

Adolescents Preferred Traits of Political Candidates

Aileen Rosette V. Mahinay Felix¹, Aloha P. Tolin², Robert I. Poculan III^{3*}

Abstract: Adolescence is the next generation in the voting arena. Using the theoretical lens of Kurt Lewin on Field Theory, this study looks into the preferred traits of adolescence in relation to Leadership and Interpersonal political candidates. The study was conducted to 363 respondents of Negros Oriental State University. The study employed quantitative design to measure political candidate's traits as preferred by adolescents. A researchers-made questionnaire was used as a tool in data gathering. The socio-demographic profile was summarized using percentage and ranking. Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance and Mann-Whitney U Test @ 5% significance level were utilized to get the significant difference of the respondents and their preferred traits of the political candidates. The study revealed that most of the respondents belong to families with income below poverty threshold and educational expense is supported by parents and siblings. It also showed that Political Candidates with a Vision and Decisiveness is what they looked for while Communication Skill is least considered. Moreover, being a member of a civic organization is a winning approval. The study further showed that there is a significant difference in the respondents' choice of political candidates' traits in relation to sex, course, family income and benefactor.

Keywords: voting participation, traits.

1. Introduction

In the past, various authors have tried to disentangle the empirical merits of traits and political participation (Quintelier et. al 2012). Research on voting behavior has consistently found that for most people, evaluations of candidate's personal and leadership qualities have more impact on vote than do candidates' positions on issues (Lewis-Beck et. al. 2008). One study pointed that personalization of politics and democratic representation implies vital cues for voter's decision as they decide on whether candidates will act in their interest and represent them. (Aicholer and Willman, 2020). This abet the evaluation of people particularly the adolescents in identifying what they are looking for in terms of traits from future political leaders. However, there are less researches undertaking these topics in the Philippines. Nevertheless, numerous researches on traits and political participation were done in western countries. For this reason, the researchers explored on the adolescent's view on certain political traits of potential political candidates. As defined in this study, these traits refer to Leadership and Interpersonal Traits of those political candidates that influence the voters or adolescents' choice specifically.

The identification of certain traits of political candidates has been essential in the political participation of people from all walks of life, since these traits more or less, influence the electorates in making their voting choice. As observed, the impact of the voice of the youth can be partly gleaned from the victory of several candidates in the latest Philippine Presidential election. This Indeed fueled the researchers in determining the traits that have guided them, in one way or another, in choosing their governmental leaders.

Focusing on adolescents has an additional advantage since we can assume that their attitudes and value patterns are still being developed. (Flanagan, 2004). These could show the significance of the role of adolescents in shaping the future of the political arena. As a constitutional mandate, here in the Philippines, the voting age starts at 18 which falls in the late adolescence stage.

Psychological and sociological theorists consider youth a politically definitive period. This is a time in life for deciding about the direction of one's future. (Flanagan, 2001). In the process, an individual tends to take stock of him/herself and his/her society. Developing an ideology enables youth to organize and manage the vast array of choices the world presents. Political ideologies are forming in adolescence when personal values, world views, and political attributions appear to be highly concordant (Flanagan & Tucker, 1999).

2. Field Theory and Voting Participation

Field theory asserts that if the person is to be understood, he or she must be seen in the light of how he or she views the world and not merely of how the world really is. At any moment of life, a person stands within such a field. A person's behavior at a specific moment will be a function of the interaction between his or her—person and environment (Ortigas, 1999). The study is anchored on Field theory because it clearly explains how the individual or the person is impinged with subjective reality and objective reality. These realities construct the perception of the individual in terms of political preference and these includes the traits that adolescents want to identify from certain political candidates. According to Visser (1994), Adolescents' reality is simultaneously formed by his subjective reality and objective events.

In its application in this study, a person can be construed as referring to the adolescents aged 18 to 20 who were enrolled at

*Corresponding author: rol_rey111975@yahoo.com

Negros Oriental State University. The political participation of these adolescents in the form of making voting choices is believed to be a function of their characteristics as persons (their values, their beliefs) and their environment. Adolescents' reality is simultaneously formed by his subjective reality and objective events (Visser, 1994).

