

**Small Turnout, Large Problems: An Analysis of Political Participation in American Large  
City Mayor Elections**

**Joshua Johnson  
Creighton University**

## **Abstract**

Voter turnout statistics in elections across the United States reveal that political participation is too low. The United States Constitution was designed in a way to give the American people effective, elected representation at multiple levels. This can only be fulfilled if people actually turn out to vote. This study seeks to explain political participation at the city level. In city level politics, turnout numbers are even lower than at the state or federal levels. Studies have shown that the average voter turnout in local elections across the country is only at 27% and is falling every year. Using large cities of over 200,000 people as the unit of analysis, my study explains political turnout in terms of demographics, political culture, and institutions.

The demographic variables I used were race, income, and education. Of these, only income and education were found to have a significant relationship with voter turnout. Interestingly, income had a strong negative relationship, though I hypothesized a positive one and the literature suggested a positive one. For political culture, I found that cities with a more liberal ideology had higher turnout numbers. I also examined the North-South cultural divide and found that cities in the North have higher turnout. None of the institutional variables studied were found significant. This study found that demographics and political culture had some explanatory power when looking at voter turnout variation. This is contrary to a previous study done by Caren which found that only individual campaign factors had any explanatory power.

## **Introduction**

In the American political system, a problem has emerged when looking at data concerning voter turnout. Voter turnout is low. This is especially true of mayoral and city council elections. In doing a study of mayoral elections of the largest cities in the United States over the

last twenty-five years, it was found that average voter turnout was only 27% and that number was decreasing from year to year (Caren 2007). Even though a vote in a local election has more mathematical weight than in a state or national election and, arguably, local politics has a greater effect on day-to-day life (Delli Carpini and Keeter 1996), the public does not turn out to vote in nearly the same numbers.

Political participation is a core principle of democracy. The United States Constitution was designed in a way to give the American people effective, elected representation at multiple levels. The system is designed to have democracy at the federal, state, and local level. State and local governments are in fact designed to give the population more democratic representation than the national government. When only a small portion of the population is bothering to fulfill their civic duty, representation cannot reach a level of effectiveness that is satisfactory to the democratic ideals put forth in the Constitution.

Why is low turnout in local elections a problem? A previous study by Hajnal and Trounstein (2005) examines the effects of low turnout on city governance. They concluded that low turnout in municipal elections leads to lower levels of descriptive representation in local politics. They argue that this can be an even larger problem at the local level than at the federal level, since certain cities have minority populations at levels well above the national average.

Though participation in local elections is generally low in cities all over the country, there is much variance from city to city. Cities such as Chicago or Philadelphia have relatively high turnout for local elections, while turnout can be in the single digits in other areas. This paper will seek to explain some of the causal factors that contribute to the variance in voter turnout in local elections.

A term that needs to be defined for this paper is local election. For the purpose of this study, I will look at the mayoral races of American cities. The mayor acts as the executive of a city and local politics. Elections for this office are fairly standardized across the country, whereas there are great differences in how elections for city councils or assemblies are done. For those reasons, only elections in which the office of the mayor is on the ballot will be used for this study.

Another definition needed is the criteria for the size of the city. This paper will examine the voting behavior of voters in cities with a population of greater than 200,000. These cities are chosen for the study because of their diversity and because of their relative importance. Voting records of smaller cities are more spurious, so they are not adequate for this study.

Voter turnout will be examined by looking at the effects of three different kinds of variables. Demographics, institutional, and political culture variables will be used in the study. By looking at the effects on turnout of all three kinds of variables and establishing a causal relationship, this study will provide a greater understanding of the variance in voter turnout in American cities.

### **Demographic Factors**

In literature concerning the relationship between blacks and voter turnout, there has not been a consensus reached among the scholars on the direction of the relationship. Many studies show that socioeconomic status has a positive correlation with likelihood to vote (e.g. Leighley and Nagler 1992; Rosentone and Hansen 1992). It has been shown that at the national level, the black population as a body votes at a higher rate than what their socioeconomic status would indicate (Murray and Vedlitz 1977). In the study done by Murray and Vedlitz, they indicated that

voting participation in the south showed the impact of race on turnout. In the study, black voters were more likely to vote than their white counterparts of the same economic status. Another study indicated that differences in the socioeconomic status between blacks and whites were a greater indicator of voting than race in general (Campbell and Kaufman 2006). These studies build a theory that suggests past studies which indicated race as a negative contributing factor to turnout may not be wholly valid.

