

MODELS OF VOTING

Doc. Dr. Kire Sarlamanov,

International Balkan University,
Skopje, Macedonia

Doc. Dr. Aleksandar Jovanoski,

University Ss. Kliment Ohridski,
Faculty of Law – Kicevo, Macedonia

ABSTRACT

Political parties that compete in elections often promote themselves through affirmative political concepts for development of the society. Expectedly, in their functioning, through the ideological determination and the institutional foundation, political parties express serious mutual differences, especially in terms of the values on which they base their public policies, the perspectives for development of the society and the separate social areas. Taking this into consideration, political parties also differ according to the credibility that they enjoy in the public. However, when making the decision for which party to give their vote in the elections, citizens are guided by different motives. Few viewpoints dominate in the theories of voting which try to explain the electoral behavior of voters. This text aims to synthesize the cognitions offered in the theories of voting and to answer the following questions: Why is some citizen voting? Why is he voting for one party and not for another political party? Why most citizens vote for certain political party and not for another one? Do they do this because they belong to a certain social group, social layer, religious community or another factor for shaping the collective affiliations? Does the voting behavior determine the feeling of loyalty to a particular social group and to what extent? Is it a matter of personal interest? In an attempt to answer these questions in the work, once again we return to the dominant theories of voting (the sociological or Columbia approach to voting, the psychological or Michigan approach and the economic one). Also the work contains short representation of the latest and insufficiently formed model of voting called model of the dominant ideology.

Keywords: Voting, Politics, Columbia school, psychological theory, Michigan school, model of dominant ideology.

INTRODUCTION:

The elections as an important agent in the development of democratic political systems, where political subjects actively participate in the creation of decisions for regulation of social relations and in this manner they gain legitimacy, are one of the central topics of the sociology of politics. Hence, the sociology of politics, in a relatively long period, monitors, observes and analyzes the electoral behavior of voters, which inter alia includes the turnout in the elections and the manner of voting. The obtained cognitions, over time, enabled the development of certain voting theories dedicated to the explanation of the voting behavior of citizens.

Depending on the motives during voting, which are given attention, in the sociology of politics and political science there is a domination of three theories: the sociological theory of voting, which is also called Columbia school of explanation of voting, the Psychological theory of voting i.e. the party identification theory, which is often called the *Michigan school* and the Economic theory of voting. In this text, besides the review of each of the three dominant theories of voting, also a comparative analysis will be offered, which will have to explain voting from a wider perspective.

SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY OF VOTING:

The sociological (Columbia) school (Lazarsfeld, Berelson and McPhee 1954; Zuckerman 1982, 1994) emphasized the group basis of voting. It indicates the fact that although particular individuals deal with politics, it refers much more to group and general purposes and interests. The citizens who select the candidates who appear in the elections, although they make personal (individual) decision, cannot be entirely isolated from the adherence to certain collective characteristics, such as social status, friends and the remaining interactions that are contact point with politics. Lazarsfeld, Berelson and McPhee (1954) particularly emphasize the role of the family and the political socialization at the expense of the remaining social impacts, which were considered dominant in a certain time period!

- *Political socialization.* The political socialization is transfer of the political culture, values and norms of the new generations in a given society (Almond and Verba 1963). Although it is most intensive in the childhood, the political socialization is a process that includes the entire lifetime of the social actors. The adoption of the initial cognitions about politics through political socialization is very important, since the initially learned values and norms are best determined compared to the remaining values and norms that the individuals acquire in a later stage of life. The initially acquired values and norms are used as a reference according to which the remaining values and norms are adopted and organized. The attitudes about politics are mainly formed in the childhood! According to the proponents of the sociological theory of voting, with the pre-election campaigns the attitudes of the citizens about certain political ideologies, parties and leaders do not change, rather they only strengthen. The effect from the impact of mass media is similar.
- *The family as an agent of socialization and a factor for voting.* The family is the source of most affiliations such as the social status, which further on has its influence on voting. Families usually show similarities in voting. Glass (1986) is convinced that it is exactly the family through the relation between the parent and the child that has an important influence in the political orientation of social actors. The basic values that determine the political life of social actors are learned within the family, as well as the identification with a given political party and the loyalty to this party.
- *Friends as an agent of primary socialization and a factor for voting.* Friends are an important factor in the political socialization. Through the conversation that is led in the circle of friends, usually a dominant political opinion is imposed and maintained, which is shared by the social actors – members of the group.
- *Media as agents of secondary socialization and a factor for voting.* According to the sociological theory, the media most commonly strengthen the attitudes which social actors have before the beginning of the campaign. Hence, it is considered that the influence of media on the decision of citizens, who they are going to vote for, is minimal.

