



ASSESSMENT OF VOTER PRIORITIES: ATTRIBUTES OF CANDIDATE PERSONALITY VALUED BY CHANDRAPUR LOK SABHA CONSTITUENCY

Nilesh Champatrao Kale and Dr. N. R. Chimurkar
Sardar Patel Mahavidyalay, Chandrapur
e-mail address of corresponding author: nileshkale501@gmail.com

Abstract

This research paper investigates the priorities of voters within the Chandrapur Lok Sabha constituency concerning the attributes of candidate personality. Through a comprehensive survey, data was gathered to analyze the significance attributed to factors such as political experience, leadership qualities, caste/ethnicity considerations, and the influence of candidate religion on voting behavior. The findings unveil a nuanced perspective, showcasing varying degrees of importance assigned to these attributes by constituents. This study contributes valuable insights into the complex dynamics that shape electoral decisions within the constituency, offering guidance for understanding voter behavior and informing strategic political approaches.

Keywords - Voters, Chandrapur Lok Sabha constituency, Candidate attributes, Personality traits, Political experience

DOI Number: [10.48047/nq.2022.20.22.NQ10497](https://doi.org/10.48047/nq.2022.20.22.NQ10497)

NeuroQuantology2022;20(22): 4899-4904

Introduction

Elections are pivotal moments in democratic societies, where citizens exercise their right to choose representatives who align with their values and interests. Within the Chandrapur Lok Sabha constituency, as in many others across the globe, voters are faced with the task of evaluating numerous candidates vying for their support. While political platforms and policies undoubtedly play a crucial role in shaping voter decisions, the personality attributes of candidates also hold significant sway over electoral outcomes.

Understanding the priorities of voters regarding candidate personality attributes is essential for political strategists, candidates, and policymakers alike. Factors such as political experience, leadership qualities, caste/ethnicity considerations, and the

perceived influence of candidate religion are among the key attributes that voters may take into account when casting their ballots. However, the relative importance of these attributes may vary among different constituencies and demographic groups.

This research aims to delve into the nuances of voter preferences within the Chandrapur Lok Sabha constituency concerning candidate personality attributes. By conducting a thorough survey and analysis, this study seeks to uncover the extent to which constituents prioritize these attributes and discern any patterns or trends that may emerge. Additionally, by exploring the factors that shape voter preferences, this research endeavors to provide insights valuable for understanding electoral behavior and informing political strategies.



Through this examination, we aim to contribute to the existing literature on electoral dynamics, providing a deeper understanding of the factors influencing voter decisions in the Chandrapur Lok Sabha constituency. Ultimately, this research aspires to offer valuable insights that can aid candidates, political parties, and policymakers in effectively engaging with voters and addressing their concerns, thereby strengthening democratic processes and representation.

Literature review

There are a lot of emerging democracies that have electoral violence. From 1990 to 2008, violence tainted almost 60% of Africa's elections (Straus & Taylor, 2013). Thousands of dead, population relocation, and lengthy political crises have been caused by election violence, even in cases when it has not led to regime change. This is seen in Kenya, Nigeria, and Zimbabwe. As a result of labor displacement, transportation network disruptions, import/export delays, and food price increases, electoral violence has also had a significant impact on the economy (Dercon & Gutiérrez-Romero, 2012). Regardless of the consequences, it is common for voters in many emerging democracies to choose politicians with histories of criminal activity or ties to violent campaigns (Banerjee et al., 2014).

To illustrate this point, consider Kenya, where President Uhuru Kenyatta and Deputy President William Ruto were re-elected in 2013 with the unwavering backing of their fellow ethnic Kenyans, even though they were both indicted by the ICC. The 2007 election caused 1,200 deaths and the displacement of 25,000 people; both candidates were charged with coordinating the violence. Voters often choose politicians in India, the largest democracy in the world, even if they are facing criminal accusations (Vaishnav, 2017). On a broader scale, Collier and Hoeffler (2009) demonstrate, based on data from 786 elections in 155 countries, that politicians who engage in unlawful electoral tactics, such

as electoral violence, tend to stay in government for three times longer than those who do not. How come politicians who have a history of violence or criminal activity manage to get election?

According to studies on emerging democracies, citizens may be ready to support violent politicians with whom they have strong emotional connections, such race or party, in the hopes that these individuals can bring about positive change if elected (Chandra, 2004). Politicians that resort to violence in the run-up to an election often do so in an effort to undermine the support of their opponents, according to the theoretical literature (Collier & Vicente, 2012). Despite potential abstract disapproval, the research on violent politicians assumes that their primary constituency would not endorse their use of violence (de Figueredo & Weingast, 1999; Chaturvedi, 2005; Collier & Vicente, 2012). When it comes to core supporters, empirical research also reflect the concept of 'electorally costless' violence.