There are some arguments out there that suggest that local politics fit in more with the black population's primary issue concerns. Whereas national politics is dominated by economic and foreign policy issues, local levels are more focused on racial and ethnic issues in the community (Lieske and Hillard 1984). When deciding whether or not to vote, issues affecting their community are shown to be more important to minority groups, particularly black and Hispanics, than other social or economic issues which often influence elections (Murray and Vedlitz 1977).

Prior work has shown that cities more divided by social cleavages tend to have larger turnout (Alford and Lee 1968). The idea behind this is that when there is class conflict or deep divides over race, the populace will be more motivated to participate in order to elect candidates more sympathetic to their own social strata. Members of groups on opposing sides of cleavages become more motivated to vote in hopes of getting the upper hand in policy decisions (Alford and Lee 1968). If it is indeed true that social cleavages will draw in more voters, then ethnic diversity in an area should draw voters. Building on the prior works of Lieske and Hillard (1984) and Alford and Lee (1968), I formulate the following hypothesis concerning black population and voter turnout:

*H1: Cities with greater black population will have higher voter turnout*

This hypothesis will be the most contentious as there are previous studies that indicate black people (or any other minority group) vote less than whites (e.g. Hajnal and Baldassare 2001; Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001). Whether or not this is true, I hypothesize that a higher black population stimulates higher turnout. I do not believe that high turnout in areas with more black people is contrary to studies like Hajnal and Baldassare (2001).

The reason for that is this study does not use the individual as the level of analysis, but rather the population of the city as a whole. High black population is shown to be a motivating factor for white voters to get out and vote (Alford and Lee 1968; Hammond 1977). This is similar to a more recent study that found that social and class conflict in areas were likely to lead to higher mobilization of voters (Winders 1999). These ideas of conflict leading to mobilization form the main theoretical basis for this hypothesis. Using this line of thinking, even if studies like Ramakrishnan and Espenshade (2001) are correct in their assessment of black voting behavior, we can still expect to see higher turnout in areas with a high black population.

Another issue apart from race that has shown to be salient when it comes to voter turnout is socioeconomic status. Prior research indicates that those of a higher economic class are more likely to vote than those in a lower class. This includes a study that shows that in the American political system, the median income of people who vote has skewed to be higher than the median of the populace as a whole (Freeman 2004). Similarly, the work of Rosenstone and Hansen (1992) has shown that the majority of voters are from a relatively high socioeconomic class. Past work has shown that places with higher income voters can expect to see higher turnout numbers in presidential elections (Leighley and Nagler 1992) as well as in congressional mid-term elections (Goidel and Shields 1997). These previous studies form the foundation of the second hypothesis being tested:

*H2: Cities with higher per capita income will have higher voter turnout.*

The prior research discussed gives a clear indication of the expected direction of the relationship. While these studies have shown that private wealth and resources increases likelihood to vote at the individual level, this study will look at the effects at a broader level by changing the unit of analysis. Cities with more wealth will have more access to information on candidates and their campaigns which will lead to an increase in participation.

The last demographic variable being tested in this model is level of education in the city. Many studies have been done regarding the effects of education on voter turnout. Studies show that more educated voters are more likely to vote (Delli Carpini and Keeter 1993; Nagler 2001). Robert A. Jackson finds that the reasons for this can be broken down into four prominent explanations: education increases a person's sense of civic duty, education increases sense of political efficacy, education makes registration easier, and education enhances political awareness (Jackson 1995).

These studies build a comprehensive theory that higher education levels in individuals make them more likely to vote. This leads to my third hypothesis:

*H3: Cities with higher education levels will have higher voter turnout.*

If individuals are more likely to vote if they are highly educated, I hypothesize that this can be transposed onto the general population. Similar to income, by changing the unit of analysis to the city level we can study whether cities with a more educated population of potential voters will see greater numbers turn up at the polls.

