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Abstract

Introduction

Elections are stressful, particularly for those who may be particularly impacted by policy changes [CITE]. The 2020 U.S. presidential election provided a possibility for the re-election of the incumbent Donald Trump, whose campaign rhetoric in 2016 heavily featured immigration and denigration towards Mexico and Mexican-Americans, including emphasis on “Building the wall” and “making Mexico pay for it”. His election in 2016 resulted in increased hate crimes, hostility etc. towards minorities, immigrants, and Muslims. Thus, the current study examines the impact of the 2020 election on Latinos/Hispanics in anticipation of the election and during the aftermath using a daily diary approach.

**Impact of elections and policy on individuals**

Macrolevel factors impact the health and wellbeing of individuals [Mention Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998, ecological perspective]. Elections are particularly useful opportunities to study such processes. Research has documented both positive and negative psychological and physiological effects of past elections, including the 2000, 2008, and 2016 US elections (Hoyt et al., 2018; Neupert, Bellington & Smith, 2019; Roche & Jacobson, 2019; Zeiders et al., 2019; Trawalter, Chung & DeSantis et al., 2011; Stanton et al., 2009, 2010; Malat, Timberlake & Williams, 2011; Schiebe, Mata & Carstensen, 2011; Craig, Martinez, Gainous et al., 2016; ), as well as other elections around the world (Williams & Mohammed, 2013; Waismel-Manor, Ifergane et al., 2011). These studies show complicated patterns of effects on positive affect, negative affect, cortisol, and testosterone, suggesting elections can be both exciting and stressful events that influence individuals’ psychology and physiology, including activating a stress response.

Of course, the candidates and policies involved in the election play an important role in how they affect individuals. Research suggests elections may have a particularly negative effect on individuals and communities who are direct targets of hostility during an election cycle (Williams & Medlock, 2017). Hispanics compose the largest growing ethnic/racial minority group in the US, the majority of whom—over 60%—are Mexican-American (CITE census). In his 2016 presidential campaign, Trump repeatedly made reference to Mexican immigrants in a denigrating way, calling Mexican immigrants “criminals” and “rapists” in his campaign announcement speech and repeatedly saying he would “build a wall” along the U.S.-Mexico border and that Mexico would pay for it (CITE). On August 31, 2016, Trump gave a campaign speech in Phoenix, AZ, describing “criminal aliens” that “freely roam our streets, walk around, do whatever they want to do, crime all over the place,” as well as suggesting policy solutions to restrict immigration, including ending “catch and release” policies, increasing the number of border patrol agents on the border, immediately deporting anyone without documentation, blocking funding for sanctuary cities, remove amnesty programs for immigrants and suspending issuances on visas (CITE). Some of these campaign promises came to fruition in the first 100 days of Trump’s term in the form of 4 anti-immigrant executive orders that included directives to extend the wall along the U.S.-Mexico border, expedite deportations, remove protections in “sanctuary cities”, increase the number of ICE agents along the border, block entry for refugees and citizens from a number of countries in the Middle East, and restrict the issuance of H-1B visas, which are primarily issued to college-educated foreigners to fill US jobs that require a college degree (CITE).

Unsurprisingly, research has shown that anti-immigration rhetoric around the 2016 election and other anti-immigration legislation and policies have had a negative effect on Hispanic/Latino individuals and communities. For example, research documents emotional symptoms including anxiety, stress, fear, anger, and immigration-related worries, along with physical symptoms including sleep disturbances and somatic symptoms among Latino youth before and after the 2016 election (CITE). One study specifically examined the effect of the 2016 election on physiological stress responses of Latino adolescents, showing changes in bedtime cortisol and diurnal cortisol slopes within the 5 days surrounding election day. Other research has shown negative effects of restrictive anti-immigrant policies on Latinos, including legislation passed in the Arizona state senate in 2010 requiring individuals to carry documentation at all times and allowing law enforcement officials to check the immigration status of anyone they suspect are undocumented, often resulting in racial profiling (Ayon & Becerra, 2013; Moya Solas, Ayon & Gurrola, 2013). This kind of legislation and related immigration raids result in elevated fear, anxiety and other negatively-valenced emotions, less use of public assistance or preventative health care, and lower birth weight among Latina mothers related to stress (Ayon & Becerra, 2013; Moya Solas, Ayon & Gurrola, 2013; Toomey, Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014; White, Blackburn et al., 2014; Novak, Geronimus et al., 2017; Wray-Lake, Wells et al., 2017; Ayon, 2018). Additionally, when taking a state-level analysis, Latinos in states with more exclusionary anti-immigrant policies also reported poor mental health at higher rates (Hatzenbuehler, Prins, Flake et al., 2017), suggesting anti-immigrant policies have an effect on both psychological and physical outcomes among Latinos.