WIDER PERSPECTIVE OF THE SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY OF VOTING:

According to the advocates of the Columbia school, the adherence of the citizens to a certain social layer significantly determines their political preferences! The reason for this is that particular political subjects declare themselves as advocates of certain interests, which are conceived as their own by the citizens who belong to the given social group. This declaration is a good foundation for the citizens who are addressed by a particular political subject in order to get more attention, however this is not sufficient. Since it is possible for few political subjects to address the same voting body, their reliability and

political practice have an important role.

The authors of the first study about the voting behavior of the citizens are Lazarsfeld, Berelson and Gaudet (1954). In their well-known study they lay the foundations of the sociological understanding of the process of anticipation of political parties by voters, whereupon they emphasize certain social characteristics of voters such as: class, religion, race and establish a connection between them and the voting for a certain political party. They notice that there is a certain structure of citizens who vote for particular political parties. Hence, the voting for some party may be predicted with a certain probability, depending on the social origin of the voter. The voting for a certain political party is a type of social activity and the citizens cannot be abstracted from their social origin when deciding for who they will give their vote. This means that the social adherence determined the political adherence of citizens!

According to the sociological theory, politics is based on the social cleavage, based on which the political energy in the society is mobilized, canalized in political subjects through which the social groups protect their interests. In this manner politics is a matter of group interests. Since social groups are not political actors, they are represented by political organizations and their guidance (political elites).

This concept of social cleavages was promoted in the sixties of the twentieth century by Lipset and Rokkan (1967), Rokkan (1970) and in this period the concept helped in the understanding of the development of the European party system. The roots of this approach may be found in *the conflict theory*.

Although Lipset and Rokkan do not provide a definition about social cleavages, they set three criteria which have essential importance for them:

- Conflict usually has socio-economic foundation
- Conflict has ideological consequences
- Conflict is not previously institutionalized.

The first criterion refers to the social basis of conflict, the second refers to the identification power of groups whose interests are protected by political parties as group interests, and the third criterion refers to locating of institutions that would successfully resolve the conflict. Institutions without authentic political legitimacy such as the syndicate and religious institutions, although they have important social influence and tools which they can use, still they are not sufficient for the resolution of the most important social conflicts. They often deal with resolution of consequences, and not causes of serious social conflicts, which is something that certain political parties tend to do, what is in the center of their political programs is precisely the resolution of the basic social conflicts.

The relevant cleavages are the ones who divide the group members according to important political differences in specific time and space. The relevant cleavages can change depending on the social-historical moment. If some new cleavages in the society emerge, this does not mean that the old ones exist, but if they are in position to mobilize the political energy around them, one could also think of the importance of each of those cleavages. The social cleavages which are in position to mobilize the political energy, substantially have deep social basis, although it is possible for some cleavages to emerge which mobilize political energy only in the short term. The most common case in such a situation is to pin those social cleavages on an already existing one, which has modeled the party system of a given state.

We may be critical in regard to the attitude that the social determines the political adherence of citizens, but the fact remains that certain social characteristics of the citizens have an impact on the adherence of citizens to a certain political party. This is similar to some social characteristics having bigger influence than others. The answer cannot be found in the social differentiation of certain social formations.

Berelson, Lazarsfeld and McPhee (1954) indicate three conditions when the social differentiation could be projected in political cleavages, as follows:

The initial social differentiation should be reflected on differences in the politics (material or symbolic) for different social groups! There must be important material and symbolic differences between large social groups that tend to manage social matters. In cases when the important material differences have been overcome to some extent, or at first glance it seems that they are not in the center of politics, then symbolic differences appear, such as the issue of abortion in USA!

