

Place of Residence and Political Attitudes in Democracies Worldwide

Annotated Bibliography

Jennifer Lin

Transitions to Democracy

November 21, 2018

References

Ahn, B. M. and W. W. Boyer (1986). Political Efficacy and Trust in Rural South Korea. *The Journal of Developing Areas* 20(4), 439–452.

Barkan, J. D., P. J. Densham, and G. Rushton (2006). Space Matters: Designing Better Electoral Systems for Emerging Democracies. *American Journal of Political Science* 50(4), 926–939.

In this study, the researchers generated a model based on the nature of the electoral districts to determine how the people in that district will vote. The researchers were interested in the interaction between place and electoral model on support for a certain party. Their model was mapped onto developing democracies and it showed that the region in which one lives influences their support for a particular party. More specifically, regardless of the electoral model that the country decides to take on in their democracy formation, rural and urban residence plays a major role in helping voters parse out their support for political parties. This is given by the stark differences in election results by district drawn based on district “urban-ness” via a GIS model.

Bell, M. M. (1992, March). The Fruit of Difference: The Rural-Urban Continuum as a System of Identity¹. *Rural Sociology* 57(1), 65–82.

Benton, T. (2007, September). The Rural–Urban Division in U.K. Politics. *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 18(3), 20–43.

This article covers a historical overview of interests in the rural and urban population in the UK. Through a historical analysis, the researcher finds that there are different interests between the urban and rural dwellers in terms of how they want to protect the environment and grow the economy. Since the urban residents outnumber the rural when it comes to elections, urban interests of Labor often take over the government. Yet, with the election of the Labor party in 1997 to government, there is a shift in the focus on rural interests. Therefore, this article suggests that place leads to different interests that are voiced in elections or through unions (i.e. the Countryside Alliance) even if there are not necessarily divides in political ideology based on place of residence.

CLOUT, H. and M. DEMOSSIER (2003, August). New countryside, old peasants? Politics, tradition and modernity in rural France. *Modern & Contemporary France* 11(3), 259–263.

In the new political environment of France (and by new, like 2003), urban dwellers have been viewing the land of the countryside as contested lands, a vision that the rural members do not want to see happen to their soil. The demands of the urban residents on rural workers for crop yields leads to ever-changing divides in public opinion on the way subsidies should be distributed and how tax money should be allocated.

Conover, P. J. (1984). The Influence of Group Identifications on Political Perception and Evaluation. *The Journal of Politics* 46(3), 760–785.

Conover, P. J. (1988, January). The Role of Social Groups in Political Thinking. *British Journal of Political Science* 18(1), 51–76.

Friedman, R. S. (1961). The Urban-Rural Conflict Revisited. *The Western Political Quarterly* 14(2), 481–495.

Gimpel, J. G. and K. A. Karnes (2006). The Rural Side of the Urban-Rural Gap. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 39(3), 467–472.

The data from previous elections in rural America suggests that the rural residents are more likely to vote Republican given their moral/social conservative values, but they may also have a reason to vote for Democrats given their stance on the economic issues. Rural residents do have a stronger sense of self-reliance and are more likely to own homes and be self employed when compared to their urban dweller counterparts. Nearly all surveys of the American electorate suggest that rural residents are more morally and socially conservative, which have the upper hand to predict their tendency to vote Republican. However, it is not right to discriminate on these lines as their economic viewpoints may motivate them to vote Democrat.

Glenn, N. D. and J. P. Alston (1967). Rural-Urban Differences in Reported Attitudes and Behavior. *The Southwestern Social Science Quarterly* 47(4), 381–400.

The research in this article considers several public opinion polls as a way to understand the differences in political attitudes between urban and rural America. The results from this analysis of data suggests that farmers living in rural area are less likely to trust others, less likely to favor birth control, and broadly speaking, more likely to be conservative. When it comes to religion, the farmers were more traditionalist and fundamentalist in their beliefs. The people whose responses were analyzed here reflect members in the South, and results suggest that individuals who were older and less educated tend to favor more authoritarian systems of government than their younger and better educated counterparts. However, while these trends are observed, there are too little pieces of information for the researchers to conclude whether the effects observed here are based on a true rural-urban divide, or by age, race, income, SES, and other related factors given that farmers' responses are similar to the responses of manual workers but different from other white-collar workers.