Compared to older adults, youth are "free" to explore different perspectives on social issues and different possible selves. The amount of political stability vs. political change is determined in part by the degree to which the younger generation adopts the views of their elders or crafts a distinct generational perspective. Thus, focusing on ways that younger generations negotiate salient social issues provides a lens on the future political landscape. Drawing from Mannheim (1952), generational theorists contend that younger generations have a "fresh contact" with their society, i.e., they see objectively similar issues and events from a perspective distinct from adults. Thus, the study aimed to find out the traits of the political candidates, in general, that directly influence the voting choice of the adolescents as electorates in the future. Their preference on Leadership and Interpersonal Traits of future leaders are part of their decision making as to whom they are going to vote for. As the next generation in the voting landscape, it is imperative to delve into their preferences for the kind of leaders they will have.

3. Methodology

The researchers created an instrument for this study. The researcher-made questionnaire was presented to experts, further, all comments and recommendations from the experts were integrated in the final instrument for validity. It was pre-tested to check on the reliability and It was also run to test on item comprehension. As soon as the pre-test was done, the researchers did a full process for the study. Results of this study are based on the responses of adolescent-electorates. A researcher-made questionnaire designed to find out the preferred leadership and interpersonal traits of political candidates was utilized. There was a total of 379 respondents to represent the 7,459 students of the university who belong to the age range 18 to 20 years old. We selected the respondents randomly with every campus represented by a number proportionate to its population size.

Out of the 379 respondents, only 363 gave their responses that account for 96.56% of the total count. These responses were statistically treated to articulate the respondents' preferred traits of political candidates.

In the statistical computation, frequency count was used to present the distribution of respondents in terms of sex, course, family income, and benefactor. Then, Weighted mean was utilized to indicate the respondents' preferred traits of political candidates. Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance and Mann-Whitney U Test were used to get the significance of the difference in the responses when respondents were grouped according to sex, course, family income and benefactor.

The paper is limited to students enrolled in Negros Oriental State University. It is also important to note that the age of respondents as adolescents covers the general range of

developmental age. With this, future interest for researches on adolescent's political choice for candidates should explore on different areas political landscape.

Results of the study were based on responses to the preferred voting traits survey, a researcher-made questionnaire designed to measure Voting trait preferences in terms of political traits: Leadership Traits and Interpersonal Traits and Organizational Involvement of potential political candidates. The survey was conducted personally by the researchers in the different campuses of Negros Oriental State University which were distributed throughout the province of Negros Oriental. Each compiled measure for each trait. Respondents were asked to have multiple responses for choosing preferred traits of a political candidate. Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by Ranks was used in obtaining the significant difference of respondents' choice in terms of age, leadership, and interpersonal traits, since the variables of the study have more than two groupings or category that are independent or not related. Moreover, this non-parametric method was utilized because data collected were not normally distributed.

Table 1
Distribution of students by campus

Campus	Population	Respondents	Percentage (%)
Bayawan-Sta. Catalina	1,027	52	13.72
Siaton	705	36	9.50
Main I and II	3,731	190	50.13
Bais I & II	1,005	51	13.46
Mabinay	203	10	2.64
Guihulgan	788	40	10.55
Total	7,459	379	100

Out of the 379 respondents there were only 363 who gave their responses equivalent to 96.56% because 16 or 4.22% opted not to answer the questionnaire. This still holds water because we cannot force the respondents to answer the questionnaire. The final set of responses was weighted to account for the socio-demographic profile and preferred political traits of the adolescents.

The variables are socio-demographic profile and the following traits: Leadership Traits and Interpersonal traits were defined. The socio-demographic profile which obtains information on sex, course, monthly family income and benefactor of the respondents. The first part is the socio-demographic profile of the respondents, the second and third parts are on leadership and interpersonal traits preferred by the respondents in making their voting choice.

In the statistical computation, the frequency count describes the distribution of the respondents in terms of the occurrences of their answers. This will be used to identify the most frequent answers of the respondents in terms of sex, course, family income and benefactor. Percentage Count was used to get the overall response of the respondents in certain categories and weighted mean was utilized to get the average point of each response.

Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance and Mann-Whitney U Test was used to get the significant difference of the respondents' choice of political candidates with regard to Sex, Course, Family Income and Benefactor.

