Determinants of Voting Behavior in Pakistan: A Theoretical Perspective

Fakhta Zeib[1],Muhammad Hassaan Zubair[2],Kashaf Abdul Razaq[2]

[1]Ph.D. Research Scholar, Institut für MedienwissenschaftPhilipps-Universität Marburg, Germany.

[2] M.Phil. Scholar, Government College University Faisalabad

[2] Visiting Lecturer, Government College University Faisalabad

Corresponding author Email: zeib@staff.uni-marburg.de

Abstract

To achieve democratic consequences of voting, the researchers have put serious concerns on what motivates people to vote and whom to vote. This article builds on theoretical grounds of voting behaviors, which explain sociological, psychological and rational choice determinants of voting behaviors,articulating both theory and previous literature. It encompasses high quality distinct but connected researches to support the theories. The scholars throughout the world are attempting to investigate the voting determinants in different political setups.Given the revival of democracy, last three decades have been very important in the political history of Pakistan. The purpose of this paper is to investigate sociological, psychological and rational choice determinants of voting behaviors in a typical Pakistani voterbased on empirical studies. The article concludes that a typical Pakistani voter is influenced by,more or less, all above-mentioned determinants.

Keywords: Voting Behavior, Sociological, Psychological, Rational Choice, Political History, Pakistan

Introduction

Very early studies of voting behavior are marked by three major schools of thoughts. Columbia school of thought (Sociological Model) which has reference to the publications ''The People's Choice'' by Lazarsfeld et al.(1944), ''Voting'' by Berelson et al.(1954)and ''Personal Influence'' by Katz & Lazarsfeld(1955). Michigan School of thought (Psychosocial Model) has major reference to the publication ''The American Voter'' by Campbell et al.(1960), and Rochester School of thought referred to as Rational Choice theory (Model of Economic voting) which has reference to the work of Anthony Downs ''An Economic Theory of Democracy'' (1957). These studies put great focus on the voting behavior of individual voters based upon a wide range of social, psychological, and need-based influences. This article gives a comprehensive overview of sociological, psychological and rational choice voting determinants of Pakistani voters. A theoretical approach in the light of sociological model, psychosocial model and rational choice theory, which is referred to as Model of Economic voting, would help us understand and establish the implications of

176

these Models in Pakistani Setting more firmly.

TheProvinces of Punjab, Sindh, and NWFP (now named as Khyber Pakhtunkhwa) in Pakistan, when these were the part of British-ruled India, have got the experience of elections in 1937 and 1946. After the partition of the sub-continent, provincial elections were observed in Punjab and NWFP in 1951, in the province of Sindh in 1953, and in Bengal in 1954 (Akhtar, 2012). However, the first general elections were announced after the first constitution in Pakistan in 1956. For the reason that elections have not been conducted at regular intervals in Pakistan, the transition from one democratic regime to another democratic regime has not been smooth.According to Akhtar, (2012), the dearth and immaturity of research about 'electoral and voting' behavior and election conduct in the political setup of Pakistan are due to irregular conduct of elections. Regardless of the question, that how free and fair these elections were, nevertheless, they contributed to the electoral consciousness of the general masses in Pakistan. Although in PPP-PML led bi-partisan political structure, the spectrum of political consciousness was limited. The literature on election conduct,voters' preferences, and social and psychological aspects behind their preferences is very limited. Past studies are either lacking concrete methodological and theoretical perspectives or having limited perspective (Butt & Awang, 2017a; Durre-E-Shawar & Asim, 2012; Tufail et al., 2015). And based upon these studies the analysis of the influences on voter choice and voters' electoral behavior was difficult.

These phenomena cannot be comprehensively studied, if the elections have not been conducted at regular intervals. However, the current study tries to look into the broader horizon covering a wide range of studies from many other countries and political setups too.

Sociological Determinants of Voting Behavior and their Implications

The sociological model is built on the argument that voter's social neighborhood and membership of other groups have a strong influence over the voting behavior of an individual. Lazarfeld et al. (1944) studied in detail the political homogeneity of social groups i.e. the association between voter's electoral behavior and the social groups he belonged to, and reach to the conclusion that social characteristics determine political preference. They also explain that voters in America do not cast their votes based on some reason, but to conform or to fit in one's social group. Even those who believe, they cast their vote based on some reason, they make a decision on the collective reason of their group, not based on one's own reason. Series of experiments that employed different research methodologies concluded that apart from early predispositions, the change in voter choice was not only due to a political candidate but due to members of the community also(Antunes, 2010, p. 147). An individual voter in an ideal democratic society is supposed to be empowered with political information and knowledge, no matter what his political beliefs are. For instance, what the real issues of majority are, what are the solutions and alternatives, what are

177

democratic and non-democratic consequences of a certain current or past issue, and a rational argument about whether a political candidate is capable of resolving this issue. Such standards are difficult to meet, also, in traditional Pakistani voters. Studies reinforce this argument and suggest that most of the voters in Pakistan do not cast their votes on the basis of these principles but on some other sociological factors(Akhtar, 2012).