## **Institutional Factors**

The second category of variables that I will examine are institutional factors. These include the form of government and method of elections. The three different institutional variables I will look at are incumbency, ballot form, and form of government.

Much work has been done on the incumbency advantage in national and state politics. Incumbency advantage is the idea that incumbent candidates in an election have a built in advantage over their opponents due to the voters being familiar with them and wanting to maintain the status quo. The incumbency advantage is a well established phenomenon and has been shown to grow over time (Cox and Morgenstern 1993). It is speculated that as campaigns become more candidate oriented instead of party oriented the advantage will increase (Cox and Katz 1996). Jacobson found that the incumbency advantage in the Federal House of Representatives had neither grown nor declined over years, but has remained pretty constant (1987).

There is a relative lack of prior research done on the incumbency advantage and its effects at the local level. One study did show that unless some sort of scandal or city-wide crisis (economic, natural disaster, etc.) happens to lower public opinion of a mayor, mayors tend to face less opposition as time goes on. The longer a mayor is in office, the lower the turnout for mayoral elections becomes (Morlan 1984). In a comparative basis across cities, we can expect that incumbent mayors decrease participation in mayoral elections.

*H4: Incumbent candidates in mayoral elections lower voter turnout.*

This could also be an extension of the feeling that voters are more likely to vote in close races and less likely to vote in landslides (Berch 1993). Because of the incumbency advantage, races with incumbents are not viewed as being as close or the voters are satisfied with the status



quo and do not seek change. Combining the idea of the incumbency advantage with the idea that closeness of race leads to high turnout, it seems to follow that incumbents, particularly popular ones, would lower turnout because the races are not expected to be as close (Berch 1993). Whether the incumbency advantage is growing (Cox and Morgenstern 1993) or not (Jacobson 1987), the literature clearly indicates that it is prevalent and has an effect on turnout at the national level. The incumbency advantage makes it difficult for majorities in state legislatures to shift because the voters are less likely to mobilize when there are strong incumbents in the seats (Ansolabahere and Gerber 1997). This study will test whether or not we can expect similar results at the local level.

Another institutional variable being examined is the progressive era reform of non-partisan ballots being used and its effect on the voting public. A non-partisan ballot is one that does not list the party affiliation of the candidate next to their name on the ballot. This removes a potential voting cue for those casting the ballot. Earlier studies have shown that non-partisan ballots tend to decrease voter turnout (Lee 1960 and Schaffner 2001). The reasons for this vary. Some have theorized that non-partisan elections are simply less exciting than partisan battles (Lee 1960). Parties seem to be less willing to mobilize the electorate when the election is on a non-partisan ballot (Schaffner 2001). This may lead to a big decrease in turnout because parties are important when it comes to campaigning and getting their members to vote.

*H5: Cities with partisan ballots will have higher turnout.*

This study will seek to find whether or not non-partisan ballots will lower turnout in big city elections.

The last institutional variable included in this model examines the effects on turnout by form of government. All of the cities in the study use the office of mayor as the head of local

government, but there is a key difference in the institutional design that changes the role and power of the office. Some cities use a mayor-council form where the mayor is the executive of local government and some cities use the council-manager form of government where the mayor serves as head of the city council and much executive power is turned over to a non-elected, professional city manager.

*H6: Cities with the mayor-council form of government will have higher turnout.*

A previous study done on cities in California indicated that cities with mayor-council forms tend to have higher turnout than those with another form of government (Hajnal and Lewis 2003). This study built off of a previous one that suggested the mayor-council distinction was the only significant institutional variable when looking at turnout in California cities (Hajnal, Lewis, and Louch 2002). The authors of these studies theorized that this was most likely do to a psychological effect of the voters. The belief is that since mayors in a mayor-council form have more executive power than those in a council-manager system, the voters are more likely to perceive the races for mayors in mayor-council systems as important. They say that this logic is similar to the logic behind why people are more likely to vote for the “most important” office of president over all other offices. Apart from these works done about the state of California, there is a dearth of literature or previous studies about the effect of the mayor-council form on voter turnout. My hypothesis presupposes that these same effects will be seen in other areas of the country and not just California.

