

2018

Personality Traits, Political Ideology, and Candidate Preference in the Deep South

Cameron D. Mackey

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, kyf164@mocs.utc.edu

Heidi L. Dempsey

Jacksonville State University, hdempsey@jsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.utc.edu/mps>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mackey, Cameron D. and Dempsey, Heidi L. (2018) "Personality Traits, Political Ideology, and Candidate Preference in the Deep South," *Modern Psychological Studies*: Vol. 23 : No. 2 , Article 7.

Available at: <https://scholar.utc.edu/mps/vol23/iss2/7>

This articles is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals, Magazines, and Newsletters at UTC Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Modern Psychological Studies by an authorized editor of UTC Scholar. For more information, please contact scholar@utc.edu.

Abstract

Previous studies have shown that disgust sensitivity (DS), right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), religious fundamentalism (RF), and belief in a just world (BJW) are associated with social conservatism and religious questioning (QUEST) is associated with social liberalism. The current study was designed determine whether these personality traits would predict who the student planned to vote for in the 2016 U.S. Presidential primary. Consistent with previous research, DS, RWA, RF, and BJW were positively correlated with social conservatism and QUEST was negatively correlated. Students who were highest on RWA, RF, and lowest on QUEST were most likely to vote for one of the Republican candidates. In contrast, students who were at the opposite end of the scales were most likely to vote for Bernie Sanders, with Hillary Clinton supporters in the middle. There were no differences in DS and few differences in BJW with regard to preferred candidate.

Keywords: polarization, ideology, liberal, conservative, politics, right-wing authoritarianism, disgust sensitivity, religious fundamentalism, quest, belief in a just world

Personality Traits, Political Ideology, and Candidate Preference in the Deep South

Leading up to and following the election of Donald Trump to the Presidency of the United States in 2016, researchers in political psychology, moral psychology, social psychology, and emotion have attempted to assess what factors predicted Trump's popularity with the U.S. constituents. The goal of the current study was to examine a group of students in the Deep South to see how the personality constructs of disgust sensitivity, right-wing authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, and quest predicted candidate preferences in the 2016 U.S. Presidential primary and students' likely voting patterns for the 2016 U.S. Presidential election.

Disgust Sensitivity

The emotion of disgust stems from an evolutionary need to avoid things which are contaminated and disease-ridden and is thus generally characterized as a universal basic emotion (Rozin, Haidt, & McCauley, 2008). Through this evolutionary process, disgust acquired some unique properties, such as once a disgusting object has touched a "clean" object, that clean object is perceived as contaminated (Rozin, Haidt, & McCauley, 2009). Further, clean objects which look similar to disgusting objects are perceived as disgusting (e.g., chocolate shaped like dog poop) (Rozin et al., 2008). In fact, "anything that reminds us that we are animals elicits disgust" (Rozin et al., 2008, p. 761). These core disgust properties are thought to cross into the moral domain when they become part of a behavioral immune system which informs individuals that certain outgroup members are repulsive and disgusting (Hodson et al., 2013; Rozin, Haidt, & Fincher, 2009; Terrizzi, Shook, & McDaniel, 2013). According to Hodson et al. (2013), "This can result from reactions to outgroup practices and/or beliefs, including (but not limited to) core disgust (e.g., ingesting their prepared foods), sex disgust (e.g., physical intimacy, exchanging bodily fluids), values (e.g., child-rearing) or disease-based contamination (e.g., they make us ill)"

(p. 196). For example, President Nixon in May 1971 was recorded in the White House saying, “They [Mexicans] don't live like a bunch of dogs, which the Negroes do live like.” In the same month, President Nixon also stated, “You see: homosexuality, dope, immorality in general—these are the enemies of strong societies. That's why the communists and the left-wingers are pushing the stuff; they're trying to destroy us” (quoted in Braiker, 2004). More recently, Presidential candidate Donald Trump issued a statement on July 6, 2015 stating, “The Mexican Government is forcing their most unwanted people into the United States. They are, in many cases, criminals, drug dealers, rapists, etc....Likewise, tremendous infectious disease is pouring across the border” (quoted in Walker, 2015). These kinds of statements by politicians are meant to elicit disgust responses in their listeners by pairing outgroup members with behaviors and people that are seen as unclean or unsafe (Shook, Ford, & Boggs, 2017).

