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Abstract: In present-day, the most effective means political leaders use to influence their base of supporters is through verbal communication. With this in mind, research shows that over the past two years, some political leaders have increasingly relied on “transferring their perception onto their base of followers, which often negatively stimulates and shapes an individual’s leadership performance.” In addition, to the detriment of our society, when political leaders transfer their perception onto their base of followers, they often misjudge the sensitive consequences of the prospective outcomes. Here for the first time, research now shows that a displaced thought process is attributed to the underlying stimulation used to arouse the transfer of one’s perception onto others. Therefore, because the “Dangerous behavior” following the transfer of one’s perception has become so prevalent in our society, such performance warrants immediate exploration.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Over the past two years, the acceleration of political rhetoric suggests that many political leaders have come to rely on the transfer of communicated perception to justify their beliefs and concept formations when rendering a decision (Jackson, 2011; Crane, 2009; Braund, 2008). Here, for the first time, we report how “Negative arousing stimuli are remembered more often…” (Sharot, Delgado, & Phelps, 2004) in the form of a displaced thought process (agitation, toleration, resonation, acceleration or integration), when it comes to measuring, “Dangerous behavior” (Lee, Donnelly, Cohen, et al., 2016) influenced by the “Transfer of Perception.”

As a result, such stimulus is now known to arouse the transfer of perception, which is considered to mentally affect, and negatively shape, an individual’s performance (decision-making and behavior). According to Ochsner (2000) when it comes to negative stimuli, “There is a reason to hypothesize that different neural networks will be involved when remembering negative stimuli.” The objective here is to identify and capture which displaced thought process is being transferred in the communicated rhetoric before it resonated, produces agitation, tolerance and is cognitively integrated and accelerated and later reciprocated into the individual’s performance.

Therefore, it is now critically essential to measure the intensity of an individual’s perception, because research now reveals how perception-based decisions follow a predictable path: The path leads to verbal, mental, and or physical harm. For instance, when President Trump made the comments about what the national football league should do to players who kneel during the national anthem, his most recent comments on Congresswoman Omar (Hayes, 2019; Stubley, 2019; AFP, 2019), Jussie Smollett and many, many others (Hoffman, Mather & Fortin, 2017; Wright, 2017).
This means now more than ever, political leaders should be held accountable for the transfer of their perception-based decisions (Brewer, 2012; Yukl & Mahsud, 2010; Frederiksen, 2010). Some leading researchers now consider this way of communication as “Dangerous behavior” (Lee, Donnelly, Cohen, et al., 2016). According to Talarico (2003), “The subjective sense of subconscious remembering when influenced by ‘agitation’ for instance is often taken into account as an actual accurate experience.” When it comes to the cognitive process of transferring one’s perception, “it is the perception others hold about an individual’s power that gives that person the ability to achieve influence over another person.”

This article describes how this pattern of arousal is related to the heightened subjective subconscious experiences that are influenced by a displaced thought process. Furthermore, to provide readers with a clear path of the intent of this paper, conclusions were drawn from the celebrated observational study by Paul Little, Hazel Everitt, and Ian Williamson (2001), which focused on “Measuring targeted communication that followed decisions made by patients concerning the perceptions of their recovery.”

The results of Little et al’s (2001) work revealed how an individual’s perceived decisions about their own recovery were often influenced by psychosomatic beliefs and concept formations of their past experiences (Kassam, Koslov & Mendes 2009; Bandura, 2001). The theories of Little et al. validated this paper by establishing the necessity of optimizing individual leadership performance in order to properly measure the intensity of perception-based decisions that followed a predictable path (Bacon, 2007; Kets de Vries & Korotov, 2007; Daudelin, 1996).

II. THE MODIFIED DEFINITION OF PERCEPTION

According to my study, “Perception is defined as the “Necessary existence of displaced energy influenced by time action and belief.” I further noted that, the reason why perception-based decisions are believed to be necessary, is because the individual exercising such decision-making feels so strong about a similar past experience and is the best way to solve the problem; which makes that person feel that, that decision was “necessary” and only exist because of the another person’s resistance to their reasoning. It is here that, studies examining memories of arousing ‘real-life’ events show that arousal heightens strong feelings from past experiences: Without necessarily enhancing the objective accuracy of the past experience to the situation at hand.

It is strongly suggested that because “Concept formations form judgments, is the reason why some political leaders have come to rely on past experiences to arouse the transfer their perception-based decisions onto others, which this paper suggests negatively shapes an individual’s leadership performance (decision-making and behavior).” With this in mind, for the first time, research victories have been made revealing that it is possible to measure the intensity of perception-based decisions that follow a predictable path.

