



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Dominance desires predicting conspiracy beliefs and Trump support in the 2016 U.S. election

Citation for published version:

Suessenbach, F & Moore, A 2019, 'Dominance desires predicting conspiracy beliefs and Trump support in the 2016 U.S. election', *Motivation Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/mot0000146>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1037/mot0000146](https://doi.org/10.1037/mot0000146)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Motivation Science

Publisher Rights Statement:

© American Psychological Association, 2019. This paper is not the copy of record and may not exactly replicate the authoritative document published in the APA journal. Please do not copy or cite without author's permission. The final article is available, upon publication, at: [10.1037/mot0000146](https://doi.org/10.1037/mot0000146)

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



1 Dominance desires predicting conspiracy beliefs and Trump support in the 2016 US
2 election.

3

4 Since 2016 terms such as “post-truth” or “alternative facts” have been symbolic for the
5 spread of evidence-absent political discourse. As decision-making absent actual facts is
6 dangerous, it is important to determine why people believe in conspiracies such as “large scale
7 voter fraud” (Trump, 2016a). In this study we showed that desires to dominate/fears of being
8 dominated (i.e., dominance motive) predicted conspiracy beliefs as voters faced challenges to
9 election-relevant cognitions (e.g., “we will win”; “we are superior”). We explained this by
10 dominance motives giving value to challenged election cognitions which would increase
11 individuals’ desires to alleviate this challenge (i.e., by adopting conspiracy beliefs). In line with
12 this we found Trump voters facing defeat pre-election believed more in election conspiracies
13 as a function of their dominance motive. This effect disappeared post-election, as by Trump’s
14 victory such challenges were arguably attenuated. Moreover, Clinton voters’ dominance motive
15 positively, though weakly, predicted believing in election conspiracies after the election.
16 Exploratory analyses showed mediating effects of conspiracy belief on the relationship between
17 dominance motives and preferring Trump over Clinton. This research complements previous
18 findings showing personality characteristics predicting conspiracy beliefs and, by using actual
19 conspiracy beliefs in a real-life event, add to their ecological validity.

20 Keywords: dominance motive; conspiracy belief; US election; Trump; Clinton.

21 “Of course there is large scale voter fraud happening on and before election day. Why
22 do Republican leaders deny what is going on? So naive!” (Trump, 2016a)

23 In 2016, US presidential candidate Trump tweeted several such statements suggesting
24 large scale voter fraud, rigged pre-election polls, or complaining about unfair media coverage
25 (e.g., Trump, 2016b, 2016c, 2016d). Contra overwhelming evidence (e.g., Bump, 2016;
26 Patterson, 2016), a majority of Trump’s voters believed these conspiracies (Tamman, 2016).
27 As deliberately irrational/evidence-absent politics hinders informed decisions, understanding
28 why people believe in such conspiracies is vital (cf. Lewandowsky & Oberauer, 2016). Previous
29 studies have linked conspiracy beliefs to situational variables (e.g., manipulations of actors’
30 morality; van Prooijen & Jostmann, 2013) or personality characteristics (e.g., exaggerated pride
31 in one’s in-group; e.g., Cichocka, Marchlewska, Golec De Zavala, & Olechowski, 2016). Here,
32 we wanted to add to the ecological validity of such findings by utilising authentic conspiracy
33 beliefs in a real-life event (i.e., the 2016 US election). Moreover, as motives/desires strongly
34 reflect how much people value certain beliefs/actions (e.g., Heckhausen & Heckhausen, 2008),
35 we investigated the predictive power of the dominance motive (DM).

36 Multiple theories hold that challenges to expected outcomes (e.g., the expectation to
37 win; Kruglanski et al., 2018), group-identity (e.g., being the superior group/not being the losers;
38 Cichocka et al., 2016), or certainty of world view (e.g., most Americans are like me; van
39 Prooijen & Jostmann, 2013) generate affectively negative motivation to reduce them (see also
40 cognitive dissonance theory; Festinger, 1957). Despite their differences, each theory presumes
41 the interplay of two components predicting reduction-motivation: the degree of perceived
42 challenge and the value of the expected outcome/group identity/world view (i.e., cognitions;
43 Festinger, 1957). Leading up to the election, Trump voters likely felt strongly challenged on all
44 these fronts, given that most polls predicted a Clinton victory, the campaign was marked by a
45 strong ‘us-against-them’ mentality on both sides, and fears of forced adherence to opponents’