**Anticipation of a stressor**

Given the impact that Trump has had on nation-wide anti-immigrant and anti-Mexican rhetoric and legislation, the prospect of his re-election in 2020 was likely a significant source of stress on Latinos and Mexican-Americans in particular. The current study examined psychological responses during the period of time surrounding the 2020 U.S. Presidential election. In particular, we focused on anticipatory processes leading up to the election, which may play an important role in the health and wellbeing of Latinos. When anticipating a stressful event, individuals prepare for the stressor, especially when the event is appraised as threatening or personally-relevant (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). This anticipatory stress can help mobilize a coping response following the stressor (Neupert & Bellingtier, 2019), but may be detrimental when it occurs repeatedly over the lifetime. Recent research has focused on vigilance or anticipatory coping in anticipation of race-related discrimination and found effects on cardiovascular function, hypertension, obesity, sleep difficulty, depression and anxiety, even when controlling for previous experiences of discrimination (CITE).

Given the importance of anticipatory stress for physical and physiological health, especially for individuals from racial/ethnic minorities that experience high daily stress burdens, the current study examined the emotions and mental health Latino young adults close to the U.S.-Mexico border before, during, and after the election. To do this, we used a daily diary approach to repeatedly measure affect and symptoms of anxiety and depression every day for the two weeks surrounding the election. Daily diary and other ecological momentary assessment methods are beneficial in that they allow for examination of within-person variation in outcomes over time (CITE trull).

**Individual appraisal of stressor**

Lastly, we examined individual differences that may exacerbate negative responses in anticipation of the election. As the impact of an election (or any stressor) depends on personal relevance, we examined the impact of factors such as nativity, ethnic identity, and cultural values of familism.

**Current study**

The current study examines the effect of the 2020 U.S. presidential election on the psychological wellbeing of Latinos/Hispanics in the US-Mexico border region. This region is unique because of continued ties between Mexican-Americans living in the US and family members living in Mexico, familiarity and contact with the border and border regulations, and the majority status of Latinos in this region (El Paso is 80% Latino, the majority of whom have Mexican heritage). We examined the effect on young adults, many of whom voted in this election for the first time, as it is an important stage of political identity development (CITE). There were additional unique factors, including the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, which changed in-person voting procedures and increased the popularity of mail-in and early voting (get statistics).

Method

**Participants**

One hundred and ten participants (28 men, 81 women, and 1 trans/non-binary person) who identified as Hispanic or Latino were recruited using the Psychology Department SONA system and word of mouth. The majority of the participants were Mexican-American (XX%) and ranged in age from XX to XX years old (*M* = 23.6). Participants received $20 for participating in an onboarding session prior to the beginning of the daily diary period. Then, participants received $40 for participating in the 2-week daily diary period. Participants received bonus compensation ($10) for completing at least 85% of the daily diary surveys, resulting in a maximum of $70 in compensation. Compensation was distributed via online Target gift cards following the daily diary period. Compliance was acceptable (*M* = XX, min = XX, max = XX).

**Procedure**

The entire study took place online and all surveys were administered using Qualtrics. The onboarding session was facilitated via Zoom, where the details of the study were described, informed consent was obtained, and participants completed an onboarding questionnaire. All onboarding sessions took place during the week before the daily diary period began (two weeks before the election). During the daily diary period, which began one week prior to the election and ended one week following the election (), participants were sent a daily survey link via email every day at 6:00 pm MT. Participants were instructed to complete that survey within 8 hours (i.e., before 2:00 am the next day). Each daily survey took less than 10 minutes to complete.

