**GENERAL**

**Brady, H., Verba, S., & Schlozman, K. (1995). Beyond Ses: A Resource Model of Political Participation. *The American Political Science Review,* *89*(2), 271-294. doi:10.2307/2082425**

Resource model of political participation: voting in election, contacting local government, giving campaign money, working informally with others on community problems, campaign work, protest, board membership or meetings

Three resources:

* Time: working campaign, writing letters, attending meetings
* Money: donations
* Civic skills (communication, organizational): if you have them, you’re more likely to be effective
  + Measured partially by educational attainment (learn at school) and participation in student government
  + And by reporting working or doing activity in organizations \*and\* written letters, given speeches, etc.

Developed in nonpolitical institutions of adult life, distributed differentially among groups given socioeconomic status

(SES explanations are socioeconomic status explanations)

**Mondak, J. J., Hibbing, M. V., Canache, D., Seligson, M. A., & Anderson, M. R. (2010). Personality and civic engagement: An integrative framework for the study of trait effects on political behavior. *American Political Science Review*, *104*(1), 85-110.**

Trait dimensions (openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and emotional stability) amount to personality and explain civic engagement

**Delli Carpini, Michael X., and Scott Keeter. 1993. “Measuring Political Knowledge: Putting First Things First.” American Journal of Political Science 37 (4): 1179–1206**

Political knowledge is unidimensional and can be assessed with just a few questions

Five-item knowledge index:

* Party control of house
* Veto override percent
* Party id location
* Judicial review
* Identify vice president

**Galston 2001 POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE, POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT, AND CIVIC EDUCATION Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci. 2001. 4:217–34**

“significant indicator of political engagement”:

* Think keeping up with politics is important
* Frequently discuss politics
* Acquisition of political knowledge from traditional news sources or replace them with new media as sources of political information

“. Political engagement is not a sufficient condition for political effectiveness,

but it is certainly necessary.” (Galston 2001, 220)

Explanations

* Education level/attainment (Nie et al, 1996) Nie NH, Junn J, Stehlik-Barry K. 1996. Education and Democratic Citizenship in America. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press. 268 pp.

**Sidney Verba, Nancy Burns and Kay Lehman Schlozman Knowing and Caring about Politics: Gender and Political Engagement. The Journal of Politics, Vol. 59, No. 4 (Nov., 1997), pp. 1051-1072**

Politically engaged = politically interested, informed, and efficacious

“measures of various aspects of political engagement, in particular, a battery of ten items testing knowledge about politics” (Verba, Burns and Schlozman, 1997, p. 1052)

Gender difference: men are more politically engaged – and this matters. Not explained by sociodemographics

Aspects of engagement:

* Political information: knowledge of government and politics, names of public officials
* Political interest
* Discussion: taking part in it, often, enjoying it
* Exposure to media: political info on news/media
* Efficacy: sense that you can impact politics

Other sources: Inglehart (1981) – WVS stuff is about civic engagement more broadly

**Jeffrey A. Karp, Susan A. Banducci 2008 When politics is not just a man’s game: Women’s representation and political engagement Electoral Studies 27 (2008) 105-115**

Institutional explanation: “presence of women as candidates and office holders can help to stimulate political engagement among women”

Tenuous relation with attitudes about the political process

Engagement = contact politician, worked together with people over concern, protest, persuade to vote for candidate, show support for party by attending meetings/putting up posters

**Frederick Solt 2008 Economic Inequality and Democratic Political Engagement American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 52, No. 1, January 2008, Pp. 48–60**

Political interest, discussion of politics, and participation in elections. Finding: inequality depresses engagement

Argument: relative power theory of political engagement – where economic power is concentrated, power also is, and less affluent will think issues are not their interest, so they engage less

Theories of inequality: Brady 2004, Ansolabehere, de Figueiredo, and Snyder

2003, Gaventa 1980

Only democratic countries: contested elections with broad suffrage

Only developed countries: poverty makes people exchange votes for benefits

Measures: all survey data

* Interest: self-reported interest in politics
* Discussion: how often discuss politics with friends
* Electoral participation: voted in last national election

**Sunshine HIllygus 2005 THE MISSING LINK: Exploring the Relationship Between Higher Education and Political Engagement Political Behavior, Vol. 27, No. 1, March 2005 ( 2005) DOI 10.1007/s11109-005-3075-8**

Engagement = political participation

Hypotheses in link between engagement and education: civic education, social networks, and political meritocracy (intelligence)

