

POLITICAL CAMPAIGN AND STOMACH INFRASTRUCTURE: UNDERSTANDING VOTERS' BEHAVIOUR IN THE NIGERIAN 2015 GENERAL ELECTION

By

Olanrewaju Emmanuel Ajiboye, Ph.D.

Department of Sociology

Faculty of Social Sciences, Lagos State University, Ojo

E-mail: oeajiboye@yahoo.com; olanrewaju.ajiboye@lasu.edu.ng

Phone: 234 8034093309

Election in Nigeria like in every other electoral democracy is periodic. The interval provides incumbents and new aspirants the opportunity to articulate and present their programmes to the electorates. The process of winning voters' support usually takes different forms, such as electronic and print media campaign, organized rallies, and sometimes outright material and monetary inducements. Therefore, this paper focuses on the renewed status of 'stomach infrastructure' vis-à-vis voters' behavior in Ekiti State during the 2015 general elections. Triangulation method of data collection was employed. The paper utilized multi-theoretical approaches to establish the nexus of interaction between stomach infrastructure and voters' behavior during 2015 general election. The paper argued that the socio-economic deprivation and lack of political education of the people provide the basis for an electorate that is amenable to manipulation by means of material and monetary inducement. Also, the paper argued that man is essentially a political animal and in the practice of politics, he could express his agenda either positively or negatively. In conclusion, the paper recommended a well orchestrated political education as a process for the electorates to achieve informed choice. Secondly, reward for political participation through outlandish emoluments must be streamlined by political stakeholders.

Key words: Political campaign; Electioneering; Stomach Infrastructure, Voters' Behaviour, Election.

Introduction

Election, which could be described as a widely and universally accepted means through which individuals are openly and methodically chosen to represent a body or community in a larger entity or government, is one of the cardinal features of modern democratic process. In democratic system, each adult citizen uses 'voting' as a means of expressing his approval or disapproval of government decisions, policies and programmes, the policies and programmes of various political parties and qualities of candidate who are engaged in struggle to get the status of being the representatives of people. Put differently, voting and election are virtuous features of the modern democratic society. Therefore, to appreciate the nexus between voting and election, electorates must be well enlightened, politically informed, and sensitized about their rights and obligations to make unbiased choice during elections.

The over sixteen years of the returns of Nigerian to democracy have witnessed profound changes to the country's political and socio-economic landscape, some of the most significant of which were made possible through voter's education. Politically, the Nigerian constitution guaranteed the right to vote and be voted for by all citizens once you are 18 years and over. In any democratic transition process, individual's behavior varies depending on the group(s) they belong and the type of norms operating in such society. It is generally believe that without social norms, human society would not function as it currently does. Humans would have to be more abstract in their behaviour, as there would not be a pre-tested 'normal' standardized lifestyle, and individuals would have to make many more choices for themselves. This is the same thing in our political arena. Political norms to a large extent influences individual political behaviour without which there may not also be a standardized method of chosen or electing political leadership in the society. Due to the inherently conformist nature of human society in general, humans are pressured into following certain rules and display certain behaviors in society, which conditions or influences the way people behave. Different behaviours are deemed to be either acceptable or unacceptable in different societies and cultures.

It should be mentioned at this juncture that different cultural and political patterns tend to produce different kinds of leaders. In addition to possessing useful political skills the successful leader often belongs to the proper social and political class. In all societies of the world, at least a slight boost on the ladder to political leadership comes from belonging to that group in the society that is held in highest respect. Nigeria political situation is not so much quite different from the practices in other societies of the world, however, perhaps, due to our cultural background, socio-economic deprivation of many, lack of adequate political education coupled with our relatively young democratic experience, our political arena have been dominated by inexperienced and opportunistic political office seekers who take advantages of the poor socio-economic conditions and poor political education of the electorates to get to power at all cost through the adoption of the so-called stomach infrastructure phenomena.

Although, a man's social class may not be the most important influence upon his chances of attaining political leadership. Nevertheless, with or without a strong system, there is to be found in every community, large or small, and in every organization, large or small a group of individuals, howsoever selected, who constitute the active political element. These active

political elements therefore adopt different methods and methodologies otherwise known as electoral campaign to win the hearts of the electorates to vote for them during election.

It should be said at this juncture that the process of electing officials into the various political offices begins with the electoral campaigns. In ideal democratic society, there suppose to be a correlation between electioneering campaigns and elections outcomes all over the world. Elections are supposed to be the verdict on all the political parties' campaigns. It should be the voice of the people pronouncing the party or the candidate which or whose promise or manifestoes mostly appealed to them. Unfortunately, this is not the case with Nigeria election, particularly the 2014 governorship election in Ekiti State which was almost replicated in other parts of the country during the 2015 general elections. The 2014 Governorship election by way of example ended in a winning for Mr. Ayo Fayose, Peoples Democratic Party governorship candidate, but his winning was astonishing election results against general expectation. Governor Kayode Fayemi, the then incumbent governor and All Progressive Congress candidate appeared to be more favour by the general opinion polls as a result of his policy of building social infrastructures in the state. What determined electoral victory in Ekiti State and other parts of the country was something very unorthodox. The governorship election results in Ekiti State which almost replicated itself in many States of the Federation during the 2015 general elections was due to the renewed stomach infrastructure approach. Elections in Nigeria generally allow the general populace to have their say while the high and mighty has their way. It is a case of the "highest bidder" or "best rigger," emerges the winner. This singular condition has dissuaded many from exercising their voting power which at the face of this ugly trend, they consider powerless. Others who try at all to vote do that for their vested interest. They either ask for money or any other items of value or are induced by the political office seekers in other to vote for them during election time. Their argument was understandable, votes don't count and winners don't fulfill their campaign promises. Given these facts, these categories of people seize the rare opportunity to take a bite on the juicy apple of the commonwealth. This is what in today known as the stomach infrastructure in Nigeria. With this development therefore, many researchers and concern individuals have come to grips with such a situation that the voting orientation, party support and political attitude have rapidly changed with the adoption of stomach infrastructure strategy in Nigeria.

Stomach Infrastructure is however not a new entrant into the country's political lexicon but rather a renewed strategy in the country's new political dispensation. All over the world, the ideal is that government should build infrastructures for the overall development of the country for the betterment of the generality of the citizenry but this is no longer the case, it is now built in the stomach of individuals.

Statement of Problems

Political education is an integral part of voting process. However, many African countries and in particular, Nigeria have very poor or non-existence political infrastructure that can engender quality political education. This therefore has in many ways affected or hindered political information transmission among the electorates. It is a known fact that one of the major obstacles to citizen political engagement is undeniably the issue of lack of access to information that could allow electorates to make enlightened political choices. Thus, for voters to fully exercise their political rights to choose according to their conscience, the political context has to allow access

to adequate political information. Though, majority of the voters participate in political activities, but still lack basic knowledge about the entire political process to take to allow for reasonable decisions on election matters. The lack of political education is manifested in peoples' traditional voting patterns as they keep voting on the basis of religion, ethnic ties, etc.,

Other factor which has equally influence voters' behavior during any election is socio-economic deprivation of the majority of populace. There is high level of poverty in the land, this has made many amenable to manipulations, hence, the latest now is the voting based on the renewed stomach infrastructure strategy adopted by the politicians. Although, several studies have been carried out on democratic governance, dividend of democracy, etc., however, little is known about how stomach infrastructure benefits impact on voters' electoral choices and election outcomes. This article seeks to determine the extent to which stomach infrastructural strategy influenced voting behavior and voting outcomes in Ekiti State during the 2014 Governorship election and the 2015 general elections. So, to achieve the foregoing, this paper will address the following questions, what accounts for the changing voting pattern behavior of the electorates in Ekiti State? What is the role(s) of stomach infrastructure in the last governorship election in Ekiti State? In what ways has poverty or socio-economic deprivation influences voters' behavior in the last election? What role(s) did political education played in the 2014 governorship election in Ekiti State on the one hand and in 2015 general elections in Nigeria at large? These and many questions are set to be addressed in this paper.