### **Political Culture Factors**

Finally, the effect of political ideology on voter turnout will be examined in this paper. Does liberalism or conservatism positively affect turnout? Theories on the effects of the two

major political ideologies are conflicting. While some studies indicate that conservatives are more likely to mobilize in elections (Press 1982 and Uhlaner 1989), others indicate that higher turnout correlates positively with liberalism (Denardo 1980). Data indicates that races with higher turnout favor democratic candidates in national and state elections (Nagel and McNulty 1996). Another study on this phenomenon concluded that any advantage was inconclusive, particularly in more modern elections (Martinez and Gill 2005).

On the national scene, studies “tell us that Democratic candidates for national office usually win when there are large turnouts and Republicans are likely to win when the turnout is small” (Fenton 1979). This could possibly be due to the long held belief that the Republican Party has greater party discipline and small turnout benefits them because there ability to avoid crossover voting (Linn 1949).

This leads into the first hypothesis concerning political culture:

*H7: Cities with a more liberal population will have higher turnout.*

The reason that liberalism will be looked at instead of conservatism is that the previous work that would indicate a different outcome (Press 1982 and Uhlaner 1989) focused on the “religious right” and not the Republican Party as a whole. The previous research in this area gives a stronger theoretical and empirical background to the stated hypothesis and not the inverse relationship.

The other aspect of political culture that this study will include is how the split in culture of northerners and southerners in the United States affects voter turnout. In his book The Idea of a Southern Nation, John McCardell theorizes that people in southern states look at themselves as southerners before they think of themselves as American. This is similar to what is seen in regions of France where regional identities take prevalence over national ones (McCardell 1979).

Other scholars have noted that there are differences amongst all the regions of the country. It is noted that the most prevalent regional differences are those between the North and South (Ladd 1998). After determining a clear split in the political cultures of the North and the South, I formulated my final hypothesis to be tested:

*H8: Cities in the north will experience higher voter turnout than cities in the south.*

In the book Governing States and Localities, the authors observe this exact effect in state wide elections. It says that closer to the Canadian border a state is, the more likely they are to have high turnout in elections (Smith 2005). Another indication for this relationship was found in a study on ballot initiatives (Tolbert et al 2001) that showed voter turnout in northern cities seemed to be less affected by ballot initiatives. Similar research found that voter turnout was generally higher in northern states with or without the presence of ballot initiatives (Everson 1981).

These previous studies build a strong theory that northern states have higher turnout at the statewide level. There is a hole in the literature on whether this also holds true at the local level. This study hypothesized that this will also hold true at the local level and that northern cities will see more turnout than southern ones.

### **Data and Variables**

This analysis uses one dependent variable, political participation in local elections. This will be measured in terms of the percentage of the voting eligible population that casts a vote in a mayoral election. The mayoral elections looked at in this study are the ones that take place after the 2003 US Census population estimates were released. This included elections in 2004, 2005,

and 2006. The range of turnout seen in the cities in this sample was quite dramatic as Garland, Texas had only 3.94% while Portland, Oregon experienced the highest with 64.95%.

Another possible way to measure turnout would be to measure turnout in terms of percentage of registered voters. The reason the latter measure is not being used is because there are disparities among voter registration numbers in some areas. This could lead to the question becoming more about why are the parties in some cities more active in voter registration drives as opposed to the question of political participation that this paper examines.

There is one independent variable for each hypothesis. The variables can be divided into the same categories as the hypotheses: demographic, institutional, and political culture variables.

The first demographic variable is black population. This will be measured in terms of percentage of the population that identifies as black. Per capita income will be used as the measure of socioeconomic status of the citizens of the city. Also, per capita income data was recorded in thousands to make the model more easily interpretable. The final demographic variable is percentage of the population over the age of 25 that has a high school degree. This is used as the measure of the education level of the city. All of this data can be found in the 2003 US Census population estimates.

