



Review

Factors Influencing Voting Decision: A Comprehensive Literature Review

Waiphot Kulachai ^{1,*} , Unisa Lerdtomornsakul ² and Patipol Homyamyen ³¹ College of Politics and Government, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, Bangkok 10300, Thailand² Faculty of Political Science, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok 10330, Thailand; unisa@yahoo.com³ Faculty of Business Administration and Information Technology, Rajamangala University of Technology Suvornabhumi, Suphanburi 72130, Thailand; patipol.h@rmutsb.ac.th

* Correspondence: waiphot.ku@ssru.ac.th

Abstract: 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. This article offers an examination of different factors that shape voting choices within the American populace. Through a comprehensive synthesis and analysis of various studies, this review seeks to give an understanding of the principal elements that drive voter conduct. Additionally, it looks at what these factors mean for democracy and proposes possible directions for continued research.

Keywords: politics; voting choice; voting decision



Citation: Kulachai, Waiphot, Unisa Lerdtomornsakul, and Patipol Homyamyen. 2023. Factors Influencing Voting Decision: A Comprehensive Literature Review. *Social Sciences* 12: 469. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci12090469>

Academic Editor: Andreu Casero-Ripollés

Received: 8 June 2023

Revised: 7 August 2023

Accepted: 15 August 2023

Published: 22 August 2023



Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

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. The purpose of this paper is to explore the elements that influence voting choices and highlight their importance in determining electoral results in the American context. By examining these factors, we can gain insights into the complexities of voter behavior, the strategies employed by political parties and candidates, and the broader implications for democratic processes.

The paper will investigate a range of influential factors, including but not limited to party affiliation, candidate characteristics, policy positions, socioeconomic factors, social influence, and media impact. Each of these factors plays a distinct role in shaping voter preferences, attitudes, and ultimately, the choices made in the voting booth. By exploring party affiliation, we will analyze how individuals' long-term allegiance to political parties affects their voting decisions. Understanding the impact of candidate characteristics will enable us to grasp how personal qualities, qualifications, and leadership attributes influence voter perceptions and preferences. The examination of policy positions will shed light on how voters evaluate candidates' stances on key issues and how those positions resonate with their own values and aspirations. Moreover, socioeconomic factors, such as economic conditions and demographic characteristics, have been found to shape voting decisions. We will explore how individuals' personal financial circumstances and societal factors influence their choices. Additionally, we will investigate the role of social influence, including the impact of social networks, family, and community, in shaping voter behavior. Finally, we will delve into the role of media and its influence on voting decisions. In an era of information abundance, understanding how media coverage, political advertising, and digital platforms shape voter perceptions and preferences is essential.

By examining these factors, this paper aims to contribute to our understanding of the complexities of voting decisions. The insights gained will have implications for political campaigns, policymakers, and the broader democratic process. Ultimately, understanding the factors that affect voting decisions is crucial for fostering informed citizen participation, enhancing electoral integrity, and ensuring democratic ideals of representation, accountability, and civic engagement.

2. Factors Influencing Voting Decisions

The review identifies several key factors that consistently emerged across the selected studies as influential in shaping voting decisions. These factors can be broadly categorized into individual-level, socio-cultural, and political determinants.

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:

1. **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.
2. **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.

3. **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.
4. **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.

5. 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.
6. 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.
7. Emotional Intelligence (EI): This concept, a crossroads of psychological and social research, continues to shape our 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.

8. **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.
9. **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.

While this article is centered on the American context, it should be noted that the relationship between socioeconomic status and voting preferences can vary based on the country, environment, and electoral system. Individual motivations and beliefs, in addition to political variables, can also mold voting behavior. In the current climate, as we grapple with issues like the coronavirus pandemic and climate change, emerging factors such as Emotional Intelligence (EI), concerns related to climate change, and personal healthcare experiences have become crucial in determining how people vote. Therefore, it is essential to consider a wide array of factors when exploring this connection.

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.

1. **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.

2. **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.
3. **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.

4. **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.
5. **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.

2.3. Political Factors

Political factors play a pivotal role in shaping voting decisions. Voters take into account various political factors such as party identification, candidate characteristics, policy positions, campaign strategies, and economic conditions when determining their votes. These factors can significantly influence voter behavior and ultimately impact election outcomes.

