

Why the Electoral College is good for political science (a

Public Choice

150, 1-25

DOI: [10.1007/s11127-011-9874-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11127-011-9874-z)

Citation Report

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Election Inversions, Coalitions and Proportional Representation: Examples of Voting Paradoxes in Danish Government Formations. Scandinavian Political Studies, 2013, 36, 121-136.	1.7	11
2	Picking a Loser? A Social Choice Perspective on the Danish Government Formation of 1975. SSRN Electronic Journal, 2013, , .	0.4	0
3	The Idealized Electoral College voting mechanism and shareholder power. Journal of Financial Economics, 2014, 113, 90-108.	9.0	13
4	Sophisticated and myopic? Citizen preferences for Electoral College reform. Public Choice, 2014, 158, 541-558.	1.7	16
5	Picking a loser? A social choice perspective on the Danish government formation of 1975. Public Choice, 2014, 158, 483-497.	1.7	1
6	Empirical social choice: an introduction. Public Choice, 2014, 158, 297-310.	1.7	2
7	Social Choice and Democratic Values. Studies in Choice and Welfare, 2016, , .	0.2	18
8	On the Democratic Weights of Nations. Journal of Political Economy, 2017, 125, 1599-1634.	4.5	26
9	Using equations from power indices to analyze figure skating teams. Public Choice, 2017, 170, 231-251.	1.7	4
10	Why noncompetitive states are so important for understanding the outcomes of competitive elections: the Electoral College 1868â€“2016. Public Choice, 2017, 173, 251-265.	1.7	2
11	Determining States A Priori Preferences for the Electoral College: 1788 2016. SSRN Electronic Journal, 2017, , .	0.4	0
12	Welfare Chauvinism vs. Race to the Bottom: Immigration and Electoral Support for Populist Right in Industrial Democracies, 1990-2009. SSRN Electronic Journal, 0, , .	0.4	0
13	Welfare Chauvinism? Refugee Flows and Electoral Support for Populist-Right Parties in Industrial Democracies. SSRN Electronic Journal, 2017, , .	0.4	4
14	Trump, Condorcet and Borda: Voting paradoxes in the 2016 Republican presidential primaries. European Journal of Political Economy, 2018, 55, 29-35.	1.8	11
15	Fair representation and a linear Shapley rule. Games and Economic Behavior, 2018, 108, 152-161.	0.8	2
16	Three Bizarre Presidential-Election Scenarios: The Perils of Simplism. Social Sciences, 2019, 8, 134.	1.4	3
17	Are Presidential Inversions Inevitable? Comparing Eight Counterfactual Rules for Electing the U.S. President*. Social Science Quarterly, 2019, 100, 1322-1342.	1.6	11
18	Exploring the effects of national and regional popular vote Interstate compact on a toy symmetric version of the Electoral College: an electoral engineering perspective. Public Choice, 2019, 179, 51-95.	1.7	5

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	The theoretical Shapley-Shubik probability of an election inversion in a toy symmetric version of the US presidential electoral system. <i>Social Choice and Welfare</i> , 2020, 54, 363-395.	0.8	6
20	Welfare Chauvinism? Refugee Flows and Electoral Support for Populist-Right Parties in Industrial Democracies. <i>Social Science Quarterly</i> , 2020, 101, 1600-1626.	1.6	4
21	U.S. Multinationals and Human Rights: A Theoretical and Empirical Assessment of Extractive Versus Nonextractive Sectors. <i>Business and Society</i> , 2020, , 000765032092897.	6.4	11
22	The significance of age structure, education, and youth unemployment for explaining subnational variation in violent youth crime in Mexico. <i>Conflict Management and Peace Science</i> , 2022, 39, 49-73.	1.8	12
23	Ignoring the Electoral College: why public choice economists understate the probability of decisive voters. <i>Public Choice</i> , 2020, 187, 439.	1.7	0
24	Aid curse with Chinese characteristics? Chinese development flows and economic reforms. <i>Public Choice</i> , 2021, 188, 407-430.	1.7	20
25	A neutral core of degressively proportional allocations under lexicographic preferences of agents. <i>Eurasian Economic Review</i> , 0, , 1.	3.0	1
26	“One Man, One Vote”-Part 1: Electoral Justice in the U.S. Electoral College: Banzhaf and Shapley/Shubik Versus May. <i>Studies in Choice and Welfare</i> , 2021, , 189-227.	0.2	4
27	On the Democratic Weights of Nations. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i> , 0, , .	0.4	7
28	Election Inversions, Coalitions and Proportional Representation: Examples from Danish Elections. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i> , 0, , .	0.4	0
29	Social Choice in the Real World. <i>Studies in Choice and Welfare</i> , 2016, , 383-430.	0.2	2
30	Fair Representation and a Linear Shapley Rule. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i> , 0, , .	0.4	0
32	Partisan Self-Interest and Views on the Electoral College: How Electoral Inversions Activate Differences in Support for the System. <i>American Politics Research</i> , 0, , .	1.4	0
33	Axiomatization of plurality refinements. <i>Public Choice</i> , 0, , .	1.7	0