46 agendas clashed with desires to gain control of one's destiny/country (e.g. MacWilliams, 2016;
47 Major, Blodorn, & Major Blascovich, 2016). Given the hostile election environment, we
48 propose DM will predict how much individuals valued these election-relevant cognitions
49 (Heckhausen & Heckhausen, 2008; Suessenbach, Loughnan, Schönbrodt, & Moore, 2019).
50 This motive represents a desire to coerce others into submission/obedience and a fear of being
51 so coerced; it relates to retaliatory behaviour in dictator games, social dominance orientation
52 (i.e., beliefs that one's ingroup should be superior to outgroups, Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, &
53 Malle, 1994), and antagonistic self-protection (i.e., narcissistic rivalry; Back et al., 2013;
54 Suessenbach et al., 2019). Along with desires to be voluntarily respected/admired (prestige)
55 and to take responsibility in and for one's group (leadership), it constitutes one of three
56 components of a broad desire for social power (Suessenbach et al., 2019). In sum, we propose
57 DM as a proxy for the value of situationally challenged election-relevant cognitions, thus
58 predicting reduction-seeking behaviour.

59 According to cognitive dissonance theory, one powerful reduction mechanism is
60 negating challenging information (i.e., subtracting dissonant cognitions; Festinger, 1957). This
61 can be achieved by giving credence to election conspiracies (e.g., Cichocka et al., 2016;
62 Kruglanski et al., 2018; van Prooijen & Jostmann, 2013) as to (pre-emptively) adjust outcomes
63 (i.e., we haven't really lost; we were cheated), group-identity (i.e., we are still great; the other
64 side was unfair), or world view (i.e., most Americans are like me; the statistics are rigged).
65 Hence, just before the election we predicted a positive relationship between Trump voters' DM
66 and their beliefs in election conspiracies (BEC; hypothesis 1). Just after the election we
67 predicted a decline, possibly a reversed, relationship between the winning (Trump) voters' DM
68 and BEC, as the challenge should have been dissolved (hypothesis 2). Similarly, we predicted
69 a positive relationship between DM and BEC in the losing (Clinton) voters (hypothesis 3).
70 Finally, we explored how differences among voters in dominance, prestige, and leadership
71 (DoPL) motives predicted voting preference when controlling BEC.

72

73 **Method**

74 **Participants**

75 Pre-election cohort size was based on a power analysis indicating about $n = 250$
76 participants necessary to detect a small to medium mean difference of $d = .30$ in DoPL motives
77 (see similar effect sizes in Choma & Hanoch, 2017). Post-election cohort N was determined by
78 the maximum sample size given our budget. We resampled data for participants who failed our
79 attention checking question, excluding $n_{pre-election} = 5$ and $n_{post-election} = 18$ participants; resulting
80 in $n_{pre-election} = 250$ (102 females, $M_{age} = 32.51$, $SD_{age} = 11.46$) and $n_{post-election} = 500$ (230 females,
81 $M_{age} = 32.77$, $SD_{age} = 12.18$). Among males we sampled about twice as many Clinton as Trump
82 voters. Among females we sampled about four times as many Clinton as Trump voters. All
83 samples were collected via www.prolific.ac, restricted to US American registered voters who
84 reported the intention to vote or had voted for either Trump or Clinton. Participants were
85 reimbursed with \$0.40 for their participation in any one study. Sample sizes, hypotheses, and
86 statistical models were preregistered (<https://osf.io/nz6qt/>); complete dataset and reproducible
87 R script can be found here: <https://osf.io/s6u6m/>. This study received the approval of the local
88 research ethic committee.

89

90 **Material**

91 Each DoPL motive was measured with 4 items (e.g., DM: “When people challenge me
92 I want to put them down hard”; Suessenbach et al., 2019). BEC was measured as agreement
93 with three items based on accusations made by Trump (e.g., Trump, 2016a, 2016b, 2016c,
94 2016d; see Items 1 to 3 in Table 1). We also measured agreement to three additional excuses
95 for losing an election not explicitly offered by Trump but only included one of these items in

96 our analysis (see Item 4 in Table 1).¹ All items were measured on a 6-point Likert scale from
97 “Strongly disagree” to “Strongly agree”.