1. **Party identification:** Party identification is a significant factor that influences voting decisions. It refers to an individual's psychological attachment to a particular political party. Party identification can shape a voter's overall political attitudes, values, and policy preferences, serving as a guiding framework for their voting behavior (Campbell et al. 1960). Party identification provides voters with a sense of identity and belonging to a larger political community. It simplifies the decision-making process by providing a heuristic or mental shortcut for evaluating candidates and their positions (Green et al. 2002). For example, voters who identify as Democrats or Republicans often align their vote with their respective party's candidates, assuming a level of ideological compatibility. Party identification influences voting decisions through several mechanisms. First, party cues help voters evaluate candidates' policy positions. When voters have a clear party identification, they tend to rely on the party's platform and reputation to infer the stances of individual candidates (Petrocik 1996). This allows voters to make informed choices even when they have limited knowledge of specific candidates or issues. Second, party identification can shape voters' perceptions and attitudes toward political events and messages. Individuals with strong party identification are more likely to interpret political information in a way that is consistent with their party's perspective (Bartels 2002). They may be more receptive to their party's messages, less critical of their party's shortcomings, and more resistant to opposing arguments. Third, party identification can influence voter turnout and engagement. Strong party identifiers are more likely to be politically active, participating in activities such as volunteering, donating, and engaging in discussions (Abramowitz 2010). Party loyalty can motivate individuals to support their party's candidates and mobilize others within their social networks to do the same. It is important to note that while party identification is a significant influence on voting decisions, it is not the sole determinant. Voters also consider other factors such as candidate characteristics, policy positions, and current political events in their decision-making process. Moreover, party identification can change over time, influenced by personal experiences, shifts in party platforms, or changes in social and political contexts (Green et al. 2002). Understanding the role of party identification in voting decisions provides insights into the dynamics of elections and political behavior. Political campaigns often target their messaging and strategies based on voters' party affiliations, aiming to consolidate support from their base and persuade swing voters who may be less tethered to a specific party.
2. **Candidate characteristics:** Candidate characteristics play a significant role in influencing voting decisions. Voters often assess various personal attributes, qualifications, and characteristics of candidates when making their electoral choices. These factors can shape voters' perceptions, attitudes, and preferences, ultimately influencing their decision to support a particular candidate. One important characteristic that voters consider is the candidate's experience and qualifications. Voters tend to evaluate can-

didates based on their educational background, professional accomplishments, and prior political experience. Candidates with a track record of relevant achievements or expertise in areas of importance to voters may be perceived as more competent and capable of effectively fulfilling the responsibilities of the position they seek (Nai and Maier 2016). Perceived leadership qualities also play a crucial role in voters' decision making. Candidates who exhibit strong leadership traits such as confidence, charisma, communication skills, and the ability to inspire and mobilize others may be viewed favorably by voters. Leadership qualities are often associated with the candidate's ability to address challenges, make sound decisions, and provide effective representation (Bass 1990). The personal integrity and trustworthiness of candidates are also influential factors. Voters value honesty, ethical conduct, and transparency in their elected representatives. Candidates who are perceived as trustworthy and credible are more likely to garner support from voters who prioritize these qualities (Lupia and McCubbins 1998). Candidate attributes that align with the voters' own values and identities can also impact voting decisions. Factors such as gender, race, ethnicity, and socio-economic background may resonate with voters who seek representation and a connection to candidates who share their experiences or can relate to their specific concerns (Fox and Lawless 2004). It is important to note that the relative importance of candidate characteristics can vary across different electoral contexts, cultural factors, and voter demographics. Additionally, the salience of candidate attributes may differ depending on the specific office being sought (e.g., presidential, legislative, or local positions). Understanding the significance of candidate characteristics in voting decisions provides insights into voter behavior and campaign strategies. Political campaigns often seek to highlight and emphasize the favorable attributes of their candidates, leveraging their qualifications, leadership qualities, and personal backgrounds to appeal to the electorate.