This implies transfer of differences into politics from generation to generation, by means of socially-conditioned socialization. Every social group has its interests, which depend on their needs and which are significantly different than the one of the remaining social groups. Family, friendship and social relations of citizens rarely pass the boundary of their social position. Taking as the point of departure the personal interests and the interests of their own network of acquaintances (their own social world), it is natural that the citizens feel adherence to a political party that is protecting and promoting those interests.

The physical and social proximity leads to more intensive internal group contact. The inherent internalized value determinations of the individual, conditioned by their social origin, assume compatibility of the social connections of the members of the same social groups. This is a good foundation for strong cohesion of social groups.

The sociological model of voting has two approaches, one of them is the *macro approach* and the other one is the *micro approach* of the social determination of voting.

The macro-sociological approach (developed by Lipset, Rokkan (1967); Rokkan (1970)), is based on adoption of the basic social conflict. The individuals included in this conflict promote the interests of the social groups that they represent. This conflict borrows the terrain of politics and takes place in the society through the political subjects and other social organizations with influence in the process of making a decision of public interest such as political parties, syndicates (unions) etc. The citizens, members to some of the social groups included in the conflict, vote for the political party that represents the interests of their social group (Dalton and Wattenberg 1993). On the other hand Lipset, Rokkan (1967), in *Party Systems and Voter Alignments*, explain the development of party systems in Western Europe, according to the different constellations of social conflicts, the so called cleavages that exist in the societies.

The micro-sociological approach insists on the differences in the closer social environment, and not social structure. Below we would have an opportunity to become more familiar with this.

The sociological model of voting was exposed to critics due to exaggeration in the insisting on differences in the social structure. The social position of the citizens is complex and it can hardly be based only on one of its elements.

Interpretation of the group interests. It is problematic to review the social groups as non-conflict groups, even when defining their own interest. This model emphasizes the importance of the complicit *between* groups, however it ignores the conflict *inside* the groups. If the social conflict is in the foundation of the society, or its development, then its genesis must be based on an elementary level. In this manner the social conflict would not be monopolized and centralized, it would be reproduced on every social relation. Social groups are heterogeneous and structured also from the inside, so for this reason they have different interests.

The sociological model of voting is often observed as *ideological voting*. This includes building attitudes about politics based on minimal information about politics in general, and about the politics of the party or the candidates who are a subject of preference.

The exceptions from the rule insisted by this model of voting would be hard to explain! This theory rarely finds a response for the possibility for citizens of higher social layers to vote for the left wing political parties and vice versa, lower social layers to vote for right wing parties. The explanation can hardly be based only on deviation from the rule!

Claiming that the citizens spontaneously determine themselves for certain political parties, this model ignores the active role of political parties in the attraction of voters!

Regardless of this criticism, the idea about the social determinism conditioned by group interests and socialization cannot be ignored during the assessment of the electoral behavior of the citizens.

PSYCHOLOGICAL THEORY OF VOTING:

Within the Michigan school, a psychological theory of voting was developed i.e. *the theory of party identification*. *The theory of party identification* of the civil participation, observes politics as an identifying-expressive phenomenon, in which the members of the group share the same values, which are compatible with the group interests. According to the representative of the theory for party identification, the voters observe the voting act as a manifestation of the adherence to a certain political option. This theory to some extent explains why the differences in the social status are not always reflected in the voting during the elections i.e. why in a certain part people with the same social status vote for the same political parties and vice versa, why people with different social status vote for the same political party.

The representatives of the Michigan school, Campbell Angus, Converse E. Philip, Miller E. Warren and Stokes E. Donald (1960; 1966) claim that the citizens are not actually determined for a certain political subject selecting between few alternatives, but they irrationally incline towards this subject! Citizens have the innate instinct to belong to some major social group. Political parties with their political ideology, values and rituals attract the citizens, giving sense of their lives. These authors determine the term (which was implemented in the analysis of the electoral behavior of citizens by themselves) *party identification* as a tendency for long-term determination of the voter to select candidates who are advocates of a certain political party. The identification with a certain party means having adherence to a certain party, with a feeling of responsibility for the same, and

not only temporary voting for the party. Additionally, party identification is a psychological force by means of which social actors interpret the events that are relevant for politics.