Research on individual differences in disgust sensitivity has consistently shown that political conservatives are higher on disgust sensitivity (easier to disgust) than political liberals (Inbar, Pizarro, & Bloom, 2009; Shook, Oosterhoff, Terrizzi, & Brady, 2017; Terrizzi et al., 2013). Inducing disgust also made conservative participants more prejudiced against homosexuals while the same manipulation reduced prejudice for liberal participants (Terrizzi, Shook, & Ventis, 2010). In a similar vein, Graham, Haidt, and Nosek (2009) showed that conservatives were more likely than liberals to value the moral foundation of purity/sacredness which suggests that things which are seen as unclean are also likely to be perceived as immoral (see also Koleva, Graham, Iyer, Ditto, & Haidt, 2012). Disgust sensitivity has also been shown to predict liking of groups which uphold traditional sexual values (e.g., Evangelical Christians, pro-life activists) and disliking of groups which challenge traditional sexual values (e.g., feminists, lesbians), regardless of political orientation (Crawford, Inbar, & Maloney, 2014).

Inbar, Pizarro, Iyer, and Haidt (2012) further found that disgust sensitivity levels predicted intentions to vote for John McCain (Republican candidate) or Barack Obama (Democrat candidate) in the 2008 U.S. Presidential election; namely, those who planned to vote for McCain had higher levels of disgust sensitivity compared to those who planned to vote for Obama. Likewise, in the 2012 U.S. Presidential election, “greater disgust sensitivity was significantly associated with lower intention to vote for Obama versus Romney and lower likelihood of actually voting for Obama” (Shook, Oosterhoff, et al., 2017, p. 284). Shook, Ford, et al. (2017) provided experimental evidence that the link between disgust sensitivity and social conservatism was mediated by a dangerous worldview. Consistent with this, even the subtlest disgust-related manipulations, such as reminding a person about the importance of cleanliness, has caused research participants to espouse more conservative viewpoints, regardless of political party (Helzer & Pizarro, 2011).

Right-wing Authoritarianism

The concept of right-wing authoritarianism emerged following WWII with the publication of *The Authoritarian Personality* (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950) as a method of understanding why certain individuals in the populace were drawn to fascist leaders such as Hitler, Franco, and Mussolini. This concept once again gained popularity in the late 20th century as Altemeyer (1988, 1996) began to study what was driving the conservative right in U.S. politics to become more and more extreme. Altemeyer (1988) reconceptualized the original authoritarian personality away from a psychoanalytically-based concept into a personality trait that is based on a social-cognitive framework. According to Altemeyer (2004), right-wing authoritarians “are (a) relatively submissive to those they consider the established authorities, (b) aggressive when they believe that authorities sanction the

aggression, and (c) conventional” (p. 426). More recently, right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) has been conceptualized as an ideological belief rather than a personality trait by some researchers (Duckitt, Bizumic, Krauss, & Heled, 2010).

Individuals who are high on RWA measures tend to be hostile and prejudiced toward minorities generally because they fear minority group members will bring about chaos and a disordered world (Altemeyer, 1988; Sibley & Duckitt, 2008). To this end, those high on RWA have been shown to be higher on beliefs relating to the world as a dangerous place and a high need for security (Jugert & Duckitt, 2009). RWA has also been linked to a fear of disease; therefore, those high on RWA also tend to be high on disgust sensitivity (Hodson & Costello, 2007). These individuals also espouse “old-fashioned” values and morality, as exemplified by a quote by U.S. Congressman Mike Pence regarding how to combat the AIDS epidemic in Africa: “The timeless values of abstinence and marital faithfulness before condom distribution are the cure for what ails the families of Africa. It is important that we not just send them money, but we must send them values that work” (Pence, 2003, p. H3574).

With regard to political orientation and RWA, Kimmelmeier (2004) found that those higher on measures of RWA were more likely to vote for Republican candidates. Likewise, Altemeyer (2006) found that Republican state legislators scored higher on RWA measures than Democrat state legislators. Regardless of whether one conceptualizes it as a personality trait or an ideological belief, authoritarianism has continued to be shown to be predictive of voting preferences. In a study similar in nature to our own, Choma and Hanoch (2017) gave questionnaires on right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation (SDO), cognitive ability, Trump attitudes, and voting intentions to primarily White, middle-aged Americans through Amazon Mechanical Turk during the U.S. Presidential Primary in 2016. They found:

Specifically, greater endorsement of RWA (the aspect of authoritarianism specific to obedience and respect of authorities and punishment of those who violate social conventions) and SDO (the aspect of authoritarianism specific to preferring hierarchical intergroup relations) uniquely predicted more positive evaluations of Trump and a greater desire to vote for him. Lower endorsement of RWA and SDO also uniquely led to intentions to vote for Clinton (Choma & Hanoch, 2017, p. 291).

