

Anthony Edward Monreal Kemp

Poli-200

10/8/2023

Homework 2

Theory 1 Response

Q: Do the individual hypotheses follow from the theory?

A: Hypothesis 1 follows from the theory naturally, using a cost/benefit analysis model logically makes the reader think of certain costs in life in reference to voting. In the US sense this is important due to our system not having a dedicated holiday for voting incorporating the notion that states that ease the cost of workers to go out and vote generally brings the inclination that those states will have a higher turnout of voters.

Hypothesis 2 follows only from one portion of the theory presented, that is the area considering the 'research' portion that voting inquires. I have difficulty accepting that the level of education relates to this theory. Merely stating that somebody with higher education bolsters cognitive ability does not mean that the cost for them is lower. Actually if somebody does have higher education then they are more likely to have a higher paying job which could be more of a cognitive load that shortens how much cost that individual is willing to take away from their work. Basically higher educated people could be busier with their work therefore having to research voting details can be more of a cost than someone with lower education.

Hypothesis 3 does not stem naturally from the presented theory. The theory is looking primarily at the benefits/cost of a voter going to cast their ballot, rather the introduction of districts is moving into a population question rather than individual.

Q: Can you think of any alternative theories or explanations that would generate the same hypotheses?

A: An alternative theory for Hypothesis 2 can be noted in Cox's work *Making Votes Count*. Cox writes out a mathematical formula and tests it to show that the less participants within an election the more a single vote holds weight toward the outcome while showing the more participants in an election then the less of an amount a single vote holds.

For Hypothesis 3 I can offer a different explanation. Since it states that districts where candidates hold extreme points of liberal or conservative positions affect voter turnout. This is not a cost/benefit hypothesis, rather it can be answered through the explanation that district populations majorly affect how many ballots are seen cast. Also, high populated areas in states like California that outnumber any outside party can lead voters from not turning out because of the prior knowledge of a party dominating those districts.

Q: Can you think of an alternate theory that would explain all three of the listed hypotheses?

A: When the benefit of voting outweighs its cost districts with highly educated people will see more of a percentage of voter turnout.

Theory 2 Response

Q: Do the individual hypotheses follow from the theory?

A: Hypotheses 1 and 3 are logical stems from the prescribed theory. Hypothesis 2 however is adding the variable of age amongst voters that is not described within the theory.

Q: Can you think of any alternative theories or explanations that would generate the same hypotheses?

A: An alternative explanation for Hypothesis 2 is that older aged voters' turnout more than younger aged voters because they have seen after effects of different administrations/policies, therefore older voters are more inclined to be in tune with elections. An alternative explanation for Hypothesis 3 is that higher media coverage could be a driving factor to convince people, but like in business, word of mouth is still relatively important and can hold weight between job, friend, and family groups to determine whether the outcome of an election is important.

Q: Can you think of an alternate theory that would explain all three of the listed hypotheses?

A: Higher media coverage from candidates in presidential and congressional campaigns can yield higher voter turnout within the older population of US voters.