The authors from the Michigan school indicate that in order to understand the voting of the citizens, one must take into consideration some long-term factors that have influence on their manner of voting. *The model of funnel* is known in theory, which explains voting according to the theory of party identification. Namely, within the family, the social actors in the process of socialization gain closeness with certain political world views, values, positions, ideologies and political attitudes. These values shape their social development, as well as their social behavior. According to Campbell Angus, Converse E. Philip, Miller E. Warren and Stokes E. Donald (1966) even the feelings of the social actors in regard to political issues are directed and shaped by their identification with a given political party!

The source of party identification includes the parents and the social milieu. On the other hand, the identification is strengthened through the refusal of the counter-impacts.

Through the family the citizens acquire the adherence to a certain political ideology. The political determination from the youth often continues during the entire life. There are many families where the citizens are determined for a given political option for generations. However there are also rational reasons why one could assume that many generations in the same family vote for the same political subject, and namely the younger members who obtain the right to vote, due to lack of experience, have their parents as a reference during the selection of the political subject.

What happens during the elections is interweaving of the long-term factors of loyalty to a certain political party and the matters that have short-term importance for every elections change, such as the current political state, the political campaign, the current party management, the candidates at the elections etc. The decision of the citizen, who he is going to vote for, depends on the intersection of these long-term and short-term factors! The conspirers of the psychological theory in the explanation of the electoral behavior, give the advantage to the long-term factors. In other words, the citizen perception of the political situation, the valorization of the proposed candidates etc. would depend on the party identification of the citizens.

The party identification is part of the identity of the citizens! As they are identified with their nationality as Macedonians, Germans, Americans, so they are identified with a certain political party such as Conservatives, Liberals, Liberal Democrats, Socialists etc. After developing the feeling of identification with a certain political party, they gain loyalty in this party same as the loyalty to a certain brand of products! Primarily because it is something that has already been checked, and then because of the acquired habit. However, we must be careful with the comparisons since there is an important difference between constantly choosing the same product checked in advance, and constantly voting for the same political party in elections! In certain situations the citizens who identify themselves with one political party, may vote for another one in the elections (which is known as *strategic voting* in theory). The citizens who identify themselves with some of the political parties also invest much more spare time and remaining resources and out of these the political parties recruit the citizens who participate in politics.

The identification with some social group implies division and expression of the expectations of the group members. The adherence to the expectations of the group members as a value of the group has been appropriately awarded. The individual is not expected to share the same internal group values when being out of the group. In a given society, the internal group relations may be cooperative or non-cooperative and their model determines the manner of the electoral politics which is reflected in the group membership.

Due to the inseparable connection between the party identification and the voting for a certain political subject implied by this model of voting, we will indicate some differences that emerge between them.

- While the identification is mostly psychological, the voting is mostly a social act. And while we cannot observe the identification directly, but only its manifestations, the voting is a specific act in which the citizens circle certain candidate in the elections.
- The voting period is regulated and limited, which does not apply for the identification.
- Voting is part of the social actions of the individuals which is legally regulated, and the identification is not.
- Voting does not vary according to intensity, while the identification varies.
- Citizens support the political parties to a different extent and in a different manner, while everyone has only one vote in the elections, regardless of the party identification, the competence, the social and economic differences of the citizens.
- Although the party identification is different from the voting by the citizens, it motivates the citizens to vote for a particular political party.

The model of party identification, similarly to the sociological model, is exposed to criticism about being

ideologically founded.

The party identification has an important role for the individual. Through simplification citizens are better oriented in the complex world of politics. In this manner they know who are the “good” and who are the “bad” politicians and this eliminated the need to observe the political debate in details and with attention. The identification is a prism through which the citizen observes the messages sent by the political parties.

