Introduction

At a time when social unrest and political turmoil have reached an apex in the global landscape, it has become more important than ever to elect leaders into the upper echelon of government whom we trust and revere. This poster juxtaposes four different theoretical perspectives in the context of the recent American presidential election to see which of them are best supported by the data.

Social Perspective:
- Hypothesis: Trump voters were more likely to be in echo-chambers than other voters.
- Results: Using “Blaub’s Index of Heterogeneity”, Trump voters were not different from other voters in terms of their echo-chambers.
  - Blaub’s Index Education Mean = 44.36%
  - Blaub’s Index Religious Mean = 7.03%
  - Blaub’s Index Guns Mean = 16.56%

Leadership Perspective:
- People have a specific conception of what constitutes effective leadership and they use this heuristic to determine whether a political candidate is worthy of their support, or lack thereof.
- Hypothesis & Results: Respondents who viewed intelligence, masculinity, and tyranny as important leadership traits were more likely to vote for Trump.
  - Intelligence: (-.160) @ .05*
  - Masculinity: (+.291) @ .01**
  - Tyranny: (+.326) @ .01**

Media Perspective:
- The media is one such forum through which individuals are influenced by the information they are provided about certain candidates that could impact their political affiliations.
- Hypothesis & Results: Respondents who binge-watched Netflix, reality television, and/or Fox News, or the lack thereof, were not found to be statistically significant in their pro-Trump voting behaviors. Although:
  - Fox News: (-.398) @ .01**
  - Netflix: (+.259) @ .01**

Discontent Perspective:
- Hypothesis: Past negative experiences with certain political sector segments has proven to be the impetus for a wave of disgruntlement and anti-establishment in constituents.
- Results: Past traumatic job experiences (e.g., layoffs) did not predict voting for Trump.
- Final MTurk respondent sample of N=156 was taken two weeks before election.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I found that the statistically significant predictor was the leadership perspective of voting behavior where I analyzed respondents’ implicit leadership preferences to deduce what traits they deemed fit in an ideal leader; Donald J. Trump in this study. The ILT subscale trait of “tyranny” was the most significant with a p-value of .001. This evidence leads me to conclude, in our sample, respondents voted for candidates who were considered as strong leaders.

Also, I found that respondents who binge-watched Netflix were more likely to vote for Trump. On the other hand, those who binge-watched Fox News were less likely to vote for Trump. However, neither correlation was found to be statistically significant after running a binary logistic regression analysis.
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