Table 2

Frequency distribution of respondents when grouped according to sex, course, family income and benefactor

Profile		Frequency	Percentage
Sex	Male	132	36.34
	Female	231	63.61
Course	AB	24	6.61
	AGRI		
	AMDNA	3	3.83
	BSACCY	9	2.48
	BSBA	48	13.22
	BSCS	24	6.61
	BSGEO	4	1.10
	BSINT		
	BSMATH	2	0.55
	BSPHARM	2	0.55
	BSPYCH	20	5.51
	BST	2	0.55
	BSCRIM	19	5.23
	EDUC	77	21.21
	ENGG	10	2.75
	HM	25	6.34
	IT	26	6.69
OSM	33	9.09	
Family Income	≤ 5,000	128	35.26
	5,001-10,000	125	34.44
	10,001-15,000	39	10.74
	15,001-20,000	23	6.34
	20,001-25,000	14	3.86
	25,001 and above	13	3.58
	Not Indicated	21	5.79
	Parents	240	66.12
	Siblings/Relatives	58	15.98
	Scholarships	56	15.43
Not Indicated	9	2.48	
Total		100	100

Table 2 presents the frequency distribution of respondents when grouped according to sex, course, family income and benefactor. It revealed that 63.61 percent of the respondents were female. 21.21% are from the College of Education and the rest were distributed throughout several courses offered across the University. The 35.26 percent and 34.44 percent belongs to the ≤5,000 and 5,000-10,000 pesos Family Income Bracket respectively. In addition, 66.12 percent were supported by their parents. Almost a quarter are enrolled in the College of Education. More than half of the sample population shared that they have a monthly Family Income between 5,000-10,000 pesos. Such data is supported, since the respondents are enrolled in a State University. Furthermore, they rely on financial support of their parents.

Table 3

Verbal description used to define the traits

	Numerical	Verbal
	Description Leadership Traits	
	1.00 - 2.33	Most Favored (MF)
Range	2.34 - 4.66	Moderately Favored (MoF)
	4.67 - 7.00	Least favored
	(LF) Interpersonal Traits	
	1.00 - 3.36	Most Favored (MF)
Range	3.37 - 6.66	Moderately Favored (MoF)
	6.67 - 10.00	Least favored (LF)

Table 3 shows the numerical weight of the Leadership Traits and Interpersonal Traits. For Leadership Traits, the computed range is 1.00 to 7.00 with corresponding verbal description as those Traits that fall on 1.00 – 2.33 is verbally described as Most Favored, 2.34 – 4.66 as Moderately Favored and 4.67 – 7.00 as Least Favored.

Same with Interpersonal Traits with a range of 1.00 – 10.00, it is verbally described as follows: those traits that fall within 1.00 – 3.36 is Most favored, 3.37 – 6.66 Moderately favored and 6.67 – 10.00 as Least Favored.

Table 4

Distribution of sex in valuing politicians' leadership traits and interpersonal traits

Leadership Trait	Female Mean	VD	Male Mean	VD
Integrity	1.99	MF	2.04	MF
Vision	2.93	MoF	3.00	MoF
Communication	4.41	MoF	4.19	MoF
Persuasion	4.63	MoF	4.44	MoF
Adaptability	4.13	MoF	4.41	MoF
Teamwork	3.72	MoF	3.97	MoF
Decision	3.38	MoF	3.5	MoF
Interpersonal Trait				
Positive Attitude	2.09	MF	3.17	MF
Attentive	2.93	MoF	3.84	MoF
Thorough	4.83	MoF	5.04	MoF
Conflict Manager	4.63	MoF	4.14	MoF
Friendly	4.87	MoF	4.63	MoF
Listener	4.38	MoF	4.82	MoF
Tactful	6.02	MoF	6.00	MoF
Sense of Humor	6.53	MoF	6.24	MoF
Empathy	4.92	MoF	4.91	MoF
Contacts and Networks	6.81	LF	6.98	LF

Table 4. Presents the distribution of Sex when grouped according to Leadership Traits and Interpersonal Traits. It shows that both male and female respondents value integrity of all the leadership traits. Thus, it indicates that with today's youth, as far as the respondents are concern, they put a prime value on honesty and truthfulness, which is what Integrity is all about. Then for Interpersonal Traits, both sexes chose Positive Attitude as Most Favored Trait of a political candidate. Based on the mean results, there is a significant difference on the choices of traits by gender, however, both are verbally described as Most Favored.

As presented in the table 5, Sex showed a significant interpretation in the choice of trait for a political candidate since *p-value* (0.023) is less than the *α value* (0.05). This further means that male and female have significant difference in choosing a trait of a political candidate. For example, the choice of a male differs from a choice of a female respondent.