3. Policy positions: Policy positions are a crucial factor that influences voting decisions. Voters often consider the policy positions and stances of candidates when determining their support in elections. The alignment of a candidate's policy positions with the preferences and values of voters can significantly impact their decision to vote for a particular candidate. Voters evaluate candidates based on their stance on key issues, such as the economy, healthcare, education, environment, national security, social issues, and more. Candidates' policy proposals and positions signal their intended actions and priorities if elected, which can resonate with specific voter concerns and aspirations (Brody et al. 1994). Voters may prioritize certain policy areas based on their personal circumstances, interests, or perceived salience of the issues at a given time. For example, voters who prioritize economic issues may carefully evaluate candidates' positions on taxation, job creation, income inequality, and economic growth. Similarly, voters concerned about environmental issues may consider candidates' positions on climate change, energy policies, and conservation. The perceived credibility and feasibility of candidates' policy positions also play a role in voting decisions. Voters assess whether candidates' proposals are well informed, evidence-based, and have a realistic chance of being implemented. Candidates who provide detailed plans and demonstrate a clear understanding of the issues may be viewed as more competent and capable of addressing voter concerns (Conover and Feldman 1981). The importance of policy positions can vary among voters. Some voters prioritize specific issues and may align themselves with candidates who closely match their policy preferences. Others may consider a broader range of factors, including candidate characteristics, party affiliation, and overall vision when making their voting decisions (Campbell et al. 1960). It is worth noting that voters' understanding of candidates' policy positions can be influenced by media coverage, campaign messaging, and political debates. Candidates' ability to effectively communicate their policy positions to voters can shape perceptions and sway voting decisions (Druckman et al. 2013). Understanding the impact of policy positions on

voting decisions provides insights into voter behavior and the dynamics of election campaigns. Political candidates and parties often strategically communicate their policy positions to appeal to different segments of the electorate, aiming to gain support and secure votes.

4. Campaign strategies: Campaign strategies play a crucial role in shaping voting decisions. Political candidates and their campaigns employ various tactics and strategies to communicate their message, mobilize supporters, and persuade undecided voters. These strategies can influence voters' perceptions, attitudes, and ultimately their decision to support a particular candidate. Effective communication is a fundamental aspect of campaign strategies. Candidates use various channels such as campaign speeches, debates, advertisements, social media, and direct voter outreach to convey their message and policy positions. The clarity, coherence, and persuasiveness of the campaign's communication can impact how voters perceive the candidate and their platform (Kahn and Kenney 2002). Targeting specific voter segments is another key strategy employed by campaigns. By identifying and focusing on specific demographic groups, geographic regions, or interest-based communities, campaigns tailor their messages and policies to resonate with the concerns and aspirations of those particular groups. This targeted approach aims to build a connection and secure support from voters who are more likely to be receptive to the campaign's appeals (Geer 2006). Mobilization efforts are essential in campaign strategies. Candidates seek to engage and activate their supporters, encouraging them to participate in the electoral process through activities such as voter registration, volunteering, and voter turnout initiatives. Mobilization strategies aim to energize the candidate's base, ensure voter loyalty, and increase the likelihood of turnout on election day (Green and Gerber 2008). Negative campaigning is another campaign strategy that can impact voting decisions. Candidates may choose to criticize opponents, highlight policy differences, or raise doubts about their opponents' character or qualifications. Negative campaigns can influence voters' perceptions of candidates, potentially shaping their attitudes and vote choices (Goldstein and Freedman 2002). The overall tone and messaging of a campaign can also shape voting decisions. Campaigns may emphasize positive qualities, such as candidates' leadership abilities, integrity, or dedication to public service. Alternatively, they may employ fear-based appeals, highlighting the potential negative consequences of electing opponents. The emotional resonance and framing of campaign messages can impact voters' perceptions and shape their preferences (Iyengar and Kinder 1987). It is important to note that campaign strategies interact with other factors such as candidate characteristics, policy positions, and voters' pre-existing beliefs. Voters' prior party identification, social networks, and exposure to media can also mediate the impact of campaign strategies on voting decisions (Holbrook and McClurg 2005). Understanding the impact of campaign strategies on voting decisions provides insights into the dynamics of elections and voter behavior. Effective campaign strategies can shape the political landscape, mobilize support, and influence the outcomes of elections.
5. Economic conditions: Economic conditions can have a significant impact on voting decisions. Voters often consider the state of the economy and their personal financial situation when evaluating political candidates and making their electoral choices. The performance of the economy and perceptions about its trajectory can shape voters' perceptions, attitudes, and preferences. Positive economic conditions, such as low unemployment rates, GDP growth, and rising incomes, can create a sense of optimism and satisfaction among voters. In such circumstances, incumbents or candidates from the governing party often benefit from the perception of effective economic management and may receive support from voters who attribute the positive economic conditions to their policies (Alesina and Rosenthal 1995). Conversely, negative economic conditions, such as high unemployment, stagnant wages, inflation, or economic crises, can lead to voter dissatisfaction and a desire for change. Voters may hold in-

