USC Dornsife Center for Economic and Social Research

USC Schaeffer Leonard D. Schaeffer Center for Health Policy & Economics

The Association Between Personality Traits and Voting in the 2016 U.S. Presidential Election

Anya Samek

Paper No: 2017-002

CESR-SCHAEFFER WORKING PAPER SERIES

cesr.usc.edu **healthpolicy.usc.edu**

The Association Between Personality Traits and Voting in the 2016 U.S. Presidential Election

Anya Samek

Center for Economic and Social Research and Department of Economics
University of Southern California
635 Downey Way, Los Angeles, CA 90037, U.S.A.

January 2017

Abstract

I examine the association between "Big Five" personality traits and voting in the 2016 U.S. Presidential election using an online panel of over 4,000 representative Americans. I find that personality has a strong, statistically significant association with voting intentions, even when controlling for voter characteristics and past voting behavior. Higher degrees of Extraversion and Conscientiousness are associated with voting for Donald Trump (the Republican candidate), while higher degrees of Neuroticism and Openness are associated with voting for Hillary Clinton (the Democratic candidate). These findings are in line with a nascent literature documenting associations of personality with conservative or liberal views.

JEL Classifications: D01, D72, C83
Keywords: online panel, Big Five personality, voting, political election

---

Corresponding author: Anya Samek, anyasamek@gmail.com. I thank Arie Kapteyn for encouraging me to explore this line of research and providing helpful comments. I thank Tania Gutsche, Jill Darling, Bas Weerman, and the team at the Understanding America Study panel for assistance with using the data from the panel. The project described in this paper relies on data from survey(s) administered by the Understanding America Study, which is maintained by the Center for Economic and Social Research (CESR) at the University of Southern California. The content of this paper is solely the responsibility of the author and does not necessarily represent the official views of USC or UAS.

1. Introduction

Few political elections in the history of America have brought about as much tension among the public as the 2016 United States (U.S.) Presidential elections. While understanding how people interact with their political environment has been a key theme of the literature on political behavior for some time, the recent elections have brought this question into greater focus. One way to shed light on this question is to explore how individual-level characteristics correlate with voting behavior. A nascent literature does this by exploring the association of voting and political beliefs and core personality traits (Gerber et al., 2011). Core personality traits have also been correlated with behavior in economic games (Ben-Ner et al., 2008; Koole et al., 2001) and labor market outcomes (Nyhus and Pons, 2005; De Fruyt and Mervielde, 1999) and are stable (Cobb-Clark and Schurer, 2012).

The "Big Five" is a widely accepted framework for understanding core personality traits, which are broad dispositions expected to affect individual behavior across a range of contexts, and are not themselves direct measures of political leanings (John et al., 2008). It is therefore interesting that related work finds strong and significant correlations of some of these traits with political behavior. Personality traits affect voter turnout and political participation, political ideology, intentions to vote for right- or left- wing candidates and support for specific issues in the U.S. and Europe (for a summary, see Gerber et al., 2011).

My contribution is to examine the association between core personality traits measured by the "Big Five" inventory (John et al., 2008) and voting in the 2016 U.S. Presidential election. To do this, I take advantage of data from surveys conducted with the Understanding America Study (UAS), an internet panel of approximately 6,000 individuals who are representative of the U.S.

population.[1] I use data from over 4,000 UAS members who participated in weekly surveys about their voting intentions during the 2016 Presidential election season. This extends the related work in two ways: first, by investigating whether 2016 voting intentions show similar patterns to prior elections that have been studied, and second, by using a unique, nationally representative sample of Americans who express their views over several months, rather than in a one-time survey as in prior work.

I find that personality has a strong, statistically significant association with voting intentions, even when controlling for voter characteristics and voting in the 2012 election. Higher degrees of Extraversion and Conscientiousness are associated with voting for Donald Trump (the Republican candidate), while higher degrees of Neuroticism and Openness are associated with voting for Hillary Clinton (the Democratic candidate). These findings are in line with past literature documenting associations in the same direction with conservative or liberal views and highlight the importance of personality in the political arena.