Holloway, S. L. (2007, January). Burning issues: Whiteness, rurality and the politics of difference. *Geoforum* 38(1), 7–20.

The goal of this paper is to explore the gap between race and rurality - do racial minorities in rural areas get represented well by the British government? The countryside has been historically portrayed by the white landscape - that is, predominantly white people. Yet, this vision of the countryside is problematic because it does not accurately depict the demographics of the inhabitants in a truly precise manner. The method in this study is a case study of the media reporting of a bonfire celebration in a rural village of Firlie in the UK. The event was significant because it showed distaste towards the Gypsy minority in the area. From the reports of interviews with local residents, many dismissed the activities given their views of the town as uniformly white, and that racial hatred has no place here. Meanwhile, urban residents would recognize this event as a form of ethnic cleansing. This points to the differences in conceptualization of rural life and the rural consciousness broadly speaking, and it depends on your place of residence. The paper points out the need to move beyond the popular conceptualizations of rurality to understand the underlying conflicts that may be impactful to the lives of individual minorities who live there.

Ishiyama, J. T. (1997). Transitional Electoral Systems in Post-Communist Eastern Europe. *Political Science Quarterly* 112(1), 95–115.

Jurkynas, M. (2004). Emerging Cleavages in New Democracies: The Case of Lithuania. *Journal of Baltic Studies* 35(3), 278–296.

- Knoke, D. and C. Henry (1977). Political Structure of Rural America. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 429, 51–62.
- Körösenyi, A. (1999). Electoral Behaviour. In *Government and Politics in Hungary*, pp. 103–116. Central European University Press.
- Kriesi, H., E. Grande, R. Lachat, M. Dolezal, S. Bornschie, and T. Frey (2006, October). Globalization and the transformation of the national political space: Six European countries compared. *European Journal of Political Research* 45(6), 921–956.
- Lee, D. O. and S. D. Brunn (1996, January). Politics and regions in Korea: an analysis of the recent presidential election. *Political Geography* 15(1), 99–119.
- LoGerfo, J. (1996). Attitudes toward Democracy among Bangkok and Rural Northern Thais: The Great Divide. *Asian Survey* 36(9), 904–923.
- Martin, P. (1997, May). Saline politics: Local participation and neoliberalism in Australian rural environments. *Space and Polity* 1(1), 115–133.
- Mckee, S. C. and D. R. Shaw (2003, March). Suburban Voting in Presidential Elections. *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 33(1), 125–144.
- Monroe, B. L. and A. G. Rose (2002). Electoral Systems and Unimagined Consequences: Partisan Effects of Districted Proportional Representation. *American Journal of Political Science* 46(1), 67–89.
- Moore, D. S. (1998). Subaltern Struggles and the Politics of Place: Remapping Resistance in Zimbabwe's Eastern Highlands. *Cultural Anthropology* 13(3), 344–381.
- ORBELL, J. M. (1970). THE IMPACT OF METROPOLITAN RESIDENCE ON SOCIAL AND POLITICAL ORIENTATIONS. *Social Science Quarterly* 51(3), 634–648.
- Reilly, B. (2007). Electoral Systems and Party Systems in East Asia. *Journal of East Asian Studies* 7(2), 185–202.
- Reisinger, W. M., A. H. Miller, and V. L. Hesli (1995). Political Norms in Rural Russia: Evidence from Public Attitudes. *Europe-Asia Studies* 47(6), 1025–1042.
- Tarrow, S. (1971). The Urban-Rural Cleavage in Political Involvement: The Case of France. *The American Political Science Review* 65(2), 341–357.
- Tavits, M. (2005). The Development of Stable Party Support: Electoral Dynamics in Post-Communist Europe. *American Journal of Political Science* 49(2), 283–298.
- Turner, J. C., P. J. Oakes, S. A. Haslam, and C. McGarty (1994, October). Self and Collective: Cognition and Social Context. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 20(5), 454–463.

van Gent, W. P., E. F. Jansen, and J. H. Smits (2014). Right-wing Radical Populism in City and Suburbs: An Electoral Geography of the Partij Voor de Vrijheid in the Netherlands. *Urban Studies* 51(9), 1775–1794.

