	
	N	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238	238

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Appendix K

Intercorrelations Among the Moral Foundations

		HarmCare	FairnessReciprocity	InGroupLoyalty	AuthorityRespect	PuritySanctity
HarmCare	Pearson Correlation	1	.581**	.202**	.195**	.204**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0	0.002	0.002	0.002
	N	238	238	238	238	238
FairnessReciprocity	Pearson Correlation	.581**	1	0.06	0.011	-0.033
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0		0.355	0.866	0.609
	N	238	238	238	238	238
InGroupLoyalty	Pearson Correlation	.202**	0.06	1	.772**	.668**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.002	0.355		0	0
	N	238	238	238	238	238
AuthorityRespect	Pearson Correlation	.195**	0.011	.772**	1	.742**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.002	0.866	0		0
	N	238	238	238	238	238
PuritySanctity	Pearson Correlation	.204**	-0.033	.668**	.742**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.002	0.609	0	0	
	N	238	238	238	238	238

**Correlation is significant at .01 (2-tailed).

Appendix L

Intercorrelations Among Social Dominance Orientation Facets

		SDOdominance	SDOantiegal
SDOdominance	Pearson Correlation	1	.794**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0
	N	238	238
SDOantiegal	Pearson Correlation	.794**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	
	N	238	238

**Correlations significant at .01 level (2-tailed)

Intercorrelations Among Right Wing Authoritarian Traits

		RWAauthsubmi	RWAtradition	RWAauthaggr
RWAauthsubmi	Pearson Correlation	1	.776**	.820**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0	0
	N	238	238	238
RWAtradition	Pearson Correlation	.776**	1	.741**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0		0
	N	238	238	238
RWAauthaggr	Pearson Correlation	.820**	.741**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0	
	N	238	238	238

**Correlations significant at .01 level (2-tailed).

Appendix M

Intercorrelations Among Trump and Hillary Opinion Variables

		TrumpOpQualTemp	TrumpleadTOT	HllaryOpQualTemp	HillaryLeadTOT
TrumpOpQualTemp	Pearson Correlation	1	.482**	-.467**	-.428**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0	0	0
	N	238	238	238	238
TrumpleadTOT	Pearson Correlation	.482**	1	-.297**	-0.054
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0		0	0.403
	N	238	238	238	238
HllaryOpQualTemp	Pearson Correlation	-.467**	-.297**	1	.590**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0		0
	N	238	238	238	238
HillaryLeadTOT	Pearson Correlation	-.428**	-0.054	.590**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0.403	0	
	N	238	238	238	238

**Correlations significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Acknowledgements

I would like to first thank my sponsor, Scott Ross, for his continued support as I navigated somewhat difficult research. Your help and commitment to my project kept me going when I really wanted to give up. I also appreciate you helping me narrow down my focus; otherwise, this paper would have been 50 more pages.

 I next would like to thank Kevin Moore for teaching the class (Evolution and Human Behavior) that made me decide to stick with Honor Scholar and for also offering me so much guidance and assistance in finishing this project. Some of our discussions last year post-election really motivated me to research politics.

Last but not least, I'd like to thank Salil Benegal. I've gotten to work very closely with you this semester, since I'm also in two of your classes, and your continued encouragement and advice about the project and the rest of my crazy academics this semester have been greatly appreciated.

I'd also like to thank the Honor Scholar Program for a great four years. Some of my favorite courses have been through the program, and I had a lot of fun venturing outside of my academic comfort zone. I'll always wish I would have had more time to polish my research and run more analyses on my data for this project, but I'm so grateful for the research this program has allowed me to conduct.

Thank you all!