2. Materials and Methods

Prior to the election season, UAS panel members completed the 44-item "Big Five" personality inventory (John et al., 1991; John and Srivastava, 1999) as well as surveys asking them about socio-economic and demographic background characteristics. The "Big Five" include Extraversion – an energetic approach toward the world; Agreeableness - prosocial and communal orientation toward others; Conscientiousness - socially prescribed impulse control/following rules and norms; Neuroticism - negative emotionality, such as feeling anxious, nervous or sad; and Openness to Experience – originality and complexity of thought (John et al., 2008). I use the

[1] See https://uasdata.usc.edu

standard method described in John et al. (2008) to compute a score for each trait, including reverse scoring all requisite items and adjusting for individual acquiescent response style.

During the election, UAS members were invited to participate in the "Daybreak Poll" administered by USC Dornsife and the Los Angeles Times, and were asked weekly: *"What is the percent chance that… (1) you will vote in the presidential election? (2) you will vote for Clinton, Trump, or someone else?"* The data analysis averages responses to these questions across all weeks since the poll start until the election (07/04/2016-11/07/2016). Reported intentions were a good predictor of actual voting behavior in similar continuous Presidential election polls conducted in 2012 and 2008 (Gutsche et al., 2014; Delavande and Manski, 2010). Partly attributed to its careful survey methods, the "Daybreak Poll" was one of few polls that correctly predicted a Trump win while a majority of other polls suggested a Trump win was highly unlikely.[2]

I merge these datasets and analyze the associations between "Big Five" personality traits and voting intentions for 4,031 respondents who participated in the three surveys.

3. Results

The average percent chance of voting in the election was 87% (s.d.=28.19%), chance of voting for Clinton was 41.48% (s.d.=44.02%) and chance of voting for Trump was 41.79% (44.01%). Most of the voting data falls on the extremes – i.e., either 0% or 100%. Table 1 displays ordinary least squares regressions (OLS) of probability of voting and voting intentions with demographic and socio-economic controls (Specifications 1-4). Tables in the appendix provide robustness checks and find similar results when using probability of a vote * candidate voting

[2] See, for example, http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-pol-usc-latimes-poll-20161108-story.html. The "Daybreak" poll actually predicted that Trump would win the popular vote, which he did not. Nevertheless, "Daybreak" was one of the few polls that gave Trump higher odds of winning the election than the majority of other polls available at the time.

intention as an outcome, conducting longitudinal regression with individual level clustering or including previous voting behavior.

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Specification (4) shows a statistically significant negative association of Extraversion with the difference between voting for Clinton versus Trump (coefficient estimate: -4.15, *p*-value<0.01), a statistically significant negative association of Conscientiousness with the difference between voting for Clinton versus Trump (coefficient estimate: -4.86, *p*-value<0.01), a statistically significant positive association of Neuroticism with the difference between voting for Clinton versus Trump (coefficient estimate: 4.46, *p*-value<0.01) and a statistically significant positive association of Openness to Experience with the difference between voting for Clinton versus Trump (coefficient estimate: 10.20, *p*-value<0.01).

We also find the usual associations with demographic and socio-economic characteristics (not reported): African Americans and Hispanics are more likely to vote for Clinton over Trump (coefficient estimates: 85.89 and 47.62 respectively, *p*-values<0.01), a Bachelor's or Professional degree increases the likelihood of a Clinton vote over Trump (coefficient estimates: 23.52 and 41.23 respectively, *p*-values<0.01) and females are more likely to vote for Clinton over Trump (coefficient estimate: 13.88, *p*-value<0.01). Specification (1) shows a statistically significant positive association of Agreeableness with probability of voting (Coefficient estimate: 0.97, *p*-value<0.05) and statistically significant negative association of Neuroticism with probability of voting (Coefficient estimate: -0.93, *p*-value<0.05).

In Specification (5), we use a similar regression to explore determinants of self-reported voting for President Barak Obama (the Democratic candidate) versus Mitt Romney (the Republican candidate) in the 2012 election (with the same controls). This question was asked in

2016 and 2,905 panel members provided a response of either Obama or Romney. We find that Extraversion is significantly negatively correlated with voting for Obama versus Romney (coefficient estimate: -2.49, p-value<0.05), while Neuroticism and Openness were positively correlated with voting for Obama versus Romney (coefficient estimates: 1.69 and 5.67 respectively, p-values<0.05). Results are directionally similar (i.e., the same personality traits associated with an Obama vote in 2012 are associated with a Clinton vote in 2016) but less pronounced, potentially due to the smaller sample size or having to rely on memory or respondents for the 2012 data.