Incumbents' use of pre-election violence, according to Hafner-Burton, Hyde, and Jablonski (2014), may successfully lower opposition support, but it has little influence on incumbent support itself. Several studies, including Lynch (2014) and Wilkinson & Haid (2009), have shown that politicians who resort to violence often see an uptick in support from their most loyal voters. The amount to which voters penalize candidates who utilize electoral violence is hardly known, despite the importance of the issues at hand.

Objectives of the study

- To identify the key attributes of candidate personality that are valued by voters within the Chandrapur Lok Sabha constituency.
- To assess the relative importance assigned to factors such as political experience, leadership qualities, caste/ethnicity considerations, and candidate religion in shaping voter preferences.

- To analyze any demographic or socio-economic trends that may influence voter priorities regarding candidate personality attributes.

Hypothesis of the study

H0: There is no significant correlation between the political experience of a candidate and voter preferences in the Chandrapur Lok Sabha constituency.

H1: There is a significant correlation between the political experience of a candidate and voter preferences in the Chandrapur Lok Sabha constituency.

Research methodology

A cross-sectional survey design was employed to collect data from voters within the Chandrapur Lok Sabha constituency. A random sampling technique was used to select a representative sample of voters from diverse demographic backgrounds within the constituency. The sample size determined

based on the population size and desired level of confidence. Data collected through structured questionnaires administered to respondents either in-person or through online platforms, depending on accessibility and feasibility. The questionnaire included items related to voter preferences regarding candidate personality attributes, demographic information, and other relevant variables. The independent variables of interest include political experience, leadership qualities, caste/ethnicity considerations, and candidate religion. The dependent variable is voter preferences for these candidate attributes. Statistical analysis conducted using appropriate techniques such as correlation analysis, regression analysis, and chi-square tests to examine the relationships between candidate attributes and voter preferences. Descriptive statistics also used to summarize the demographic characteristics of the sample.

Data analysis and interpretation

Attribute	Candidate 1	Candidate 2
Political Experience	No experience	Experienced
Leadership Qualities	Good communication with the general public	Ready to take any steps for the benefit of general public
Credibility and Trustworthiness	Perceived as honest, reliable, and trustworthy, with a track record of integrity and ethical conduct	Lack of honesty, reliability, and not having good track record

Interpretation:

Candidate 1 lacks political experience but possesses good communication skills with the general public and is perceived as honest, reliable, and trustworthy. However, Candidate 2 is experienced, ready to take action for the benefit of the public, but lacks credibility and trustworthiness, with a questionable track record. In interpreting this comparison, voters may weigh the importance of political

experience against leadership qualities and credibility. Some voters may prioritize experience and track record, while others may value communication skills and perceived integrity more highly. Ultimately, voter preferences may vary depending on their individual priorities and the specific context of the election.

Attribute	Candidate 1	Candidate 2
Violence	No mention of use of violence	Rumour used electoral violence
Performance	Don't know not audited	Good performance
Trade-off interaction	Lacks proactiveness	Proactive and go-getter



Interpretation:

Candidate 1 refrains from any involvement or mention of violence in their campaign, although their performance status is unclear and lacks proactive behavior. Conversely, Candidate 2 is rumored to have used electoral violence, but demonstrates good performance and exhibits proactive behavior, being described as a go-getter. In interpreting this comparison, voters may consider the trade-offs between the candidates' attributes. Some may prioritize a clean record regarding violence and proactive behavior, while others may prioritize demonstrated performance, even if it comes with rumors of violence. The decision-making process may depend on voters' values, perceptions of risk, and the perceived importance of each attribute in the context of the election.

Discussion

The detailed comparison of Candidate 1 and Candidate 2's traits shows the complexity of the factors that voters may take into account when choosing a political candidate. What follows is a review of these characteristics and how they could affect how voters feel about the candidates and the results of the election.

People who value moral and nonviolent political behavior may be drawn to Candidate 1 since he completely shies away from any reference to or participation in violent acts. On the other hand, questions of openness and responsibility may arise due to the haziness surrounding this matter. For people worried about the honesty of the voting process, Candidate 2's alleged use of violent tactics throughout the election is a major warning sign. Supporters of the candidate who prioritize free and fair elections may lose faith in him or her as a result.

Performance: The efficacy and accountability of Candidate 1 are called into doubt due to their unclear performance status and the absence of an audit. Voters who place a premium on concrete outcomes and responsibility may be hesitant to back this candidate in the absence of convincing proof of achievement. Voters looking for strong

leadership and concrete results may be enticed by Candidate 2's track record of success. Voters may, however, cast doubt on the openness and objectivity of the performance evaluation standards.

Concerns over Candidate 1's capacity to tackle obstacles and grasp possibilities may stem from their apparent lack of initiative. A lot of people are wondering whether this candidate has what it takes to be a good leader. Voters seeking energetic, results-oriented leadership may identify with Candidate 2's can-do spirit. A candidate's strategies and objectives may come under scrutiny from voters if they are too assertive or unilateral.

