have produced nonobvious propositions consistent with empirical evidence.[60] In the present context consider the consequences of adding an expressive benefits term, E, to (1):

$$(2) \qquad\qquad E(P) = p(B) - c + E.$$

Far from being empirically vacuous, (2) gives rise to at least four propositions. Notice that p, the probability of individual impact, determines the balance between instrumental and expressive motivations (e.g., if $p = 0$, any participation *must* be expressively motivated). Thus, if individuals decide whether or not to participate based on (2), the following propositions would hold (ceteris paribus):

—Numbers proposition: Mass arenas will be dominated by those participating for expressive reasons, whereas elite arenas will have more instrumental participators. This proposition is simply the generalized paradox of not voting. In a presidential election, for example, the probability that one's vote determines the outcome is so infinitesimal that only the deluded would vote for instrumental reasons. But in a small government board or legislative subcommittee each participant could well have the deciding vote.

—Level proposition: Participation in national arenas will be more expressive than participation in local arenas. The logic underlying this proposition is similar to that underlying the previous one, assuming that local arenas generally have fewer participants. Two dozen dog lovers who pack the monthly meeting of the local recreation board to oppose a leash law may reasonably believe they can change the outcome, but those tens of thousands who travel to Washington to march for some cause must be primarily expressing their preferences.

—Resource proposition: When resources are unequally distributed, those with more of them are more likely to be instrumentally motivated than those with fewer. Money is the obvious example. The senior citizen who sends $10 in response to a direct-mail appeal warning of the diabolical intentions of Ted Kennedy or Jesse Helms is more likely to be expressing a preference than is the $200,000 soft-money contributor who expects something more tangible for his or her investment.

—Dynamic proposition: In sequential processes, when the final outcome becomes obvious, only expressive participants will be left in the

60. Fiorina (1976).