4. Conclusion

Articles in the popular press pronounced the 2016 U.S. Presidential election as unique or "unprecedented" both in terms of the partisan support for the candidates and in the polls' failure to predict the large support for Trump.[3] Here, we show that at least with respect to core personality characteristics of voters, voting behavior mirrored past elections. For instance, previous work consistently found that Conscientiousness is associated with supporting conservative candidates, while Openness to Experience is associated with supporting liberal candidates, a result we also observe (Gerber et al., 2011). Gerber et al. (2012) investigate the relationship between Emotional Stability (the opposite of Neuroticism) and political views, finding that people scoring high on Emotional Stability (and low on Neuroticism) are less likely to feel anxious about their economic futures, and therefore respond less favorably to redistributive policies. Along these lines, we find that individuals scoring higher on Neuroticism are likely to support Clinton (and individuals scoring high on Emotional Stability are likely to support Trump).

[3] E.g., see http://www.npr.org/2016/07/03/484214413/the-most-unprecedented-election-ever-65-ways-it-has-been

Personality traits are thought to be stable over one's lifetime. Since these traits are measured prior to voting intentions in our data, we might see this as suggestive evidence that different personalities cause people to vote in certain ways. However, a nascent series of research papers have suggested an intriguing new explanation: another factor, namely, genetic predisposition, is proposed to affect both personality and voting behavior (Verhulst et al., 2012; Funk et al., 2013).

5. References

Ben-Ner, Avner, Amit Kramer, and Ori Levy. "Economic and hypothetical dictator game experiments: Incentive effects at the individual level." *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 37.5 (2008): 1775-1784.

Fruyt, Filip, and Ivan Mervielde. "RIASEC types and Big Five traits as predictors of employment status and nature of employment." *Personnel Psychology* 52, no. 3 (1999): 701-727.

Delavande, Adeline, and Charles F. Manski. 2010. "probabilistic polling and Voting in the 2008 presidential election: evidence from the American Life Panel." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 74:433–59.

Cobb-Clark, Deborah A., and Stefanie Schurer. "The stability of big-five personality traits." *Economics Letters* 115.1 (2012): 11-15.

Gerber, Alan S., et al. "Personality and the strength and direction of partisan identification." *Political Behavior* 34.4 (2012): 653-688.

Gerber, Alan S., Gregory A. Huber, David Doherty, and Conor M. Dowling. "The big five personality traits in the political arena." *Annual Review of Political Science* 14 (2011): 265-287.

Gutsche, Tania L., et al. "The RAND continuous 2012 presidential election poll." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 78.S1 (2014): 233-254.

John, Oliver P., and Sanjay Srivastava. "The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives." *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* 2.1999 (1999): 102-138.

John, Oliver P., Eileen M. Donahue, and Robert L. Kentle. "The big five inventory—versions 4a and 54." (1991).

John, Oliver P., Laura P. Naumann, and Christopher J. Soto. "Paradigm shift to the integrative big five trait taxonomy." *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* 3 (2008): 114-158.

Koole, Sander L., Wander Jager, Agnes E. van den Berg, Charles AJ Vlek, and Willem KB Hofstee. "On the social nature of personality: Effects of extraversion, agreeableness, and

feedback about collective resource use on cooperation in a resource dilemma." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 27, no. 3 (2001): 289-301.

Nyhus, Ellen K., and Empar Pons. "The effects of personality on earnings." *Journal of Economic Psychology* 26, no. 3 (2005): 363-384.

Verhulst, Brad, Lindon J. Eaves, and Peter K. Hatemi. "Correlation not causation: The relationship between personality traits and political ideologies." *American Journal of Political Science* 56, no. 1 (2012): 34-51.

Table 1: Associations of "Big Five" Personality Traits with Voting Intentions

	(1) Probability of Voting	(2) Probability Clinton Vote	(3) Probability Trump Vote	(4) Clinton-Trump	(5) Obama (v. Romney)
Extraversion	0.971**	-1.232	2.914***	-4.146***	-2.494**
	(0.478)	(0.741)	(0.709)	(1.276)	(1.086)
Agreeableness	0.654	0.489	0.752	-0.263	-0.213
	(0.395)	(0.805)	(0.781)	(1.507)	(1.269)
Conscientiousness	-0.0844	-2.252***	2.608***	-4.859***	-1.810
	(0.440)	(0.726)	(0.743)	(1.369)	(1.151)
Neuroticism	-0.925**	1.663***	-2.800***	4.464***	1.692**
	(0.433)	(0.496)	(0.513)	(0.869)	(0.666)
Openness	0.426	5.096***	-5.101***	10.20***	5.671***
	(0.443)	(0.678)	(0.677)	(1.246)	(0.825)
Demographic Controls	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Constant	56.59***	17.99***	29.78***	-11.79***	53.77***
	(2.965)	(2.142)	(2.808)	(4.063)	(5.528)
Observations	4,031	4,031	4,031	4,031	2,905
R2	0.122	0.191	0.157	0.188	0.131