For institutional variables, the first one is incumbent candidates. This will be measured as a dichotomous variable with “0” meaning an election without an incumbent and “1” meaning an election with an incumbent. Another institutional variable is the form of the ballot. This is also dichotomous with “0” being an election which employs a non-partisan ballot and “1” being an election that uses a partisan ballot. The final institutional variable is form of government. In this case, I will code cities that use a mayor-council form of government as a “1” and cities that use

council-manager systems as a “0”. This data on individual city government forms and officials was taken from the official city clerk web sites.

Finally, for political culture variables I will use a variable for liberalism. Liberalism for a city will be measured as the percentage of the population that voted for the democratic candidate (John Kerry) in the 2004 presidential election. Though this is not an exact measure of liberalism in the population, it is commonly used in the literature.

Another measure of political culture in the city is the distinction of being either a northern city or a southern city. Southern cities will be defined as cities that are in states that were members of the Confederacy during the Civil War. Since this study hypothesizes that northern cities will have higher turnout, cities in the north will be coded as “1” and cities in the south will be coded as “0”.

A discussion of the sample size of this study is needed here. Big cities were defined as those with over 200,000 residents. According to the 2003 US Census population estimates which were the source of all the demographic variables, this would give an n-size of 98. Not all of these cities had a mayoral election in the time frame I was looking at, leading to a lowering of the sample size. Also, the cities of Shreveport and Baton Rouge, Louisiana were removed because they held mayoral elections after the events of Hurricane Katrina, so the population estimates of 2003 were not completely accurate measures of the population at the time of the elections. These exceptions left the final n-size of this study at 83.

## **Methods and Findings**

For this study an OLS regression was used to determine the model. OLS was used because the dependent variable (turnout) was measured as a percentage and was therefore a

continuous variable. There were some concerns about multi-collinearity among the independent variables, particularly the income and education variables. Therefore, before the final OLS regression model was run, a correlation procedure was run on the independent variables. After finding that none of the variables had a Pearson correlation of over .7, none of them needed to be excluded from the final model. The results of the OLS regression are shown in Table 1.

Table 1  
Voter Turnout in Big City Mayor Elections

	Voter Turnout (std error)
Black Population	.08 (.075)
Income	-.766** (.333)
Education	.476*** (.175)
North/South	4.973** (2.491)
Presidential Vote	.222** (.102)
Incumbent Candidate	-1.181 (2.401)
Partisan Ballot	1.357 (2.368)
Mayor-Council Government	.403 (2.457)
Constant	-16.689 (11.839)
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.207

83

Number of  
Observations

---

**Notes: The dependent variable is percentage of voting age population that cast a vote in the mayor election. Coefficients are OLS regression coefficients with standard errors in parenthesis.**

**\*P≤ .10; \*\*P≤ .05; \*\*\*P≤.01 \*\*\*\* P≤.001**

Using the values shown in the table, the equation for this regression model becomes:

*Voter Turnout = .08(Black Population) + -.766(Income) + .476(Education) + 4.973 (North/South) + .222 (Presidential Vote) + -1.181 (Incumbent Candidate) + 1.357 (Partisan Ballot) + .403 (Mayor-Council) + -16.689.* This regression equation is useful for predicting

the expected turnout of mayoral elections. The final model shows an R<sup>2</sup> value of .207.

Substantively, this means that the independent variables used in the study account for approximately 21% of the measured variance of voter turnout.

### **Discussion of Findings and Hypotheses**

*H1: Cities withy higher black populations will have higher voter turnout.*

The coefficient for this variable turned out to be .08, but was not found to be statistically significant. Therefore, I am unable to reject the null hypothesis of no relationship between black population and voter turnout. Neither the prior research that indicates a positive relationship (e.g. Campbell and Kaufman 2006; Murray and Vedlitz 1997) nor the research that suggests a negative relationship (e.g. Hajnal and Baldassare 2001; Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001) can be confirmed or disconfirmed by the results of this study.

*H2: Cities with higher per capita income will have higher voter turnout.*



The results for this variable are particularly interesting. The literature suggested (e.g. Freeman 2004; Goidel and Shields 1997; Leighley and Nagler 1992) and I hypothesized a positive relationship between a city's per capita income and voter turnout. This prior research was done on elections at the state and national level. The results of this study suggest a difference between those levels and the local level.

