

Factors Influencing Voting Decision

Subjects: **Political Science**

Contributor: Waiphot Kulachai , Unisa Lerdtomornsakul , Patipol Homyamyen

The voting decisions of a population are vital in forming the political structure of a country. Recognizing what influences voters' selections is key for politicians, candidates, and those crafting policy.

politics

voting choice

voting decision

1. Introduction

Voting decisions are at the heart of democratic societies, as they shape the composition of governments and determine the policies that govern our lives. However, the choices individuals make at the ballot box are influenced by a myriad of factors that impact their decision-making process. Exploring and understanding these factors is crucial for comprehending voter behavior and the dynamics of elections.

2. Factors Influencing Voting Decisions

2.1. Individual-Level Factors

The relationship between socioeconomic status (SES) and voting decisions is a complex and multifaceted topic that has been studied extensively by political scientists and sociologists. While there is no single consensus on the precise nature of this relationship, research suggests that SES can have a significant influence on voting patterns. Here are a few key points and studies to consider:

- **Income:** Income can be a significant factor influencing individuals' voting decisions. Research has shown that income levels can shape political preferences and voting behavior in various ways. Several studies have found a positive correlation between income levels and political participation, including voting. Higher-income individuals tend to be more politically engaged and more likely to vote compared to those with lower incomes. For example, a study by [Verba et al. \(1995\)](#) found a positive relationship between income and voter turnout in the United States. Studies by [Alesina and Glaeser \(2004\)](#) have found that higher-income individuals are more likely to support conservative or right-leaning parties. This can be attributed to the belief that conservative policies, such as lower taxes and less government intervention, align with their economic interests. Higher-income individuals may prioritize economic issues such as business growth, investment, and reduced regulation. On the other hand, lower-income individuals are more likely to support left-leaning parties that advocate for policies promoting income redistribution, social welfare programs, and economic equality. They may perceive these policies as beneficial for their economic well-being and the reduction in income disparities.

Additionally, research by [Bartels \(2008\)](#) suggests that income inequality can also influence voting decisions. Bartels found that individuals in societies with higher levels of income inequality are more likely to support left-wing parties or candidates. This could be because income inequality can lead to perceptions of unfairness and a desire for policies that address economic disparities. Moreover, studies have shown that the impact of income on voting decisions can vary depending on other factors such as education level, occupation, and regional differences. For example, individuals with higher levels of education may prioritize different policy issues compared to those with lower levels of education, regardless of their income. In conclusion, income can play a significant role in shaping voting decisions. Higher-income individuals often lean towards conservative policies, while lower-income individuals tend to support left-leaning policies that address income inequality and social welfare.

- **Education:** Education can have a significant impact on individuals' voting decisions. Research has consistently shown that individuals with higher levels of education are more likely to vote. A study by [Nie et al. \(1976\)](#) found that educational attainment is one of the strongest predictors of political participation. Numerous studies have demonstrated a strong association between educational attainment and political preferences. Research conducted by [Evans and Andersen \(2006\)](#) suggests that higher levels of education are generally associated with more liberal or left-leaning political orientations. This is partly attributed to the exposure to diverse ideas, critical thinking skills, and access to information that comes with higher education. Well-educated individuals often prioritize issues such as social justice, equality, and progressive policies that address societal challenges. Furthermore, educational attainment is linked to increased political engagement and participation. Studies have shown that individuals with higher levels of education are more likely to vote, join political organizations, and engage in political discussions. This increased involvement allows them to have a greater influence on the political process and shape their voting decisions based on a more informed understanding of the issues at hand. However, it is important to note that the relationship between education and voting decisions is complex, and there are variations among different contexts and societies. Other factors such as socioeconomic status, cultural background, and regional differences can also influence the impact of education on voting behavior. In summary, higher levels of education tend to be associated with more liberal political orientations and increased political engagement. Education equips individuals with critical thinking skills, access to information, and a broader understanding of social issues, which can shape their voting decisions and policy preferences.
- **Gender:** Gender can significantly influence individuals' voting decisions, with distinct patterns observed between men and women. Previous findings showed a relationship between gender and political preferences. Some studies have found that women tend to be more likely to support left-leaning parties or candidates compared to men ([Karp and Banducci 2008](#); [Matland and Studlar 1996](#)). This gender gap in voting behavior can be attributed to various factors. Women often prioritize issues such as healthcare, education, social welfare, and gender equality, which are commonly associated with progressive policies. Additionally, women's political attitudes and behaviors may be influenced by their experiences, including societal expectations, gender roles, and experiences of discrimination ([Monroe 1995](#)). Conversely, men are more likely to support conservative or right-leaning parties ([Burns and Gimpel 2000](#)). They may prioritize issues such as national security, economic growth, and traditional values. Cultural and social factors, including traditional gender roles and expectations,