cumbents or the party in power accountable for economic downturns, and their voting decisions may reflect their discontent or desire for alternative policies (Erikson 1988). Voters' personal economic circumstances can also influence their voting decisions. Individuals who feel economically secure or have experienced improvements in their financial well-being may be more likely to support candidates who are perceived as maintaining or promoting favorable economic conditions. Conversely, individuals facing economic hardships, job loss, or financial instability may seek candidates who offer promises of economic relief or change (Bartels 2008). It is important to note that the relationship between economic conditions and voting decisions can be complex. Voters' perceptions of the economy are subjective and can be influenced by various factors, including media coverage, partisan cues, and personal experiences. Additionally, voters may prioritize other issues or factors, such as social issues, foreign policy, or candidate characteristics, over economic conditions in their voting decisions (Campbell et al. 1960). Understanding the impact of economic conditions on voting decisions provides insights into voter behavior and electoral outcomes. Political candidates and parties often emphasize their economic policies and propose measures to address economic concerns, recognizing the importance of the economy in shaping voters' preferences and electoral success.

3. Discussion

When discussing the factors influencing voting decisions, it is essential to consider a range of factors that shape voter behavior. These factors can be broadly categorized into individual-level factors, such as demographics and personal characteristics, and contextual or situational factors, including political, social, and economic contexts. At the individual level, demographic characteristics such as age, gender, education, income, and race/ethnicity have been found to influence voting decisions (Evans 2000). For instance, older individuals tend to have higher voter turnout rates, while younger voters are often more politically engaged and inclined towards progressive policies (Goerres 2007). Educational attainment has been linked to increased political participation and liberal policy preferences (Tenn 2007). Additionally, gender and racial/ethnic identities can shape political attitudes and choices (Hajnal and Lee 2011). Psychological factors also play a role in voting decisions. Attitudes, values, beliefs, and political ideologies contribute to the formation of preferences and can guide voter choices (Converse 1964). Personal experiences, socialization processes, and exposure to political information through media and social networks further shape these attitudes (Jennings and Niemi 1981). Contextual factors are equally influential. The political environment, including the performance and reputation of political parties and candidates, can sway voter decisions (Funk 1999). Economic conditions, such as unemployment rates and income inequality, can affect voters' perceptions of their own economic well-being and influence their choices (Lewis-Beck and Stegmaier 2000). Social issues, cultural values, and identity politics also shape voting decisions (Gidengil et al. 2001). It is important to note that voting decisions are complex and multifaceted, influenced by the interplay of various factors. Moreover, the relative importance of these factors can vary across individuals and contexts, making it challenging to pinpoint a single dominant influence.

4. Implications

Voting decisions are influenced by a variety of factors, including but not limited to party identification, candidate characteristics, policy positions, campaign strategies, and economic conditions. These factors collectively shape the democratic process and have implications for the functioning of democratic systems. Here are some key implications:

Representation: Voting decisions determine who will hold public office and make decisions on behalf of the electorate. When voters make informed choices based on their preferences, values, and interests, the elected representatives are more likely to reflect and represent the diverse perspectives and concerns of the population.

Accountability: Voting decisions hold political leaders accountable for their actions and policies. By choosing to support or reject incumbents or candidates based on their performance, voters can influence the behavior and decision making of elected officials. The fear of electoral consequences can incentivize politicians to be responsive to the needs and demands of the electorate.