Objectives of the study

The general objective of this paper is to establish the nexus of interaction between political campaign, stomach infrastructure, voters' behavior and election outcomes during the 2015 general election. The specific objectives of the paper are:

- i. to examines the socio-economic conditions of voters in Ekiti State during both the governorship and general elections in the State;
- ii. to determines the level of political education/awareness among the electorates in Ekiti State;
- iii. to examines how stomach infrastructure has influenced voters' behavior during the 2014 governorship election and 2015 general elections in Ekiti State with a view to establishing possible lessons therefrom;
- iv. to suggests ways of improving voters' awareness and behavior for future elections in Ekiti State.

Literature Review

Understanding why people vote for one party rather than another can be said to be influenced by several factors that are contained in different models of voting behaviour. Voting and political behaviour of individuals in any democratic societies generally can be understood from two but interdependent perspectives namely the long term and short term factors. In the long term, there are three main sources of influence that shape political orientation which also creates long-term effects. The most important influence started from what sociologists described as the primary agent of socialization which is the family. Children often adopt their parents' ideological values. Secondly, Schools or educational Institutions and their various personalities have also been found to exert significant impact on political orientation of individuals. Lastly is the influence of

peers on political orientation. The short-term factors also affect voting behaviour and voting outcomes during election in any given society. These factors differ from the long-term factors as they are often short-lived. However, they can be just as crucial in modifying political orientation. The ways in which these two sources are interpreted often relies on the individual's specific political ideology formed by the long-term factors. It should be mentioned at this juncture that both the long term and short term factors are encapsulated in the various models that explained the voting behaviour and voting outcomes in any election in the society.

Determinants of Voting in Nigeria

Voting in Nigeria, several authors suggest that voting behavior in Nigeria is predominantly influenced by some form of identity factor such as ethnicity, family lineages, religion, etc. (Bratton and Van de Walle 1997; Barkan 1979; Ferree 2004, 2008; Lindberg et al, 2008). Substantial empirical evidence supports the view that Africans at large and Nigerians in particular are primarily "identity" voters. In essence, voting in Nigeria is in many cases nothing more than an ethnic census. An individual voter uses ethnicity as the proxy for the expected benefits for voting for a particular candidate. Simply, voting in Africa is considered to be largely dependent on ethnic identification. Fridy (2007) in his finding concludes that ethnicity is an extremely significant factor in Ghanaian elections. Likewise, Erdmann (2007) equally finds that voter alignment and party affiliation are largely influenced by ethnicity. Thus, although not exclusively, political parties in Africa tend to be dominated by particular ethnic groups rather than being on the basis of ideology. Ndegwa (1997) explains the observed ethnic voting patterns as due to the fact that Africans possess "dual citizenship." That is, Africans are members of two types of political communities in the same temporal and spatial world. On the one hand, they are members of their civic-republican community which is often their ethnic or community group and to which they owe some obligations. At the same time, they are members of the modern national state. Ndegwa (1997) suggests that the membership in the national state is guided by conception of status and rights rather than duties. This dual citizenship undermines the democratization process as Africans continue to show allegiance to their civic republican community.

Ethnic voting in Africa gives credence to Horowitz (1985) expressive voting hypothesis whereby ethnic voters use their votes to register their identity as members of groups. Such voting implies that voting is not the outcome of a careful evaluation of policy positions or the performance of leaders. Instead, it is identity that matters. Fish (2008) describes identity politics as follows: You are practicing identity politics when you vote for or against someone because of his or her skin color, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or any marker that leads you to say yes or no independently of a candidate's ideas or policies. In essence, identity politics is an affirmation of tribe against the claims of ideology.....An identity politics voter says in effect, I don't care what views he holds, or even what bad things he may have done, or what lack of ability he may display, he's my brother, or he's my kinsman, or he's my landsman,... In some cases, voting seems to go beyond ethnicity. In a study of the 1994 Malawi's general election, Kalipeni (1997) shows that regionalism was the dominant fact or explaining voting patterns. Although Malawi has many ethnic groups, none can claim a majority which necessitates formation of coalitions. The evidence shows that ethnic groups crystallized to form three "super ethnic groups" each in a distinct region. Although Kalipeni suggests that voting patterns are

primarily due to regionalism rather than ethnicity, it is clear that ethnicity remains important.

In a study of Nigerian elections, Lewis (2007) observes that while identity is important in Nigerian politics, ethnicity is not the only axis of identification. Identity in Nigeria takes many dimensions such as ethnicity, economic, social, cultural and religion factors. Furthermore, Lewis finds that identity is not fixed and varies by region and over time. In other words, identity is rather fluid. Nevertheless, Lewis finds that ethnic feelings are strongest in for example the Niger Delta where people feel discriminated and exploited.

Some recent studies using survey data of voting in Africa suggest that, while ethnicity is an important determinant of voting behavior in Africa, it is not the only factor as there are several interrelated factors. In a study of Nigerian elections, Lewis (2007) observes that while identity is in Nigerian politics, ethnicity is not the only axis of identification. Identity in Nigeria takes many dimensions such as ethnicity, economic and religion. Furthermore, Lewis finds that identity is not the only factor (Bratton, et al 2005). Some studies find that Africans are concerned about other factors that relate to their well-being. In particular, some studies have shown that Africans are concerned about pocketbook issues such as their incomes and other indicators of economic well-being such as employment, living standards and provision of public goods (Posner and Simon 2002; Youde 2005).

Furthermore, controlling for these other factors weakens the importance of ethnicity. In Nigeria today, money politics, vote buying have become the order of the day in our politicking. Political parties and candidates are not bother about good manifestoes and moral integrity of candidates contesting for elective posts, often, they have resorted to vote buying which has recently taken various forms ranging from giving of gifts such as bags of rice, vegetable oil, soaps, customized wrist watch, clothes, etc to manipulate the electorates to vote for them. This makes political office in Nigeria an enterprise investment with the highest investor making the most gains. Such culture of expensive electioneering does not favour the electorates freely expressing their will in the ballot, without any form of of financial inducement. Hence, money and other gift items become the determining factors of how the electorate chooses their candidates in a specific election.

Theoretical Orientation of Study

Social Exchange Theory of Voting Behaviour

The key tenet of social exchange theory is that human behaviour is in essence an exchange, particularly of rewards (Homans, 1961) or resources of primarily material character (wealth) (Cook, 2000; Stolte et al., 2001) and secondarily of symbolic attributes. Presumably, such exchange transactions permeate all social phenomena (Coleman, 1990), including group processes and intergroup relations, which are conceived as sets or joint outcomes of voluntary individual actions induced by rewards (Blau, 1964). In this view, exchange transactions constitute the foundation and open secret (Homans, 1961) of social life, of group processes and relations particularly.

Exchange theorists have elaborated and summarized the above argument as follows. Arguably, social action is an exchange of (tangible or intangible) activities and rewards/costs between

individuals on the grounds that people have always explained their conduct by means of its benefits and costs to them. Exchange represents the basis of human behaviour (Homans, 1961) and is pervasive throughout social life (Coleman, 1990). Social exchange theory views social life as consisting of exchanges among social actors (individuals or collectivities) of a variety of valuable resources, including material goods, financial resources, and intangible social goods, (humor, respect, information) (Dowd,1975). Social exchange may happen on a variety of levels; individuals may exchange with organizations (such as exchanging work effort for a pay check) and governments with each other (such as foreign aid exchange for loyalty).