**Measures**

**Onboarding.** In the onboarding questionnaire, participants completed a number of trait measures, including measures of trait anxiety (Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7 [GAD-7]; CITATION), trait depression (Patient Health Questionnaire-9 [PHQ-9]; CITATION), ethnic identity, including subscales related to identity exploration and identity commitment (Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised [MEIM]; CITATION), and cultural values of familism, including support (example items: “Family provides a sense of security because they will always be there for you”; “It is important to have close relationships with aunts/uncles, grandparents, and cousins”), obligation (example items: “Older kids should take care of an be role models for their younger brothers and sisters”; “Parents should be willing to make great sacrifices to make sure their children have a better life”), and referent subscales (example items: “When it comes to important decisions, the family should ask for advice from close relatives”; “It is important to work hard and do one’s best because thie work reflects on the family”) (Mexican American Cultural Values Scale [MACVS], CITATION). Additionally, participants rated their agreement to two items we created assessing associations between Trump and ICE (“Donald Trump has had a huge impact on border policy” and “I associate ICE with Donald Trump”), which we created because of the emphasis Trump’s campaign and administration have had on immigration issues and border policy. Last, participants indicated which presidential candidate they were leaning towards voting for (Response options: Trump, Biden, Other candidate, Not voting, Haven’t decided) and since the onboarding questionnaire was administered two weeks before the election, whether they had already voted, either by mail or by early voting. Other measures were administered that are not relevant to the current analyses, along with several demographic variables (e.g., age, gender, nativity, and parents’ nativity). A complete list of all measures administered can be found in the Supplementary Material.

**Daily diary period.** In each daily diary survey, participants were asked to first rate the degree to which they felt a number of different emotions that day. We used items from the PANAS-X (CITATION) to assess positive and negative affect and added 3 items to assess anxiety (anxious, worried, restless) and 3 items to assess depression (depressed, sad, downhearted). Additionally, [describe news engagement variable]. Several other measures were administered, including items assessing in-person and vicarious forms of racial/ethnic discrimination, but will not be discussed here. A complete list of all measures administered can be found in the Supplementary Material.

**Analytic Approach**

First, to examine trends in psychological outcomes (negative and positive affect, depression, and anxiety) during different periods of time within the study, we used multilevel piecewise growth models (Singer & Willet, 2003). To fit these models, we first determined three distinct time periods or stages over the course of the study: Days 1-6 (before the election), days 7-10 (after the election but before the winner was announced), and days 11-14 (after Biden was announced the winner). To estimate a separate slope or trajectory for the outcome during each time period, we created three unique time-varying predictors (one for each time period) to include in the model. In addition to estimating these three different slopes, we estimated the initial intercept for Stage 1 but did not include additional intercepts for Stage 2 and Stage 3, presuming that outcomes would be consistent in elevation from one stage to another and merely shift in trajectory. Additionally, we included participant as a random factor and let the intercept vary randomly by participant.[[1]](#footnote-1) Thus, the model (without covariates) is described as:

Outcome ~ 1 + A1 + A2 + A3 + (1|SubID)

where A1 coded Days 1-14 as {0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6}, A2 coded Days 1-14 as {0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 4, 4, 4}, and A3 coded Days 1-14 as {0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 2, 3}. The parameter associated with A1 estimated by the model describes the trajectory of the outcome during Stage 1. The parameters associated with A2 and A3 describe the trajectories of the outcome during Stages 2 and 3, respectively. We first report the results of piecewise growth models with no covariates to estimate general trends across the whole sample. Four models were fit to investigate trajectories in negative affect, positive affect, depression, and anxiety separately. Then, we report the results for models that include voting intentions as a moderator of the trajectory in each of the three stages.[[2]](#footnote-2). Last, to examine risk factors for increases in negative outcomes in anticipation of the election, we report the results of models exploring the effects of individual difference variables (e.g., ethnic identity, nativity) on Stage 1 trajectory.[[3]](#footnote-3)