Although, the sociological model provides strong theoretical grounds for electoral studies in the past and in the current era also. Nevertheless, it is also true that the studies are conducted setting particular parameters and not all studies, always, are measured on the same parameters. The parameters of the studies conducted 1944 (People's Choice), 1954 (Voting) and 1955 (Personal Influence) may have changed up till now. However, we should reevaluate the sociological determinants of electoral behavior in today's social context because of many reasons. The parameters of the formation of social groups and individualistic characteristics are not the same as were in 1944.Second, the patterns of information production and consumption by the members of social groups have changed i. e today's empowered voter is involved in the process of consumption and production at the same time.Third, the technological developments have made communication more complex technologically but facilitated interactivity and flexibility in communication process among the members of social groups. Forth, in a high choice media environment, the members of the social groups have many alternative sources of information i.e. receive information from multiple sources, and they are more empowered than the voters of that time when the study was conducted.

Berelson, Lazarsfeld, and McPhee replicated the study and analyzed presidential elections in 1948 to have a deep insight over social differentiation in groups. The results were published in 1954 in ''Voting": A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign'' reinforced greater social and physical proximity between members of groups. Electoral cleavage is maintained in social groups on the basis of class, ethnic and ecological divisions. According to Barelson et al. (1954, p.75), these characteristics are present in contemporary America too. Social determinants of electoral behavior identified by scholars are present in every society having minor variations and voter's voting behavior should also be analyzed in this perspective. The study includes the most influential sociological determinants of voting behavior

Among other sociological factors that define voting behavior of an individual, peer group and family members also determine voting behavior. Gavin Stamp, a political reporter of BBC states that one-third of young adults claim that their voting decisions are influenced by their family members and peer groups[1]. According to Kudrnáč & Lyons, (2017), the young voters, who live with their parents, are influenced by their parents for voting. In the social and

---

[1] Article can be accessed from Stamp, G., (2010). *BBC News - Election: How do friends and family influence votes?*

political context, these influences are categorized into two different types of influences; decide to vote and decide whom to vote.Gidengil et al., (2016)demonstrate that the turnout of the adult voting has a strong association with parental voting. The most influential social pressure is from within the household (André Blais et al., 2019). For most young adults, the family is the most influential determinant in the democratic participation of youth i.e. voting (Edwards et al., 2006). However, these researches validate family as a positive contributor to political learning, especially, voting of a young voter. Nevertheless, the situation takes another turn when this voting determinant i.e. family, influences the voting decisions of a young voter. However, the central point here is the interconnections between the individuals and their families; family is most likely to influence the individual's attitudes and choices of voting.

The role of canvasser as a communicator in influencing the electoral behavior of a social group is also important sociological determinant. Discussing the importance of personal relationships with other members of social groups, Sinclair et al., (2013) conclude empirically, that canvassers from the same social group have more effect on voters' turnout.

In Pakistan's socio-political scenario, the society is divided in social groups on the bases of caste, class, and religion. This social differentiation is important to look as a precondition for the analysis of electoral behavior. The true spirit of democracy is met when people are free in their choice to elect electoral representatives, people do vote but their choices are influenced by many social and political pressures imposed by such as politicians, landlords, tribal heads, and biradries(M. Ahmed, 2008; Martin & Picherit, 2020). Parochial approach towards national and local issues has changed the parameters of political choices during elections, which ultimately affected the democratic process. Moreover, economic issues and poor law and order situation in the country has made the focus of the voters very narrow. Voting behavior of an ordinary voter in Pakistan has been characterized by 'focus on local and personal issues' rather than 'national and collective issues. Moreover,parochialism, multiculturalism, and socio-cultural diversification have changed the democratic discourse(Haider, 2017). Political researcher and analyst Rasul Bakhsh Rais discussing non-party elections of 1985 states that 'ignorance of national issue and importance of local issues' is the general behavior of Pakistani voter.