Exchange theorists argue that social life is founded on these exchanges, in which the parties desire to maximize their returns on their exchange by getting as much or more than they give. If one party to the exchange is not receiving an equitable return, that party will withdraw and seek other exchanges. It should be mentioned at this juncture that social life is not quite that simple. In exchange theory, it is important to consider whether those making exchanges hold equal power (equal resources), because power influences how the exchange will occur. More powerful exchange partners, whether individuals, corporations, community groups, or nations, have a larger reserve of valued resources to give. Being thus endowed, they have a wide range of potential partners eagerly awaiting an exchange opportunity. Because they can pick and choose among exchange partners, they can control the terms of the exchange to their own benefit

In applying the concepts of exchange theory to voters' behavior and voting outcome, we could examine the relative power of participants in the exchange which may be conditioned by socio-economic status, or other social factors as well as the various types of exchanges that are on going between the electorates and political office seekers and those undertaken under special conditions such as during campaigns or election periods. The principle of exchange and reciprocity are sometimes visible in the gift of various types that occur election, including financial and materials giving to electorates. To further explain how exchange performs its role during election, some people have argued that voting for a particular party or candidate by electorates in an election is essentially delayed reciprocity, i.e. repayment on a deferred debt for gifts (monetary and materials) received during campaigns. In this sense, the norm of reciprocity is a special case of exchange theory operating between the various stakeholders. Morgan, et al (1998) suggest that keeping the exchange at least somewhat "even" is important to the well-being of participants. Electorates who are recipients of both financial and material gifts often value the opportunity to support a particular party or candidate, even if that support involves simply campaign for or voting for such party or candidate. Family members with physical impairments requiring a lot of assistance can be broadly defining support that is exchanged if understood that they are still making a contribution (Walker, Martin, and Jones, 1992).

Social exchange has received considerable research attention, in part because of the renewed stomach infrastructure in Nigeria political lexicon.

Rational Choice Theory

Rational Choice Theory is an economic explanation of voting behavior which has been credited to the work of Anthony Downs (1957) titled "An Economic Theory of Democracy." The theory explained electoral behavior taking a departure from the political economy of Kenneth Arrow

(1951, 1986) that establishes a nexus of interactions between economic parameters such as resources, goods and technology and a voting outcome or choice. The premise is simple: if the assumptions of rational choice are able to explain the market, then they can explain the political functioning. It establishes a direct analogy between consumers and voters and between enterprises and political parties. If companies seek to maximize profits and consumers act to maximize the utility, we can, then, theorize in the sense that voters seek to maximize the utility of their vote as the parties act to maximize electoral gains obtained from their political proposals.

The central thesis of this theory is that parties in democratic politics are analogous to entrepreneurs in a profit-seeking economy. So as, to attain their private ends, they formulate whatever policies they believe will gain the most votes, just as entrepreneurs produce whatever products they believe will gain the most profits for the same reason. In order to examine the implications of this thesis, we have assumed that citizens behave rationally in politics.

The operation of the model is based on three fundamental premises: (a) all decisions — those that are made by voters and political parties — are rational, i.e, guided by self interest and enforced in accordance with the principle of maximization of action's utility; (b) the democratic political system implies a level of consistency that supports predictions about the consequences of decisions made by voters and political parties, that is, their agents which include voters, parties and government are responsible and trustworthy, which makes it possible to make predictions about the consequences that result from different choices, and (c) the democratic system assumes that despite the consistency stated in the model, that is the level of uncertainty, sufficiently important to allow different options.

The concept of rationality is of key importance in understanding the theory of rational choice and it is important to clarify that in Downs' economic theory, rationality is the assumption that voters and political parties act directly according to the their own interests. From this perspective, the term rationality is applied in the sense that the means used are appropriate to the goals, According to this understanding of rationality, elections serve to choose a government and, consequently, rational behavior in an election is one that is oriented towards this objective and not to any other.

The axiom of self-interest applies equally to activities of political parties. According to rational choice theory, political parties seek to win elections, not by any altruistic motive relating to the application of a political program, but to gain prestige for itself and the gains inherent to being in power. Since the prestige and profits that political parties pursue is concretized by electoral victories, then we can say that the main objective of parties is winning elections. The rational objective is materialized if they can get more votes than any other party. Namely, the activity of political parties is itself guided by the principle of utility maximization of action.

The rationality of the political system derives from the fact that voters, political parties and government have always several interconnected options available to choose from, ordered from most to least favorable. Under this approach, when faced with two alternatives, the rational subjects compare the expected benefits of each option. In cases of electoral choice, they compare the expected results for the election of the party in government, with the expectation of earnings

in case of winning the opposition party. If the difference between these two values is positive, they vote for the governing party. If the difference is negative, they vote for the opposition. If the value is zero, they will abstain from voting. The rational choice presupposes, therefore, not only the possibility of making predictions about the behavior of other individuals, political parties and government, but also the possibility to compare them.

Methodology

There is no doubt that the quality and success of any research work, to a large extent, is determined by the methodology adopted. In a simple sense, method can be said to refer to the research techniques or the tools that are used for data collections and analyses. These include the study area; population or universe of interest; sampling procedure; sampling frame; sample size, data collection instrument and method of data analysis. It can also be referred to as the philosophy of the research process.

Population of study

The target population was Nigerian citizens who are resident in Ekiti State as at the time of the election and who are also 18 years or older and therefore eligible to vote as specified by the Nigerian constitution.

Unit of analysis and Sample size

The universe of the surveys or the unit of analysis comprises men and women of age (18) eighteen years and above. It is often experienced by social researchers, that, it is practically impossible to study all the subject or items in the population especially where the population is so large and scattered, hence, the need for the use of sampling technique to select the sample of respondents to be interviewed. A total of Nine Hundred (900) persons were included in the sample. This is because, the number was considered relatively large enough to enable us to draw inferences and makes generalization on the entire population of the electorates in the State.

Sampling Procedures and Sampling Techniques

In order to collect an unbiased sample for the study, multi-stage sampling technique was adopted. Both probability and non-probability sampling techniques were employed to select the samples of eligible voters' respondents interviewed. The proposed (900) Nine Hundred respondents was shared among the selected Districts from the various geo-political areas of the Ekiti State.

Ekiti State has sixteen (16) constitutionally recognized local government areas. These local governments were grouped into three geo-political zones with specific number of local governments. The three geo-political zones are Ekiti South Senatorial District, Ekiti Central Senatorial District and Ekiti North Senatorial District. Next was the identification of the enumeration areas using the National Population Commission Enumeration Districts as contained in 2006 population census. One enumeration district was randomly selected from each of the three senatorial districts making three enumerated districts. It should be mentioned that each Enumeration District is a small compact area with well-defined and identifiable boundaries consisting of few numbers of towns and villages (National Population Commission, 2006). The

three enumeration districts included in the study are – Ado, Ise/Orun and Iye Districts from Ekiti South, Central and North Senatorial District respectively.

Since the selected enumerated districts contains some numbers of towns and villages, next was the identification of the various towns and villages as contained in each of the enumerated district. From the various enumeration areas identified, a total of twenty-five (25) enumeration areas were randomly selected from the three Senatorial Districts using lottery method approach. This was followed by the identification of the streets in each of the selected areas with the aid of a street map used during the pre study visit to the study areas.

Following the identification of the streets was the selection of the households included in the study. Therefore, to select a manageable numbers, every n^{th} number was randomly selected using systematic sampling techniques, from the selected streets in the areas for the proposed 900 sample size. Finally, systematic sampling technique was used to select the household included in the survey, while in the selected households one eligible voter (male or female) over 18 years and above found was interviewed (using non-probability method of accidental sampling technique to include people in the homes until the sample size of 900 respondents were completed.