Notes: Ordinary least squares regression reporting on association between Big Five traits (standardized) and voting intentions in 2016 (1-4), controlling for age, race, gender, educational attainment and income. Outcome measure is an average of all of individual's responses (self reported probability, 0 to 100) (1-4). (4) reports on probability of Clinton minus probability of Trump vote. (5) reports vote in 2012 for Obama or Romney, as self-reported in 2016. Includes state clustering. Robust standard errors in parentheses.
**** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.*

Data Analysis Appendix (Online only)

Tables 1-2 display output from Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regressions on probability of voting, probability of voting for Clinton/Trump, and probability of voting for Clinton/Trump conditional on a vote – taking an average of all responses over time, by individual. Explanatory variables are each of the Big Five personality measures and demographic/socio-economic controls. Table 3 also displays a regression with prior voting for Obama/Romney as a dependent variable. Additional tables provide robustness checks (controlling for past voting behavior, and re-running analysis as a longitudinal panel). **Note:** The figure in the blog post is created using Col (4) of Table (2).

Table 1: Association between Big Five Personality Traits and Unconditional Voting Intentions

	(1) Probability of Voting	(2) Probability Clinton Vote	(3) Probability Trump Vote	(4) Clinton-Trump
Extraversion	0.971**	-1.232	2.914***	-4.146***
	(0.478)	(0.741)	(0.709)	(1.276)
Agreeableness	0.654	0.489	0.752	-0.263
	(0.395)	(0.805)	(0.781)	(1.507)
Conscientiousness	-0.0844	-2.252***	2.608***	-4.859***
	(0.440)	(0.726)	(0.743)	(1.369)
Neuroticism	-0.925**	1.663***	-2.800***	4.464***
	(0.433)	(0.496)	(0.513)	(0.869)
Openness	0.426	5.096***	-5.101***	10.20***
	(0.443)	(0.678)	(0.677)	(1.246)
Gender (Male=1)	0.795	-6.643***	7.241***	-13.88***
	(0.969)	(1.241)	(1.357)	(2.333)
Age: 35-49	4.755***	2.106	4.174**	-2.068
	(1.227)	(1.759)	(1.559)	(2.919)
Age: 50-64	9.612***	7.564***	5.656***	1.908
	(0.985)	(1.760)	(1.799)	(3.265)
Age: 65+	15.45***	10.80***	11.61***	-0.809
	(1.349)	(2.129)	(2.499)	(4.334)
African American	6.920***	49.07***	-36.82***	85.89***
	(1.351)	(2.447)	(1.933)	(4.021)
Hispanic	2.541	25.08***	-22.54***	47.62***
	(1.909)	(4.254)	(2.663)	(6.528)
Other Race	0.0672	9.942***	-10.54***	20.48***
	(1.819)	(2.185)	(2.690)	(4.577)
High School	9.819***	1.550	5.727*	-4.176
	(2.933)	(1.894)	(3.354)	(4.386)
Some College	17.10***	6.344***	4.703	1.640
	(2.875)	(2.112)	(3.091)	(4.262)
Bachelor's Degree	20.49***	18.46***	-5.063	23.52***
	(2.854)	(2.418)	(3.455)	(5.103)
Professional Degree	20.73***	28.09***	-13.14***	41.23***
	(3.113)	(2.669)	(3.546)	(5.374)
Family Income: 25k-50k	3.217**	-1.259	4.442***	-5.701**
	(1.365)	(1.608)	(1.632)	(2.790)
Family Income: 50k-75k	7.251***	-3.160*	8.874***	-12.03***
	(1.310)	(1.769)	(1.381)	(2.745)
Family Income: 75k-100k	9.580***	1.911	8.262***	-6.351
	(1.353)	(1.913)	(2.313)	(3.845)
Family Income: Above 100k	8.868***	-0.673	10.00***	-10.67***
	(1.435)	(1.827)	(2.204)	(3.651)
Constant	56.59***	17.99***	29.78***	-11.79***
	(2.965)	(2.142)	(2.808)	(4.063)
Observations	4,031	4,031	4,031	4,031
R2	0.122	0.191	0.157	0.188