Table 6 and 7 shows the interpersonal traits as being evaluated by the respondents by course. Bachelor of Arts students chose Positive Attitude as the most favorable. Bachelor of Science in Agriculture selected Positive Attitude, Attentiveness, Thorough, Conflict Manager, Friendly, Listener, and Empathy as the most favorable. AMDNA chose Sense of Humor as moderately favorable. BSACCY chose Attentiveness as the most favorable. BSBA did not choose a most favorable trait. BSCS, on the other hand chose six most favorable traits. BSGEO selected three most favorable traits. BSINT have not chosen a most favorable trait. BSMATH chose one favorable

trait. BSPHARMA chose two favorable interpersonal traits, Positive Attitude and Attentiveness, respectively. BPSYCH chose Positive Attitude as the most favorable. BST chose three most favorable traits. BSCRIM chose three most favorable traits. EDUC and ENGNG have chosen two most favorable traits. HM chose one most favorable trait. IT was not able to choose a most favorable trait. OSM chose five most favorable interpersonal traits.

Having *p-value* of 0.021 which is less than the *α value* of 0.05 suggest that there is a significant difference in choosing a political trait for a candidate by course which further explains that BS Psychology respondents have different choice of trait for a political candidate than that of respondents enrolled in another course.

Table 9 presents the Leadership Traits and Interpersonal

Traits of Politicians as rated by the respondents who are grouped by income. Respondents who are under 10,001-15,000 Moderately Favor Integrity and Positive Attitude while those who belong to the rest of the Income Brackets chose Integrity and Positive Attitude. It seems that the choices of the respondents are based on the opportunities offered to them at home and in school.

Given a *p-value* of (0.033) that is lesser than the *α value* of 0.05, presents that the choice of traits by respondents differs with the Family Income of the political candidates.

Table 11 presents the Interpersonal Traits chosen by respondents based on the respondents' benefactor. For Leadership Traits, Integrity is preferred by respondents supported almost all benefactor by except for Scholarship which Moderately Favors Integrity. Same is also true with

Table 5
Significant difference of sex to political traits

Variables Compared	Test Statistics	p-value	α value	Interpretation
Sex vs. Political Traits	Mann-Whitney U Test	0.023	0.05	Significant

Table 6
Distribution of course in valuing politician's leadership traits and interpersonal traits

	AB	AGRI	BSACCY	BSBA	BSCS	BSGEO	BSINT	BSPHAR
Leadership Trait								
Integrity	MF	MF	MF	MF	MF	MoF	MoF	MF
Vision	MoF	MoF	MoF	LF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Communication	MoF	MoF	MoF	LF	LF	LF	MoF	MoF
Persuasion	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MF	LF	LF
Adaptability	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	LF	MoF	MoF
Teamwork	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	LF	MoF	MoF
Decision	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Interpersonal Trait								
Positive Attitude	MF	MoF	LF	MoF	MoF	MF	LF	MF
Attentive	MoF	MoF	LF	LF	MoF	MF	LF	MoF
Thorough	MoF	MoF	LF	MoF	LF	MF	LF	MoF
Conflict Manager	MoF	MoF	LF	MoF	MoF	MoF	LF	MoF
Friendly	MoF	MoF	LF	MoF	LF	LF	LF	LF
Listener	MoF	MoF	LF	MoF	LF	LF	LF	MoF
Tactful	MoF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF
Sense of Humor	MoF	LF	MoF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF
Empathy	MoF	MF	LF	LF	MoF	LF	LF	MoF
Contacts and Networks	MoF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF

Table 7
Continued, distribution of course when grouped into leadership traits and interpersonal traits

Leadership Trait	BSMATH	BSPSY	BST	BSCRIM	EDUC	ENGNG	HM	OSM
Integrity	MF	MF	MF	MF	MF	MF	MoF	MoF
Vision	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Communication	MoF	LF	LF	MoF	MoF	LF	MoF	LF
Persuasion	MoF	LF	LF	LF	MoF	MoF	MoF	LF
Adaptability	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	LFF	MoF	MoF
Teamwork	MoF	MoF	LF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Decision	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Interpersonal Trait								
Positive Attitude	MoF	MF	LF	MF	MF	MF	MF	MoF
Attentive	MoF	LF	MF	MF	MF	MF	MoF	MoF
Thorough	LF	LF	MF	LF	MoF	LF	LF	MoF
Conflict Manager	MF	MoF	MF	MF	MoF	MoF	LF	MoF
Friendly	LF	MoF	LF	MoF	MoF	LF	MoF	MoF
Listener	MoF	LF	MoF	MoF	MoF	LF	MoF	MoF
Tactful	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF
Sense of Humor	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF
Empathy	LF	LF	MoF	MoF	LF	LF	LF	MoF
Contacts and Networks	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF

Table 8
Significant difference of course to political traits

Variables	Test Statistics	p-value	α value	Interpretation
Course vs. Political Traits	Kruskall Wallis One Way Analysis of	0.021	0.05	Significant

Table 9
Distribution of family income in valuing politicians' leadership and interpersonal traits

	0-5,000	5,001-10,000	10,001-15,000	15,001-20,000	20,001-25,000	25,000 and above
	VD	VD	VD	VD	VD	VD
Leadership Trait						
Integrity	MF	MF	MoF	MF	MF	MF
Vision	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Communication	MoF	MoF	MoF	LF	MoF	MoF
Persuasion	MoF	MoF	LF	LF	MoF	MoF
Adaptability	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Teamwork	MoF	MoF	MoF		MoF	MoF
Decision	MoF	MoF	MoF		MoF	MoF
Interpersonal Trait						
Positive Attitude	MF	MF	MoF	MF	MF	MF
Attentive	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MF	MF
Thorough	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Conflict Manager	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Friendly	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Listener	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Tactful	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Sense of Humor	MoF	LF	MoF	LF	MoF	LF
Empathy	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Contacts and Networks	MoF	LF	LF	LF	MoF	LF

Table 10
Significant difference of family income to political traits

Variables	Test Statistics	p-value	α value	Interpretation
Family Income vs. Political Traits	Kruskal Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance	0.033	0.05	Significant

Table 11
Distribution of family income in valuing politicians' leadership trait and interpersonal trait

Benefactor	Parents	Siblings/ Relatives	Scholarships	Parents and Siblings	Parents and Scholarship	Siblings and Scholarships	Parents, Siblings and Scholarships
Family Background							
Leadership							
Integrity	MF	MF	MoF	MF	MF	MF	MF
Vision	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Communication	MoF	MoF	MoF	LF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Persuasion	MoF	MoF	LF	LF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Adaptability	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Teamwork	MoF	MoF	MoF		MoF	MoF	MoF
Decision	MoF	MoF	MoF		MoF	MoF	MoF
Interpersonal Trait							
Positive Attitude	MF	MF	MoF	MF	MF	MF	MF
Attentive	MoF	NoF	MoF	MoF	MF	MF	MF
Thorough	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Conflict Manager	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Friendly	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Listener	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Tactful	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Sense of Humor	MoF	LF	MoF	LF	MoF	LF	LF
Empathy	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF	MoF
Contacts and	MoF	LF	LF	LF	MoF	LF	LF

Interpersonal Traits.

As presented in the table, sex showed a significant difference in the choice of trait for a political candidate since *p-value* (0.023) is less than the *α value* (0.05). This further means that the two values: male and female have significant difference in choosing a trait of a political candidate. For example, the choice of male respondents is different from the choice of female respondents.

4. Discussion

The study aimed in finding out the traits of political candidates as future electorates that may directly influence the voting choice of the adolescents. The traits that the respondents identified were very significant in giving information to the public through which it affects their voting choice, specifically the adolescents. Based on the results of the study, adolescents

do have the choice on who they want to vote as their political leaders according to the traits that they may be looking for. This could be acquired by the visible characteristics of the political candidates which conform with their influences and expectations. The appraisal of such traits should not be temporary, because the expectations of adolescents go beyond what they see. The qualities that they chose were more than the promises that politicians say during the campaign period. If they see these qualities on political leaders, adolescents can trust on their judgment and the votes that they cast on can predict performance of politicians.