Data Collection

A questionnaire was developed consisting of 32 closed-ended questions and six open ended questions covering broadly the following areas: Socio-demographics, mode of acquiring political information, knowledge of democratic/voting rights, assessment of government performance, reasons for voting, Stomach Infrastructure, and voting behaviour, The questionnaire was structured in such a way that it captured all the areas of concerns. It should also be mentioned that all the field assistants were well trained in the art. They were given extensive background information on the theoretical grounding of the study as well as the study's aims and objectives, and were trained on how to administer the questionnaire as well as on research ethics, logistics and safety issues and what to expect in the field. In addition, they were closely monitored by the researcher and other supervisors. In other to have a very robust article, twenty (20) in-depth interviews were conducted. Party leaders, opinion leaders, religion leaders, etc were included in the interview.

A Brief History of Ekiti State

Ekiti State is located in the South West Geo-Political Zone of Nigeria. The State was created out of the former Ondo State in 1995. It was carved out of the territory of old Ondo State, covers the former twelve local government areas that made up the Ekiti Zone of old Ondo State. On creation, the State took off with sixteen (16) constitutionally recognized Local Government Areas (LGAs), having had an additional four carved out of the old ones. Ekiti State is one of the thirty-six states (Federal Capital Territory (Nigeria)) that constitute Nigeria. Ekiti State is reputed to have produced the highest number of professors in Nigeria, hence, it has been nickname the Fountain of Knowledge on account of the large number of educated elites in the State. An important tourist attraction in the state is the Ikogosi Warm Spring. The population of Ekiti as at 2006 census figure stood at 2, 398,957 which when broke down into gender made up of 1,215,487 males and 1,183,470 females.

Ekiti State is mainly an upland zone, rising over 250 meters above sea level. It lies on an area underlain by metamorphic rock. It is generally undulating country with a characteristic landscape that consists of old plains broken by step-sided out-crops that may occur singularly or in groups or ridges. Such rocks out-crops exist mainly at Aramoko, Efon-Alaaye, Ikere-Ekiti, Igbara-odo-Ekiti and Okemesi-Ekiti. The State is dotted with rugged hills, notable ones being Ikere-Ekiti Hills in the south, Efon-Alaaye Hills on the western boundary and Ado-Ekiti Hills in the centre.

Data Analysis

This section starts with an overview of the socio-demographic profile of respondents and their benefits of stomach infrastructure which provides a context for later findings. An examination of levels of access to political information and participation in political activities provides insight into the extent to which respondents engage with political issues, while their knowledge of rights is tested in order to examine public awareness of constitutionally guaranteed civil and socioeconomic rights. Effort was then made to analyze the voting behaviour, reasons for voting and political party preferences. Attempt was also made to analyze the various factors that influence voting behaviour, with particular reference to the influence of stomach infrastructure as identified in the various explanatory models of voting behavior reviewed in the literature.

Percentage Distribution of Respondents by selected socio-demographic characteristics by gender.

Variables	Gender				Total	
	Male		Female			
Gender Composition	N = 470	52.3%	N = 428	47.7%	N = 898	100%
<i>Age (year)</i>						
18 – 24	48	5.3	54	6.0	102	11.3
25 – 34	54	6.0	115	12.8	169	18.8
35 – 44	89	9.9	92	10.2	181	20.2
45 – 54	135	15.0	78	8.7	213	23.7
55 – 64	52	5.8	48	5.3	100	11.1
65 – 74	63	7.0	34	3.8	97	10.8
75 and above	29	3.2	7	0.8	36	4.0
Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100
<i>Marital Status</i>						
Single	94	10.5	116	12.9	210	23.4
Married	265	29.5	272	30.3	537	59.8
Separated/Divorced	89	9.9	32	3.6	121	13.5
Widowed/Widower	22	2.5	8	0.9	30	3.3
Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100
<i>Religion Affiliation</i>						
Islamic	178	19.8	152	16.9	330	36.7
Christianity	220	24.5	254	28.3	474	52.8
A. T. R.	67	7.5	21	2.3	88	9.8
Others	5	0.6	1	0.1	6	0.7

Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100
Ethnic Group						
Yoruba	350	39.0	306	34.1	656	73.1
Hausa	31	3.5	17	1.9	48	5.3
Igbo	86	9.6	105	11.7	191	21.3
Others	3	0.3	0	0.0	3	0.3
Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100
Educational Status						
Literate	362	40.3	389	43.3	751	83.6
Illiterate	108	12.0	39	4.3	147	16.4
Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100
Educational Qualification						
No formal schooling	108	12.0	39	4.3	147	16.4
Primary School	32	3.6	52	5.8	84	9.4
S.75/Grade III/Technical School	24	2.7	28	3.1	52	5.8
WASCE/Grade II	44	4.9	58	6.5	102	11.4
HSC/A'Level/OND/NCE	82	9.1	62	6.9	144	16.0
B.Sc/HND/Postgraduate	180	20.0	132	14.7	312	34.7
No Response	-	0.0	57	6.3	57	6.3
Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100

Source: Field Works 2015

Discussions: Socio-Demographic Characteristics

Gender Composition of the sample population

From the survey picture given in the table above, Eight hundred and Ninety Eight (898) valid questionnaires were analyzed out of the 900 questionnaires distributed. The table revealed that Male respondents constituted 52.3% of the successfully interviewed population while the female constituted 47.7%. It should be mentioned at this juncture however, that, there are more men in the sample because men are more interested in politics and tend to discuss political matter freely than their females' counterparts. Hence, we were able to access more men than their females' counterparts. On the age of the respondents, the table reveals that age 45 – 54 had the highest respondents with 23.7% of the total respondents, followed by age 35 – 44 with 20.2%. Respondents within age category 75 years and over had the least number of respondents representing 4.0% of the total percentage of the respondents. The implications of the distributions is that, those age categories that fall within what can be described as mid-age are found to be more in the distributions. This may not be unconnected with their agile nature as against those aged 70 and above.

The marital statuses of the respondents were equally analyzed. The table of distribution revealed that, those that are married are in majority with total number of 537 respondents representing 59.8%. This was followed by those who are single representing 23.4% of the total population. The widow/widower recorded the list number of respondents with a total of 30 respondents representing 3.3%. From the responses of the respondents interviewed, the distributions showed that more Christians, four hundred and seventy-four respondents representing 52.8% of the total sample population than Moslems three hundred and thirty representing 36.7% of the total sample

populations were interviewed. Six respondents representing (0.7%) indicated others, while the remaining 88 (9.8%) affirmed ATR. The significance of the distributions is that, there is no significant relationship between religion and politics. All the known religions embraced politics as shown in the distributions above.

The table of distributions above showed that Yoruba ethnic group predominates with a total number of 656 (73.1%) respondents, followed by Igbo with 191 (21.3%) respondents. Hausa ethnic group comes next with a total of 48 (5.3%) respondents, while those who indicated others were 3 (0.3%) respondents. The dominance of the Yoruba respondents can be attributed to the choice of the study location. In spite of the heterogeneity nature of the study location, Ekiti State has been found to retain its Yoruba ancestry despite the growth and development achieved so far in the State. The distributions of respondents above showed that those who indicated that they were literate are more with 751 (83.6%) of the total population as against 147 (16.4%) who indicated illiterate. When further probed from the respondents their various educational qualification. Three Hundred and twelve (34.7%) had either HND, B.Sc and Postgraduate education; 144 (16.0%) had HSC/A'LEVEL/OND/NCE Certificate; and 102 (11.4%) respondents had WAEC/Grade II educational qualification. Eighty Four (9.4%) had primary education. However, 57 (6.3%) did not answer the question on educational qualification.

Percentage Distribution of Respondents by selected Socio-Economic Status by gender.