Measures: voter turnout and participation in other political activities (written to a public official, attended a political meeting, contributed money to a political candidate, or contributed money or time to a political cause)

**James Sloam 2012. New Voice, Less Equal: The Civic and Political Engagement of Young People in the United States and Europe. Comparative Political StudiesVolume 47, Issue 5, April 2014, Pages 663-688 https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414012453441**

Youth and political engagement; differences in US, UK, GE are related to individual wealth and education

Measures:

* Vote
* Campaign
* Contact politician
* Petition
* Boycott
* Protest
* Collective action for cause

**Judith Torney-Purta, Carolyn Henry Barber and Wendy Klandl Richardson Trust in Government-related Institutions and Political Engagement among Adolescents in Six Countries. Acta Politica, 2004, 39, (380–406)**

Forms of engagement: voting, conventional political participation that goes beyond

voting, and community participation

Argument: “suggesting a ‘threshold’ of trustworthiness that a political system needs to establish in order to foster civic and political participation in young people”

Theory focused on the importance of trust in adolescents/young people

**VIOLENCE AND CONFLICT**

**BLATTMAN, C. (2009). From Violence to Voting: War and Political Participation in Uganda. *American Political Science Review,* *103*(2), 231-247. doi:10.1017/S0003055409090212**

What is the political legacy of violent conflict?

Finding: “evidence for a link from past violence to increased political engagement among excombatants” - “abduction leads to substantial increases in voting and community

leadership, largely due to elevated levels of violence witnessed. Meanwhile, abduction and violence do not appear to affect nonpolitical participation.”

Methods: northern Uganda, quasirandom variation in who was conscripted by abduction, survey + qualitative data that builds the theoretical argument

Argument: “violence may lead to personal growth and political activation, a possibility supported by psychological research on the positive effects of traumatic events”

Other finding similar patterns: Wood (2003) in El Salvador, Bellows and Miguel (2006, 2008) in Sierra Leone

Measures of participation:

* Voted in referendum
* Is a community mobilizer: elected, organize meetings
* Political jobs: council person

Community participation as well:

* Member of a group (water, peace, school, church…)
* Volunteers
* Attend

[Show table with mean and SD of all relevant variables in PDET and non PDET counties]

**Hadzic, D., & Tavits, M. (2019). The gendered effects of violence on political engagement. *The Journal of Politics*, *81*(2), 676-680.**

[Looked at pre-print version, forthcoming]

“How does civil conflict affect political engagement?”

Argument: violence makes citizens view politics as combative; traits associated with this view are more associated with masculinity, therefore violence increases engagement in men, but decreases it in women

Methods: experiment in Bosnia. Making violence more salient makes women want to express less desire in engaging in politics

DV: measure respondent’s desire to engage in politics

* How likely they are to vote in future elections, 4-point scale
* How interested in politics, 4-point scale
* Combine into engagement scale (higher=more desire)

**Shair-Rosenfield, S., & Wood, R. (2017). Governing well after war: How improving female representation prolongs post-conflict peace. *Journal of Politics*, *79*(3), 995-1009. https://doi.org/10.1086/691056**

More about the effect of women engagement on post-conflict peace

“We argue that the proportion of female representatives in a national legislature prolongs peace following a negotiated settlement. Moreover, we highlight two mechanisms through which greater female representation reduces the risk of conflict recurrence: (1) by prioritizing social welfare spending over military spending and (2) by improving public perceptions of good governance and the credibility of political elites” – effect conditioned by nominal democracy

Main IV is women participation: proportion in lower house

**Michal Bauer, Christopher Blattman, Julie Chytilová, Joseph Henrich, Edward Miguel, and Tamar Mitts Can War Foster Cooperation? Journal of Economic Perspectives—Volume 30, Number 3—Summer 2016—Pages 249–274 http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/jep.30.3.249doi=10.1257/jep.30.3.249**

“consistent finding has emerged: people exposed to war violence tend to behave more cooperatively after war”

“The evidence suggests that war affects behavior in a range of situations, real and experimental. People exposed to more war-related violence tend to increase their social participation by joining more local social and civic groups or taking on more leadership roles in their communities.”