can also shape men's political orientations ([Monroe 1995](#)). It is important to note that the gender gap in voting behavior is not uniform across countries and contexts, and variations exist within gender groups. Factors such as age, education, race, and socioeconomic status can intersect with gender to influence voting decisions ([Franceschet and Piscopo 2012](#)). In summary, gender plays a significant role in shaping voting decisions, with women tending to support left-leaning parties or candidates more often than men. The gender gap in voting behavior can be attributed to differences in issue priorities and societal experiences.

- **Age:** Age can have a significant influence on individuals' voting decisions, with distinct voting patterns observed across different age groups. Research has consistently shown a relationship between age and political preferences. Various studies have found that younger voters, typically those in their late teens to early thirties, tend to support more progressive or left-leaning parties and candidates ([Dalton 2008](#); [Tilley and Hobolt 2011](#)). Younger voters often prioritize issues such as climate change, social justice, and generational concerns, which align with progressive policies ([Blais et al. 2004](#)). They may also be more open to social change and less tied to traditional institutions and values ([Inglehart and Norris 2000](#)). In contrast, older voters, typically those above the age of fifty or sixty, tend to lean towards conservative or right-leaning parties ([Dalton 2008](#); [Tilley and Hobolt 2011](#)). Older voters often prioritize issues such as economic stability, security, and maintaining traditional values and institutions ([Campbell 2008](#)). They may also be more resistant to rapid social change ([Inglehart and Norris 2000](#)). The relationship between age and voting behavior can be influenced by factors such as cohort effects, life experiences, and political socialization ([Dalton 2008](#); [Tilley and Hobolt 2011](#)). As individuals age and go through different life stages, their priorities and perspectives may evolve, leading to changes in their voting decisions. It is important to note that the relationship between age and voting behavior can vary across different countries and contexts. Factors such as the political landscape, economic conditions, and cultural values can also shape the voting decisions of different age groups ([Dalton 2008](#)). In summary, age plays a significant role in shaping voting decisions, with younger voters tending to support more progressive parties or candidates, while older voters lean towards conservative parties. Differences in issue priorities, life experiences, and generational values contribute to the varying voting patterns across different age groups.
- **Political ideology:** Political ideology refers to a set of beliefs, values, and principles that shape one's views on social, economic, and political issues. These ideologies often align with specific political parties or movements. Political leanings, whether tilting conservative or liberal, play a substantial role in guiding electoral choices. These leanings act as a bridge, linking voters to candidates that reflect their intrinsic values and policy inclinations. Those aligned with conservative values typically emphasize societal order, the importance of a laissez-faire economic stance, and a strong national defense, leading them to side with candidates who vocalize these priorities. In contrast, liberal-minded voters usually champion societal progression, economic regulation, and a wider embrace of inclusivity, driving their support toward candidates with these viewpoints ([Mason 2018](#)). In conclusion, political ideology serves as a significant predictor of voting decisions. Understanding an individual's ideological stance provides insights into their policy preferences and the political parties or candidates they are likely to support.
- **Personality traits:** Personality traits can also play a significant role in shaping individuals' voting decisions. Research conducted by [Gerber et al. \(2011\)](#) suggests that certain personality traits are associated with specific