MacWilliams (2016) found that authoritarianism predicted support for Trump as a presidential candidate, but Ludeke, Klitgaard, and Vitriol (2018) found that it was specifically the aggression facet of authoritarianism which most strongly predicted support for Donald Trump (and Ted Cruz).

Religious Fundamentalism and Quest

Allport (1954) noted that religion had a paradoxical relationship with prejudice—sometimes increasing people’s prejudices and sometimes decreasing people’s prejudices. Since then, many have attempted to differentiate which religiously-associated personality traits are associated with increased or decreased tolerance. One of the more promising lines of research appears to be the distinction between religious fundamentalism (RF) and quest (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). Religious fundamentalism has been defined as, “the belief that there is one set of religious teachings that clearly contain the fundamental, basic, intrinsic, essential, inerrant truth about humanity and deity...that this truth must be followed today according to the fundamental, unchangeable practices of the past” (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992, p. 118). Altemeyer (1996) documented such a strong and consistent relationship between RWA and RF that he suggested that “fundamentalism can therefore usually be viewed as a religious manifestation of right-wing authoritarianism” (p. 161). In contrast, quest has been defined as an

“open-ended, questioning approach to religion” (Batson, Eidelman, Higley, & Russell, 2001, p. 40) in which change is expected and part of growth, questions about one’s religion are valued, doubt and skepticism is allowed, and reason is encouraged over blind faith (Edwards, Hall, Slater, & Hill, 2011). Religious fundamentalism and quest have been found to be strongly negatively correlated with each other (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Edwards et al., 2011). With regard to politics, Antonenko Young, Willer, and Keltner (2013) showed that religious fundamentalism was positively correlated with political conservatism. We are aware of no studies to date which relate quest with political conservatism or liberalism.

Belief in a Just World

The construct of belief in a just world (BJW) was introduced by Lerner in the 1960s after a series of attribution experiments showed that participants connected people’s positive outcomes with their perceived worth (Lerner, 1965; Lerner & Miller, 1978). “People with BJW are motivated to believe in a world that is stable, orderly, and logical, one where good things happen to good people and bad things happen to bad people; we get what we deserve and we deserve what we get” (Strelan, 2007, p. 882). Research has shown that victim blaming restores a person’s belief in a just world after it has been challenged (Furnham, 2003). Dittmar and Dickinson (1993) found that those who tend to endorse a strong belief in a just world tend to endorse a conservative, right-wing ideology and support the status quo. “That is, if the world is just, the relative distributions of wealth in a society, social and political institutions, role divisions, financial and military arrangements, etc., must also be just and should therefore be maintained” (Dittmar & Dickinson, 1993, p. 260). However, there is also a line of research which shows that belief in a just world may be a healthy coping technique and related to forgiveness of interpersonal transgressions, particularly when it is focused on one’s own

relationship with the world, rather than others' relationships with the world (Furnham, 2003; Strelan, 2007; Strelan & Sutton, 2011).

Hypotheses

In sum, the previous research reviewed has shown strong evidence that there should be a relationship between RWA, RF, DS, and BJW and one's political orientation. Those highest on these measures should be the most conservative, especially on social conservative issues such as abortion, gay rights, feminism, and immigration. To that end, those highest on these measures should also endorse political candidates who are Republican, since this is the party which most strongly identifies as socially conservative. Although there is no research directly relating quest to political affiliation, since it has been shown to be inversely related to RF, one would predict that it also should be inversely related to RWA, DS, and BJW. Further, those highest on quest should endorse Democrat candidates since they espouse socially liberal values. Thus, the hypotheses in the current study are as follows:

Hypothesis 1: There will be a significant positive correlation between social conservatism, right-wing authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, belief in a just world, and disgust sensitivity.

Hypothesis 2: There will be a significant negative correlation between social conservatism and quest.

Hypothesis 3: Those who plan to vote for a Republican candidate in the U.S. Presidential primary will score significantly higher on right-wing authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, belief in a just world, and disgust sensitivity and significantly lower on quest than those who plan to vote for a Democrat candidate.

Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 318 participants: 108 males (35.5%), 196 females (64.5%), and 14 who did not provide demographic information. Of the participants who provided demographic information, the majority were White ($n = 218$; 71.7%), with the next largest group being African-American ($n = 63$; 20.7%). There were fewer than 10 participants in the remaining racial categories (Hispanic, Asian, Pacific Islander, Bi-racial or Multi-racial, and other). Most students self-identified as Republican ($n = 113$; 37.8%) or as Democrats ($n = 87$; 27.4%). The remainder of students were independent ($n = 49$; 16.4%), Libertarian ($n = 20$; 6.7%), Tea Party ($n = 4$; 1.3%), or other ($n = 26$; 8.7%). About half were freshmen ($n = 143$; 47%); 61 were sophomores (20.1%); 34 were juniors (11.2%); and 66 were seniors (21.7%). All participants were recruited from introductory and advanced psychology classes and an introductory sociology class in a regional university in Alabama. They completed the online survey in exchange for course credit between February 22, 2016, and March 1, 2016, before the “Super Tuesday” U.S. Presidential primary, of which Alabama and Georgia were participants. Although not asked about state of residence, the university demographics are such that 81% of the university students are Alabama residents and 12% are Georgia residents.

Survey

We used SurveyMonkey to create an online survey which consisted of questionnaires measuring disgust sensitivity, right-wing authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, and quest.

Disgust sensitivity was measured using the 8-item short form of the Disgust Sensitivity Scale (Inbar et al., 2009). This measure consisted of two sections. In the first section students indicated the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with disgust statements on a 4-point Likert scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” (e.g., “If I see someone vomit, it makes

me sick to my stomach”). In the second section, students rated on a 4-point Likert scale the degree to which they found each statement disgusting from “not disgusting at all” to “very disgusting” (e.g., “You see a bowel movement left unflushed in a public toilet). Students’ mean ratings ranged from 1.00 to 4.00 with a mean sample rating of 2.85 ($SD = 0.60$), with the internal consistency reliability estimate of $\alpha = .75$ for the questionnaire.

To measure RWA, we chose the 22-item version of the Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale (Altemeyer, 2006). Participants rated each item on a 9-point Likert scale from “very strongly disagree” to “very strongly agree” with a “neutral” midpoint. Items included topics relating to strong leadership, hostility toward outgroup members and dissenters, and “traditional values” (e.g., “The only way our country can get through the crisis ahead is to get back to our traditional values, put some tough leaders in power, and silence the troublemakers spreading bad ideas” and “Our country will be destroyed someday if we do not smash the perversions eating away at our moral fiber and traditional beliefs”). Students’ mean ratings ranged from 1.00 to 8.70 with a mean sample rating of 4.67 ($SD = 1.62$), with the internal consistency reliability estimate of $\alpha = .94$ for the questionnaire.

Altemeyer & Hunsberger’s (2004) 12-item Religious Fundamentalism Scale was used to assess people’s belief in the unerring authority of their religion and religious texts. Identical in structure to the RWA scale, participants rated each item on a 9-point Likert scale from “very strongly disagree” to “very strongly agree” with a “neutral” midpoint. Items on the RF scale included “God has given humanity a complete, unfailing guide to happiness and salvation, which must be totally followed” and “To lead the best, most meaningful life, one must belong to the one, fundamentally true religion.” Students’ mean ratings ranged from 1.00 to 9.00 with a mean

rating for this sample of 5.51 ($SD = 2.16$), with the internal consistency reliability estimate of $\alpha = .93$ for the questionnaire.

People's openness to questioning their religious beliefs was assessed using the 16-item QUEST Scale (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). These items were also scored on the same 9-point Likert scale as the RWA and RF scales. Items focused on reasoning about faith, the expectancy of change, and the value of religious skepticism (e.g., "My religious beliefs may change in the future as I mature and learn" and "The real goal of religion ought to be to make us wonder, think, and search, NOT take the word of some earlier teachings"). Students' mean ratings on this scale ranged from 1.00 to 9.00 with a mean sample rating of 4.61 ($SD = 1.60$), with the internal consistency reliability estimate of $\alpha = .91$ for the questionnaire.

Belief in a just world was measured using the Revised Belief in a Just World Scale in which participants indicated the extent to which they personally agreed or disagreed with six statements (Rubin & Peplau, 1975). These statements (e.g., "I believe that, by and large, people get what they deserve") were rated on a 6-point Likert scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." Students' mean ratings on this scale ranged from 1.00 to 6.00 with a mean sample rating of 3.81 ($SD = 0.93$), with the internal consistency reliability estimate of $\alpha = .79$ for the questionnaire.