98 (Insert Table 1 here)

99

100 **Procedure**

101 The pre-election/post-election sample was collected one and two days before/after the
102 US election on the 8th of November 2016 and introduced as a study on personality, voting
103 preferences, and opinions regarding the 2016 US election. Participants were registered voters
104 for the 2016 US election with the intention to vote (pre-election) or had already voted (pre- and
105 post-election) for either Trump or Clinton. After checking these requirements and obtaining
106 participants’ informed consent, we asked for intention/vote (pre-election) or vote (post-
107 election). Following this, participants filled in the 12 DoPL items, three items regarding BEC,
108 and three additional excuses followed by standard demographic questions (i.e., age, gender,
109 occupation). Participants were not fully debriefed pre-election, only post-election, in case some
110 participated in both parts. We gave all participants an email address for any questions.

111

112 **Results**

113 **Belief in election conspiracies**

114 (Insert Table 2 here)

115 Cronbach’s α s were sufficient across all measures, $.70 < \alpha s < .87$, however, the
116 additional excuse item did not correlate with BEC, $r(748) = -.09, p = .056$ (see Table 2). We
117 conducted a preregistered linear regression of BEC on DoPL motives, dummy coded voting
118 preference (Trump = 0), dummy-coded study part (pre-election = 0), and all possible

119 interactions between DM, voting preference, and study part (Figure 1). Note, that including
120 prestige and leadership motives in these models controlled for shared/non-specific hope to gain
121 power (Suessenbach et al., 2019). Thus, all DM effects reported here refer to residualised effects
122 (Vize, Collison, Miller, & Lynam, 2018); nonetheless, results were essentially equivalent when
123 removing prestige and leadership motives (see Figure A1, Tables A1 & A2 in Appendix). BEC
124 was positively related to DM for Trump voters pre-election, $\beta = 0.24$, $t = 2.93$, $p = .004$
125 (hypothesis 1). Post-election, this relationship significantly weakened, $\beta = -0.21$, $t = -2.04$, $p =$
126 $.042$ (interaction term; hypothesis 2), to essentially 0 ($\beta = 0.24 - 0.21 = 0.03$) but did not reverse.
127 Independent of study part and voting preference, the prestige motive was positively, $\beta = 0.11$, t
128 $= 3.18$, $p = .002$, and the leadership motive negatively related to BEC, $\beta = -0.08$, $t = -2.32$, $p =$
129 $.021$. Trump voters had generally higher BEC than Clinton voters pre-election, $\beta = -1.41$, $t = -$
130 11.90 , $p < .001$. This difference remained, though weaker, post-election, $\beta = 0.32$, $t = 2.22$, $p =$
131 $.027$.

132 Testing hypothesis 3, we re-coded voting preference (Clinton = 0) and study part (post-
133 election = 0) and repeated our analysis, demonstrating that DM was positively related to BEC
134 in Clinton voters after the election, $\beta = 0.11$, $t = 2.15$, $p = .032$. Though this relationship was
135 descriptively smaller pre vs post-election, there was no significant difference in pre-post
136 regression slopes, $\beta = -0.04$, $t = -0.51$, $p = .607$.

137 (Insert Figure 1 here)

138 Analysis of additional excuse item #4 showed Trump voters' DM did not relate to beliefs
139 that Clinton's child had a more positive impact than Trump's children pre-election, $\beta = -0.18$, t
140 $= -1.80$, $p = .072$ (hypothesis 1). Nonetheless, in line with our predictions (hypothesis 3), DM
141 was significantly positively related to the corresponding belief in Clinton voters post-election,
142 $\beta = 0.14$, $t = 2.44$, $p = .015$. Neither of these two relationships differed pre- and post-election

143 ($ps > .080$; hypothesis 2). However, given little reliability of results concerning such single
144 items (Postmes, Haslam, & Jans, 2013), we will not further interpret these results.

