

[Applied Economics Letters](#) >
Volume 26, 2019 - Issue 19

140 | 0 | 17
Views | CrossRef citations to date | Altmetric

Articles

Party-crashers or wallflowers? The lack of strategic voting in experimental primaries

Calvin Blackwell   & Peter T. Calcagno

Pages 1641-1648 | Published online: 16 Mar 2019

 [Download citation](#)  <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504851.2019.1591585>



Sample our
Economics, Finance,
Business & Industry Journals
>> [Sign in here](#) to start your access
to the latest two volumes for 14 days

 [Full Article](#)  [Figures & data](#)  [References](#)  [Citations](#)  [Metrics](#)
 [Reprints & Permissions](#) [Get access](#)

ABSTRACT

Open and semi-open primaries allow members of opposing political parties to participate in the selection of candidates for the general election. This feature has led to the claim that partisans will ‘cross-over’ and vote in the rival party’s primary, thereby sabotaging that party’s selection process. Using an experimental election, in which it is costly to vote, we find that most voters vote sincerely or not at all, and find little evidence of strategic voting.

 **KEYWORDS:** [Voting](#) [experiment](#) [primary types](#)

 **JEL CLASSIFICATION:** [D72](#) [H11](#)

[< Previous article](#)

[View issue table of contents](#)

[Next article >](#)

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the College of Charleston Summer Undergraduate Research Funding program for help funding this research, and Daniel Taber and Kathryn Abbott for their research assistance. Partial funding for this project came from the Center for Public Choice & Market Process, School of Business, College of Charleston. Earlier versions of this paper were presented at annual meetings of the Southern Economic Association, Economic Science Association and of the Public Choice Society. Monika Koeppel-Turyna and Matthew Holian provided helpful comments.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Highlights

- We conduct an experiment of voting under different primary types.
 - We examine voter choices in primary and general elections when costs increase.
 - Voters are largely unwilling to engage in strategic voting.
-

Additional information

Funding

This work was supported by the Center for Public Choice & Market Process, School of Business, College of Charleston; College of Charleston Summer Undergraduate Research Funding;



Related research

People also read

Recommended articles

Cited by

Foreign direct investment and productivity spillovers: is China different? >

Hongzhong Fan et al.
Applied Economics Letters
Published online: 16 Mar 2019

[Weak efficiency of the cryptocurrency market: a market portfolio approach >](#)

David Vidal-Tomás et al.
Applied Economics Letters
Published online: 25 Mar 2019

Information for

[Authors](#)

[R&D professionals](#)

[Editors](#)

[Librarians](#)

[Societies](#)

Opportunities

[Reprints and e-prints](#)

[Advertising solutions](#)

[Accelerated publication](#)

[Corporate access solutions](#)

Open access

[Overview](#)

[Open journals](#)

[Open Select](#)

[Dove Medical Press](#)

[F1000Research](#)

Help and information

[Help and contact](#)

[Newsroom](#)

[All journals](#)

[Books](#)

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email

 [Sign me up](#)



[Copyright © 2023 Informa UK Limited](#) [Privacy policy](#) [Cookies](#) [Terms & conditions](#)

[Accessibility](#)

 **Taylor & Francis Group**
an **informa** business

Registered in England & Wales No. 3099067
5 Howick Place | London | SW1P 1WG