In addition to examining trajectories in outcomes using piecewise growth models, we examined the effect of news engagement from day to day using same-day and lagged multilevel models. To separate between-person and within-person effects, we used the disaggregation method (Curran & Bauer, 2011), which creates two separate predictors that capture the between- and within-person effects. The predictor capturing the between-person effect is simply the mean level of news engagement for an individual across all days. Thus, this predictor has no within-person variance. The predictor capturing the within-person effect is the person-centered level of news engagement reported each day (since the mean for each person is zero, there is no between-person variance). These two predictors were included in models that predicted the outcome on each day (negative affect, positive affect, anxiety, or depression), along with the following covariates: day of the week (to account for weekend effects) and the outcome on the previous day (to account for stability in affect from day to day).[[4]](#footnote-4) Lagged models were also used to examine the effect of news engagement on one day to predict outcomes on the following day, using the same predictors and covariates.[[5]](#footnote-5) In all models, participants was used as a random factor and only the intercept was allowed to vary randomly by participant, as models would not converge when random slopes were included.

Results

**Multilevel Piecewise Growth Models**

First, we fit four separate piecewise growth models (one for each outcome of interest) with no covariates to estimate overall trends in each of the four stages. As Figure XX illustrates, depression and negative affect significantly increased in anticipation of the election (*b* = 0.08, 95% CIs [0.05, 0.11], *p* < .001, *f*2 = .02, and *b* = 0.06, 95% CIs [0.04, 0.06], *p* < .001, *f*2 = .03, respectively). Then, following the election but before the winner was announced, there was significant change in all four outcomes. Depression, negative affect, and anxiety significantly decreased, *b*s = -.07 – -0.15, *p*s < .001, *f*2 = .01 – .04, while positive affect significantly increased *b* = 0.06, 95% CIs [0.04, 0.06], *p* < .001, *f*2 = .03. Finally, following the announcement of the winner, all outcomes remained stable except for positive affect, which significantly decreased, *b* = -0.13, 95% CIs [-0.18, -0.08], *p* < .001, *f*2 = .02.

**Voting intention as a moderator.** To examine the effect of voting intention, we created a binary variable that coded for whether participants intended to (or had already) voted for Trump (1 = Intending to vote or voted for Trump, 0 = All other response options).[[6]](#footnote-6) As before, we fit four separate piecewise growth models (one for each outcome of interest), but included the binary voting intentions variable as a moderator of the trajectory in each stage. As Figure XX illustrates, Trump supporters and non-Trump supporters differed significantly in their trajectories in anticipation of the election. Whereas Trump supporters did not demonstrate any significant change in any of the outcomes, non-Trump supporters reported significant increases in negative affect, *b* = 0.08, 95% CIs [0.06, 0.10], depression, *b* = 0.11, 95% CIs [0.08, 0.14], and anxiety, *b* = 0.03, 95% CIs [0.00, 0.06]. Following the election but before the winner was announced, again Trump supporters differed significantly from non-Trump supporters. Trump supporters did not report any significant changes in any of the outcomes whereas non-Trump supporters reported decreasing negative affect, *b* = -0.12, 95% CIs [-0.15, -0.09], depression, *b* = -0.18, 95% CIs [-0.22, -0.13], and anxiety, *b* = -0.08, 95% CIs [-0.12, -0.04], as well as increasing positive affect, *b* = 0.11, 95% CIs [0.07, 0.15]. Finally, following the announcement of the winner, we found no significant differences in trajectories between Trump and non-Trump supporters, although positive affect did significantly decrease among non-Trump supporters, *b* = -0.14, 95% CIs [-0.20, -0.08]. Thus, support for different presidential candidates affected outcomes in primarily the first two stages, although the outcomes affected differed across stage.