Students also reported whom they planned to vote for in the upcoming presidential primary (or whether they did not plan to vote), which party they planned to vote for in the U.S. Presidential election in November, how interested they were in politics, and which political party they affiliated with (or none). Students also self-reported how liberal or conservative they saw themselves to be overall, on economic issues (such as taxes, government regulations), and on social issues (such as abortion, gay marriage, death penalty) on a 7-point scale ranging from

“very liberal” to “very conservative” with a midpoint of “moderate/middle-of-the-road.” Finally, students were asked the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with a variety of political issues (e.g., gun control), although these data will not be analyzed in the present paper.

Results

Consistent with Hypothesis 1, there was a significant positive correlation between social conservatism (SC), right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), religious fundamentalism (RF), belief in a just world (BJW) and disgust sensitivity (DS) (see Table 1). Consistent with Hypothesis 2, there was a significant negative correlation between social conservatism and quest. The strongest predictors of social conservatism were RWA, followed by RF, QUEST (negative), with BJW showing a moderate relationship and DS showing a small relationship. To further investigate whether any predictors added unique variance beyond RWA, we conducted a stepwise linear regression analysis with each of these five variables as predictors of social conservatism. None of the variables beyond RWA explained a significant proportion of variance in social conservatism scores.

To investigate whether students who planned to vote for Democrat or Republican Presidential candidates in the U.S. Primary differed in their personality traits and ideology (Hypothesis 3), we conducted a multivariate ANOVA. Tests of between-subjects effects indicated that contrary to expectations, there were no differences in DS based on candidate choice, $F(5, 203) = 1.16, p = .33, \eta_p^2 = .03$. However, consistent with our hypothesis, there were differences in RWA based on candidate choice, $F(5, 203) = 27.85, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .40$. As shown in Table 2, those who planned to vote for Bernie Sanders were significantly lower in RWA than those who planned to vote for Hillary Clinton. In turn, those who planned to vote for Clinton were significantly lower than those who planned to vote for any of the Republican

candidates. Also consistent with our hypothesis, there was a significant effect of RF on candidate choice, $F(5, 203) = 17.96, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .30$. Those who planned to vote for Sanders were significantly lower on RF than those who planned to vote for Clinton or the Republican candidates. Contrary to expectations, those who planned to vote for Clinton were not significantly different on RF than those who planned to vote for Ben Carson or Trump. However, they were significantly lower than those who planned to vote for Ted Cruz or Marco Rubio. Consistent with our hypothesis, there was also a significant main effect of BJW, $F(5, 203) = 3.05, p = .01, \eta_p^2 = .07$; however the pattern of results were not consistent with expectations. Those who planned to vote for Sanders were significantly lower on BJW than those who planned to vote for Carson, Cruz, or Trump. But, Sanders voters did not differ from Clinton or Rubio voters on BJW. Further, Clinton voters did not differ on BJW compared to any students who planned to vote for a Republican candidate. Finally, with regard to QUEST, consistent with our hypotheses, there was a significant main effect, $F(5, 203) = 12.04, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .22$. Those who planned to vote for Sanders were significantly higher on QUEST than those who planned to vote for Clinton, who, in turn, were significantly higher than any who planned to vote for a Republican candidate.

Discussion

These findings present a very telling look into the polarization seen in American politics today. In this study, we looked at college students in a regional university in Alabama in order to ascertain whether personality and ideological variables predicted how students planned to vote in the 2016 U.S. Presidential primary. We found that those who planned to vote for Bernie Sanders differed significantly from both Republican candidate voters—which we expected—and Hillary Clinton voters—which we did not expect. Clinton voters in our sample scored higher on right-

wing authoritarianism (RWA) and religious fundamentalism (RF) than Sanders voters; Sanders voters scored higher on religious quest. Clinton voters were lower on RWA and higher on quest than voters for Republican candidates, but Clinton voters had similar scores on belief in a just world (BJW) and RF to some of the Republican candidate voters. This suggests that Clinton voters are not as different in their personalities and ideology from the Republican voters, especially compared to how distinct Sanders voters are. It also provides some of the first evidence for the use of the quest construct in predicting political candidate preferences.