*Notes: This OLS regression reports on the association between Big Five personality traits (standardized) and voting intentions, controlling for demographics and SES. While most respondents complete the election survey multiple times, the outcome measure is an average of all of their responses (self reported percent probability, 0 to 100). Column (4) reports on probability of Clinton minus probability of Trump vote. Omitted baseline group is Age 18-34, White, Less than High School education, income below 25k. Includes state clustering. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.*

Table 2: Association between Big Five Personality Traits and Intentions Conditional on Voting

	(1) Clinton Vote*Prob Vote	(2) Trump Vote*Prob Vote	(3) Clinton-Trump
Extraversion	-1.534**	2.825***	-4.359***
	(0.694)	(0.723)	(1.306)
Agreeableness	0.391	0.624	-0.233
	(0.820)	(0.782)	(1.542)
Conscientiousness	-2.170***	2.915***	-5.084***
	(0.733)	(0.776)	(1.442)
Neuroticism	1.913***	-2.450***	4.363***
	(0.487)	(0.575)	(0.990)
Openness	4.707***	-5.120***	9.827***
	(0.737)	(0.699)	(1.356)
Gender (Male=1)	-7.251***	7.850***	-15.10***
	(1.237)	(1.479)	(2.569)
Age: 35-49	0.0702	4.353***	-4.283
	(1.888)	(1.421)	(3.074)
Age: 50-64	4.913**	2.785	2.128
	(2.094)	(1.968)	(3.875)
Age: 65+	6.448***	6.274**	0.173
	(2.283)	(2.637)	(4.722)
African American	50.85***	-42.53***	93.38***
	(2.720)	(2.095)	(4.592)
Hispanic	26.73***	-26.82***	53.55***
	(4.084)	(2.896)	(6.845)
Other Race	11.97***	-12.27***	24.24***
	(3.008)	(2.629)	(5.262)
High School	-1.865	0.553	-2.418
	(2.112)	(3.022)	(4.631)
Some College	0.965	-4.060	5.025
	(1.915)	(2.738)	(4.053)
Bachelor's Degree	13.28***	-15.95***	29.23***
	(2.191)	(2.422)	(3.977)
Professional Degree	22.13***	-24.08***	46.21***
	(2.709)	(3.175)	(5.382)
Family Income: 25k-50k	-2.088	3.554**	-5.643*
	(1.799)	(1.567)	(3.047)
Family Income: 50k-75k	-5.373***	6.996***	-12.37***
	(1.578)	(1.477)	(2.761)
Family Income: 75k-100k	-0.623	5.474**	-6.097
	(2.064)	(2.280)	(4.081)
Family Income: Above 100k	-2.952	6.750***	-9.702**
	(2.018)	(2.316)	(4.121)
Constant	30.47***	46.91***	-16.44***
	(2.728)	(3.459)	(5.766)
Observations	4,031	4,031	4,031
R2	0.188	0.177	0.199

*Notes: This OLS regression reports on the association between Big Five personality traits (standardized) and probability of voting for Clinton or Trump times probability of voting at all, controlling for demographics and SES. Omitted baseline group is Age 18-34, White, Less than High School education, income below 25k. Includes state clustering. While most respondents complete the election survey multiple times, the outcome measure is an average of all of their responses (self reported percent probability, 0 to 100). Column (4) reports on probability of Clinton minus probability of Trump vote. Includes state clusters. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.*

Table 3: Determinants of Voting for Obama (v. Romney) in Previous Election

	(1) Voted for Obama (v. Romney)
Extraversion	-2.494**
	(1.086)
Agreeableness	-0.213
	(1.269)
Conscientiousness	-1.810
	(1.151)
Neuroticism	1.692**
	(0.666)
Openness	5.671***
	(0.825)
Gender (Male=1)	-9.445***
	(2.102)
Age: 35-49	1.989
	(2.507)
Age: 50-64	-0.00470
	(2.032)
Age: 65+	-0.281
	(3.204)
African American	42.17***
	(2.801)
Hispanic	28.13***
	(2.601)
Other Race	15.26***
	(2.810)
High School	2.302
	(4.757)
Some College	2.670
	(4.945)
Bachelor's Degree	9.140
	(5.459)
Professional Degree	15.64**
	(6.037)
Family Income: 25k-50k	-3.487
	(2.625)
Family Income: 50k-75k	-10.14***
	(2.256)
Family Income: 75k-100k	-8.404**
	(3.211)
Family Income: Above 100k	-13.64***
	(3.793)
Constant	53.77***
	(5.528)
Observations	2,905
R2	0.131