political orientations and voting behaviors. For instance, individuals with higher levels of openness to experiences tend to be more receptive to new ideas and are more likely to support progressive policies and candidates. On the other hand, individuals with higher levels of conscientiousness, which includes traits such as self-discipline and organization, are more inclined towards conservative ideologies that emphasize order and tradition. Furthermore, studies have shown that agreeableness, which relates to cooperation and empathy, is associated with support for policies that prioritize social equality ([Mondak et al. 2010](#); [Bakker and Lelkes 2018](#)). Individuals with higher levels of agreeableness are more likely to endorse candidates and parties that advocate for inclusive social policies ([Gerber et al. 2011](#)). In a study conducted by [Vecchione et al. \(2018\)](#), it was found that individuals with higher levels of extraversion tend to vote for parties or candidates that emphasize charisma and assertiveness. Extraverts are more likely to be attracted to leaders who are energetic and outgoing, whereas introverts may prefer more reserved and thoughtful candidates. In summary, personality traits can influence voting decisions by shaping individuals' political orientations and preferences. Understanding the relationship between personality and voting behavior provides valuable insights into how people make their electoral choices.

- Emotional Intelligence (EI): This concept, a crossroads of psychological and social research, continues to shape researchers' understanding of political science. Pioneered by [Mayer and Salovey \(1990\)](#) and later championed by [Goleman \(1995\)](#), EI refers to the capacity to recognize, understand, control, and effectively use emotions. Recent studies have been probing the connection between EI and political engagement, uncovering intriguing connections. [Lodge and Taber \(2013\)](#) underscore the intertwined nature of emotion and cognition in political thinking. Emotions can offer shortcuts or heuristics that influence how individuals evaluate political stimuli. For instance, a voter might feel fear when considering certain policies, leading them to oppose those policies even if a logical evaluation might suggest otherwise. Simultaneously, cognitive processes can also influence how one interprets and responds to emotional experiences, shaping the direction and intensity of political attitudes.
- Climate Change Concerns: As the evidence and impacts of climate change have grown clearer and more pervasive, so has its influence on voting behavior. The urgency of addressing climate change has become increasingly salient among voters in recent years. A study by [Anderson and McGregor \(2018\)](#) found that concern for climate change is a significant predictor of voting behavior, especially for younger voters who are likely to bear the brunt of climate change impacts. Similarly, [Mildenberger and Tingley \(2019\)](#) found that constituencies with higher proportions of climate-concerned voters are more likely to vote for candidates who prioritize climate action. On a more specific level, [Tranter and Booth \(2020\)](#) discovered that personal experiences with extreme weather events, which are projected to increase due to climate change, significantly increase the likelihood of voters supporting climate-focused policies and politicians. Further, [Bechtel and Scheve \(2021\)](#) studied the relationship between climate change concerns and international cooperation. Their findings suggest that voters concerned about climate change are more likely to support international cooperation on climate policy, reflecting a realization that climate change is a global issue requiring global solutions.
- Healthcare Experiences: The significance of healthcare as an integral part of human welfare fundamentally impacts voters' decision-making processes. Voters' personal encounters with the healthcare system, whether

satisfying or disappointing, and their perception of the system's overall performance hold considerable sway over their voting choices. Research by [Haselswerdt \(2018\)](#) highlighted that individuals' personal experiences with healthcare can guide their voting choices. Experiences that meet or exceed expectations can solidify support for the current system or incumbent politicians, whereas subpar experiences can stimulate a call for change, prompting voters to lean against the existing political order. Moreover, [Gollust and Rahn \(2019\)](#) discovered that personal health crises, such as severe illnesses or accidents, can substantially realign voters' priorities. In these situations, voters tended to assign a greater weight to healthcare policies when casting their votes. This phenomenon was found to be valid even among voters who previously did not view healthcare policies as a decisive factor in their voting decisions. Extending this perspective to a broader scale, [Geruso and Layton \(2020\)](#) found that communities with inferior health outcomes, a potential sign of deficient healthcare services, were more likely to vote for candidates pledging healthcare reforms. Lastly, research by [Clinton and Sances \(2021\)](#) revealed the profound influence of the COVID-19 pandemic on voting behavior, particularly in areas severely impacted by the pandemic. These areas were more inclined to support candidates advocating for enhanced public health measures and improvements in healthcare.