145

146 **Power motives and voting for Trump or Clinton**

147 Three pre-registered Bonferroni corrected 2(gender: male vs female)*2(voting
148 preference: Trump vs Clinton) ANOVAs with the DoPL motives as DVs assessed pre-election
149 differences in social power motives between Trump and Clinton voters, controlling for gender.
150 On average males had higher DM than females ($M_{\text{males}} = 10.09$ vs $M_{\text{females}} = 8.03$), $F(1, 246) =$
151 8.76 , $p = .010$, $\eta^2_G = .03$, as did Trump voters ($M = 10.71$) compared to Clinton voters ($M =$
152 8.62), $F(1, 246) = 7.99$, $p = .015$, $\eta^2_G = .03$. There was no interaction ($p = 1$). Neither prestige
153 nor leadership motives significantly differed for males vs females, Trump vs Clinton voters, or
154 any combination of these variables. Results remained essentially unchanged when using only
155 unique variance of each DoPL motive as DVs (i.e., using the residuals from regressing each
156 DoPL motive on the respective other two).

157 Finally, in an exploratory mediation model based on pre-election data, we investigated
158 whether voters' BEC explained the relationship between DM and voting for Trump over
159 Clinton. The positive relationship between voters' DM and their probability to vote for Trump
160 over Clinton, $b = 0.11$, $p < .001$, was fully mediated by BEC, $b = -0.01$, $p = .725$ (see Figure 2).
161 Thus, desire to dominate others and belief in false conspiracies combined to predict preference
162 for Trump.

163 (Insert Figure 2 here)

164 **Discussion**

165 We correctly predicted Trump voters facing defeat pre-election endorsed beliefs in false
166 conspiracies as a function of their DM. This effect disappeared post-election, since Trump's
167 victory arguably attenuated previous challenges to election-relevant cognitions (e.g., the
168 expectation to win; the belief that one's in-group is superior). Clinton voters' DM positively
169 predicted BEC post-election, though weakly and only descriptively stronger than pre-election.
170 These findings support the idea that DM predicts individuals valuing election-relevant
171 cognitions and negating factual information (i.e., adopt conspiracy beliefs) which challenge
172 these (cf. Festinger, 1957). As such they extend our knowledge of DMs and could prove
173 valuable in predicting BEC in the future. By utilising authentic BEC in a real-life scenario these
174 findings complement more controlled studies using hypothetical scenarios (e.g., van Prooijen
175 & Jostmann, 2013), showing that challenging valued cognitions can produce conspiracy beliefs
176 in meaningful natural settings.

177 Exploratory analyses showed higher DMs for Trump voters and males, relative to
178 Clinton voters and females. Trump potentially attracted more dominance-driven voters, as his
179 ideas were more strongly based on dominance mechanisms (e.g., Henrich & Gil-White, 2001;
180 Suessenbach et al., 2019) - forcing deference to the US from other states, or certain sub-groups'
181 superiority over others (e.g., "Caucasian" & "Males" over "Mexicans"; Degani, 2016;
182 Filipovic, 2016). To some extent these higher DMs might have benefitted Trump as they
183 predicted higher BEC which in turn predicted a higher probability to vote Trump. Finally,
184 independent from pre/post-election assessment and voting preference, residualised prestige and
185 leadership motives related to BEC positively and negatively, respectively. As with or without
186 controlling for these shared social power influences DM showed equivalent results when
187 predicting BEC and given that we had no hypotheses for prestige and leadership we will not
188 further interpret these results.

189 Study limitations include BEC items only being based on Trump’s statements (although
190 we matched phrasings to voter intention). Thus, we can neither compare Trump and Clinton
191 voters’ *general* BEC nor its relationship with DM. Similarly, the interpretation of Trump
192 benefitting from dominance-driven voters’ conspiracy endorsements is limited to these specific
193 conspiracies. Note that for this study we could not find authentic conspiracies of Clinton voters
194 (even Russian election meddling seemed more accurate than conspiracy; e.g., Entous,
195 Nakashima, & Miller, 2016); nonetheless, if possible, future studies should assess a wider range
196 of actual conspiracy beliefs. Furthermore, we did not assess the impact of individual election-
197 relevant cognitions but assumed all were challenged. Differentiating them would have been
198 difficult in a naturalistic setting; nonetheless, future studies could attempt to develop items more
199 clearly phrased towards certain cognitions or create controlled lab conditions which challenge
200 specific cognitions. Finally, although the process from challenging information to adopting
201 conspiracy beliefs is straight forward to assume we did not measure its individual steps. Future
202 studies could improve on this by using more suitable methods; for example, researchers could
203 measure negative affect with EMG (cf. Larsen, Norris, & Cacioppo, 2003) after experimentally
204 challenging valued cognitions. This negative affect should then be reduced in individuals
205 adopting conspiracy beliefs.