**Individual differences as moderators.** In an exploratory manner, we tested a number of individual differences and attitudes as moderators of the trajectories of the negative outcomes (negative affect, anxiety, and depression) prior to the election, where we see the greatest increases in negative outcomes. Specifically, we tested the moderating role of ethnic identity, nativity, three sub-scales of familism (support, obligation, referent), trait anxiety, and trait depression. Of these variables, all had some moderating effect, although not all on the same outcomes (see Table XX). Ethnic identity significantly moderated trajectories for negative affect and depression, such that higher levels of ethnic identity were related to steeper positive trajectories in anticipation of the election. Nativity significantly moderated trajectories for anxiety, such that non-US-born participants had steeper positive trajectories than US-born participants. Familism (but only the support sub-scale) significantly moderated anxiety, such that higher levels of familism support values were related to steeper positive trajectories. Trait anxiety significantly moderated trajectories for negative affect, anxiety, and depression, such that higher trait anxiety was related to steeper trajectories. Finally, trait depression significantly moderated trajectories for anxiety, such that high trait depression was related to steeper trajectories. We additionally examined attitudes associating ICE and Trump but found no moderating influence.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Ethnic identity | | | Nativity | | | Familism (support) | | | Trait anxiety | | | Trait depression | | |
|  | *b* | *p* | *f2* | *b* | *p* | *f2* | *b* | *p* | *f2* | *b* | *p* | *f2* | *b* | *p* | *f2* |
| Negative affect | *.*01 | **.018** | .05 | -.03 | .139 | .00 | .01 | .054 | .01 | -.02 | **.009** | .15 | -.01 | .117 | .07 |
| Anxiety | .01 | .169 | .00 | -.08 | **<.001** | .01 | .03 | .**004** | .01 | -.05 | **<.001** | .16 | -.03 | .**017** | .09 |
| Depression | .03 | **.021** | .05 | -.03 | .257 | .01 | .02 | .156 | .01 | -.03 | **.030** | .16 | -.01 | .615 | .08 |

**Table XX.**

**Impact of Daily News Engagement**

We used disaggregated multilevel models to examine the effect of daily news engagement on same-day negative affect, positive affect, anxiety, and depression. These models included both between-person and within-person predictors along with covariates (day of the week and the relevant outcome on the previous day). Additionally, we examined the effect of daily news engagement on next-day negative affect using lagged multilevel models with the same predictors.

**Between-person effect.** Between-person variance in news engagement was positively related to same-day negative affect, *b* = 0.11, 95% CIs [0.04, 0.17], *p* = .002, *f*2 = .03 and depression, *b* = 0.17, 95% CIs [0.08, 0.27], *p* = .001, *f*2 = .03, but not positive affect or anxiety. The relationship was in the positive direction, such that individuals who engaged in more news overall reported higher levels of negative affect and depression over the course of the study.

**Within-person effect (same day).** Within-person variance in news engagement was positively related to all same-day outcomes. More news engagement on a particular day relative to a person’s mean level of news engagement, was related to higher negative affect, *b* = 0.10, 95% CIs [0.07, 0.13], *p* = .001, *f*2 = .04, higher positive affect, *b* = 0.08, 95% CIs [0.05, 0.12], *p* < .001, *f*2 = .03, higher anxiety, *b* = 0.08, 95% CIs [0.04, 0.12], *p* = .001, *f*2 = .03, and higher depression, *b* = 0.14, 95% CIs [0.09, 0.18], *p* < .001, *f*2 = .04, on that same day.

**Within-person variance (next day)**. News engagement on a particular day relative to a person’s mean level of news engagement, had a similar effect on negative affect, positive affect, and depression on the following day, such that more news engagement on a particular day relative to one’s own average predicted higher negative affect, [STATS], higher positive affect, *b* = 0.06, 95% CIs [0.03, 0.10], *p* < .001, *f*2 = .01, and higher depression [STATS] on the following day. No lagged effects were found on anxiety.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Same Day | | | | | | Next Day | | | | | |
|  | Between-person | | | Within-person | | | Between-person | | | Within person | | |
|  | *b* | *p* | *f2* | *b* | *p* | *f2* | *b* | *p* | *f2* | *b* | *p* | *f2* |
| Negative affect | *.*11 | **.002** |  | .10 | **<.001** |  |  |  |  | .04 | **.010** |  |
| Positive affect | .09 | .074 |  | .08 | **<.001** |  |  |  |  | .06 | **<.001** |  |
| Anxiety | .04 | .470 |  | .08 | **<.001** |  |  |  |  | .04 | .072 |  |
| Depression | .17 | **.001** |  | .14 | **<.001** |  |  |  |  | .06 | **.025** |  |