2.2. Socio-Cultural Factors

Socio-cultural factors play a crucial role in shaping individuals' voting decisions. These factors encompass a range of social and cultural influences that can shape political orientations and preferences.

- **Social identity:** Social identity plays a significant role in shaping individuals' voting decisions. Research has shown that people's identification with certain social groups can influence their political preferences and voting behavior. Studies have highlighted the impact of social identities such as race, ethnicity, gender, and social class on voting decisions ([Huddy 2013](#); [Plutzer and Zipp 1996](#)). Individuals often align their voting choices with the interests and perspectives associated with their racial and ethnic identities. Minority voters may support candidates or parties that they perceive as more attentive to their concerns regarding racial or ethnic equality and social justice ([Hajnal et al. 2017](#)). Similarly, gender identity can influence voting decisions, with women often supporting candidates or policies that address issues of gender equality and reproductive rights ([Dolan 2014](#)). Furthermore, group identity and socialization processes within social networks can shape individuals' political choices. Families, communities, and peer groups can transmit political values and beliefs that influence voting decisions ([Mondak et al. 2010](#)). In summary, social identity significantly influences voting decisions. The social groups to which individuals belong, such as race, ethnicity, gender, and social class, can shape their political preferences and align their voting choices with the interests and perspectives associated with their social identities.
- **Ethnicity and race:** Ethnicity and race can significantly influence individuals' voting decisions. Research has consistently shown that racial and ethnic identities play a crucial role in shaping political preferences and voting behavior. Studies have found that individuals from minority racial and ethnic groups often support candidates or parties that they perceive as more attentive to their concerns regarding racial or ethnic equality and social justice ([Hajnal et al. 2017](#)). For example, members of marginalized racial or ethnic communities may be more

likely to support policies addressing issues such as discrimination, immigration, or criminal justice reform ([Barreto et al. 2009](#)). Moreover, research has shown that racial and ethnic identity can create strong bonds within social groups, leading to cohesive voting patterns ([Plutzer and Zipp 1996](#)). Members of specific racial or ethnic communities may vote collectively, based on shared experiences, values, and political goals ([Barreto et al. 2009](#)). Additionally, racial and ethnic identity can influence voter turnout and engagement. Studies have indicated that individuals who strongly identify with their racial or ethnic background are more likely to participate in political activities, such as voting and mobilization efforts ([Hajnal et al. 2017](#)). It is important to note that the relationship between race, ethnicity, and voting behavior is complex, and there are variations within racial and ethnic groups. Factors such as socioeconomic status, educational attainment, and generational differences can intersect with race and ethnicity to shape individuals' political choices ([Fraga et al. 2018](#)). In summary, racial and ethnic identities significantly influence voting decisions. Members of minority racial and ethnic groups often align their voting choices with candidates or parties that address their concerns regarding racial or ethnic equality and social justice, leading to cohesive voting patterns within these communities.

- Religion: Religion can significantly influence individuals' voting decisions. Numerous studies have highlighted the impact of religious beliefs and affiliations on political preferences and voting behavior. Research has shown that individuals often align their voting choices with candidates or parties that they perceive as compatible with their religious values and moral convictions ([Green et al. 1996](#); [Layman 2001](#)). For example, religious voters may prioritize issues such as abortion, same-sex marriage, or religious freedom, and support candidates who share their stances on these issues. Different religious traditions and denominations can also shape voting decisions. Studies have found variations in political preferences among different religious groups ([Wald and Calhoun-Brown 2014](#)). For instance, conservative Protestant Christians may be more likely to support conservative candidates, while liberal Protestants or members of other religious traditions may lean towards progressive or left-leaning candidates. Religious institutions and leaders can also play a role in shaping voting behavior. Sermons, religious teachings, and endorsements by religious leaders can influence the political attitudes and choices of their followers ([Smidt 2003](#)). It is important to note that the relationship between religion and voting behavior is complex, and individuals within religious communities can hold diverse political views. Factors such as individual interpretations of religious teachings, personal values, and other sociodemographic characteristics can intersect with religious beliefs to shape voting decisions ([Djupe and Gilbert 2009](#)). In summary, religion significantly influences voting decisions. Individuals often align their voting choices with candidates or parties that they perceive as compatible with their religious values and moral convictions, leading to variations in political preferences among different religious groups.
- Media influence: Media influence plays a significant role in shaping individuals' voting decisions. Research has consistently demonstrated the impact of media on political preferences and voting behavior. Numerous studies have shown that media exposure can shape individuals' attitudes, knowledge, and perceptions of political candidates and issues ([Prior 2007](#); [Iyengar and Kinder 2010](#)). The media serves as a primary source of information about politics for many individuals, influencing their understanding and evaluation of political events and candidates. Media outlets can have ideological leanings or biases that shape the framing and presentation