Moreover, in rural areas especially campaigns are dominated by influences of candidates, caste/ biradri, ties to the clan, pressures of feudal setups (Rais, 1985). Though this argument was not supported by empirical evidence, but meanwhile and afterward many researchers analyzed the effects of caste/ biradri and feudal set up on voting behavior and found strong influences of these determinants on the voting behavior of non-urban voters (A. Ahmed, 2014; Haider, 2017). Moreover, with a broader conceptualization of ethnicity i.e. tribes, races, caste, and nationalities, Butt & Awang (2017b) found the likelihood of voting of urban and non-urban voters on the basis of above mentioned ethnic

indicators.The impact of caste/ biradri system on voting behavior in Pakistan was investigated by many other scholars (Akbar Leghari et al., 2020; Akhtar, 2012; Wilder, 1999) and found a strong influence of 'Zat'(caste) and biradri on electoral and political process of the province of Punjab. The non-urban people from the province of Punjab in Pakistan accept authoritarian rule, which is the product of multiculturalism, caste/ biradri system, and parochial political culture (Ziring, 1977). Sadiq et al.(2014) also conclude the strong impact of biradrismin the political alignment of the people of Punjab. Although national-level politics does not follow these trends as much as local politics does; regional and local politics and candidates use the favors of major biradries to win their constituencies. A study conducted in two major districts of Punjab revealed that voting behavior is found to be influenced by the sociological model coupled with the authoritarian rule.The structure of society itself does not allow free will to be executed for casting vote rather strict guidelines are imposed by authoritarian personalities such as feudal lords to influence voting decisions (Jamil Ahmed et al., 2010).

Caste system has been very influential in the rural politics of Pakistan, since 70% of the population of Pakistan lives in rural areas and the effects of caste/ biradri and the feudal system can not be ignored in the political system and electoral process of Pakistan. This major proportion of the population of Pakistan is more likely to exhibit passive political behavior (Haider, 2017; Wilder, 1999). Moreover, the caste and feudal system, at a specific level, have strong connectedness with each other. Feudal lords, who are called 'Zamindar' and 'Jagirdar' are authoritative on people of their area and put a strong influence on their political affiliations. As they already have passive political behavior and parochial approach towards politics and national issues, feudal lords well understand their weakness and exploit their needs. Feudal system in the politics of Pakistan is influential in elections in two ways; (1) Feudal lords put influence on people, who work on their land and are dependent on them for their even smaller needs. (2) They put influence on the people who belong to the same caste and biradri and exploit their sentiments in the name of caste and biradri. In contrast to the above discussion, Waseem (1994) argues that increasing awareness has lead voters of Pakistan to participate in an electoral activity based on the delivery system associated with their needs.

Many studies explored voting determinants from Pakistan's electoral perspective, but their focus of the research was limited to particular constituencies (A. G. Chaudhry et al., 2014; Jamil Ahmed et al., 2010). While going through the literature on electoral behavior and election conduct in Pakistan, unfortunately, the dearth of broader research horizon in the perspective of the political setup of Pakistan is observed. However, from the past literature, the study concludes that a great influence of caste, biradri, and feudal factors on voting decisions capture the political setup in Pakistan.

In the socio-political tradition of Pakistan, It has been observed that the endorsements from family members and

friends' networks have a greater influence on voting and voting decisions i.e. whom to vote. A family structure in Pakistani society is closed bounded; younger children stay with their parents and in most cases, married children and their parents also stay with each other, either at their parents' house or at the children's house. However, according to the viability of Kudrnáč & Lyons (2017)'s argument in the family structure of Pakistan, it seems quite logical that most of the adult children face influences from the family, as they used to stay with their parents. They further regard it as the transmission of social values from one generation to another. A. Ahmad et al.(2020) 's findings also revealed that both sociological determinants; biradri and family, influence the voting decisions of the voters of rural Punjab.

Fogg proposes theoretically, that individual voter's acquaintances may help voters to decide about which candidates are better or whom to vote for. In addition, it is more likely that a particular candidate is also supported by voter's acquaintances. (Fogg & Eckles, 2007; Fogg & Iizawa, 2008). Being part of one's social network increases the probability of casting a vote (Bond et al., 2017; Nickerson, 2007), and even, the probability of casting a vote correctly when network provide unambiguous signals about the political candidate (Sokhey & McClurg, 2012).

The social surroundings of a person, to which he belongs, have a substantial effect on his electoral behavior, even in overall increasing voting turnout. Political messages emphasizing electoral participation were delivered to 61 million facebook users during the 2010 U.S. congressional elections. This study was conducted measuring their effect on three variables, political self-expression, information seeking, and real-world voting behavior. The messages did not only influence receiving users but also the friends of users and friends of friends. (Bond et al., 2012, pp. 295–298). Another study, which was the replication of Bond et al. (2012), conducted in 2012 presidential elections focused on sociological influences provoked by social media.The study suggests that an increased voting trend was observed among close friends of those who directly received the messages. However, the study emphasized the effects of social influences more than the effects of direct messaging (Jones et al., 2017).