The coefficient came out to be  $-.766$ . This means that for every increase of a thousand dollars in a city's per capita income, we can expect a decrease in turnout in mayoral elections of  $.766$  of a percent. With significance at the  $.05$  level we may reject the null hypothesis.

*H3: Cities with higher levels of education will have higher voter turnout.*

The coefficient for this variable was  $.476$ . For every increase of 10% in a city's number of people who graduated high school, we can expect an increase of approximately 5% in voter turnout. It was also significant at the  $.05$  level. These results indicate that we may reject the null hypothesis of no relationship. The prior research done by Nagler (2007) and others (Delli Carpini and Keeter 1993; Jackson 1995) on the effects of education levels on voter turnout at the individual level are suggested to also be applicable in mayor elections with cities as the unit of analysis.

*H4: Incumbent candidates in mayoral elections lower voter turnout.*

*H5: Cities with partisan ballots will have higher turnout.*

*H6: Cities with the mayor-council form of government will have higher turnout.*

None of the institutional variables suggested by the literature and that I hypothesized came up as significant in this study. This is particularly interesting in the case of non-partisan vs. partisan ballots since there is such an extensive body of literature that suggests a significant relationship (Lee 1960 and Schaffner 2001). The mayor-council relationship shown to have

significance in California cities (Hajnal and Lewis 2003) can not be shown to translate nationally by this study. No support can be found for the hypothesis that the incumbency advantage curbs turnout. For the purposes of this study, I cannot reject the null hypothesis for any of these hypotheses.

*H7: Cities with a more liberal population will have higher voter turnout. .*

The coefficient of .222 came up as significant at the .05 level. These numbers mean that we can reject the null hypothesis. Substantively, this means that for every percentage point increase in voting John Kerry got in a city, we could expect turnout to increase .222 percent.

*H8: Cities in the north will experience higher voter turnout than cities in the south.*

The coefficient for this variable was 4.973 and was significant at the .05 level. For this variable, we can reject the null hypothesis. For cities identified as being northern cities, that distinction is good enough for a 5% increase in voter turnout by itself.

The  $R^2$  figure of .207 tells us that in mayoral elections about 21% of the variation in the voter turnout is explainable by the independent variables tested. This number may not seem high. But, when we are dealing with turnout that is as low 3.9% in Garland, Texas any information on how to increase turnout is beneficial. In a previous study looking at municipal elections over the last 25 years, Neal Caren found that demographic and political culture factors were weakly correlated to turnout figures and only individual campaign factors were significant (Caren 2007). That study shows that in individual elections, campaign factors are the most explanatory, but they do us little good when trying to do a broad study of the determinants of outcome. Because individual campaign factors are always changing it is hard to tell what effect they have on outcome over time, whereas race and other socioeconomic factors are always prevalent in a society.

In general, this study found that a number of demographic and political culture variables were significant in explaining the variance of voter turnout. Institutional variables were not found to be significant. Though this study is able to give a good general view of the determinants of voter turnout there are some limitations. For instance, the point of this study was to examine political participation in local politics. Though voter turnout in local elections is a good indication of participation, it is not the only form of participation. There are other ways of participating in local politics that this does not account for. For instance, other possible measures of political participation that could be used are amount of time or money that individuals contribute to local campaigns. Also, there may be other demographic, institutional, and political culture variables not part of this study that could have some explanatory power.

## **Conclusion**

In my study of voter turnout in big city mayor elections, I found that my hypotheses concerning education, liberalism, and north/south distinction were confirmed and significant. I also found that the relationship of per capita income to turnout was significant, but in the opposite direction that I hypothesized. This was a quite interesting result, as it ran contrary to all of the literature in the field and was directly opposite to results about national and state level elections. One reason for this finding could be that higher income individuals are more interested in the economic and security issues prevalent at the other levels than the social issues at the local level. Further research is needed to determine whether this is an explanation for this or whether it is something different. Also, this result could just be a product of this particular sample and not indicative of a national trend. A more inclusive study will help us answer these questions.