<i>Gender Composition</i>	Gender				Total	
	Male		Female			
<i>Socio-Economic Status</i>	N = 470	52.3%	N = 428	47.7%	N = 898	100%
Employment Status						
Working	386	43.0	306	34.1	692	77.1
Not Working	84	9.3	122	13.6	206	22.9
Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100
If Working, Nature of work						
Civil Servants	152	22.0	179	25.9	331	47.8
Private Workers	86	12.4	68	9.8	154	22.3
Self Employed (Artisan, Commercial Drivers, Okada Riders, etc)	122	17.6	56	8.1	178	25.7
Business	26	3.8	3	0.4	29	4.2
Total	386	55.8%	306	44.2%	692	100
Income per month						
Below 10,000:00	186	20.7	205	22.8	391	43.5
10,000 – 19,000	52	5.8	82	9.1	134	14.9
20,000 – 29,000	31	3.5	28	3.1	59	6.6
30,000 – 39,000	22	2.4	32	3.6	54	6.0
40,000 – 49,000	38	4.2	22	2.4	60	6.7
50,000 – 99,000	54	6.0	32	3.6	86	9.6
100,000 and above	87	9.7	27	3.0	114	12.7
Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100

If Not working, source(s) of income						
Family Support	22	10.7	38	18.4	60	29.1
Charity Organizations/Philanthropy	5	2.4	12	5.8	17	8.3
Pension	8	3.9	3	1.5	11	5.3
Others, Please specify	49	23.8	69	33.5	118	57.3
Total	84	40.8	122	59.2	206	100
Types of Accommodation						
Single Room	215	23.9	168	18.7	383	42.7
Room and Palour	116	12.9	132	14.7	248	27.6
Block of Flat	87	9.7	92	10.2	179	20.0
Bungalow/Duplex	52	5.8	36	4.0	88	9.8
Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100
Ownership of the Building						
Rented Apartment	58	6.5	82	9.1	140	15.6
Family House	178	19.8	243	27.1	421	46.9
Employer	64	7.1	12	1.3	76	8.5
Government	5	0.6	3	0.3	8	0.9
Personal Building	165	18.4	88	9.8	253	28.2
Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100
Ownership of other Essentials Necessities of Life						
Car(s)	<i>Respondents were found to possess two or more of these essential necessities of life, hence majorities of the respondents indicated such.</i>					
Television/ Radio						
Refrigerator						
Landed Property						
Computer Device/Accessories						
Bank Account						
Others						

Source: Field Works 2015

Efforts were made to find out the socio-economic status of the voters to ascertain how socio-economic deprivation or the level of vulnerability of voters has been able to make them amenable to manipulation by the political office seekers. The table above revealed that 77.1% of the total respondents claimed that they are working, while the remaining 22.9% claimed they are not working. On what those that are working do for a living, 47.8% are civil servants; self employed (Artisan, Commercial drivers, Okada-riders, e.t.c) had 25.7%, while private workers and business are 22.3% and 4.2% respectively. Furthermore, efforts were made to find out respondents who are making monthly income. Those whose income is below 10,000 per month are in majority with 43.5%, followed by those who earned between 10,000 – 19,000 with 14.9%. Only 114 respondents representing 12.7% of the sample population earned 100,000 and above monthly. The significant of the income distribution above is that, it is evident that majority of the electorate have low socio-economic station. This may not be unconnected with why they were easily influenced or induced by the political office seekers to vote for them.

The significant of the above income distributions is that, people with low socio-economic status are more likely to support stomach infrastructure and oppose to the provisions of social infrastructure. This view has been supported by the two major theories reviewed in this work. The findings confirmed the claims by the majority of the people included in the in-depth interview conducted. Of significant to mention was the position of those who claimed that “*ebi o ki wonu ki oro miran wo*” meaning that, when one is hungry there is no room to think rationally over other things. This was also confirm when some claimed that to enjoy social infrastructures, one needs to stay alive, health and happy and that is why the need for food and shelter come first before comfort and social recognition in Abraham Maslow’s hierarchy of need.

Those who claimed not working expressed various sources of income. Some of which included family support, charity organizations, pension, e.t.c. those who claimed other sources had the highest number with 118 representing 57.3%. This is a pointer to the fact that for this category of people to survive, they must depend on something. This therefore might have been reason why the stomach infrastructure became so popular and widely accepted by majority of the electorate. Further indicative of the poor socio-economic background of the respondents could be seen in the distribution of respondents by the types of the accommodation they currently occupied. The table revealed that majority of the respondents’ lives in one room apartment with a total of 383 representing 42.7%, followed by those who live in room and parlour apartment with 248 (27.6%) while those who live in a block of flat and bungalow/duplex had 20.0% and 9.8% respectively.

When respondents were asked about the ownership of the building, the table revealed that majority of the respondents’ lives in the family house, with 421 (46.9%) respondents, followed by those who live in their personal building with 28.2%. Employees and government recorded 8.5% and 0.9% respectively. On the ownership of the other essentials necessity of life, Majority of the respondents claimed they have, with respondent indicated two or more of the items, hence, we did not bother to analyze this to avoid double entry. The significant of the above distributions is that, the level of socio-economic status of individual affects their voting behavior.

Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Political Participation by gender.

<i>Gender Composition</i>	Gender				Total	
	Male		Female			
<i>Political Participation</i>	N = 470	52.3%	N = 428	47.7%	N = 898	100%
Are you a registered member of any Political Party?						
Yes	189	21.0	202	22.5	391	43.5
No	281	31.3	226	25.2	507	56.5
Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100
If Yes, do you hold any post in your party?						
Yes	52	5.8	38	4.2	90	10.0
No	418	46.5	390	43.5	808	90.0
Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100
Have you ever participated in the previous elections in the State?						
Yes	345	38.4	310	34.5	655	72.9

No	125	13.9	118	13.2	243	27.1
Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100
If never participated in the previous elections, why?						
Under Age	82	33.7	76	31.3	158	65.0
Not in the Country	5	2.1	9	3.7	14	5.8
Political Apathy	34	14.0	26	10.7	60	24.7
Others	4	1.6	7	2.9	13	5.3
Total	125	51.4	118	48.6	243	100
Did you vote in the just concluded election?						
Yes	389	82.8	353	75.1	742	82.6
No	81	17.3	76	8.5	157	17.5
Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100

Source: Field Works 2015

This section examines the level of political participation by the respondents and their various activities before, during and after the 2015 general elections. We started with membership of political parties. The tables revealed that majority (507-56.5%) are not registered members of any political party while the remaining 391(43.5%) claimed they are registered members of the various political parties. The table further revealed that only 10.0% of those who claimed to they are registered members of the various parties hold elective posts in their various parties, leaving the remaining 90% as ordinary members. On the participation in the previous elections, 655(72.9%) had participated while 27.1% had never. Various reasons were adduced for not participating in the previous elections were ranges from under age as at the previous election, absence from the country, political apathy and others. However, the number of those who participated in the last 2015 general election has slightly increased from the previous elections. 742(82.6%) voted during the 2015 general elections, while 17.4% claimed they did not. The sociological significant of the distributions is that people are getting more enlightened on the right to exercise their franchise, however, efforts must be intensified to educate electorates more on the ideal election and voting behavior.

Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Factors Influencing Voting Behaviour by gender.