Because of this, it is imperative that adolescents prefer political candidates that possess Leadership and Interpersonal Traits because they are the “out front” or “they lead the way” to guide their lives as constituents. This means that their choice of trait, Integrity for Leadership, as an example is valuable to them. As a result, traits play a crucial part in the formation of impression on the part of the political candidate at the same time the preference of the respondents. While, the respondents assigned prime value of Integrity for Leadership Traits and Positive Attitude for Interpersonal Traits, it is to note that their responses vary with gender as being a male or female. The variation of courses offered by the university also elicits different responses from the group. For instance, diverse preference of Leadership traits and Interpersonal Traits were shown across courses. Most of the courses place prime value on integrity while the rest of the traits were Moderately Favored. Integrity (being truthful and trustworthy, and having character and conviction) was the most frequently chosen trait. As adolescents, Honesty is fundamental trait for potential political candidates. They still favor credibility and excellent reputation and high point of Integrity. On the other hand, Positive Attitude was generally chosen by most of the Courses. The academic background of the respondents possibly influenced the preference of trait. The training on respondents’ future vocation may influence their voting choice to enhance student’s professional life. It may perhaps prepare them how to “fit-in” since some of the courses require neutrality when it comes to political viewpoint. It is interesting to reveal that, all Courses pointed out that Contacts- Networks Trait was Least Favored.

The trust that adolescents’ have on their potential political candidates are values that they want because they will be in the future political arena. Hence, they call for political leaders with Integrity and Positive Attitude who will lead and guide them to perform a leadership that is anchored on good qualities. Their choice is a predictor of what kind of political leaders they will have in the future.

5. Conclusion

Therefore, adolescents’ preference on Leadership and Interpersonal Traits of future leaders are part of their decision making as to whom they are going to vote for; with the results of the study, it brings to light the queries on what adolescents are looking for in terms of traits of political candidates, because of this, it is a strong support for the Social Science discipline as it gives significant contribution to how political processes can

be understood by people from all walks of life. It plays a unique role in how affect and cognitive processes takes place and works hand in hand to give a sense of freshness on how adolescents create their political judgment; and to guide their decision on political affairs. These greatly affect the shaping of political candidates’ traits as crucial determinants in how future leaders will perform in the political arena.

It is further inferred in the study, that there is a significant difference in the choice of political traits by respondents when they are grouped according to: sex, course, family income and benefactor. These data are key support on how these variables are playing roles in the assessment of decision making of adolescents and their impact in their voting preference. This is very important in the behavioral-social disciplines.

The views presented in this paper may be of service to interested politicians as a guide in molding and designing their campaign propaganda, who run for public - office with sensitivity to the concerns of the voting public. It can also be of assistance to Media practitioners for the wholesome image packaging of endorsed candidates. Further, this could be helpful for fellow Behavioral Scientist who are focusing on affective and cognitive cause in identifying political behavior. Likewise, for Social-Political Scientist in educating the voting public.

This study greatly provides information for the citizens or the public in making their voting choices and of course to the adolescents who are next-in-line to the voting field for them to develop vigilance and to protect their votes. This paper finally concludes that the study on the preferred traits of political candidates address the many issues and concerns of how adolescents choose their preferred traits of political leaders. Furthermore, it highlights that in the end, this is about watchfulness of politician’s public behavior, accountability and public image. With this, the results are strong foothold on the implication of values and the improvement of the quality of life of the people based on voting judgment particularly the adolescents who are the next generation.

References

- [1] Aicholer, J. and Willman, J. 2020. Desired Personality Traits in Politicians: Similar to me but none of a leader. *Journal of Research in Personality*, vol. 88, October 2020.
- [2] Flanagan, Constance, and Nakesha Faison. 2001. Youth civic development: Implications of research for social policy and program. *Ann Arbor: Society for Research in Child Development*.
- [3] Flanagan, C., & Tucker, C. (1999). Adolescents’ explanations for political issues: Concordance with their views of self and society. *Developmental Psychology*, 35, 1198–1209.
- [4] Flanagan, C., & Faison, N. (2001). Youth civic development: Implications of research for social policy and programs. *Social Policy Reports*, no. 1. 17.
- [5] Mannheim, Karl. 1952. The Problem with Generations. In Mannheim 1952. pp. 276-252.
- [6] Ortigas, Carmela D. 1999. *Group Process in the Philippines*. Ateneo de Manila Press, pp. 1-7.
- [7] Quintelier, E. and Hoogne, M. (2012). Political Attitudes and Political Participation: A Panel Study on the on Socialization and Self-Selection Effects among late Adolescents. *International Political Science Review*, 33, 2012.
- [8] Visser, M. (1994). The psychology of Voting Action. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*.