ECONOMIC THEORY OF VOTING:

It would not be completely correct to come to a conclusion that the citizens are identified with a particular political subject for which they are ready to vote in many occasions! According to some authors this is the behavior only of the citizens who do not have significant experience with voting. The remaining citizens who identify themselves with a particular political subject have certain expectations from the voting for the same (Achen 2002).

The founder and the most influential author of the economic school of voting Downs (1957), considers the citizens as active subjects, and not as passive subjects being addressed by political parties! They claim that when making the decision about giving their vote, the citizens are motivated by their personal interest! The citizens weigh between the price that they are paying (the vote they give for some political subject, thereby investing their trust in them) and the gain they expect from such investment. During this process they always try to maximize the gain, meaning that they vote for the political party that they believe would provide this gain. Namely, in an ideal situation, the voter weighs between the gains he has from a certain governing political party and the expected gain from the parties in opposition. Hence, the voter gives his vote for the party that he expects to provide him the biggest and most secure gain.

Fiorina (1976) includes the expressive motives as an important factor in the voting decision of the citizens, however in her opinion, they are dominated by the instrumental motives. In this manner she is also trying to resolve the problem with the turnout in elections. According to this viewpoint, the expressive motives cannot be autarchically explained! Additionally, such explanation is considered as tautological. The voters do not vote for some candidate because they want to, but because they have instrumental motives! Hence, the voting in the elections has rational-psychological foundation. Overbye (1995) agrees that the rational choice is instrumental, emphasizing that the root of every motivation are the material personal interests. However, unlike the classical approaches of the economic school he proposes to review the group base of interests, combined with the *game theory*.

INFORMATION AS A FOUNDATION OF THE RATIONAL VOTING:

According to the theory of economic (rational) voting, what is of key importance is the diversity and the quality of information on the basis of which social actors make decisions for who to give their vote in the elections! It is a rare case for social actors to have available complete information about the politics and the possible repercussions from the political processes on their lives. As the conspirers of this theory notice, the citizens often make their decisions about voting depending on few areas of functioning of the governing party (Lupia and McCubbins 1998).

According to this, so called *approach to asymmetric information game*, voters own different quantity of information that they mutually exchange. Sometimes the citizen owns some information which is not familiar for the others. The citizen may own or may not own preferences, and these may be honest or untruthful to the remaining citizens. With mediating goods of building reputation the citizens have the will to renew the cooperation. This equilibrium of the repeated (regenerating) game with its elements of trading, payments and discounts, generates predictability. The major substantial acceptance of the process guarantees that the reputation value would have a richer set of assumed relations with the voting behavior of citizens. For example: the reputation of an honest and socially acceptable behavior enables trade and sale of many goods with a higher price!

This model does not apply in case when the citizen is honest and cooperative because he has altruistic mood and he is not guided according to the measurements of the personal interesting model. In another case the citizen may have high *discount factor* or unlike opportunities for alternative decisions for voting and in such case the model cannot work as personal interesting model.

During the determination for voting the legitimacy of the political subjects is not unimportant, which makes the key difference between the constructive efforts of the political subjects. When the voter determines for whom to vote, he has options from variety of political parties with similar platforms, and he will make a decision for the

party that he believes would be most beneficial. As one can notice, the key role for the legitimacy of the political parties is the trust that the voters have for them.

At the same time voters in multi-party systems sometimes vote strategically for the second or the third preference which has real chances to win the elections i.e. voters may not vote for their first preference if it is a matter of a small party that does not have chances to win the elections (Cox 1997).

THE ECONOMIC THEORY OF VOTING AND THE TURNOUT IN THE ELECTIONS:

The attitude for the connection of the voting with the gain of the voter opens the issue about the turnout of the voters. As we have already seen, the turnout is bigger in situations of crisis, than in situations of economic prosperity or wellbeing. If in the first case we can have understanding to some extent, than this theory has serious problems to explain the absence of interest of citizens to support social processes most of which have serious interest to continue! The explanation may be that in the cognitive device of the citizens, the connection between the electoral results and the development of social processes is interrupted. However, considering the fact that this position compromises the foundations of the economic model of voting, the second alternative of Lipset's *sleeping dog* remains, which could be more acceptable, but it is also a difficult position to defend, in terms of the economic model of voting. This would imply that the citizens have trust in the political system as an entirety and to some point they are interested for the nuances which will determine the social development! The criticism that this model is exposed to, and which does not go as far as the previous, retains on the terrain of the rational choice, is the two-dimensionality of the interest. Citizens sometimes not only vote for their gain, but there are also moments when they vote against their detriment. This could be positioned in the category of punishing voting, which does not get much attention by the representatives of this model of voting.