Gender Composition	Gender				Total	
	Male		Female			
Factors Influencing Voting Behaviour	N = 470	52.3%	N = 428	47.7%	N = 898	100%
Have you ever participated in electoral campaign before?						
Yes	150	16.7	172	19.2	322	35.9
No	320	35.6	256	28.5	576	64.1
Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100
If Yes, Why?						
Support my party	41	12.7	48	14.9	89	27.6
Support the candidate of my choice	28	8.7	29	9.0	57	17.8
Support because of past achievement	38	11.8	39	12.1	77	23.9
Support because of party/candidate's promise	43	13.4	56	17.4	99	30.7

Total	150	46.7%	172	53.4	322	100
Have you ever received gift(s) from any political party/candidate(s)						
Yes	335	37.3	286	31.9	621	69.2
No	135	15.0	142	15.8	277	30.8
Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100
If Yes, what type of gift(s)?						
Cash (Money)	82	13.2	78	12.6	160	25.8
Food Items (Rice, Yam, Beans, etc)	165	26.6	116	18.7	281	45.2
Other Material (Clothing, Wrist Watch, etc)	56	9.0	64	10.3	120	19.3
Others, specify	32	5.2	28	4.5	60	9.7
Total	335	53.9	286	46.1	621	100
Are you satisfied with the quality and quantity of the gift given to you?						
Yes	148	23.8	172	27.7	320	51.5
No	187	30.1	114	18.4	301	48.5
Total	335	53.9	286	46.1	621	100
Have you any regret for collecting such gift(s)?						
Yes	8	1.3	6	1.0	14	2.3
No	327	52.7	280	45.1	607	97.7
Total	335	54.0	286	46.0	621	100
What was your reason(s) for voting for the party of your choice in the last general election?						
Because I belong to the same party	165	18.4	181	20.2	346	38.5
Because of the party/candidate promise (Manifestoes)	72	8.0	82	9.1	154	17.1
Because the party/candidate gave food and other items before the election	233	26.0	127	14.1	360	40.1
Others, Please specify	46	5.1	38	4.2	84	9.3
Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100
Do you think that your economic status has anything to do with your voting choice?						
Yes	315	35.1	289	32.2	604	67.3
No	155	17.2	139	15.5	294	32.7
Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100
Would you have voted contrary if your economic status is much better than as you are now?						
Yes	289	32.2	302	33.6	591	65.8
No	181	20.1	126	14.1	307	34.2
Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100
If you are asked to vote again, will you still vote for the same candidate or party?						
Yes	281	31.3	305	34.0	586	65.3
No	189	21.0	123	13.7	312	34.7
Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100
Were you satisfied with the outcome of the last election in the State? Why?						
Yes	336	37.4	298	33.2	634	70.6
No	134	14.9	130	14.5	264	29.4

Total	470	52.3%	428	47.7%	898	100
-------	-----	-------	-----	-------	-----	-----

Source: Field Works 2015

In this section, attempt was made to find out from the respondents factors influencing their voting behaviors in the past elections. Effort was made to begin the interactions with participation in the election campaigns and their reason(s) for participation. 322(32.9%) of the total sample size confessed they actually participated. Various reasons were adduced for their participation which include; support, party/candidate because of the electoral promise 30.7%, participated as a member of party 27.6%, past achievement 23.9% and candidate of choice had 17.8%.

Due to the renewed stomach infrastructural strategy of the political office seekers, effort was made to find out if the electorates/voters have ever received gift(s) from political party/candidate(s). The table revealed that majority confessed that they did collect gift(s) from party/candidate(s) with 621 respondents representing 69.2% while the remaining 277(30.8%) claimed they have never. When those who confessed ever collected gift(s) were asked to name those gift(s), various items were mentioned. These items included food items (Rice, Yam, Beans, e.t.c) with 281 (45.2%) respondents, cash (Money) 160(25.8%), material items (Clothing, customized wrist watch, e.t.c), 120 (19.3%) and 60 (9.7%) respondents. When those who have ever collected items from party/candidates were asked to confirm whether they are satisfied with the quality of the gift(s) items received, 51.5% claimed they were satisfied, while others (48.5%) said they were not satisfied.

Furthermore, respondents who have ever collected gift(s) were asked if they have any regret for doing so. 97.7% claimed they have never regretted doing so while very few 2.3% claimed they regretted ever collected gift(s) from the party/candidate(s). Attempt was made to investigate into the influence of stomach infrastructure on voter's behavior, hence they were asked why they have voted the way they did during the last election. Various reasons were equally adduced for their voting behavior. For instance, 360(40.1%) voted because of the gift(s) they have collected, 38.5% voted because they were members of particular parties, 17.1% voted for the party/candidate(s) because of their manifestoes/promise, while 9.3% voted because of other reasons. The findings from the distributions above were in total agreement with the claims by the positions of those included in the in-depth interview. Of significant to also mention are those who believe and claimed that "*ohun ti eye ba je, ohun ni eye ma gbe fo*" meaning that it is what you have eaten that is yours, while others also believe that "*eru inu ni a fi ngbe eru ita*" meaning that it is what you have eaten that will helps you to carry on with the other physical activities. These people believed that, our politicians have made so many promises unfulfilled, hence, they prefer to get whatever they can get from them before voting them into power.

To further probe into the factors influencing voting behavior of the respondents, questions on whether respondent's economic status has anything to do with their voting choices was asked. Majority of the respondents agreed that their economic status influenced their voting choice with a total of 604 (67.3%) respondents while 294 (32.7%) did not believe that their economic statuses influenced their voting choices. It should also be mentioned that 65.8% of those who confessed that their economic status influenced their voting behavior also confessed that they

would have voted contrary if their economic status has been much better. On whether they will still vote for the same party/candidate if they are asked to vote again, majority with 65.8% claim they would still vote for the same party or candidate(s) if they are to vote again as long as such party or candidate are ready and willing to give them their own share of the national cake. Generally, respondents were asked to comment if satisfied with the outcome of the last general election in the State, 70.6% claimed they were satisfied while the remaining 29.4% confessed they were not satisfied with the outcome.

LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODELS SHOWING THE EFFECTS OF SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON POLITICAL PARTICIPATION OF VOTERS/ ELECTORATES IN 2015 GENERAL ELECTION

VARIABLES	MALE		FEMALE	
	Coefficient	Odds	Coefficient	Odds
AGE				
18-24	0.373	1.452	0.312	1.366
25-34	0.382	1.465	0.325	1.384
35-44	0.241	1.273	0.222	1.249
45-54	0.423	1.527	0.211	1.235
55-64	0.521	1.702	0.113	1.323
65-74	0.364	1.551	0.221	1.259
75 and above	RC	1.00	RC	1.00
MARITAL STATUS				
Single	0.572	1.733	0.334	1.621
Married	0.478	1.613	0.366	1.442
Divorced/Separated	0.548	1.730	0.481	1.618
Widow/Widower	RC	1.00	RC	1.00
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
Literate	0.3976	1.488	0.244	1.276
Illiterate	RC	1.00	RC	1.00
EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION				
No formal Schooling	0.532	1.762	0.254	1.286
Primary	-0.174	0.840	-0.321	0.725
S.75/Grade III/Technical School	-0.471	0.624	-0.534	0.586
WASCE/GradeII	0.271	1.311	0.211	1.235
HSC/A'Level/OND/NCE	0.572	1.733	0.334	1.621
B.Sc/HND/Postgraduate	0.478	1.613	0.366	1.442
Others (Professional Qualifications, etc)	RC	1.00	RC	1.00
OCCUPATION				
Civil Servant	0.202	1.224	0.121	1.129
Private Worker	0.554	1.740	0.891	2.438
Self Employed (Artisan, okada rider,etc)	0.324	1.383	0.894	2.445
Business	RC	1.00	RC	1.00
INCOME PER MONTH				
Below 10,000:00	0.202	1.224	0.121	1.129
10,000 – 19,000	0.554	1.740	0.891	2.668
20,000 – 29,000	0.324	1.606	0.894	2.445
30,000 – 39,000	0.202	1.224	0.621	2.129
40,000 – 49,000	0.554	2.775	0.891	2.438