Notes: The outcome variable in this regression is whether the respondent voted for Obama or Romney (1 is Obama, 0 is Romney), excluding non-respondents. Omitted baseline group is Age 18-34, White, Less than High School education, income below 25k. Includes state clustering. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Table 1A: This replicates Table 1 but includes controls for prior voting behavior in 2012

	(1) Probability of Voting	(2) Probability Clinton Vote	(3) Probability Trump Vote	(4) Clinton-Trump
Extraversion	0.477	-0.533	1.811***	-2.344**
	(0.400)	(0.590)	(0.623)	(1.032)
Agreeableness	0.574	0.348	0.664	-0.315
	(0.385)	(0.634)	(0.674)	(1.210)
Conscientiousness	-0.459	-1.742***	1.739***	-3.481***
	(0.396)	(0.599)	(0.608)	(1.097)
Neuroticism	-0.365	1.313***	-2.042***	3.355***
	(0.392)	(0.451)	(0.487)	(0.800)
Openness	0.862*	3.236***	-2.876***	6.112***
	(0.433)	(0.617)	(0.673)	(1.200)
Gender (Male=1)	0.385	-3.357***	3.508***	-6.865***
	(0.721)	(1.049)	(1.228)	(2.103)
Age: 35-49	1.038	-0.458	3.473**	-3.932*
	(1.269)	(1.588)	(1.346)	(2.346)
Age: 50-64	2.961**	4.503***	2.736	1.767
	(1.209)	(1.622)	(1.750)	(3.012)
Age: 65+	5.539***	6.017***	7.198***	-1.181
	(1.312)	(1.763)	(1.904)	(3.136)
African American	2.369*	27.75***	-20.54***	48.29***
	(1.307)	(2.443)	(1.206)	(3.301)
Hispanic	3.194***	14.87***	-12.36***	27.23***
	(1.165)	(3.466)	(2.391)	(5.653)
Other Race	0.823	5.111**	-4.900**	10.01**
	(1.353)	(2.310)	(2.145)	(4.033)
High School	6.912**	-0.843	5.803*	-6.646*
	(2.749)	(1.862)	(2.896)	(3.624)
Some College	9.121***	1.488	2.767	-1.279
	(2.406)	(1.996)	(2.558)	(3.514)
Bachelor's Degree	10.34***	9.907***	-5.486**	15.39***
	(2.454)	(1.831)	(2.569)	(3.434)
Professional Degree	10.74***	15.98***	-10.30***	26.27***
	(2.408)	(2.263)	(3.040)	(4.573)
Family Income: 25k-50k	1.031	-1.304	2.564*	-3.868*
	(1.272)	(1.358)	(1.451)	(2.253)
Family Income: 50k-75k	2.341*	-1.508	2.947**	-4.456*
	(1.190)	(1.696)	(1.308)	(2.601)
Family Income: 75k-100k	4.661***	1.738	3.824**	-2.087
	(1.232)	(1.844)	(1.634)	(3.045)
Family Income: Above 100k	3.562***	1.863	2.737*	-0.874
	(1.037)	(1.356)	(1.606)	(2.682)
vote2012s==1.Too young to vote	-20.42***	16.30***	-20.78***	37.08***
	(3.623)	(4.175)	(5.384)	(8.006)
vote2012s==2.Did not vote	-32.52***	6.364***	-22.77***	29.14***
	(2.162)	(2.192)	(3.266)	(4.648)
vote2012s==3.Romney	3.736**	-4.380*	20.50***	-24.89***
	(1.667)	(2.421)	(2.877)	(4.677)
vote2012s==4.Obama	2.215	46.16***	-30.46***	76.61***
	(1.677)	(2.150)	(3.126)	(4.563)
vote2012s==5.Someone else = o,	-	-	-	-
Constant	77.50***	8.374***	45.60***	-37.23***
	(2.983)	(2.551)	(4.477)	(6.305)
Observations	3,956	3,956	3,956	3,956
R2	0.358	0.464	0.416	0.481

Note: Omitted category for prior voting behavior is “voted for someone else”

Table 2A: This replicates Table 2 but includes controls for prior voting behavior in 2012.