This finding may be because the American South is far more conservative than the rest of the United States (Valentino & Sears, 2005). Therefore, Southern liberals are likely to be far less liberal than the rest of the United States, even if they believe they are more liberal than the average person (Feinberg, Tullett, Mensch, Hart, & Gottlieb, 2017). That is, when a person is surrounded by conservatives, any idea that is a deviation from the norm may seem more liberal than it is in reality.

Further, although Clinton was more liberal than many of the other candidates who ran in the 2008 and 2016 Democratic elections, she was not rated as more liberal than Barak Obama (who won the 2008 election), nor Sanders (Willis, 2015). For example, Breier (2015) ran analyses on Clinton's voting records during the 110th and 113th Congresses by using the DW-NOMINATE statistical system as a base and concluded that she was the 11th most liberal member of Congress, while Sanders was ranked as the most liberal member. Thus, if one can truly predict social conservatism from measures such as RWA, RF, and QUEST, it makes sense that Sanders supporters would have the most extreme scores on these measures, given that Sanders is the most liberal candidate. However, it was surprising that these differences did not carry over into other predicted domains such as disgust sensitivity and belief in a just world.

On the Republican side, the differences between candidates is much smaller. Although some studies have found Donald Trump supporters to be higher on RWA (e.g., MacWilliams, 2016), we did not find any significant differences between Trump voters and those who planned to vote for other Republican candidates. In fact, there were few differences between Trump voters and other Republican candidate voters on any of the measures used in the current study. This suggests that those who voted for Trump do not differ in ideology and personality from the traditional Republican voters. However, consistent with previous research, those who support Republican candidates in general are higher on RWA and RF and lower on quest.

Limitations

As with any study conducted with college students, the results cannot be generalized to describe the U.S. adult population, especially the population of likely voters. Given that this survey was administered in a regional university, it is very likely that Bernie Sanders' rhetoric on college education was more salient to this sample than it would be in the general population. It is clear that Sanders's overwhelming popularity within our sample does not mirror his approval ratings among Alabamians (or Georgians) as a whole, as was shown when he lost the primary to Hillary Clinton. Another limitation to take into consideration is the small sub-sample sizes obtained through the study. That is, although the overall sample was quite large, a sizable subgroup ($n = 81$) did not plan to vote in the primary. Thus, a substantial amount of our sample could not be included into our analysis of personality traits in accordance with whom they were planning to vote for in the Super Tuesday primary. Further, some of the Republican candidates running had a small number of potential voters (e.g., Ted Cruz with 18) which limited our power to detect differences.

Future Research

In future studies, it would be interesting to compare specific regions of the U.S. to see if this relationship between personality traits, ideology, and party preferences holds over time and across candidates. Further, more research needs to be conducted to see why there was not relationship between disgust sensitivity and conservative candidate preferences. This is not consistent with previous research in the field and thus further investigations are warranted to see if it is simply a sampling issue or a limitation to theory. Finally, we plan to further these studies by adding in Haidt and Graham's (2007) research on moral foundations to see how it relates to candidate preferences, RWA, RF, BJW, DS, and quest in this student population.

References

- Adorno, T., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. Oxford, England: Harpers.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism*. San Francisco, CA, US: Jossey-Bass.
- Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The authoritarian specter*. Cambridge, MA, US: Harvard University Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (2004). Highly dominating, highly authoritarian personalities. *Journal of Social Psychology, 144*(4), 421-447.
- Altemeyer, B. (2006). The authoritarians. Retrieved from <https://theauthoritarians.org/options-for-getting-the-book/>
- Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest, and prejudice. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 2*(2), 113.
- Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (2004). A revised religious fundamentalism scale: The short and sweet of it. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 14*(1), 47-54.
- Antonenko Young, O., Willer, R., & Keltner, D. (2013). "Thou shalt not kill": Religious fundamentalism, conservatism, and rule-based moral processing. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality, 5*(2), 110-115. doi:10.1037/a0032262
- Batson, C. D., Eidelman, S. H., Higley, S. L., & Russell, S. A. (2001). "And who is my neighbor?" II: Quest religion as a source of universal compassion. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 40*(1), 39-50.
- Braiker, B. (2004, May 27). The best of the Nixon years. *Newsweek*.