MODEL OF DOMINANT IDEOLOGY:

In these last decades, one more model of voting became an issue of conspiracy between sociologists, which not even nearly achieved the attractiveness of the previous three, and this is the model of the dominant ideology. Insisting on the colossal influence that the process of ideological indoctrination and manipulation can play in the determination of the party preferences, this theory shares many similarities with the sociological model. The key difference between the sociological model and the model of dominant ideology is that the second one emphasizes the role of media, the government and especially the system of education in the process of self-identification of individuals in the social structure. Shortly said, according to the conspirers of this model, the social position of the individuals as a determinant of their party preference is under the influence of media and education, in a manner in which the media manipulation wears and covers all previous political loyalties – built on family, personally-interesting or doctrinal interests.

One more of the characteristics of this model is the excessive emphasizing of the ability of media to move the voting process in their own favor and to impose issues for discussion which are of their own interest.

The biggest criticism that is directed at the expense of this model refers to the complete neglecting of the individual autonomy in the determination and strengthening of the party preferences in the voting process (Hejvud, 2004:458)!

SYNTHESIS OF THE VOTING MODELS:

Talking into consideration that all models deal with citizens who come out in elections, it implies that if we simplify and make them all refer to one same voter, hypothetically it is possible for the voter to behave according to all theories simultaneously. Namely, it is possible for the citizen to identify himself with a certain political party and simultaneously that political party may protect the interest of the social group that the voter belongs to and he may have gain for such personal determination. However there are no many citizens where all voting models can be simultaneously recognized in their voting process.

Part of the citizens determines to vote mostly only according to one of the models for voting. They unconditionally vote for a certain political subject or exceptionally according to the social group they belong to, and the economic calculations are either decisive and cannot be underestimated, neither can the abilities and the power of media in the construction of voting preferences.

According to what is indicated so far, there is no doubt that these models complement between each other. This means that not any of them covers the entire space of voting behavior of the citizens, rather each is concentrated only on a particular segment of this space. It is obvious that each of these voting models is based on human nature. Namely, the human is a complex, social, emotional and rational creature, so during the determination of

the relation with objective reality he will try to reflect all sides of his nature, but simultaneously some people are more connected with the social groups they belong to, same as some people being more emotional, others being more rational in their actions and some others are more susceptible to media manipulation.

Here we do not want to claim that the domination of some side of the individual determines the manner of voting by that person, we only want to indicate that all citizens own coherent predispositions to vote according to any of these four reviewed models of voting. Here we will not review all aspects of human nature with the necessary details and its implications, but we will limit our review only for the voting behavior of citizens. This means that for citizens who vote according to their social position one cannot say that they are not emotional or rational, but only that they are led by their adherence to the social group they belong to during the selection of the party or candidate they will vote for. In other words, we do not claim that everyone who is dominantly an emotional person will vote according to the model of party identification, only that the ones who feel bigger connection with a certain political party, they will vote for that party. The analogy for the remaining voting models is implied by itself!

As the man with its characteristics represents a unique creature, also the voting by citizens is unique with all its models. But simultaneously the citizens have one vote and they are using it by marking a certain political subject. For citizens who vote according to the party identification, the gain from the given vote is not decisive, same as for the ones who vote rationally – the emotional adherence to a certain political subject is not decisive. This is the origin of the distance between the models for electoral behavior of citizens, which departing from the premise that every citizen has only one vote, claim that a certain factor that is emphasized by the particular model is decisive for the determination of citizens for whom to give their vote. We came to the conclusion that the factors that these models refer to, have the same complex genesis from whose diversification the voting models of citizens are separated. If it is so then the insisting of only one of the factors would be unjustifiable. As it is problematic to unify the voting model, it is also that much problematic to simplify its genesis. Since there are few manners according to which it is determined how the citizens will vote, there are also different citizens who make decisions according to some of the previously mentioned models.