of political news, potentially influencing individuals' voting decisions ([Gentzkow and Shapiro 2011](#)). Individuals who consume media aligned with their own political beliefs may be more likely to have their views reinforced, while exposure to diverse media sources can lead to a more balanced and nuanced understanding of political issues. Moreover, media coverage of political campaigns, debates, and candidate performances can influence individuals' perceptions and evaluations of candidates ([Basil et al. 2018](#)). Media narratives and the emphasis on specific issues or controversies can shape the salience and importance individuals assign to different aspects of a candidate's platform or character. It is important to note that the influence of media on voting decisions is complex, and individuals' media consumption habits and critical thinking abilities can moderate media effects ([Prior 2007](#)). Factors such as personal beliefs, social networks, and other information sources also interact with media and have an influence on voting behavior. In summary, media influence significantly shapes voting decisions. Media exposure can shape individuals' attitudes, knowledge, and perceptions of political candidates and issues, potentially influencing their voting preferences and evaluations of candidates.

- **Social networks:** The influence of social networks on voting decisions has been a topic of significant interest and research in recent years. Social networks, such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram, have become platforms where individuals engage in political discussions, share political content, and interact with political candidates and campaigns. Studies have shown that social networks can have both direct and indirect effects on voting decisions. Firstly, social networks provide a space for political information dissemination, where individuals can access news articles, opinion pieces, and campaign messages. Exposure to such content can shape individuals' political knowledge, attitudes, and preferences, which in turn may influence their voting decisions ([Bakshy et al. 2015](#); [Bond et al. 2012](#)). Secondly, social networks facilitate social influence and information diffusion processes. Users are often connected to friends, family, and acquaintances on these platforms, and they are exposed to the political opinions and behaviors of their social contacts. Research has demonstrated that individuals are more likely to adopt the political views of their network connections, particularly when those connections are close and highly influential ([Fowler and Christakis 2008](#); [Cialdini and Goldstein 2004](#)). Furthermore, social networks provide opportunities for political campaigns to target specific demographic groups and engage in personalized messaging. Campaigns can leverage user data and algorithms to deliver tailored content to individuals based on their interests, demographics, and online behavior. This targeted messaging can be effective in mobilizing and persuading voters ([Kreiss 2016](#)). However, the influence of social networks on voting decisions is not without its challenges and concerns. Issues such as the spread of misinformation, echo chambers, and the potential for manipulation through social media platforms have raised questions about the quality of information and its impact on democratic processes ([Guess et al. 2019](#); [Pennycook and Rand 2019](#)). Overall, social networks have emerged as powerful tools that can shape individuals' voting decisions through information exposure, social influence, and targeted messaging. Understanding these dynamics and their implications is essential for policymakers, scholars, and individuals as they navigate the intersection of technology, social networks, and democracy.