Policy Outcomes: Voting decisions shape the policy outcomes and directions of governments. When voters choose candidates who align with their policy preferences, the elected officials are more likely to enact policies that reflect those preferences. Thus, voting decisions have a direct impact on the formulation and implementation of public policies.

Democratic Legitimacy: Voting decisions contribute to the legitimacy of democratic systems. When voters actively participate in elections and exercise their right to vote, it enhances the perception that governments are chosen by the people and enjoy popular support. High voter turnout and widespread participation strengthen the democratic legitimacy of the political process.

Political Culture and Engagement: Voting decisions help shape the political culture and levels of civic engagement within society. When citizens are actively involved in the electoral process and exercise their voting rights, it fosters a sense of civic duty and promotes broader political engagement. Voting can serve as a gateway to further political participation, such as volunteering, activism, and community involvement.

Social Cohesion: Voting decisions can contribute to social cohesion and national unity. When individuals from diverse backgrounds and with different perspectives participate in the democratic process, it allows for the expression of various opinions and interests. By engaging in peaceful and inclusive electoral contests, societies can work towards fostering a sense of shared purpose and collective decision making.

Understanding the factors that influence voting decisions and their implications for the democratic process is crucial for policymakers, political parties, and citizens alike. It helps inform electoral strategies, policy-making processes, and efforts to strengthen democratic institutions and values. Additionally, promoting voter education, enhancing political discourse, and ensuring equal access to the electoral process can further enhance the integrity and inclusivity of the democratic process.

5. Future Research Direction

Research on voting decisions is a dynamic and ongoing field with many possible future directions. As the world continues to evolve politically, socially, and technologically, there are several interesting areas to be explored:

1. **Influence of Social Media and Digital Information:** As our reliance on digital platforms grows, there is increasing interest in understanding how information spread through these channels affects voting decisions. This includes the impact of social media algorithms, “echo chambers,” misinformation or “fake news,” and online political advertising.
2. **Impact of Polarization:** Many democracies are experiencing increased political polarization, where the political discourse becomes more extreme, and the middle ground seems to shrink. Studying the causes, consequences, and possible solutions to this trend could provide valuable insights.
3. **Role of Populism:** Populism has been on the rise in many countries, with leaders claiming to represent the “common people” against an alleged “elite”. Understanding how populism influences voting behavior and political systems could be a fruitful area of research.
4. **Intersectionality:** As our understanding of identity becomes more nuanced, it is essential to understand how intersecting identities (like race, gender, class, religion, etc.) influence voting behavior. For instance, how does being a working-class, female immigrant shape one’s political views?

5. Psychological Factors: Delving deeper into the psychological underpinnings of voting behavior could be another exciting direction, such as the impact of cognitive biases, emotion, and moral values on political decisions.
6. Climate and Environment Politics: As climate change becomes an increasingly pressing issue, understanding how environmental concerns shape voting decisions will be crucial.
7. Impact of Changing Demographics: Aging populations, increasing diversity, urbanization, and other demographic shifts are changing the electorate's face. Understanding how these changes will impact voting behavior is another critical research area.
8. Effects of Electoral Systems and Reforms: Different electoral systems can influence voting behavior in various ways. Studying the effects of these systems, as well as proposed electoral reforms, could yield interesting results.
9. Voter Suppression and Enfranchisement: Exploring the effects of laws and practices designed to suppress or enhance voter turnout can provide valuable insights into the dynamics of voting behavior and how to ensure fair elections.

These future research directions highlight the need for interdisciplinary approaches, combining insights from political science, psychology, sociology, information technology, and other fields. By understanding the complexities of voting behavior, researchers can help to improve political engagement, policymaking, and democratic governance.