Hence, every citizen has predispositions in the determination for which party he is going to vote, to be led by some of the motives from the four models of voting, however this is dominantly determined by only one of them. This does not mean that there are no other motives as well, only that in case of conflict of motives (for example, a man who identifies himself with one political subject, to have the interest to vote for another political subject), he will be determined for the dominant motive.

A rare case is for a citizen who identifies himself with a certain political subject, to vote for another political subject, since then we would have the right to claim that although he would identify himself with the political subject, the dominant motive for him would be the gain.

As we indicated, some authors of the rational approach of the economic school, such as Fiorina (1976) and Schuessler (2000) point out the rational (instrumental) foundations of the expressive motives for voting.

We do not exclude that possibility as well. However, unlike them we will point out that it could only apply for citizens who have motives to interpret their voting according to each of the three models of voting. Further on, we expand this note also in the opposite direction. Much larger part of the citizens who vote according to expressive motives are participants in the political process. In case when they had ambitions that they were able to fulfill during their practice of politics, at the same time they are qualified to be considered as citizens who vote according to instrumental motives. Unlike them, the citizens who vote according to expressive motives get much more connected to socio-psychological and utilitarian motives. However the possibility remains open in the time continuum, for a person to vote according to one type of motives and behaves electorally, even to vote according to other motives.

Since citizens have only one vote and they want to use it in order to have influence on the process of making the most important decision in the elections, it is possible for some other reasons to exist, which will have influence on their decision during the voting process.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Achen, H. Christopher (2002). *Parential Socialization and Rational Party Identification, Political Behavior*; Springer
- [2] Almond, A. Gabriel and Verba, Sidney (1963). *The Civic Culture*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- [3] Berelson, R. Bernard R, Lazarsfeld, F. Paul and McPhee, N. William, (1954). *Voting*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [4] Campbell, Angus Converse, E. Philip, Miller, E. Warren and Stokes, E. Donald (1960). *The American*

- Voter*. New York: Wiley.
- [5] Campbell, Angus, Converse, E. Phillip, Miller, E. Warren and Stokes, E. Donald (1966). *Elections and the Political Order*. New York: Wiley
- [6] Cox, Karl 1997. *Making Voters Count*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- [7] Downs, Anthony (1957). *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper & Row
- [8] Dalton, Russel J and Wattenberg, Martin P. (1993). "The not so simple act of voting", in: Ada W. Finifter (ed.) *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*. Washington, p. 193-218.
- [9] Fiorina, Morris (1976). "The Voting Decision: Instrumental and Expressive Aspects" *Journal of Politics* 38: 390-413.
- [10] Fiorina, Morris (1981). *Retrospective Voting in American National Elections*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- [11] Glass, V. B. J. (1986). "Attitude similarity in three generational families: Socialization, status inheritance, or reciprocal influence?" in *American Sociological Review*, 685-698
- [12] Hejvud, Endru (2004). *POLITIKA*, Beograd: Clio Lazarsfeld, F. Paul. Berelson, R. Bernard and Gaudet, Hazel 1954.(1968). *The people's choice*. New York, 3rd ed.
- [13] Lipset, M. Seymour and Rokkan, Stein (1967). "Cleavage Structures, Party Systems, and Voter Alignments: An Introduction". In: Lipset, S./Rokkan, S. (ed.) *Party Systems and Voter Alignments*. New York, 1-64
- [14] Lupia, and McCubbins, (1998). *The Democratic Dilema*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- [15] Rokkan, Stein (1970). *Citizens, Elections, Parties*. Oslo: Free Press
- [16] Zuckerman, S. Alan (1982). "New Approaches to Political Cleavage: A Theoretical Introduction." *Comparative Political Studies*
- [17] Zuckerman, S. Alan, Nicholas A. Valentino, and Zuckerman W. Ezra (1994). "A Structural Theory of Vote Choice: Social and Political Networks and Electoral Flows in Britain and the United States." *Journal of Politics* No.56