“we see little systematic difference by the type of violence experienced”

“The results appear to hold for men and women, as well as children and adults exposed to violence, and are remarkably similar for both the victims and perpetrators of violence”

Method: meta-analysis of 16 studies and review

Outcome measures:

* Social group participation: clubs, teams, community orgs
* Community leadership and participation: local meetings, community work
* Trust: trust in others in community
* Prosocial behavior in experimental games
* Voting, local and national – sum and standardize
* Knowledge of and interest in politics (familiarity…) – sum and standardize

Existing theoretical explanations

* Neoclassic econ: need for more social insurance among most victimized, and more need for personal safety among victims
* Changes in norms: evolution; violence and intergroup competition make in-group cooperation more favored
* Psych: more general shift in preferences; response to trauma, or in PoliSci, experience of war-related injustice makes individuals prefer collective action (Wood 2003)

**Rozenas, A., Schutte, S., & Zhukov, Y. (2017). The Political Legacy of Violence: The Long-Term Impact of Stalin’s Repression in Ukraine. *Journal of Politics*, *79*(4), 1147–1161. https://doi-org.ezproxy.eafit.edu.co/10.1086/692964**

Indiscriminate violence reduces long-term political support for perpetrator. “Communities more exposed to indiscriminate violence in the past will—in the future—oppose political forces they associate with the perpetrators of that violence.”

Evidence: “communities subjected to a greater intensity of deportation in the 1940s are now significantly less likely to vote for “pro-Russian” parties” – deportation of nationalist insurgents to Siberia

Methods:

* IV regression: railroads
* RD design: administrative boundaries

**Balcells, L. (2012). The Consequences of Victimization on Political Identities: Evidence from Spain. Politics & Society, 40(3), 311–347.** [**https://doi.org/10.1177/0032329211424721**](https://doi.org/10.1177/0032329211424721)

Individual experiences of violence in the Spanish Civil War affected the ideological preferences of survivors.

“… victimization does matter for political identities: it leads to the rejection of the perpetrators’ identities, and its impact lasts for more than one generation”

“on one hand, only severe (and not moderate) victimization leaves an imprint”

**Noam Lupu Leonid Peisakhin 2017 The Legacy of Political Violence across Generations American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 61, No. 4, October 2017, Pp. 836–851**

“Does political violence leave a lasting legacy on identities, attitudes, and behaviors?”

Argument: “We argue that violence shapes the identities of victims and that families transmit these effects across generations. Inherited identities then impact the contemporary attitudes and behaviors of the descendants of victims.”

Evidence: deportation of Crimean Tatars in 1944: family experience of Soviet violence affects their political attitudes three generations later

Measure legacy of violence:

* Did any family member die during deportation and how many (ordinal measure)

Focused on effects on attitudes:

* Ingroup attachment, victimhood, threat perception
* Support for Russia, Chechen, local leaders, etc.
* Turnout, willingness to participate – findings indicate that violence increases these

**Bellows, John and Miguel, Edward. 2009. War and local collective action in Sierra Leone. Journal of Public Economics. Volume 93, Issues 11–12, December 2009, Pages 1144-1157**

“better understanding the short-run economic and political impacts of civil war.”

Existing mechanisms mostly psych: post-traumatic stress and PT growth. Some behavioral too: individuals might have a taste for punishing social norm violations, which in turn might lead to more willingness to punish free-riders

Evidence from survey in Sierra Leone

Civic participation outcomes:

* Attendance community meetings
* Membership social group
* Membership political group, plus voted/registered to vote and knowledge of political events and figures

**De Luca, G., & Verpoorten, M. (2015). Civil war and political participation: Evidence from Uganda. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, *64*(1), 113-141.**

“impact of the armed conflict afflicting Uganda in 1996–2007 on civic and political participation, measured by the frequency of political discussion, meeting attendance, and electoral turnout”

Methods: DiD with survey waves

Measures: “two distinct dimensions of political participation: electoral participation and more informal active citizenship”

* Informal active citizenship: community meetings, discuss politics with friends
* Electoral participation: voted or not

Results: conflict has a positive and significant effect on informal political participation (meetings and discussions), but not on formal electoral participation (less turnout)

* Explanations:
  + Resource model of participation (Brady, Verba, and Schlozman, 1995): conflict disrupts economic activity, more free time to engage and be interested
  + Violence creates more challenging environment for voting (infrastructure, displacement, safety) and doesn’t raise interest in national-level politics/elections – consistent with resource model, where interest in politics is key variable

**METHODS**

**Solon, G., Haider, S. J., & Wooldridge, J. M. (2015). What Are We Weighting For? *Journal of Human Resources*, *50*(2), 301–316. https://doi-org.ezproxy.eafit.edu.co/10.3368/jhr.50.2.301**

“When estimating population descriptive statistics, weighting is called for if needed to make the analysis sample representative of the target population. With regard to research directed instead at estimating causal effects, we discuss three distinct weighting motives: (1) to achieve precise estimates by correcting for heteroskedasticity; (2) to achieve consistent estimates by correcting for endogenous sampling; and (3) to identify average partial effects in the presence of unmodeled heterogeneity of effects. In each case, we find that the motive sometimes does not apply in situations where practitioners often assume it does.”