6. Conclusions

This comprehensive review provides an overview of the factors that influence voting decisions. The synthesis of multiple studies indicates that individual-level, socio-cultural, and political factors all play a significant role in shaping voter behavior. While this review offers valuable insights, it also highlights the need for further research in specific areas, such as the impact of emerging technologies on voter decision making. By gaining a deeper understanding of the factors that influence voting decisions, policymakers and candidates can foster a more informed and engaged electorate.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, W.K., and U.L.; resources, P.H.; data curation, P.H.; writing—original draft preparation, W.K.; writing—review and editing, U.L.; visualization, P.H.; supervision, W.K.; project administration, W.K.; All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Acknowledgments: We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the Dean of the College of Politics and Government, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University for his invaluable guidance and support throughout the process of writing this article.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Abramowitz, Alan I. 2010. *The Disappearing Center: Engaged Citizens, Polarization, and American Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Alesina, Alberto, and Edward Ludwig Glaeser. 2004. *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe: A World of Difference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Alesina, Alberto, and Howard Rosenthal. 1995. Partisan cycles in congressional elections and the macroeconomy. *American Political Science Review* 89: 634–47.
- Anderson, Cameron D., and Michael R. McGregor. 2018. Climate change and broadbanding: Evidence from Canadian elections. *Environmental Politics* 27: 715–39.
- 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. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Bakshy, Eytan, Solomon Messing, and Lada A. Adamic. 2015. Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. *Science* 348: 1130–32. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Barreto, Matt A., Stephen Nuno, and Gabriel R. Sanchez. 2009. The mobilization of Latino voters: A fieldExperiment. *American Political Science Review* 103: 407–29.
- Bartels, Larry M. 2002. Beyond the running tally: Partisan bias in political perceptions. *Political Behavior* 24: 117–50. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Bartels, Larry M. 2008. *Unequal Democracy: The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 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.
- Bass, Bernard M. 1990. *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*. Glencoe: Free Press.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Brody, Richard A., Paul M. Sniderman, and Philip E. Tetlock. 1994. Political group dynamics and policy preferences: Homogeneity, false consensus, and distinctive representations. *American Political Science Review* 88: 336–55.
- Burns, Peter, and James G. Gimpel. 2000. Economic insecurity, prejudicial stereotypes, and public opinion on immigration policy. *Political science quarterly* 115: 201–25. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Campbell, Amy L. 2008. The young and the realigning: A longitudinal analysis of youth political behavior. *American Journal of Political Science* 52: 685–96.
- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. Hoboken: Wiley.
- Cialdini, Robert B., and Noah J. Goldstein. 2004. Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology* 55: 591–621. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- 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. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Conover, Pamela Johnston, and Stanley Feldman. 1981. The origins and meaning of liberal/conservative self-identifications. *American Journal of Political Science* 25: 617–45. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Converse, Philip E. 1964. The nature of belief systems in mass publics. In *Ideology and Discontent*. Edited by David E. Apter. Glencoe: Free Press, pp. 206–61.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2008. *The Good Citizen: How a Younger Generation Is Reshaping American Politics*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Djupe, Paul A., and Christopher P. Gilbert. 2009. *The Political Influence of Churches*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dolan, Kathleen. 2014. Do women and men represent women and men? Sex and gender in election 2012. *Politics & Gender* 10: 1–24.
- Druckman, James N., Samara Klar, and Yanna Krupnikov. 2013. The political affordances of social media: Leveraging technology and participation. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 644: 143–62.
- Erikson, Robert S. 1988. *The Macro Polity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, Geoffrey. 2000. The continued significance of class voting. *Annual Review of Political Science* 3: 401–17. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- 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.
- 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. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Fox, Richard L., and Jennifer L. Lawless. 2004. Entering the arena? Gender and the decision to run for office. *American Journal of Political Science* 48: 264–80. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- 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.
- 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.
- Funk, Carolyn L. 1999. Bringing the candidate into models of candidate evaluation. *The Journal of Politics* 61: 700–20. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