206 Saturated by “post-truth” and “alternative facts” we must determine factors relating to
207 endorsing evidence-absent opinions. We used such statements from Trump and found DM
208 predicted Trump voters’ BEC prior to potential defeat in, and Clinton voters’ after defeat
209 following, the 2016 US election. Beliefs decoupled from reality are especially dangerous in the
210 political sphere. Our research suggests that lowering fears of being dominated by the other party
211 may reduce self-protective BECs. This could be achieved, for example, by mutually enforced
212 stricter civility norms in politics.

213 **Appendix**

214 (Insert Figure A1 here)

215 (Insert Table A1 here)

216 (Insert Table A2 here)

217

218 **Bibliography**

- 219 Back, M. D., Küfner, A. C. P., Dufner, M., Gerlach, T. M., Rauthmann, J. F., & Denissen, J.
220 J. A. (2013). Narcissistic admiration and rivalry: Disentangling the bright and dark sides
221 of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *105*(6), 1013–1037.
222 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034431>
- 223 Bump, P. (2016, December). There have been just four documented cases of voter fraud in the
224 2016 election. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from
225 [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/12/01/0-000002-percent-of-all-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/12/01/0-000002-percent-of-all-the-ballots-cast-in-the-2016-election-were-fraudulent/?utm_term=.0adb817bb240)
226 [the-ballots-cast-in-the-2016-election-were-fraudulent/?utm_term=.0adb817bb240](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/12/01/0-000002-percent-of-all-the-ballots-cast-in-the-2016-election-were-fraudulent/?utm_term=.0adb817bb240)
- 227 Choma, B. L., & Hanoch, Y. (2017). Cognitive ability and authoritarianism: Understanding
228 support for Trump and Clinton. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *106*, 287–291.
229 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.10.054>
- 230 Cichocka, A., Marchlewska, M., Golec De Zavala, A., & Olechowski, M. (2016). ‘They will
231 not control us’: Ingroup positivity and belief in intergroup conspiracies. *British Journal*
232 *of Psychology*, *556–576*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjop.12158>
- 233 Degani, M. (2016). Endangered intellect: a case study of Clinton vs Trump campaign
234 discourse. *Iperstoria - Testi Letterature Linguaggi*, (8), 131–145. Retrieved from
235 http://www.iperstoria.it/joomla/images/PDF/Numero_8/generale_8/Degani_intestato.pdf
- 236 Entous, A., Nakashima, E., & Miller, G. (2016). Secret CIA assessment says Russia was
237 trying to help Trump win White House. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from
238 [https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/obama-orders-review-of-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/obama-orders-review-of-russian-hacking-during-presidential-campaign/2016/12/09/31d6b300-be2a-11e6-94ac-3d324840106c_story.html)
239 [russian-hacking-during-presidential-campaign/2016/12/09/31d6b300-be2a-11e6-94ac-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/obama-orders-review-of-russian-hacking-during-presidential-campaign/2016/12/09/31d6b300-be2a-11e6-94ac-3d324840106c_story.html)
240 [3d324840106c_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/obama-orders-review-of-russian-hacking-during-presidential-campaign/2016/12/09/31d6b300-be2a-11e6-94ac-3d324840106c_story.html)

241 Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson and
242 Company.

243 Filipovic, J. (2016). The revenge of the white man. *TIME*. Retrieved from
244 <http://time.com/4566304/donald-trump-revenge-of-the-white-man/>

245 Heckhausen, J., & Heckhausen, H. (2008). *Motivation and action*. New York: Cambridge
246 University Press.

247 Henrich, J., & Gil-White, F. J. (2001). The evolution of prestige: Freely conferred deference
248 as a mechanism for enhancing the benefits of cultural transmission. *Evolution and*
249 *Human Behavior*, 22(3), 165–196. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138\(00\)00071-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138(00)00071-4)

250 Kruglanski, A. W., Jasko, K., Milyavsky, M., Chernikova, M., Webber, D., Pierro, A., & di
251 Santo, D. (2018). Cognitive consistency theory in social psychology: A paradigm
252 reconsidered. *Psychological Inquiry*, 29(2), 45–59.