	(1) Probability Clinton Vote	(2) Probability Trump Vote	(3) Clinton-Trump
Extraversion	-0.683	1.914***	-2.597**
	(0.577)	(0.618)	(1.061)
Agreeableness	0.283	0.572	-0.288
	(0.651)	(0.674)	(1.252)
Conscientiousness	-1.571**	2.249***	-3.820***
	(0.587)	(0.654)	(1.167)
Neuroticism	1.365***	-1.825***	3.190***
	(0.441)	(0.563)	(0.930)
Openness	2.707***	-3.029***	5.735***
	(0.696)	(0.695)	(1.311)
Gender (Male=1)	-3.786***	4.200***	-7.986***
	(1.036)	(1.326)	(2.210)
Age: 35-49	-1.490	4.967***	-6.457***
	(1.512)	(1.213)	(2.380)
Age: 50-64	3.732*	2.291	1.441
	(1.952)	(1.840)	(3.604)
Age: 65+	4.597**	5.423***	-0.826
	(1.785)	(1.916)	(3.392)
African American	30.62***	-24.48***	55.10***
	(2.634)	(1.391)	(3.806)
Hispanic	16.14***	-16.94***	33.08***
	(3.590)	(2.555)	(6.035)
Other Race	6.702**	-6.551***	13.25***
	(3.058)	(2.216)	(4.895)
High School	-3.315	1.618	-4.933
	(2.394)	(2.713)	(4.495)
Some College	-1.347	-3.132	1.785
	(2.299)	(2.838)	(4.491)
Bachelor's Degree	7.772***	-12.72***	20.49***
	(2.171)	(2.197)	(3.608)
Professional Degree	12.89***	-17.66***	30.56***
	(2.879)	(3.257)	(5.637)
Family Income: 25k-50k	-1.369	2.442*	-3.811
	(1.537)	(1.335)	(2.437)
Family Income: 50k-75k	-2.075	2.781*	-4.856*
	(1.576)	(1.416)	(2.689)
Family Income: 75k-100k	0.720	2.848	-2.127
	(1.903)	(1.710)	(3.281)
Family Income: Above 100k	1.443	1.536	-0.0933
	(1.615)	(1.884)	(3.258)
vote2012s==1.Too young to vote	22.20***	-11.67**	33.88***
	(4.118)	(4.712)	(7.579)
vote2012s==2.Did not vote	17.94***	-11.59***	29.53***
	(2.023)	(3.012)	(4.217)
vote2012s==3.Romney	-4.583*	19.07***	-23.65***
	(2.392)	(2.904)	(4.670)
vote2012s==4.Obama	47.09***	-31.80***	78.89***
	(2.256)	(3.138)	(4.708)
vote2012s==5.Someone else = o,	-	-	-
Constant	13.19***	55.56***	-42.37***
	(3.579)	(5.166)	(8.274)
Observations	3,956	3,956	3,956
R2	0.445	0.411	0.470

Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: Omitted category for prior voting behavior is “voted for someone else”

Table 3A: This replicates Table 1 but is a Longitudinal Regression (Not Including State Clusters)