III. THE PURPOSE OF MEASURING THE INTENSITY OF PERCEPTION

Measuring the intensity of perception remains a neglected issue of perception research. The solution to measuring the intensity of an individual’s perception is all around us but just hidden from our sight because we are often blind to our personal biases. The very notion has long been shown to be subtle, elusive, and was never precisely matched to physiological arousal of negative stimuli of past experiences, which has become a common practice of President Trump’s leadership performance for example. This paper also presents an argument in favor of reframing perception-based decisions into a psychosomatic field of study. The objective is to identify how perceptive concept formations and chronological oppressive factors influence an individual’s leadership performance (decision-making and behavior) to properly investigate measuring the intensity of an individual’s perception.

IV. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In this paper, I described in theory how the state of applied performance could reveal real-time neuro-feedback for measuring the intensity of individual perception-based decisions that follow a predictable path. To measure a real-time perception-based decision, individual leadership performance is conceptualized as an optimization of the individuals reasoning capability. This real-time measurement is based the level of influence by a displaced thought process as the individual processes information about their environment, especially when engaged in situations of uncertainty. The overarching objective is measuring how the transfer of perception influences human performance (decision-making and behavior) attributed to dangerous behavior that is reciprocated in to actions of mental, verbal, and even physical harm because of such transfer.
V. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MEASURING PERCEPTION-BASED DECISIONS

LeMay, Vollmer, and Ellis (2007) noted that, in the present day, “It is appropriate that political leaders have their individual leadership performance measured.” LeMay, Vollmer, and Ellis’s argument suggested that “To expect changes in the discursive communication, prominent political leaders must be held responsible for the transfer of all of their perception-based performance.” For example, measuring a political leader’s perception-based decision that was used to provide a directive to enforce or change a constitutional law or a judicial or executive policy. Current research suggests that the transfer of communicated perception has now become an obvious practice of some federal and state lawmakers, including police officers, especially in their reasoning for allocating resources, and enforcing laws they were hired to enforce (Hannum, Martineau, & Reinelt, 2007; Goleman, 2000; Heifetz & Laurie, 1997).

VI. WHY MEASURE INDIVIDUAL LEADERSHIP PERFORMANCE

It is appropriate to begin this section with literature that describes Albert Bandura’s (2001) “Social Cognitive theory,” to understand why it is important to measure an individual’s leadership performance. Bandura’s social cognitive theory outlines how internal and external subconscious experiences can be used to measure the intensity of an individual’s perception-based decisions (Crothers, Hughes, & Morine 2008). Bandura believed that the origin of an individual’s subconscious reasoning takes place when in an environment where observations, decisions, and behaviors have been adapted and processed through social and institutional learning (Northouse, 2010). For instance, the thought process that develops an individual’s internal perceived self-worth because of their wealth, race, gender, or financial and family status.

With this in mind, Doris Collins in 2002 performed a study that obtained outcomes of eighty-three studies on “Performance-level evaluation methods in management…” that supports innovative methods for measuring an individual’s leadership performance (decision-making and behavior). Collins work came after collaborating her theories with the inspiring work of (Newstrom, 1995) in which identified significant gaps in (Ellis & Davidi, 2005) cognitive neuro-feedback models that could be later applied to research targeting the optimization of an individual’s leadership performance.

Collins theories also suggested that the performance management interventions identified in her work produced the means of applying (Kassam, Koslov & Mendes 2009) neuro-biofeedback related to how individuals transfer subconscious perceptive beliefs onto others when personally engaged. Overall, the finding of Collins study supports the argument of this article, which specially focuses on an innovative approach that identifies the “psychosomatic” significance for measuring the intense transfer of communicated perception. According to some researchers, today it is critically important to evaluate our political leader’s psychosomatic performance, especially performance that affects all members of our society.

VII. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 The Moral Challenges of Perception-Based Performance

Over the past two years, a common question that prevents most political leaders from taking a stand regarding issues of right and wrong is the question concerning the moral challenges in perception-based performance. The 2009 work of Steve Guglielmo, Andrew Monroe, and Bertram Malle titled “At the Heart of Morality Lies Folk Psychology” was relied upon to add value to this paper. The findings of Guglielmo et al’s (2009) work, showed how the influences of folk psychology are formed within an individuals internalized thoughts as either intentional, a choice, or free will when transferred onto others.