**Cohen, M. J., & Zechmeister, E. J. (2018). Measuring Political Knowledge in the AmericasBarometer.**

There’s two way of measuring political knowledge in LAPOP/Americas Barometer: which use?

Use Colombia survey:

* Interviewer assessment is the new one and correlates well with respondent directed measures of political knowledge, political interested and respondent education
* Measure is positively correlated with political participation measures – predicts what it’s supposed to predict
  + Turnout
  + Partisanship
  + Interest
  + Internal efficacy
  + News consumption

**LAPOP**

**Piñeiro, R., Rhodes-Purdy, M., & Rosenblatt, F. (2016). The Engagement Curve: Populism and Political Engagement in Latin America. *Latin American Research Review*, 3-23.**

“the impact of inequality on engagement is not constant, but changes depending on the strategic choices of political leaders. Populist leaders, who tend to explicitly connect political and socioeconomic exclusion, can activate latent grievances around inequality”

“However, our argument suggests an important modification to resource theory: the inability of the poor to pay the costs of participation is not constant because political leaders can step in to help bear the burden, thus moderating the impact”

“try to assess how political strategy interacts with inequality to produce the variation in pat- terns of engagement that we observe.”

* Types of political strategies: two dimensions anti-elite mobilization or not and redistributive claims or not

Measurement: political engagement is a latent variable, using LAPOP

* Indicators: “The items we use as indicators are attended a municipal council meeting, petitioned local officials, attended a political meeting, attended a protest, retrospective vote, prospective vote, and party ID.”
* Method: confirmatory factor analysis??? To solve latent variable problem

**Carreras, M. (2016). Compulsory voting and political engagement (beyond the ballot box): A multilevel analysis. *Electoral Studies*, *43*, 158-168.**

“results suggest that compulsory voting has a negligible effect on political engagement. However, the results also reveal an interesting interaction. Citizens with low levels of education are more likely to be cognitively engaged with the political process when voting is mandatory”

Two different forms of engagement:

* Cognitive political engagement: individual psych attachment to political system: interested, seeks info, attached to parties…
* active engagement in the political arena beyond the ballot box: contact politicians, attend party or town meetings

Methods: use LAPOP, run multilevel models (logits and linear)

* Measure cognitive PE:
  + Political interest: how much
  + Attention to political news: how often (TV, radio, newspaper, internet)
  + Partisanship, party ID: do you identify with a party
  + Political discussion: how often with other people
* Measure beyond ballot active PE:
  + attending party meetings: if and how often
  + contacting local officials at the municipality: contacted, requested sought help to any official
  + involvement in community affairs: meetings if and how often

**Córdova, A., & Hiskey, J. (2015). Shaping politics at home: Cross-border social ties and local-level political engagement. *Comparative Political Studies*, *48*(11), 1454-1487.**

Do people with relatives in the US have different political engagement levels? Why? They do

Methods: use LAPOP

* five dependent variables
  + Participation In local government meeting in last 12 months
  + Attachment to party
    - Party id
    - Efforts to persuade others
  + National level politics
    - Voter turnout for presidential
    - Petition to national level office

**Rosenblatt, F., Bidegain, G., Monestier, F., & Rodríguez, R. P. (2015). A Natural Experiment in Political Decentralization: Local Institutions and Citizens' Political Engagement in Uruguay. *Latin American Politics and Society*, *57*(2), 91-110.**

Natural experiment: some towns have local elections, some don’t, what happens with political engagement?

Survey with confirmatory factor analysis to weight variables in measuring latent engagement

**Cohen, M.J. Protesting via the Null Ballot: An Assessment of the Decision to Cast an Invalid Vote in Latin America. *Polit Behav* 40, 395–414 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-017-9405-9**

Use LAPOP to study invalid voting (DV) – explained by political knowledge (IV), used as form of protest (mechanism)

**Carreras, M., & Irepoglu, Y. (2013). Trust in elections, vote buying, and turnout in Latin America. *Electoral Studies*, 32(4). Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1xr1j5mg**

LAPOP to study voting (DV) – explained by perception of unfairness (depresses) and vote buying (increases)