I found that black population, having incumbents in the race, partisan ballots, and mayor-council systems of government are not significant in explaining the variance of turnout. The big question that comes up after the analysis is why none of the institutional variables came up as significant when the literature suggested they would. Perhaps this indicates some sort of fundamental difference in how local politics works as opposed to the other levels of government or a difference in people's attitudes towards it. Or, this could indicate that when looking at local politics, there are different institutional variables that need to be examined.

Since not as much work has been done in the field of local politics as has been done at the state and federal levels, this study could be used as the groundwork for future studies. One future study could be to use similar methods, but change the focus from big cities to a more inclusive study of cities in general. Also, a whole set of campaign variables could be added to a future model. For instance, research could be done on the effects of campaign dollars spent or television time spent devoted to local campaigns and their effect on participation. Another way to improve the model is to perhaps include more years and be able to do a time series analysis to examine the variation within individual cities over the year.

## References

- Alford, Robert R. and Eugene C. Lee. 1968. "Voting Turnout in American Cities". *American Political Science Review* 62:796-813.
- Ansolabahere, Steven and Alan Gerber. 1997. "Incumbency Advantage and the Persistence of Legislative Majorities". *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 22:161-178.
- Berch, Neil. 1993. "Another Look at Closeness and Turnout". *Political Research Quarterly* 46:421-432.
- Browning, Rufus P., Marshall Dale Rogers, David H. Tabb. 1979. "Minorities and Urban Electoral Change: A Longitudinal Study". *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 15:206-228.
- Caren, Neal. 2007. "Big City, Big Turnout? Electoral Participation in American Cities". *Journal of Urban Affairs* 29:31-46.
- Cox, Gary W. and Jonathan N. Katz. 1996. "Why Did the Incumbency Advantage in U.S. House Elections Grow?". *American Journal of Political Science* 40:478-497.
- Cox, Gary W., and Scott Morgenstern. 1993. "The Increasing Advantage of Incumbency in the U.S. States". *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 18:495-514.
- Delli Carpini, Michael X. and Scott Keeter. 1993. "Measuring Political Knowledge: Putting First Things First". *American Journal of Political Science* 37:1179-1206.
- Delli Carpini, Michael X. and Scott Keeter. 1996. What Americans Know About Politics and Why it Matters. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- Denardo, James. 1980. "Turnout and the Vote: The Joke's on Democrats". *The American Political Science Review* 74:406-420.
- Everson, David H. 1981. "The Effects of Initiatives on Voter Turnout: A Comparative State Analysis". *The Western Political Quarterly* 34:415-425.

- Featherman, Susan O. 1983. "Ethnicity and Ethnic Candidates: Vote Advantages in Local Elections". *Polity* 15:397-415.
- Fenton, John H. 1979. "Turnout and the Two-Party Vote". *The Journal of Politics* 41: 229-234.
- Freeman, Richard B. 2004. Social Inequality. New York: Russell Sage. 703-728
- Goidel, Robert K. and Todd G. Shields. 1997. "Participation Rates, Socioeconomic Class Biases, and Congressional Elections: A Crossvalidation". *American Journal of Political Science* 41:683-691.
- Hajnal, Zoltan and Mark Baldassare. 2001. Finding Common Ground: Racial and Ethnic Attitudes in California. San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California.
- Hajnal, Zoltan and Paul G. Lewis. 2003. "Municipal Institutions and Voter Turnout in Local Elections". *Urban Affairs Review* 38:645-668.
- Hajnal, Zoltan, Paul G. Lewis, Hugh Louch. 2002. Municipal Elections in California: Turnout, Timing, and Competition. San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California.
- Hajnal, Zoltan and Jessica Trounstine. 2005. "Where Turnout Matters: The Consequences of Uneven Turnout in City Politics". *The Journal of Politics* 67:515-535.
- Hammond, John L. 1977. "Race and Electoral Mobilization: White Southerners, 1952-1968". *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 41:13-27.
- Jackson, Byran O. 1987. "The Effects of Racial Group Consciousness on Political Mobilization in American Cities". *The Western Political Quarterly* 4:631-646.
- Jackson, Robert A. 1995. "Clarifying the Relationship Between Education and Turnout". *American Politics Research* 23:279-299.