- Breier, B. (2015). Using simple data to see how liberal Hillary Clinton actually is. Retrieved from <https://medium.com/@misterdisco/using-data-to-see-how-liberal-hillary-clinton-actually-is-db94c992d8e2#.8738pftjf>
- Choma, B. L., & Hanoch, Y. (2017). Cognitive ability and authoritarianism: Understanding support for Trump and Clinton. *Personality and Individual Differences, 106*, 287-291. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.10.054
- Crawford, J. T., Inbar, Y., & Maloney, V. (2014). Disgust sensitivity selectively predicts attitudes toward groups that threaten (or uphold) traditional sexual morality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 70*, 218-223. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.07.001
- Dittmar, H., & Dickinson, J. (1993). The perceived relationship between the belief in a just world and sociopolitical ideology. *Social Justice Research, 6*(3), 257-272. doi:10.1007/BF01054461
- 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*(5), 685-715. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2010.00781.x
- Edwards, K. J., Hall, T. W., Slater, W., & Hill, J. (2011). The multidimensional structure of the quest construct. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 39*(2), 87-110.
- Feinberg, M., Tullett, A. M., Mensch, Z., Hart, W., & Gottlieb, S. (2017). The political reference point: How geography shapes political identity. *PLoS One, 12*(2), e0171497.
- Furnham, A. (2003). Belief in a just world: Research progress over the past decade. *Personality and Individual Differences, 34*(5), 795-817. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00072-7

- Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*(5), 1029-1046.
doi:10.1037/a0015141
- Haidt, J., & Graham, J. (2007). When morality opposes justice: Conservatives have moral intuitions that liberals may not recognize. *Social Justice Research, 20*(1), 98-116.
doi:10.1007/s11211-007-0034-z
- Helzer, E. G., & Pizarro, D. A. (2011). Dirty liberals! Reminders of physical cleanliness influence moral and political attitudes. *Psychological Science, 22*(4), 517-522.
doi:10.1177/0956797611402514
- Hodson, G., Choma, B. L., Boisvert, J., Hafer, C. L., MacInnis, C. C., & Costello, K. (2013). The role of intergroup disgust in predicting negative outgroup evaluations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 49*(2), 195-205. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.11.002
- Hodson, G., & Costello, K. (2007). Interpersonal disgust, ideological orientations, and dehumanization as predictors of intergroup attitudes. *Psychological Science, 18*(8), 691-698.
- Inbar, Y., Pizarro, D., Iyer, R., & Haidt, J. (2012). Disgust sensitivity, political conservatism, and voting. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 3*(5), 537-544.
doi:10.1177/1948550611429024
- Inbar, Y., Pizarro, D. A., & Bloom, P. (2009). Conservatives are more easily disgusted than liberals. *Cognition & Emotion, 23*(4), 714-725. doi:10.1080/02699930802110007
- Jugert, P., & Duckitt, J. (2009). A motivational model of authoritarianism: Integrating personal and situational determinants. *Political Psychology, 30*(5), 693-719.

- Kemmelmeier, M. (2004). Authoritarianism and candidate support in the U.S. Presidential elections of 1996 and 2000. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 144*(2), 218-221.
doi:10.3200/SOCP.144.2.218-221
- Koleva, S. P., Graham, J., Iyer, R., Ditto, P. H., & Haidt, J. (2012). Tracing the threads: How five moral concerns (especially purity) help explain culture war attitudes. *Journal of Research in Personality, 46*(2), 184-194. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2012.01.006
- Lerner, M. J. (1965). Evaluation of performance as a function of performer's reward and attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1*(4), 355-360.
doi:10.1037/h0021806
- Lerner, M. J., & Miller, D. T. (1978). Just world research and the attribution process: Looking back and ahead. *Psychological Bulletin, 85*(5), 1030-1051. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.85.5.1030
- Ludeke, S. G., Klitgaard, C. N., & Vitriol, J. (2018). Comprehensively-measured authoritarianism does predict vote choice: The importance of authoritarianism's facets, ideological sorting, and the particular candidate. *Personality and Individual Differences, 123*, 209-216. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2017.11.019
- MacWilliams, M. C. (2016). Who decides when the party doesn't? Authoritarian voters and the rise of Donald Trump. *PS: Political Science & Politics, 49*(04), 716-721.
doi:10.1017/s1049096516001463
- Pence, M. (2003). *Congressional record*. Retrieved from
<https://www.congress.gov/congressional-record/2003/5/1/house-section/article/H3574-5>.
- Rozin, P., Haidt, J., & Fincher, K. (2009). From oral to moral. *Science, 323*(5918), 1179-1180.