RRPP is the dutch party that is considered to be anti-immigration and anti-establishment. The research question is: How does municipal density affect support for this party in the Netherlands? Social networks are often tied to space, making political socialization a possible result of electoral geography. The party of interest here is also particularly critical of urban conditions given their political stances. The opposing party, PVV, is more friendly towards urban residents. The results from the 2010 election suggests that urban areas are more likely to support the PVV, unless these areas have high levels of immigrant peoples, which may signal that the relation is due to social composition. The concentration of social classes that is unique to the political environment may also matter in determining how the people living in each neighborhood support political parties. In short, place of residence may not fully explain political preferences.

Vepsäläinen, M. and K. Pitkänen (2010, April). Second home countryside. Representations of the rural in Finnish popular discourses. *Journal of Rural Studies* 26(2), 194–204.

Walks, R. A. (2004, August). Place of Residence, Party Preferences, and Political Attitudes in Canadian Cities and Suburbs. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 26(3), 269–295.

In the 2003 election, Canada's New Democratic party (NDP - left wing) chose leaders who would prioritize the needs of the cities. Their candidate had a background of helping reform the inner cities, and their support poured in from that region. At that point, the inner cities were known to be of the left and the suburbs lean to the right. Most of the research in this topic have been conducted in the context of the United States, and this paper aims to see if the same relationship exists in Canada. Specifically, the researchers are interested in understanding if the suburbs are a major factor contributing to the rise and continuous support of right wing leaders. The data for this study comes from the Canada Elections Study (CES). The results suggest that place of residence plays an important role in structuring party preference. Furthermore, increasing polarization between party preferences for city versus suburban dwellers is moving along the same magnitude as party polarization.

Walks, R. A. (2005). The City-Suburban Cleavage in Canadian Federal Politics. *Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue canadienne de science politique* 38(2), 383–413.

This study analyzed the voting patterns of Canadians based on where they lived in federal elections from 1945 to 1997. The goal was to understand any divergences in voting behavior between these people. Through data analyses that considered regional factors, the results suggest that there is a divergence in how people vote based on where they live. While these patterns are only

prevalant after 1980, the results suggest that urban and suburban residents are increasingly diverging on their partisan support. This political polarization is prevalent and increasing as suburban voters move towards support the right wing party while the urban residents move towards supporting the left wing parties. As a result, place matters and characteristics of the place do play a role in this observed trend.

Walks, R. A. (2006, June). The Causes of City-Suburban Political Polarization? A Canadian Case Study. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 96(2), 390–414.

Walsh, K. C. (2012). Putting Inequality in Its Place: Rural Consciousness and the Power of Perspective. *The American Political Science Review* 106(3), 517–532.

Wegren, S. K. (2002). Democratization and Urban Bias in Postcommunist Russia. *Comparative Politics* 34(4), 457–476.

Williamson, T. (2008, November). Sprawl, Spatial Location, and Politics: How Ideological Identification Tracks the Built Environment. *American Politics Research* 36(6), 903–933.

The present study is interested in understanding the influence of spatial context in partisan vote. Using the 2000 census data and 2000 Social Capital Community Benchmark survey, the results suggest that individuals are more likely to vote based on who they interact with. Therefore, in suburban areas and rural places where neighbors must drive to get places, people engage with different views less and are more likely to retain their conservative views. Meanwhile, people in urban areas are more likely to deal with diversity in perspectives in their daily life and would be more open to voting for a liberal stance on policy as a reflection of these interactions.

Wlezien, C. and A. H. Miller (1997). Social Groups and Political Judgments. *Social Science Quarterly* 78(3), 625–640.