- Geer, John G. 2006. *In Defense of Negativity: Attack Ads in Presidential Campaigns*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gentzkow, Matthew, and Jesse M. Shapiro. 2011. Ideological segregation online and offline. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 126: 1799–839. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- 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. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Geruso, Michael, and Timothy Layton. 2020. Upcoding: Evidence from Medicare on squishy risk adjustment. *Journal of Political Economy* 128: 984–1026. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Gidengil, Elisabeth, André Blais, Richard Nadeau, and Neil Nevitte. 2001. Women to the left? Gender differences in political beliefs and policy preferences. In *Gender and Utopia: The Postindustrial Revolution and the Unexpected Consequences of the Second Demographic Transition*. Edited by Inglehart Ronald and Norris Pippa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 140–69.
- Goerres, Achim. 2007. Why are older people more likely to vote? The impact of ageing on electoral turnout across Europe. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 9: 90–121. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Goldstein, Ken, and Paul Freedman. 2002. Campaign advertising and voter turnout: New evidence for a stimulation effect. *Journal of Politics* 64: 721–40. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Goleman, Daniel. 1995. *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books, Inc.
- 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. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Green, Donald P., and Alan S. Gerber. 2008. *Get Out the Vote: How to Increase Voter Turnout*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Green, Donald P., Bradley Palmquist, and Eric Schickler. 2002. *Partisan Hearts and Minds: Political Parties and the Social Identities of Voters*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- 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.
- Guess, Andrew M., Brendan Nyhan, and Jason Reifler. 2019. Exposure to untrustworthy websites in the 2016 US election. *Nature Human Behaviour* 3: 308–13. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Hajnal, Zoltan L., and Taeku Lee. 2011. *Why Americans Don't Join the Party: Race, Immigration, and the Failure (of Political Parties) to Engage the Electorate*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hajnal, Zoltan, Nazita Lajevardi, and Lindsay Nielson. 2017. Voter identification laws and the suppression of minority votes. *The Journal of Politics* 79: 363–79. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- 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. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Holbrook, Thomas M., and Scott D. McClurg. 2005. The mobilization of core supporters: Campaigns, turnout, and electoral composition in United States presidential elections. *American Journal of Political Science* 49: 803–18. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- 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.
- 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. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Iyengar, Shanto, and Donald R. Kinder. 1987. *News That Matters: Television and American Opinion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Iyengar, Shanto, and Donald R. Kinder. 2010. *News That Matters: Television and American Opinion*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jennings, M. Kent, and Richard G. Niemi. 1981. *Generations and Politics: A Panel Study of Young Adults and Their Parents*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kahn, Kim Fridkin, and Patrick J. Kenney. 2002. The slant of the news: How editorial endorsements influence campaign coverage and citizens' views of candidates. *American Political Science Review* 96: 381–94. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Karp, Jeffery 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. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Kreiss, Daniel. 2016. Seizing the moment: The presidential campaigns' use of Twitter during the 2012 electoral cycle. *New Media & Society* 18: 1473–90.
- 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. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Lewis-Beck, Michael S., and Mary Stegmaier. 2000. Economic determinants of electoral outcomes. *Annual Review of Political Science* 3: 183–219. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Lodge, Milton, and Charles S. Taber. 2013. *The Rationalizing Voter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lupia, Arthur, and Mathew D. McCubbins. 1998. *The Democratic Dilemma: Can Citizens Learn What They Need to Know?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mason, Lilliana. 2018. *Uncivil Agreement: How Politics Became Our Identity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 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. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Mayer, John D., and Peter Salovey. 1990. Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality* 9: 185–211.

- Mildenberger, 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. [[CrossRef](#)]
- 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. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Monroe, Kristen R. 1995. The psychology of genocide: A review of the literature. *Ethics & International Affairs* 9: 215–39.
- Nai, Alessandro, and Jürgen Maier. 2016. Candidate traits and vote choice. In *The Oxford Handbook of Electoral Persuasion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 124–43.
- Nie, Norman H., Sidney Verba, and John R. Petrocik. 1976. *The Changing American Voter*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- 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. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
- Petrocik, John R. 1996. Issue ownership in presidential elections, with a 1980 case study. *American Journal of Political Science* 40: 825–50. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Plutzer, Eric, and John F. Zipp. 1996. Identity politics, partisanship, and voting for women candidates. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 60: 30–57. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Prior, Markus. 2007. *Post-Broadcast Democracy: How Media Choice Increases Inequality in Political Involvement and Polarizes Elections*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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.
- Tenn, Steven. 2007. The effect of education on voter turnout. *Political Analysis* 15: 446–64. [[CrossRef](#)]
- 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.
- Tranter, Bruce, and Kate Booth. 2020. Scepticism in a changing climate: A cross-national study. *Global Environmental Change* 60: 101984. [[CrossRef](#)]
- 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.
- Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wald, Kenneth D., and Allison Calhoun-Brown. 2014. *Religion and Politics in the United States*, 7th ed. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.