- Rozin, P., Haidt, J., & McCauley, C. (2009). Disgust: The body and soul emotion in the 21st century. In *Disgust and its disorders: Theory, assessment, and treatment implications*. (pp. 9-29). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Rozin, P., Haidt, J., & McCauley, C. R. (2008). Disgust. In M. Lewis, J. M. Haviland-Jones, & L. F. Barrett (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions, 3rd ed.* (pp. 757-776). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Rubin, Z., & Peplau, L. A. (1975). Who believes in a just world? *Journal of Social Issues, 31*(3), 65-89.
- Shook, N. J., Ford, C. G., & Boggs, S. T. (2017). Dangerous worldview: A mediator of the relation between disgust sensitivity and social conservatism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 119*, 252-261. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2017.07.027
- Shook, N. J., Oosterhoff, B., Terrizzi, J. A., & Brady, K. M. (2017). "Dirty politics": The role of disgust sensitivity in voting. *Translational Issues in Psychological Science, 3*(3), 284-297. doi:10.1037/tps0000111
- Sibley, C. G., & Duckitt, J. (2008). Personality and prejudice: A meta-analysis and theoretical review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 12*(3), 248-279. doi:10.1177/1088868308319226
- Strelan, P. (2007). The prosocial, adaptive qualities of just world beliefs: Implications for the relationship between justice and forgiveness. *Personality and Individual Differences, 43*(4), 881-890. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2007.02.015
- Strelan, P., & Sutton, R. M. (2011). When just-world beliefs promote and when they inhibit forgiveness. *Personality & Individual Differences, 50*(2), 163-168. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2010.09.019

- Terrizzi, J. A., Shook, N. J., & McDaniel, M. A. (2013). The behavioral immune system and social conservatism: A meta-analysis. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 34(2), 99-108. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2012.10.003
- Terrizzi, J. A., Shook, N. J., & Ventis, W. L. (2010). Disgust: A predictor of social conservatism and prejudicial attitudes toward homosexuals. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49(6), 587-592. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2010.05.024
- Valentino, N. A., & Sears, D. O. (2005). Old times there are not forgotten: Race and partisan realignment in the contemporary south. *American Journal of Political Science*, 49(3), 672-688.
- Walker, H. (2015, July 6). Donald Trump just released an epic statement raging against Mexican immigrants and 'disease'. *Business Insider*.
- Willis, D. (2015, February 17). Hillary Clinton and the 2016 democrats: Mostly liberal, together. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/02/18/upshot/hillary-clinton-and-the-2016-democrats-mostly-liberal-together.html>

Table 1

Summary of Intercorrelations of Social Conservatism (SC), Disgust Sensitivity (DS), Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA), Religious Fundamentalism (RF), and Religious Questioning (QUEST)

	SC	DS	RWA	RF	BJW	QUEST
SC	—					
DS	.13*	—				
RWA	.75**	.23**	—			
RF	.66**	.21**	.83**	—		
BJW	.31**	.12*	.41**	.35**	—	
QUEST	-.61**	-.26**	-.79**	-.87**	-.30**	—

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Table 2

Summary of Means (SD) of Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA), Religious Fundamentalism (RF), and Religious Questioning (QUEST) for Each Political Candidate in the Primary

	<i>N</i>	RWA	RF	BJW	QUEST
Bernie Sanders (D)	80	3.31 (1.5) ^a	4.13 (2.0) ^a	3.53 (1.1) ^a	5.54 (1.4) ^a
Hillary Clinton (D)	21	4.72 (1.0) ^b	5.54 (1.1) ^b	3.82 (1.1) ^{a,c}	4.39 (1.0) ^b
Ben Carson (R)	35	5.60 (.92) ^c	6.49 (1.6) ^{b,c}	4.18 (.74) ^{b,c}	3.90 (1.4) ^c
Ted Cruz (R)	18	5.41 (1.5) ^c	7.22 (1.9) ^c	4.19 (.76) ^{b,c}	3.99 (1.7) ^c
Marco Rubio (R)	24	5.53 (1.5) ^c	6.76 (1.9) ^c	3.83 (.89) ^{a,c}	3.96 (1.7) ^c
Donald Trump (R)	37	5.84 (1.4) ^c	6.46 (1.9) ^{b,c}	3.99 (.91) ^{b,c}	3.86 (1.5) ^c

Note. Those items which do not share a superscript are significantly different from one another.