253 Larsen, J. T., Norris, C. J., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2003). Effects of positive and negative affect on
254 electromyographic activity over zygomaticus major and corrugator supercilii.
255 *Psychophysiology*, 40, 776–785.

256 Lewandowsky, S., & Oberauer, K. (2016). Motivated rejection of science. *Psychological*
257 *Science*, 25, 217–222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721416654436>

258 MacWilliams, M. C. (2016). Who decides when the party doesn't? Authoritarian voters and
259 the rise of Donald Trump. *Political Science & Politics*, 49(04), 716–721.
260 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096516001463>

261 Major, B., Blodorn, A., & Major Blascovich, G. (2016). The threat of increasing diversity:
262 Why many White Americans support Trump in the 2016 presidential election. *Group*
263 *Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430216677304>

264 Narayanswamy, A., Cameron, D., & Gold, M. (2016). Money raised as of Dec. 31. *The*
265 *Washington Post*. Retrieved from
266 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/politics/2016-election/campaign-finance/>

267 Patterson, T. E. (2016, January). Pre-primary news coverage of the 2016 presidential race:
268 Trump's rise, Sanders' emergence, Clinton's struggle. *Shorenstein Center*. Retrieved
269 from [https://shorensteincenter.org/pre-primary-news-coverage-2016-trump-clinton-](https://shorensteincenter.org/pre-primary-news-coverage-2016-trump-clinton-sanders/)
270 [sanders/](https://shorensteincenter.org/pre-primary-news-coverage-2016-trump-clinton-sanders/)

271 Postmes, T., Haslam, S. A., & Jans, L. (2013). A single-item measure of social identification:
272 Reliability, validity, and utility. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 52(4), 597–617.
273 <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12006>

274 Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance
275 orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of*
276 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(4), 741–763. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741)
277 [3514.67.4.741](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741)

278 Suessenbach, F., Loughnan, S., Schönbrodt, F. D., & Moore, A. B. (2019). The dominance,
279 prestige, and leadership account of social power motives. *European Journal of*
280 *Psychology*, 33, 7–33. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2184>

281 Tamman, M. (2016, October). Half of Republicans would reject election result if Clinton
282 wins: Reuters/Ipsos. *Reuters*. Retrieved from [http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-](http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-election-poll-rigging-idUSKCN12L2O2)
283 [election-poll-rigging-idUSKCN12L2O2](http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-election-poll-rigging-idUSKCN12L2O2)

284 Trump, D. J. (2016a). Large scale voter fraud. *Twitter*. Retrieved from
285 <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/787995025527410688>

286 Trump, D. J. (2016b). Rigged polls. *Twitter*. Retrieved from

287 <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/790534428942622721>

288 Trump, D. J. (2016c). Unfair media coverage I. *Twitter*. Retrieved from

289 <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/787699930718695425>

290 Trump, D. J. (2016d). Unfair media coverage II. *Twitter*. Retrieved from

291 <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/787258211283918848>

292 van Prooijen, J.-W., & Jostmann, N. B. (2013). Belief in conspiracy theories: The influence of

293 uncertainty and perceived morality. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 43*, 109–

294 115.

295 Vize, C. E., Collison, K. L., Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2018). Examining the effects of

296 controlling for shared variance among the Dark Triad using meta-analytic Structural

297 Equation Modelling. *European Journal of Personality, 46*–61.

298 <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2137>

299

300 **Tables**

301 Table 1. Depicting 3 items measuring belief in election conspiracies offered by Trump
 302 (Items 1 to 3) as well as one additional excuse for losing the election not offered by Trump.
 303 Wording was adapted to match participant’s voting preference (i.e., we replaced “Donald
 304 Trump” with “Hillary Clinton” and vice versa; Curly brackets) and study part (i.e., we used the
 305 present tense, pre-election, and the past tense post-election; Squared brackets).