The significance of Guglielmo et al.’s work suggested that choice is the main reason that defines the psychosomatic behavior of passing judgment and perpetuating the negative transfer of communicated perceptions onto others. In support of Guglielmo et al’s (2009) work, Yamashiro (2013) noted that political leaders should be examined often to determine how the intensity to which their personal subconscious biases negatively influences theirs and the actions of others. According to Yamashiro (2013), “When an individual makes a judgment based on the perception of another person, that judgment is internalized based on an individual’s ‘Working memory’; which has been known to trigger "Dangerous behavior" (Lee et al, 2016).
For example, when an individual makes a judgment of another person’s social status, or position of power, at this point, based on such “Working memory” the performance can now be measured based on the intensity of the displaced thought process that triggered the judgment. It is here that the investigations into measuring the intensity level in which displaced thought process has stimulated the individual’s performance before, while, and even after transferring one's perception onto another person begin. In general, Guglielmo et al.'s work support Albert Bandura’s theory which also revealed that the inner workings of cultural values of personal intent are the core for identifying those individuals who have learned to practice immoral judgments of blaming, and assigning blame on those who oppose them.

The question then becomes what is the “Intensity” level of the energy model (displaced thought process) that stimulated the individual's performance and how do we measure it. With this in mind, Anda, Feliti, Bremner (2006) noted that "Evidence of the exacerbation of blaming and assigning blame on those who oppose a person’s intent has been observed in the Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) studies. The ACE study, concluded that mental, verbal and physical harm are major risk factors for further violence…” when transferring one's perception onto others. (Lee, Donnelly, and Cohen et al., 2016) noted, inciting ”Violent behavior also affects mental health and expands demands on healthcare more broadly ….”

2.2 The Negative Morality of Perception

In consideration for Cushman, Young, and Hauser’s work titled, “The Role of Conscious Reasoning, and Intuition in Moral Judgment,” the definition of morality derived from their work suggested that some individuals in high political leadership often blur the boundaries between perception and structured leadership when it comes to the way they communicate to their base. In 2006, Keith Ansell-Pearson and Carol Diethe translated Friedrich Nietzsche’s study, on “The Genealogy of Morality,” and arrived at the conclusion that “He who has the power to avenge, good with good, and evil with evil, actually practices and believe they are an avenger; and to their base are considered grateful and revengeful, and is perceived as good.”

Ansell-Pearson and Diethe further translated Nietzsche as suggesting, the issue is not only he who does harm is bad, but also he who is contemptible is counted as bad. The translations of Ansell-Pearson and Diethe also suggested that because of this historical view, some male political leaders essentially have forgotten to be moral and to be ethical. In other words, some political leaders have come to rely on the practice of transferring their perceptions through negative rhetorical discourse to inspire their base.

For example, according to Sonmez, (2019), “House Speaker, Nancy Pelosi had to demand extra security to protect Congresswoman Omar, because President Trump intently transferred his perception to his base, resulting in reciprocated behavior reflected in increased death threats made on her life.” Keith Ansell-Pearson and Carol Diethe translations on “The Genealogy of Morality” were a credit to the focus of this article because their conclusions identified specifically how an individual’s immoral performance (decision-making and behavior) can be stimulated through an intentional transfer of perception. As we see play out, in the above example where perceptions are deliberately being communicated onto others, the results are often reciprocated in the form of mental, verbal, and even physical violent harm.

2.3 Deconstructing the Transfer of perception

Although internalized explanations of the deliberate transfer of communicated perception have become more evident, deconstructing the narratives of such transfer is now very necessary and warrants immediate exploration (Derrida, 2004). The process of deconstructing communicated perceptions is achieved by pinning down which displaced thought process is most signified in the narrative in order to identify subconscious learning that stimulated the intent of a conscious transfer of perception (Tosey, Visser, & Saunders, 2012).

Today subconscious learning that stimulates the intent of a conscious transfer of perception has infiltrated into the functional and transactional foundations of our social institutions, including educational and other public organizations (Weigel, 2008). I also noted that deconstructing perception-based decisions establishes the window of opportunity for “Optimizing an individual’s leadership performance” (Vogel, Wade, and Hackler, 2007; Derrida, 2004). Friston, Daunizeau, and Kiebel’s (2009) suggested that personal perceptions grounded within subconscious reasoning are often influenced by past experiences.
Leakman, Panter-Brick, and Saleh (2014) argued that “Childhood experiences of conflict, physical and emotional neglect can lead to developmental psychosomatic of damaging thought patterns that can play out into future dangerous behavior in the form of verbal, mental, and even physical violence …”. With this in mind, Veltman and Piper (2014) suggested that the influence of conflict and oppression should be taken into account when evaluating psychosomatic behavior, which can be overt or conducted secretly without the oppressed person(s) knowing they are being oppressed.

Herek, Gillis, and Cogan (2009) argued that oppression is commonly formed in the context of internalized perceptions, which can be “observed in cases where an individual or group believes that those who oppose them do not conform” to the internal expectations and controls of a dominant group (p. 436). Veltman and Piper (2014) supported the views of Herek et al., by highlighting how oppression is internally manifested in different ways when stimulated by a displaced thought process. According to Postmes and Smith (2009), a good example of individual’s practicing control over others is when mainstream members of society support obvious and blatant influences of discrimination and approve the action(s) and behavior it represents. For example, failure to punish race-related hate speech or support for sexist speech, or smearing reputable individuals of our society (Schneider & Bos 2014; Killen, Rutland, & Jampol, 2008).