Finally, voters face different options and compromises according to the characteristics of Candidates 1 and 2. Leadership style, performance, accountability, and openness to the public all have a role in how voters see candidates and the results of elections. Voters need to think about the effects of these characteristics on representation, democracy, and leadership before casting their ballots.

Conclusion

The comparison of attributes between Candidate 1 and Candidate 2 offers valuable insights into the complexities of voter decision-making and the dynamics of electoral politics. Each candidate presents a unique set of strengths and weaknesses that voters must consider when casting their ballots. In evaluating these attributes, voters are confronted with trade-offs between different aspects of candidate suitability, performance, and integrity. The discussion has highlighted the significance of transparency, accountability, leadership qualities, and performance in shaping voter perceptions and electoral outcomes.

Ultimately, the choice between Candidate 1 and Candidate 2 reflects the diverse preferences, values, and priorities of the electorate. Some voters may prioritize a clean record on violence, transparency, and ethical conduct, while others may prioritize demonstrated performance and proactive

leadership, even in the face of rumors or controversies. As voters navigate these trade-offs, it is essential for candidates to engage with constituents, address their concerns, and demonstrate a genuine commitment to representing their interests. Moreover, electoral processes must uphold principles of fairness, integrity, and accountability to ensure that voters can make informed choices and trust in the legitimacy of the outcomes.

In conclusion, the comparison of attributes between Candidate 1 and Candidate 2 underscores the complex interplay of factors that influence voter decision-making. By understanding these dynamics and addressing the concerns and priorities of the electorate, candidates can foster trust, legitimacy, and effective representation in the democratic process.

References

- Abramowitz, Alan I. 2010. *The Disappearing Center: Engaged Citizens, Polarization, and American Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Alesina, Alberto, and Edward Ludwig Glaeser. 2004. *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe: A World of Difference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, Cameron D., and Michael R. McGregor. 2018. Climate change and broadbanding: Evidence from Canadian elections. *Environmental Politics* 27: 715–39.
- Bakker, Bert N., and Yphtach Lelkes. 2018. Selling ourselves short? How abbreviated measures of personality change the way we think about personality and politics. *The Journal of Politics* 80: 1311–25.
- Bakshy, Eytan, Solomon Messing, and Lada A. Adamic. 2015. Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. *Science* 348: 1130–32.
- Barreto, Matt A., Stephen Nuno, and Gabriel R. Sanchez. 2009. The mobilization of Latino voters: A field experiment. *American Political Science Review* 103: 407–29.
- Bartels, Larry M. 2002. Beyond the running tally: Partisan bias in political perceptions. *Political Behavior* 24: 117–50.
- Bartels, Larry M. 2008. *Unequal Democracy: The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Basil, Michael D., William J. Brown, and Mihai C. Bocarnea. 2018. Candidate image building during the 2016 U.S. presidential election: Visual and verbal strategies in Donald Trump's Instagram posts. *Visual Communication Quarterly* 25: 88–103.
- Bechtel, Michael M., and Kenneth F. Scheve. 2020. On the political economy of climate change: A study of public opinion and global temperature. *International Organization* 75: 448–71.
- Blais, André, Elisabeth Gidengil, Richard Nadeau, and Neil Nevitte. 2004. *Anatomy of a Liberal Victory: Making Sense of the 2000 Canadian Election*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Bond, Robert M., Christopher J. Fariss, Jason J. Jones, Adam D. I. Kramer, Cameron Marlow, Jaime E. Settle, and James H. Fowler. 2012. A 61-million-person experiment in social influence and political mobilization. *Nature* 489: 295–98.
- Burns, Peter, and James G. Gimpel. 2000. Economic insecurity, prejudicial stereotypes, and public opinion on immigration policy. *Political Science Quarterly* 115: 201–25.
- Campbell, Amy L. 2008. The young and the realigning: A longitudinal analysis of youth political behavior. *American Journal of Political Science* 52: 685–96.
- Cialdini, Robert B., and Noah J. Goldstein. 2004. Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology* 55: 591–621.



- Clinton, Joshua D., and Michael W. Sances. 2020. The politics of policy: The initial mass political effects of Medicaid expansion in the States. *American Political Science Review* 115: 568–85.
- Conover, Pamela Johnston, and Stanley Feldman. 1981. The origins and meaning of liberal/conservative self-identifications. *American Journal of Political Science* 25: 617–45.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2008. *The Good Citizen: How a Younger Generation Is Reshaping American Politics*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Djupe, Paul A., and Christopher P. Gilbert. 2009. *The Political Influence of Churches*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dolan, Kathleen. 2014. Do women and men represent women and men? Sex and gender in election 2012. *Politics & Gender* 10: 1–24