#	Category	Item wording
1	Rigged pre-election polls	The pre-election polls are {were} rigged against Donald Trump [Hillary Clinton] in a way that they are {were} showing more voters in favour of Hillary Clinton [Donald Trump] than there actually are {were}.
2	Voter fraud	At this year’s election, more than 2% of votes in favour of Hillary Clinton [Donald Trump] will actually be {have actually been} invalid due to voter fraud but will be {have been} counted towards the valid votes for Hillary Clinton [Donald Trump].
3	Unfair media coverage	The portrayal of Donald Trump [Hillary Clinton] in the media has been very unfair as compared to Hillary Clinton’s [Donald Trump’s] portrayal.
4	Positive impact of candidates’ children	Hillary Clinton’s child [Donald Trump’s children] had a lot more positive impact on voters than Donald Trump’s children [Hillary Clinton’s child].

306

307

308 Table 2. Correlations across pre- and post-election as well as across Trump and Clinton
 309 voters for DoPL motives and sum scored belief in election conspiracies (BEC) as well as one
 310 additional excuse item for losing the election (Add. item). Mean and [SD] in diagonal.

	Dominance	Prestige	Leadership	BEC	Add. item
Dominance	9.21 [4.00]				
Prestige	.30***	14.91 [3.61]			
Leadership	.29***	.40***	14.48 [4.44]		
BEC	.23***	.10*	.07	9.54 [3.57]	
Add. item	.06	.12**	-.06	-.09	2.62 [1.35]
Cronbach's α	.84	.78	.87	.70	-

311 *** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$; after Bonferroni-Holm correction.

312

313

314 Table A1. Belief in election conspiracies (BEC) predicted by dominance motive, voting
 315 preference (Trump = 0), study part (pre-election = 0) and any interaction between these
 316 variables.

	β	SE	t	p
Intercept	0.97	0.10	9.64	<.001
Dominance	0.25	0.08	3.08	.002
Voting preference	-1.37	0.12	-11.56	<.001
Study part	-0.21	0.12	-1.70	.090
Voting preference*study part	0.32	0.15	2.17	.030

Dominance*voting preference	-0.18	0.11	-1.75	.081
Dominance*study part	-0.20	0.10	-1.95	.026°
Dominance*voting preference*study part	0.25	0.13	1.90	.057

317 ° one-tailed test.


318

319 Table A2. BEC predicted by dominance motive, voting preference (Clinton = 0), study
320 part (post-election = 0) and any interaction between these variables.

	β	SE	t	p
Intercept	-0.30	0.04	-6.76	<.001
Dominance	0.12	0.05	2.46	.014
Voting preference	1.05	0.09	12.27	<.001
Study part	-0.11	0.08	-1.39	.166
Voting preference*study part	0.32	0.15	2.17	.030
Dominance*voting preference	-0.07	0.08	-0.85	.397
Dominance*study part	-0.05	0.08	-0.60	.547
Dominance*voting preference*study part	0.25	0.13	1.90	.057

321

322




324

325 Figure 1. Belief in election conspiracies (BEC) predicted by dominance motive, voting
 326 preference, and study part; controlling for shared influences of the prestige and leadership
 327 motive. BECs for both Trump voters, pre-election, and Clinton voters, post-election, were
 328 significantly and positively related to the dominance motive (hypothesis 1 & 3, respectively).
 329 Moreover, the relationship between BEC and the dominance motive in Trump voters was
 330 significantly stronger pre-election than post-election (hypothesis 2).

331

332



333

334

335


336

337

338

339

Figure 2. Simple mediation model showing that, pre-election, the positive relationship between voters' dominance motives (latent variable) and the probability to vote for Donald Trump over Hillary Clinton (measured variable; linked through logistic link function) was completely mediated by voters' beliefs in election conspiracies (latent variable).



340

341

342

343

344

345

346

Figure A1. Belief in election conspiracies (BEC) predicted by dominance motive, voting preference, and study part; not controlling for shared influences of the prestige and leadership motive.

347 **Footnotes**

348 1) We removed items #5 (“As a woman Hillary Clinton has an advantage as most US
349 voters would vote for any female presidential candidate.”) and #6 (“It doesn’t matter what kind
350 of personalities presidential candidates have, the candidate with more campaign funds always
351 wins.”) as they were tailored to the specific event of Trump losing the election. Stronger belief
352 that a woman (Item #5) or the candidate with more campaign funds (Item #6) has an unfair
353 advantage does not represent an excuse for a defeat for Clinton voters, as their candidate was
354 female and she also was the candidate with more campaign funds (Narayanswamy, Cameron,
355 & Gold, 2016).

356