- Jacobson, Gary C. 1987. "The Marginals Never Vanished: Incumbency and Competition in Elections to the U.S. House of Representatives, 1952-82". *American Journal of Political Science* 31:126-141.
- Kahn, Kim Fridkin and Patrick J. Kenney. 1999. "Do Negative Campaigns Mobilize or Suppress Turnout? Clarifying the Relationship between Negativity and Participation". *The American Political Science Review* 93:877-889.
- Ladd, Everett Carl. 1998. "States and Regions in the US: How Similar? Where Different?". *The Public Perspective* 9:10-31.
- Lee, Eugene C. 1960. The Politics of Nonpartisanship. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Leighley, Jan E., and Jonathan Nagler. 1992. "Socioeconomic Class Bias in Turnout, 1964-1988: The Voters Remain the Same." *American Political Science Review* 86:725-36
- Lieske, Joel and Jan William Hillard. 1984. "The Racial Factor in Urban Elections". *The Western Political Quarterly* 37:545-563.
- Linn, Edward L. 1949. "The Influence of Liberalism and Conservatism on Voting Behavior". *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 13:299-309.
- Martinez, Michael D. and Jeff Gill. 2005. "The Effects of Turnout on Partisan Outcomes in Presidential Elections 1960-2000". *The Journal of Politics* 67:1248-1274.
- McCardell, John. 1979. The Idea of a Southern Nation. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Morlan, Robert L. 1984. "Municipal vs. National Election Voter Turnout: Europe and the United States". *Political Science Quarterly* 99:457-470.
- Murray, Richard and Arnold Vedlitz. 1977. "Race, Socioeconomic Status, and Voting

- Participation in Large Southern Cities”. *The Journal of Politics* 39:1064-1072.
- Nagel, Jack H. and John E. McNulty. 1996. “Partisan Effects of Voter Turnout in Senatorial and Gubernatorial Elections”. *The American Political Science Review* 90:780-793.
- Nagler, Jonathan. 1991. “The Effect of Registration Laws and Education on U.S. Voter Turnout”. *American Political Science Review* 85:1393-1405.
- Niven, David. 2004. “The Mobilization Solution? Face-to-Face Contact and Voter Turnout in a Municipal Election”. *The Journal of Politics* 66:868-884.
- Press, Robert M. 1982. “Bible and the Ballot: How Strong is the Religious Right?”. *Christian Science Monitor* 74:1.
- Ramakrishnan, S. Karthick and Thomas J Espenshade. 2001. “Immigrant Incorporation and Political Participation in the United States”. *International Migration Review* 35:870-910.
- Rosenstone, Stephen J., and John Mark Hansen. 1993. *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America* New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Schaffner, Brian F., Matthew Streb, Gerald Wright. 2001. “Teams Without Uniforms: The Nonpartisan Ballot in State and Local Elections”. *Political Research Quarterly* 54:7-30.
- Smith, Kevin. 2005. Governing States and Localities. Washington: CQ Press.
- Tolbert, Caroline J., John A. Grummel, Daniel A. Smith. 2001. “The Effects of Ballot Initiatives on Voter Turnout in the American States”. *American Politics Research* 29:625-648.
- Uhlener, Carole J. 1989. “Rational Turnout: The Neglected Role of Groups”. *American Journal*



*of Political Science* 33:390-422.

Winders, Bill. 1999. "The Roller Coaster of Class Conflict: Class Segments, Mass Mobilization, and Voter Turnout in the U.S., 1840-1996". *Social Forces* 77:833-862.

**Data Appendix: Descriptive Statistics**

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Voter Turnout (%)	21.65	10.77	3.94	64.95
Black Population (%)	22.2	19.35	.40	81.6
Income Per Capita (in Thousands)	20.77	5.03	11.08	39.16
Education (%)	78.13	9.35	43.2	93.9
Incumbent	.67	.47	0	1
Partisan Ballot	.52	.5	0	1
Mayor-Council	.65	.48	0	1
Liberalism	54.2	14.02	24	90
North/South	.63	.49	0	1