References

1. Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
2. Alesina, Alberto, and Edward Ludwig Glaeser. 2004. *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe: A World of Difference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
3. Bartels, Larry M. 2008. *Unequal Democracy: The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
4. Nie, Norman H., Sidney Verba, and John R. Petrocik. 1976. *The Changing American Voter*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
5. Evans, Geoffrey, and Robert Andersen. 2006. The Political Consequences of Trust. In *Handbook of Political Science Research on the Middle East and North Africa*. Berlin and Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 635–48.
6. Karp, Jeffrey A., and Susan A. Banducci. 2008. Political efficacy and participation in twenty-seven democracies: How electoral systems shape political behaviour. *British Journal of Political Science* 38: 311–34.
7. Matland, Richard E., and Donley T. Studlar. 1996. The contagion of women candidates in single-member district and proportional representation electoral systems: Canada and Norway. *The Journal of Politics* 58: 707–33.
8. Monroe, Kristen R. 1995. The psychology of genocide: A review of the literature. *Ethics & International Affairs* 9: 215–39.
9. Burns, Peter, and James G. Gimpel. 2000. Economic insecurity, prejudicial stereotypes, and public opinion on immigration policy. *Political science quarterly* 115: 201–25.
10. Franceschet, Susan, and Jennifer M. Piscopo. 2012. Gender and political backgrounds in Argentina. In *The Impact of Gender Quotas*. Oxford: Oxford Academic, pp. 43–56.
11. Dalton, Russell J. 2008. *The Good Citizen: How a Younger Generation Is Reshaping American Politics*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
12. Tilley, James, and Sara B. Hobolt. 2011. Is the government to blame? An experimental test of how partisan cues shape responses to government performance. *American Journal of Political Science* 55: 515–30.
13. Blais, André, Elisabeth Gidengil, Richard Nadeau, and Neil Nevitte. 2004. *Anatomy of a Liberal Victory: Making Sense of the 2000 Canadian Election*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
14. Inglehart, Ronald, and Pippa Norris. 2000. The developmental theory of the gender gap: Women's and men's voting behavior in global perspective. *International Political Science Review* 21: 441–63.

15. Campbell, Amy L. 2008. The young and the realigning: A longitudinal analysis of youth political behavior. *American Journal of Political Science* 52: 685–96.
16. Mason, Lilliana. 2018. *Uncivil Agreement: How Politics Became Our Identity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
17. Gerber, Alan S., Gregory A. Huber, David Doherty, and Conor M. Dowling. 2011. Personality traits and the consumption of political information. *American Political Science Review* 39: 32–84.
18. Mondak, Jeffery J., Matthew V. Hibbing, Damarys Canache, Mitchell A. Seligson, and Mary R. Anderson. 2010. Personality and civic engagement: An integrative framework for the study of trait effects on political behavior. *American Political Science Review* 104: 85–110.
19. Bakker, Bert N., and Yphtach Lelkes. 2018. Selling ourselves short? How abbreviated measures of personality change the way we think about personality and politics. *The Journal of Politics* 80: 1311–25.
20. Vecchione, Michele, Shalom H. Schwartz, Guido Alessandri, Anna K. Döring, Valentina Castellani, Gian V. Caprara, and Jan Cieciuch. 2018. Personality and political orientation: Meta-analysis and test of a Threat-Constraint Model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 115: 964–98.
21. Mayer, John D., and Peter Salovey. 1990. Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality* 9: 185–211.
22. Goleman, Daniel. 1995. *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books, Inc.
23. Lodge, Milton, and Charles S. Taber. 2013. *The Rationalizing Voter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
24. Anderson, Cameron D., and Michael R. McGregor. 2018. Climate change and broadbanding: Evidence from Canadian elections. *Environmental Politics* 27: 715–39.
25. Mildemberger, Matto, and Dustin Tingley. 2019. Beliefs about climate beliefs: The importance of second-order opinions for climate politics. *British Journal of Political Science* 49: 1279–307.
26. Tranter, Bruce, and Kate Booth. 2020. Scepticism in a changing climate: A cross-national study. *Global Environmental Change* 60: 101984.
27. Bechtel, Michael M., and Kenneth F. Scheve. 2021. On the political economy of climate change: A study of public opinion and global temperature. *International Organization* 75: 448–71.
28. Haselswerdt, Jake. 2018. Expanding Medicaid, expanding the electorate: The Affordable Care Act's short-term impact on political participation. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 43: 649–88.
29. Gollust, Sarah E., and Wendy M. Rahn. 2019. The bodies politic: Chronic health conditions and voter turnout in the 2008 election. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 44: 951–75.

