* [**The Effect of Social Conformity on Collective Voting Behavior**](https://www.jstor.org/stable/25791755?read-now=1&seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents)

This article investigates the effect of social conformity on voting behavior. Past research shows that many people vote to conform with the social norm that voting is a civic duty. The hypothesis here is that when conformity motivates people to vote, it also stimulates conformist behavior among some voters when they decide which party to vote for. This produces a distinctive relationship between voter turnout and the distribution of votes among parties—a relationship not anticipated by rational choice theory. I test a mathematical model of this behavior with linear and nonlinear regression analyses of state-level data for presidential elections in the United States from 1904 to 1996, longitudinal data on parliamentary elections in Western Europe over most of the twentieth century, and cross-sectional data for recent elections in Western Europe, Eastern Europe, and Russia. The results generally validate the model.

* [**Rethinking Why People Vote: Voting as Dynamic Social Expression**](https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/todd_rogers/files/rethinking.pdf)

Traditional models of why people vote conceptualize voting as a static, self-interested decision. This conceptualization cannot explain why people vote given the miniscule probability that their vote will affect most election outcomes. In this chapter we advance a new behavioral model of why people vote. We begin by describing recent field experimental research that inductively explores the characteristics of effective get-out-the-vote communication channels. This research finds that more personal means of communicating (i.e., face-to-face canvassing) are more motivating than less personal ones (i.e., telephone calls). We then develop a conceptual model of voting as a “dynamic social expression.” Doing so links the question of why people vote to an array of behavioral research that has not been systematically linked to it before. We discuss implications for voter mobilization strategy, and also set out an agenda for future research.

# [**Does Internet voting make elections less social? Group voting patterns in Estonian e-voting log files (2013–2015)**](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0177864)

This study finds strong evidence of e-voting in pairs. Same aged male-female pairs seem to be voting in close proximity to each other, consistent with spouses or partners voting together. Also, female-female and female-male pairs with large age differences seem to be voting together, consistent with a parent voting with an adult aged offspring. With regards to voting speed we see the second vote in a vote pair being considerably faster than the first vote, again indicating a shared voting act. That is to say, although participants were voting virtually, they’re doing so in-person with the people around them (mostly kin)—evidence that shows voting is a social activity.

# [**Social Media and Voting**](https://www.pewinternet.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/9/media/Files/Reports/2012/PIP_TheSocialVote_PDF.pdf)

Brief look at how some voters might share their voting information (i.e., who they voted for). The study presents solid statistics on who they spread the information to and on what social media platforms. They found that 22% (approx 27 million) of registered voters have let others know how they voted on a social networking site such as Facebook or Twitter.

# [**Descriptive Social Norms and Motivation to Vote: Everybody's Voting and so Should You**](https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1017/S0022381608090117)

Psychological research on descriptive social norms suggests that emphasizing the opposite—that many do vote—would be a more effective message. In two get-out-the-vote field experiments, the study finds that messages emphasizing low expected turnout are less effective at motivating voters than messages emphasizing high expected turnout. The findings suggest that descriptive social norms affect vote intention only among citizens who vote infrequently or occasionally. Practically, the results suggest that voter mobilization efforts should emphasize high turnout, especially when targeting occasional and low rate of participation voters. More generally, our findings suggest that the common lamentation by the media and politicians regarding low participation may undermine turnout.