	(1) prob_vote	(2) prob_clint	(3) prob_trump	(4) diff
big5extra	1.093**	-1.110*	2.919***	-4.033***
	(0.456)	(0.670)	(0.691)	(1.235)
big5agree	0.515	0.205	0.886	-0.683
	(0.482)	(0.708)	(0.730)	(1.304)
big5cons	-0.130	-2.168***	2.481***	-4.648***
	(0.472)	(0.693)	(0.715)	(1.278)
big5neuro	-0.955**	1.531**	-2.804***	4.322***
	(0.436)	(0.640)	(0.660)	(1.178)
big5open	0.389	5.012***	-4.997***	10.02***
	(0.457)	(0.671)	(0.692)	(1.237)
gender	0.622	-6.692***	6.725***	-13.37***
	(0.824)	(1.185)	(1.213)	(2.146)
age2	4.941***	2.565	4.083**	-1.527
	(1.144)	(1.680)	(1.732)	(3.095)
age3	9.673***	7.919***	5.482***	2.430
	(1.131)	(1.660)	(1.712)	(3.059)
age4	15.50***	10.78***	11.63***	-0.870
	(1.376)	(2.020)	(2.083)	(3.721)
black	5.915***	42.72***	-34.11***	76.83***
	(1.447)	(2.107)	(2.167)	(3.856)
hisplatino	2.536*	23.69***	-21.77***	45.55***
	(1.501)	(2.201)	(2.270)	(4.055)
other_race	-1.220	1.011	-3.981*	4.385
	(1.380)	(1.984)	(2.032)	(3.596)
ed2	10.02***	1.657	5.789*	-4.147
	(2.117)	(3.106)	(3.202)	(5.722)
ed3	17.18***	6.191**	4.758	1.419
	(2.027)	(2.974)	(3.066)	(5.478)
ed4	20.56***	18.29***	-4.915	23.19***
	(2.168)	(3.182)	(3.281)	(5.862)
ed5	20.84***	27.98***	-12.97***	40.93***
	(2.299)	(3.374)	(3.479)	(6.215)
income2	2.905**	-2.256	4.877***	-7.135**
	(1.219)	(1.790)	(1.846)	(3.298)
income3	7.003***	-3.980**	9.152***	-13.14***
	(1.316)	(1.932)	(1.992)	(3.559)
income4	9.352***	0.694	8.883***	-8.215**
	(1.485)	(2.180)	(2.248)	(4.016)
income5	8.540***	-1.944	10.47***	-12.46***
	(1.420)	(2.085)	(2.150)	(3.840)
polldayno	0.0212***	0.0321***	0.0175***	0.0147***
	(0.00143)	(0.00167)	(0.00161)	(0.00267)
Constant	55.41***	17.27***	28.04***	-10.72*
	(2.138)	(3.134)	(3.230)	(5.768)
Observations	47,619	47,609	47,609	47,609
Number of Clusters	4,022	4,022	4,022	4,022

Note: This replicates Table 1, but uses a panel data approach with individual-level random effects. It also excludes state-level clusters.

Table 4A: This replicates Table 2 but is a Longitudinal Regression (Not Including State Clusters)

	(1) clint_vote	(2) trump_vote	(3) diff2
Extraversion	-1.431**	2.798***	-4.235***
	(0.681)	(0.693)	(1.288)
Agreeableness	0.131	0.797	-0.666
	(0.720)	(0.732)	(1.360)
Conscientiousness	-2.070***	2.779***	-4.851***
	(0.705)	(0.717)	(1.333)
Neuroticism	1.783***	-2.420***	4.189***
	(0.651)	(0.662)	(1.229)
Openness	4.613***	-4.995***	9.618***
	(0.683)	(0.695)	(1.290)
Gender (Male=1)	-7.203***	7.436***	-14.56***
	(1.208)	(1.222)	(2.246)
Age: 35-49	0.505	4.201**	-3.705
	(1.709)	(1.738)	(3.228)
Age: 50-64	5.248***	2.595	2.645
	(1.689)	(1.718)	(3.191)
Age: 65+	6.426***	6.268***	0.121
	(2.055)	(2.090)	(3.882)
African American	44.31***	-38.87***	83.12***
	(2.145)	(2.177)	(4.028)
Hispanic	25.34***	-25.96***	51.42***
	(2.240)	(2.277)	(4.230)
Other Race	2.850	-4.629**	6.801*
	(2.023)	(2.047)	(3.763)
High School	-1.809	0.589	-2.420
	(3.159)	(3.213)	(5.969)
Some College	0.839	-3.991	4.818
	(3.025)	(3.077)	(5.715)
Bachelor's Degree	13.10***	-15.77***	28.86***
	(3.237)	(3.292)	(6.115)
Professional Degree	21.99***	-23.89***	45.87***
	(3.432)	(3.490)	(6.484)
Family Income: 25k-50k	-3.099*	4.165**	-7.259**
	(1.821)	(1.852)	(3.441)
Family Income: 50k-75k	-6.204***	7.414***	-13.63***
	(1.965)	(1.999)	(3.713)
Family Income: 75k-100k	-1.895	6.284***	-8.211*
	(2.218)	(2.256)	(4.190)
Family Income: Above 100k	-4.245**	7.398***	-11.70***
	(2.121)	(2.157)	(4.006)
Sequential day number poll completed (07/04=1)	0.0242***	0.0117***	0.0125***
	(0.00173)	(0.00168)	(0.00285)
Constant	30.30***	45.29***	-14.94**
	(3.188)	(3.242)	(6.018)
Observations	47,609	47,609	47,609
Number of Clusters	4,022	4,022	4,022

Note: This replicates Table 1, but uses a panel data approach with individual-level random effects. It also excludes state-level clusters.