30. Geruso, Michael, and Timothy Layton. 2020. Upcoding: Evidence from Medicare on squishy risk adjustment. *Journal of Political Economy* 128: 984–1026.
31. Clinton, Joshua D., and Michael W. Sances. 2021. The politics of policy: The initial mass political effects of Medicaid expansion in the States. *American Political Science Review* 115: 568–85.
32. Huddy, Leonie. 2013. From Group Identity to Political Cohesion and Commitment. In *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 361–92.
33. Plutzer, Eric, and John F. Zipp. 1996. Identity politics, partisanship, and voting for women candidates. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 60: 30–57.
34. Hajnal, Zoltan, Nazita Lajevardi, and Lindsay Nielson. 2017. Voter identification laws and the suppression of minority votes. *The Journal of Politics* 79: 363–79.
35. Dolan, Kathleen. 2014. Do women and men represent women and men? Sex and gender in election 2012. *Politics & Gender* 10: 1–24.
36. Barreto, Matt A., Stephen Nuno, and Gabriel R. Sanchez. 2009. The mobilization of Latino voters: A field experiment. *American Political Science Review* 103: 407–29.
37. Fraga, Luis R., John A. Garcia, Rodney E. Hero, Michael Jones-Correa, Valerie Martinez-Ebers, and Gary M. Segura. 2018. *Latinos in the New Millennium: An Almanac of Opinion, Behavior, and Policy Preferences*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
38. Green, John Clifford, James L. Guth, Corwin E. Smidt, and Lyman A. Kellstedt. 1996. *Religion and the Culture Wars: Dispatches from the Front*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
39. Layman, Geoffrey C. 2001. Religion and political behavior in the United States: The impact of beliefs, affiliations, and commitment from 1980 to 1994. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 65: 230–53.
40. Wald, Kenneth D., and Allison Calhoun-Brown. 2014. *Religion and Politics in the United States*, 7th ed. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
41. Smidt, Corwin E. 2003. The role of churches in political mobilization: Evidence from a national study. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 42: 229–38.
42. Djupe, Paul A., and Christopher P. Gilbert. 2009. *The Political Influence of Churches*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
43. Prior, Markus. 2007. *Post-Broadcast Democracy: How Media Choice Increases Inequality in Political Involvement and Polarizes Elections*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
44. Iyengar, Shanto, and Donald R. Kinder. 2010. *News That Matters: Television and American Opinion*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
45. Gentzkow, Matthew, and Jesse M. Shapiro. 2011. Ideological segregation online and offline. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 126: 1799–839.

46. Basil, Michael D., William J. Brown, and Mihai C. Bocarnea. 2018. Candidate image building during the 2016 U.S. presidential election: Visual and verbal strategies in Donald Trump's Instagram posts. *Visual Communication Quarterly* 25: 88–103.
47. Bakshy, Eytan, Solomon Messing, and Lada A. Adamic. 2015. Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. *Science* 348: 1130–32.
48. Bond, Robert M., Christopher J. Fariss, Jason J. Jones, Adam D. I. Kramer, Cameron Marlow, Jaime E. Settle, and James H. Fowler. 2012. A 61-million-person experiment in social influence and political mobilization. *Nature* 489: 295–98.
49. Fowler, James H., and Nicholas A. Christakis. 2008. Dynamic spread of happiness in a large social network: Longitudinal analysis over 20 years in the Framingham Heart Study. *British Medical Journal* 337: a2338.
50. Cialdini, Robert B., and Noah J. Goldstein. 2004. Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology* 55: 591–621.
51. Kreiss, Daniel. 2016. Seizing the moment: The presidential campaigns' use of Twitter during the 2012 electoral cycle. *New Media & Society* 18: 1473–90.
52. Guess, Andrew M., Brendan Nyhan, and Jason Reifler. 2019. Exposure to untrustworthy websites in the 2016 US election. *Nature Human Behaviour* 3: 308–13.
53. Pennycook, Gordon, and David G. Rand. 2019. Lazy, not biased: Susceptibility to partisan fake news is better explained by lack of reasoning than by motivated reasoning. *Cognition* 188: 39–50.

Retrieved from <https://encyclopedia.pub/entry/history/show/110845>