**Table XX.**

Discussion

Elections are stressful events and this is especially so for vulnerable communities that are impacted by potential policy changes (Williams & Medlock, 2017). The current study examined the impact of the 2020 U.S. presidential election on Latino young adults living on the U.S.-Mexico border. There were a number of things that made this election particularly unique. First, it took place during a global pandemic and during a time that El Paso was experiencing a spike in cases, hospitalizations, and deaths due to Covid-19. Because of the pandemic, the state of Texas (?) extended the period for early voting and relaxed requirements for mail-in voting, such that XX of all votes cast in El Paso were cast prior to election day. Because of these unusual factors, it took much longer to count votes nationwide—thus, it was not clear who won the election until several days after the polls closed, instead of several hours after the polls closed as has been the case for prior elections. Thus, we examined how psychological outcomes fluctuated during three distinct periods of time: the week leading up to the election, the several days following the election but before the results were known, and several days following the announcement of Joe Biden as the winner of the election.

As expected, we saw increases in negative affect, anxiety, and depression during the week prior to the election, although the increase in anxiety was only present among non-Trump supporters. Then, following the election, we saw these negative outcomes decrease while positive affect increased in anticipation of the announcement of Biden as the winner. Finally, positive affect returned to baseline following the announcement of Biden as the winner and trajectories for negative affect, anxiety, and depression were flat. This pattern of results suggests Election Day itself was anticipated as a stressor and even though the outcome of the election was not known for several more days, negative outcomes decreased following Election Day. This is consistent with other work….. [CITATIONS].

In an exploratory fashion, we additionally investigated individual differences that moderated the increase in negative affect, anxiety, and depression in anticipation of the election, as individuals’ appraisal of a stressor is important in determining both the consequence of the stressor and how one mobilizes resources to cope in anticipation of the stressor (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). One such factor was nativity, such that non-US-born participants had steeper positive trajectories than US-born participants. This is consistent with the idea that those who will be most significantly negatively impacted by the outcome of an election (in this case, the continued presidency of Donald Trump) to experience the most stress in anticipation of the election. In this case, non-US-born participants may have felt particularly uneasy about the prospect of Trump’s continued presidency and its effect on immigration policy, crossing the border to work or visit family, and continued encouragement of prejudice against immigrants and Mexicans. The deadly impact of anti-immigrant prejudice was felt especially keenly in El Paso on August 3, 2019, when a White man from Allen, Texas drove 10 hours to El Paso and shot and killed 22 people in a Walmart. The shooter told police he targeted Mexicans and prior to the shooting released an anti-immigrant manifesto online saying he was carrying out the attack in “response to the Hispanic invasion of Texas” (CITE). Thus, the moderating effect of nativity on increases in anxiety prior to the election is unsurprising.

Ethnic identity and familism (specifically, familism values related to support) additionally moderated negative outcomes, such that individuals with stronger ethnic identity experienced steeper increases in negative affect and depression and individuals with stronger familism support values experienced steeper increases in anxiety. In past research, these two factors are typically seen as protective for both mental and physical health (CITE), although ethnic identity is sometimes associated with mixed outcomes (CITE). In the current study, rather than being protective, these factors seem to exacerbate the stress experienced in anticipation of the election.

Last, we examined how daily fluctuations in news engagement surrounding the election was related to psychological outcomes. Engagement in politics on a daily basis is generally considered a stressor (Ford & Feinberg, 2020), and thus, we expected that both between- and within-person variance in news engagement would predict higher negative outcomes. We found that individuals who engaged in more news overall reported higher levels of negative affect and depression over the course of the study. Daily fluctuations in news engagement had a similar effect, such that days on which individuals engaged in more news than they usually did, they reported

Piecewise

* Talk about increases in negative outcomes in anticipation of the election
* Things that are usually protective had exacerbating effect
* ??

Daily multilevel models

* News engagement was related as expected to negative outcomes
* Not related as expected to positive affect
  + Positive same-day effect, carries over into next day (lagged effect)
  + Potentially that people who are more engaged in news feel more extremes? More negative during negative times, more positive during positive times?
    - Separate into before and after election?
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