50,000 – 99,000	0.324	1.383	0.894	2.983
100,000 and above	RC	1.00	RC	1.00
FAMILY SIZE/NUMBER OF CHILDREN				
1 – 3 Children	0.805	2.237	0.745	2.106
4 – 6 Children	0.300	1.350	0.242	1.274
7 Children and above	RC	1.00	RC	1.00
TYPES OF ACCOMODATION				
Single Room	-0.539	0.583	-0.425	0.654
Room and Parlour	0.446	1.562	0.596	1.815
Block of Flat	0.290	1.336	-0.335	0.715
Bungalow/Duplex	RC	1.00	RC	1.00

NOTE: **P<0.01, *P<0.05, RC stands for Reference Category

A number of the socio-demographic variables already considered in the bivariate analyses were used to re-examine the proximate determinants of voters' behavior/participation through the execution of a multivariate analytical technique based on logistic regression, utilizing the maximum-likelihood estimation procedure. The dependent variable is political participation among the voter's respondents. The variable is dichotomous, coded as 1 if currently having regular income, and 0 if otherwise. Many background and socio-demographic variables were considered in initial explanatory models. The variables were entered as dummies as usual, with one category omitted from the model for reference. Since the goal is to find a model that fits the data well enough such that the chi-square value is small, we removed many variables for which the estimated odds ratios are not significantly different from 1.0 (no association). Table above presents a model that is both parsimonious and makes substantive sense with respect to level of political participation. The odd ratios of two logistic regression models examining proximate determinants of voters' political education, political behavior and election outcomes. As shown in the table, separate models are developed on the basis of gender, examining the effects of the independent variables on the likelihood of voter's sources of political education. The analysis of the table reveals that the age of the respondents, marital status, educational status and family size are significantly related to political participation.

In the male models, all the variables included in the table are significantly related to voter's participation. For instance, respondents who are within ages 18 – 24 years are 1.6 times more likely to participate in politics than ages 75 years and over, which is the reference category in this table. Also, those within ages 25 – 34 years are 1.4 times more likely to report various sources of information than the reference category. Others that fall within ages 35 – 44 years and those within ages 45 – 54 years are 1.2 and 1.5 times more likely than those in the reference category. Also those within ages 55 – 64 and 65 – 74 are 1.7 and 1.5 times more likely than the reference category. The marital status of the respondents indicate that those who are still single and those who are married are 1.7 and 1.6 times respectively more likely to report participation than the reference category. Those who are divorced/separated are 1.7 time more likely than the reference category. Respondents who are literate are 1.4 times more likely to report participation than the reference category.

The table further reveals that family size is significantly related to political participation. For instance, men with about 1–3 family size and those with 4 – 6 family size are 2.2 and 1.3 times respectively more likely to report participating in election than those with a large family size of 7 children and above which is the reference category. Those who reported currently working are 1.4 times more likely than the reference category who is not currently working. The table also reveals that the Civil servant, Private workers and self employed are 1.2; 1.7 and 1.3 times more likely to participate in politics the reference category in the table.

In the same vein, the female model as indicated in the table shows that in the various age cohorts, older women who fall within ages 18 – 24, ages 25 – 34, ages 35 – 44, 45 – 54, 55 - 64 and ages 65 – 74 are 1.3; 1.3; 1.2; 1.2; 1.3 and 1.2 times respectively more likely to report participation, particularly from current works than those within ages 75 years and over. On marital status, women who are still single, married and divorced are 1.6; 1.4 and 1.6 times more likely to report participation than the widow/widower category. Those who are literate are 1.2 times more likely to and those who are currently working are also 1.5 times more likely to report same than the reference category.

Furthermore, table above shows that the family size is significantly related to level of participation in the female model. For instance, those with 1 – 3 family size are 2.1 times more likely to report participation than the reference category, while those with 4– 6 family are 1.2 times more likely to than the reference category.

LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODELS SHOWING THE EFFECTS OF SOME SELECTED STOMACH INFRASTRUCTURE VARIABLES ON VOTER’S BEHAVIOUR DURING 2015 GENERAL ELECTION.

VARIABLES	MALE		FEMALE	
	Coefficient	Odds	Coefficient	Odds
Ever participated in election campaign				
Yes	0.321	1.379	0.286	1.331
No	RC	1.00	RC	1.00
Reason(s) for participation				
Party Member	0.496	1.642	0.289	1.335
Candidate(s) of my choice	-0.552	0.576	-0.350	0.705
Because of past achievement	0.386	1.544	0.387	1.445
What the candidate promise	RC	1.00	RC	1.00
Ever collected gift(s) from aspirants or parties				
Yes	0.401	1.493	0.334	1.397
No.	RC	1.00	RC	1.00
Types of Gifts				
Cash (Money)	0.331	1.392	0.442	1.556
Food Items (Yams, Rice, Beans, etc)	0.132	1.141	0.228	1.256
Material Items (Clothes, Wrist watch, etc)	-0.344	0.709	-0.282	0.754
Others	RC	1.00	RC	1.00
Satisfaction with the gifts				
Satisfied	0.431	1.539	0.424	1.528
Not Satisfied	RC	1.00	RC	1.00
Satisfaction with the outcome of the last election				

Very Satisfied	0.431	1.539	0.542	1.719
Satisfied	0.127	1.135	0.428	1.534
Not Satisfied	RC	1.00	RC	1.00

NOTE: **P<0.01, *P<0.05, RC stands for Reference Category

The primary aim of this section is not different from the general aims of the study. The primary objective of this section is to present an explicit discussion on the stomach infrastructure and understanding voter's behavior during the general election in Ekiti State and also to examine the effects of some selected socio-economic variables on voter's behaviour and how it has been able to influence overall voting outcomes in the 2015 general election in Nigeria. To achieve the above, the logistic regression model was utilized in estimating the influence of the selected socio-economic variables on voter's behavior. Table above presents the odds ratios of two logistic regression models, that is, two separate models are developed on the basis of gender. In the male model, Ever participation in election campaign, Reason for participation, ever collected anything from the party or candidates. Types of the gift and satisfaction with the quality of the gift(s).

In the table above, men who had ever participated in campaign are 1.3 more likely than the reference category. On the various reasons for participating, party membership, candidate of choice, past achievement are 1.6; 0.5 and 1.5 are more like than the reference category. On receipt of gift from the party or candidates, men who received materials from politicians are 1.4 likely to vote in a particular way different from his or her usual practice. Those who received money and food items are 1.3 and 1.1 more likely to change their voting behavior than the reference category. Those who received material items such as clothes, wrist watch are 0.7 less like to than the reference category. In the female model, women who participated in the electoral campaign are 1.3 more likely than the reference category, Women who received cash and food items are 1.5 and 1.2 more likely to change their political behavior than the reference category. Finally, on the level of satisfaction, women who collected one form of gift or the other are 1.7 more likely to express satisfaction with the outcome of the election than the reference .

Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

Summary

Voting behavior in itself is a form of political behavior that is characterized at its most basic level as an attempt by the electorates to use power of the ballot to bring about the desires change for self actualization. Attempt to understand why people vote the way they do has long been central concern of political and social scientists. Elections occupy a prominent place in the democratic government. It is a means through which people express and enforce their political opinion and regulate political organization of the society. However voters' behaviour during any election is influence by several factors such as ethnic affiliation, social group, ideology, money, material gifts, religion etc, and the extent political parties and candidates make use of these variables for the sake of winning the election. Responses to the question on what influences voter's behavior makes more informed voting choices. This article examines the various factors that influenced voting behavior and its implication for future election in Ekiti State. The study found that socio-economic deprivation and lack of political education of the people provide the

basis for an electorate that is amenable to manipulation by means of material and monetary inducement. The study also found that man is essentially a political animal and in the practice of politics, he could express his agenda either positively or negatively.