**VIII. DISCUSSION AND RESULTS**

In this article, I relied upon my research study that focused on how negative influences of “Perception” shapes an individual’s leadership performance. The participants in my study were women political leaders who were asked to provide narratives of how perception negatively influenced the under-representation of their political leadership. The discussions presented in my recent study concluded, that the transfer of communicated perception is often based on a subconscious experience that when consciously called upon is often stimulated by a displaced thought process and based on a selective and assumed past experience (Wang, 2007; Hartley & Tranfield, 2011).

During my study, all of the participant’s echoed sentiments that the transfer of communicated perception indeed encompasses personal oppressive influences from past experiences, which some considered as a way of life (Burke, 2013). To properly interpret Burke’s above citation, Michel Foucault’s 1980 work on “Power and Knowledge” was referred upon. Foucault’s work supported how most present-day political leader’s performance (decision-making and behavior) is heavily influenced by their perceptions (Chiu, Gelfand, Yamagishi, Shteynberg & Wan, 2010).

Even when organizational policy and laws are in place for individuals to adhere to, individual perception(s) still subconsciously influences the performance of some political leaders (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2005). Over half of the participants in my study voiced that “From a governance and policy-making point of view, the ability to stop relying on their perception-based decisions would be welcomed” (Elmuti, Jai, & Davis, 2009).

**IX. CONCLUSION**

The urgent importance for researching how perception negatively shapes an individual’s performance of political leaders is because today, the intentional transfer of communicated perceptions are being reciprocated in our society in the form of cruel verbal, mental, and even physical harm. The question becomes, does measuring the intensity of perception-based decisions that follow a predictable path contribute to improving social change, and accountability of a political leader’s performance? Throughout this paper, I discussed how an energy model (displaced thought process) often stimulates the transfer of perception-based decisions and the purpose of obtaining biofeedback from this transfer in order to measure the intense verbal, mental, and physical harm of reciprocated performance from this transfer.

This reciprocated behavior is all around us and is not hidden from our sight any longer. As a result, “it has become critically important to identify impulsive reactions to all situations. I believe that in today’s society “a more formal structured leadership approach is the only option to keep a record of how any decision was made, what information it was based on, and who was involved.” Measuring the intensity of subconscious perceptions “might not be able to correct the experiences of past decisions, but it will help to recognize the value of applying the principles of structured leadership in future performances.”

The objective here is so that, if something does go wrong and the performance is criticized, it is possible to show that the individual’s decision-making and behavior were based on a decision other than an individual’s perception. The nature of structured leadership and decision-making does differ considerably compared to a perception-based decision. In contrast,
unlike structured-based decisions, perception-based decisions have “no one correct approach to personal governance.” The circumstances surrounding perception-based decisions can vary considerably, and for the first time can be measured because research now shows such decisions follow a predictable path.”

If this is the case, “What happens when people do not trust each other?” Is it possible that “They will ignore, disguise, and distort facts; ideas, conclusions, and feelings that they believe will increase their perception of others?” All in all, the additional focus of this article suggests that everyone is a “Leader”, simply because all leaders make decisions. For example, if an individual chooses to follow someone, a “decision” was made to do so. However, “Many factors can influence and stimulate an individual’s decision-making process”. For instance, “prejudice or wishful thinking might affect judgment.” In addition, “Reliance is often placed on past experiences without consideration of past mistakes.” It is here that, “Making a decision using perception alone should not be an option, but is often merely done because it is the easy way out.”

This article was mainly written to identify the dangerous behavior reciprocated from the communicated “Transfer of Perception” which is suggested to negatively shape and influence an individual’s leadership performance. In the last two years, and even today, we have witnessed an alarming increase in political discursive rhetoric that has ended in dangerous and violent behavior by those who reciprocated the communicated perceptions of some political leaders. With this in mind, current research now suggests that because perception-based decisions follow a predictable path, measuring the intensity of such decisions warrants further exploration.

**X. RECOMMENDATIONS**

Again, the reason this article is so important because it allows researchers to ask the question of, “Why are political leaders intently transferring their perception unto their base?” In consideration of the theories presented, if political leaders who are intent on “Transferring their perceptions” onto their base, the practice of this dangerous behavior will attribute to long-term mental health and social conflicts on the fabric of American life, its people, our American values and threaten the world's view of the capacity of the United States political leadership. Overall, there is growing concern and an urgent need for immediate exploration into the long-term effects in how perception-based decisions negatively shape an individual’s leadership performance (decision-making and behavior).
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