Conclusions

This study concludes that a combination of attitudinal, social and psychological factors influenced the voting behavior in the 2014 Governorship election in Ekiti State and the general elections in Nigeria during the 2015 election. Attitudinal factors played vital roles in determining the choice of candidates for elective post. Also social factors such as religion, social class etc play certain level of roles. On the other hand, stomach infrastructure factor such as distributions of food items, material gifts, physical cash, etc cannot be over emphasized in the election because it actually go a long way to determine the outcome of the election in the state. It is therefore, imperative that the use of these determinants should be avoided and elections should be conducted in a very free and fair manner. Mere presence of an electoral system does not make a political system democratic. The will of people is expressed through electioneering campaign and uninterrupted voting process in elections, therefore, all undemocratic and unfair means like financial inducement and other forms of manipulation and rigging need to be avoided.

Recommendations

From the various analysis and findings of the research, the followings recommendations were made to address issues emanating from the study of electoral campaigns and stomach infrastructure: Understanding Voters' behavior during the 2015 general elections in Nigeria.

The INEC should engage more actively in civic and voter education to equip potential voters relevant knowledge about their socio-economic rights, civic responsibility and the right to exercise franchise by the electorates.

INEC should take steps to ensure all stakeholders are aware of their right and obligations in upholding the ideal of democratic norms

INEC must ensure that all undemocratic and unfair means like financial inducement, distributions of food items and other forms of manipulation and rigging are discouraged.

The use of stomach infrastructure strategy should be discouraged in all ramifications before, during and after election. Therefore, offenders must be dealt with to serve as deterrent to others who may want to adopt the same strategy.

The jumbo salaries attached to the various elective offices in Nigeria should be discouraged in other not to make it more attractive to political office seekers again.

References

- Anderson, J.E. (2011). Public Policy making. Boston: Wadsworth.
- Barkan, Joe D. (1979), "Legislators, Elections, and Political Linkage," in Barkan J oe D. and John J. Okumu (Eds), Politics and Public Policy in Kenya and Tanzania , New York: Praeger, pp. 64-92.

- Blau, P. M. (1964), *The Structure of Social Associations*, John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Bratton, Michael and van de Walle, Nicolas (1997) *Democratic Experiments in Africa. Regime Transitions in Comparative perspective*, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Bratton, Michael, Mattes, Robert, and Gyimah-Boadi, E. (2005), *Public Opinion, Democracy, and Market Reform in Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bratton, M. (2008). *Vote-buying and violence in Nigerian election campaigns*, Afrobarometer, Working Paper No. 99.
- Bratton, M., Bhavnani, R. & Chen, T-H. (2012). *Voting Intentions in Africa: Ethnic, Economic or Partisan? Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, 50(1), 27-52.
- Bratton, M. & van de Walle, N. (1997). *Democratic experiments in Africa. Regime transitions in comparative perspective*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Brooks, C., Nieuwbeerta, P. & Manza, J. (2006). *Cleavage-based Voting Behaviour in Crossnational Perspective: Evidence from Six Post-war Democracies*, *Social Science Research*, 35(1), 88-128.
- Burbank, Matthew J. (1997) "Explaining Contextual Effects on Vote Choice," *Political Behavior* Vol. 1 no. 2 : 113-132.
- Carothers, Thomas, "How Democracies Emerge: The Sequencing Fallacy," *Journal of Democracy*, 18 (January) 2007, 12-27.
- Catt, H. (1996). *Voting Behaviour: A Radical Critique*. London: Leicester University Press.
- Centre for Democracy and Development (2014) *Briefing Note on Voter Education and the 2015 Elections in Nigeria*, CDD
- Chandler, M. (1988). *Models of Voting Behaviour in Social Research*. *Synthese*, 76(1), 25-48.
- Coleman, James (1990). *Foundations Of Social Theory*. Cambridge: Belknap Press.
- Cook, Karen (2000), *Charting Futures for Sociology: Structure and Action*, *Contemporary Sociology*; Vol. 29 : 685 - 692
- Dowd, James J. (1975) "Aging as a Exchange: A Preface to Theory", *Journal of Gerontology* 30: 585-594.
- Downs, Anthony (1957), *An Economic Theory of Democracy*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Erdmann, Gero (2007). "The Cleavage Model, Ethnicity and Voter Alignment in Africa: Conceptual and Methodological Problems Revisited," *GIGA Working Papers*, Working Paper No. 63, (December).
- Edlin, Aaron S., Gelman, Andrew and Kaplan, Noah (2007), "Voting as a Rational Choice: Why and How People Vote to Improve the Well-Being of Others," *Rationality and Society*, Vol. 19(3): 293-314.
- Elischer, Sebastian (2008) "Ethnic Coalitions of Convenience and Commitment: Political Parties and Party Systems in Kenya," *GIGA Working Papers*, Working Paper No. 68, February (2008).
- Eiffert, Ben, Edward Miguel and Daniel Posner, "Political Sources of Ethnic Identification in Africa," paper presented at a conference on *The Microfoundations of Mass Politics in Africa* held at Michigan State University, May 12-13, 2007.
- Erdmann, Gero (2007). "Ethnicity, Voter Alignment and Political Party Affiliati on- An African Case: Zambia," *GIGA Working Papers*, Working Paper No. 45, (March).
- Ferree, Karen E. (2004) . "The Micro-Foundations of Ethnic Voting: Evidence From South Africa," *Afrobarometer Working Paper*, no. 40, (June).

- Fish, Stanley. "When 'Identity Politics' is Rational," *New York Times*, February 17, 2008.
- Homan, G. C. (1961), *The Human Group*; New York; Harcourt Brace.
- Horowitz, Donald L. (1985). *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kersting, N. (2009). Voting Behaviour in the 2009 South African Election. *Afrika Spectrum*, 44(2), 125-133.
- Kalipeni, Ezekiel, "Regional Polarisation in Voting Pattern: Malawi's 1994 Elections," *African Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 2 (1): 152-167.
- Lewis, Peter (2007). "Identity, Institutions and Democracy n Nigeria," *Afrobarometer Working Papers*, Working Paper No. 68 (March 2007).
- Lindberg, Staffan I. and Morrison, Minion K.C., "Are African Voters Really Ethnic or Clientelistic? Survey Evidence from Ghana," *Political Science Quarterly*, 123, Spring (2008),
- Morgan, Leslie and Suzanne, Kunkel (1998), *Ageing: The Social Context*; Pine Forge press; Sage Publications Company, California.
- Ndegwa, Stephen (1997), "Citizenship and Ethnicity: An Examination of Two Transition Moments in Kenyan Politics," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 91 No. 3 (September): 599-616.
- Posner, Daniel N. and Simon, David J (2002). "Economic Conditions and Incumbent Support in Africa's New Democracies: Evidence from Zambia," *Comparative Political Studies*, 35, no 3 : 313-336.
- Sanders, D. (2003). Party Identification, Economic Perception, and Voting in British General Elections, 1974-1997. *Electoral Studies*, 22(2), 239-263.
- Stolte, John, Gary Fine, and Karen Cook. (2001). Sociological Miniaturism: Seeing the Big Through the Small in Social Psychology. *Annual Review of Sociology* 27: 387-413.
- Szwarcberg, M. (2013). The Microfoundations of Political Clientelism: Lessons from the Argentine Case. *Latin American Research Review*, 48(2), 32-54.
- United National Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) (2010). *Combating Poverty and Inequality. Structural Change, Social Policy and Politics*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Walker, R. and Ahmad, W. (1992) Asian older People: housing, health and access to services, *Ageing and Society*, 17, Pp. 141 – 165.
- Wantchekon, L. (2003). Clientelism and Voting Behavior: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Benin. *World Politics*, 55(3), 399-422.
- Youde, Jeremy (2005), "Economics and Government Popularity in Ghana," *Electoral Studies* 24, no 1: 1-16.
- Zucco, C. (2013). When Payouts Pay Off: Conditional Cash Transfers and Voting Behavior in Brazil 2002–10. *American Journal of Political Science*, 57(4), 810-822.