Charles H. Kennedy in his article about politics of Sindh province, states that "people are more prone to their traditional biases and attachments instead of relieving themselves from the undue burden of malign tendencies which hinder the growth of free liberal ideas and institution[2]"(Kennedy, 2016, pp. 938–955). According to Kennedy, the voting behavior of voters of Sindh is above the quest of their needs and interests. Nevertheless, we argue here that this kind of voting behavior is not limited to Sindhi voters but the shreds of empirical evidence from researches on the voting behavior of the voters of other provinces especially for the province of Punjab conclude the same results (Akbar Leghari et al., 2020; Haider,

---

[2]The article was originally published in 1991.
Kennedy, C. H., (1991). The Politics of Ethnicity in Sindh. Vol. 31, No. 10 (Oct., 1991), pp. 938-955. University of California Press.

2017).However, the study of democracy requires a thorough examination of the political system of the country and its election conduct. Therefore, the argument is justified that if the above-mentioned pressures influence the political system and the election conduct in Pakistan, then the standard form of democracy is difficult to achieve.

Psychological Determinants of Voting Behavior and their Implications

Michigan model, based on psychological factors, used the concept of partisanship to overcome the limitations of the Columbia model by jointly exploring sociological long-term factors and socio-political short term factors which influence voting behavior and election results. The Psychological model also emphasizes to study an individual as a primary voting unit for the analysis of electoral behavior but in context to political partisanship. According to this concept, partisanship is a psychological association of an individual with the political party which does not guarantee a firm relation with the political party such as registration of casting vote for it (Antunes, 2010). According to Campbell et al.(1960) and Miller & Shanks(1996), partisanship creates through social orientation with reference groups to whom he does not belong but get associated by acting upon the social rules of the group. In nutshell, political partisanship comes through the connection of individuals who have an association with certain political parties.

Palmer(1975) in his book *'Elections and political development: The south Asian Experience'*, defines the hierarchy of political participation in terms of voter involvement, from low involvement to high involvement; apathetic, spectator, transitional and gladiatorial activities. He very well operationalized these levels to collect empirical evidence to test psychological determinant of the voting behavior of voters. He explained that the level of voter involvement in the electoral process and decision about voting corresponds to his attachment with the political party or candidate (p.62).

Baxter discussed the voting phenomenon from the perspective of political parties, their campaigns, and party manifesto through which they try to attract voters. Moreover, he highlighted that the established administrative patterns, in which election is conducted, also affect voting behavior (1971). Earlier studies like Baxter and Burki (1975) clearly indicate the selected political inclination towards a two-party political setup, either PPP (Pakistan People's Party) or Awami League, and afterward toward PPP and PML (Pakistan Muslim League). However, ignoring its connectivity with other factors such as "availability of choosing" from limited options of political partiesfor decades, and lacking empirical evaluation of voter's perception in this concern. Among other psychological influences gender biases, political ideology, display of personality, emotions, political biases, anxiety and fear proved as substantial indicators of voting behavior (Qorri, 2018). Further, personality attributes, religious affiliation and political campaigns also contribute to one's voting decisions (Akhlaq Ahmad et al., 2020).

Many scholars criticized sociological model for just explaining the long-term consistency of voting behavior and ignoring the voting behaviors which vary from one election to another and the voting behavior of individuals who vote differently being in a certain social group or the voting behavior of the individuals who belong to different social groups. Considering these limitations, the sociological model emphasizes a study of voting behavior not only from voter's perspective but also from contextual factors including political programs of parties, the economic situation in a country, and the political structure of a country (Antunes, 2010; Glasgow & Alvarez, 2005). Political determinant such as election campaigns of political parties, party manifesto, political leaders, candidates, and political electoral activities have been under considerable debate among many researchers from the 1970s to onward, to analyze electoral behavior (Burki & Baxter, 1975; Waseem, 1994). However, social determinants from the perspective of voter such as voter's needs, motivations, preferences, and criteria for the selection of particular candidates requires consideration to evaluate voter's voting behavior.

Jacobson(2015)'s analysis of various studies reveals that 'minimal effect' thesis about election campaigns has declined and confirms the effectiveness of electoral campaigns as adeterminant of electoral behavior in many aspects i.e. voting turnout, voting decision, influencing persuadable voters and enlighten uninformed voters. However, early scholars while discussing the effects of fundamental conditions (the economic condition of the country), also put

emphasize on partisan identities (voter's interest with specific political party)(Gelman & King, 1993).

In electoral behavior and election studies, evaluating the effectiveness of short term factors such as election campaign, image and personality of candidates and party leaders or single-issue voting behavior and long-term factors such as the geography of the voter, social class, policy voting or ethnicity have also been under investigation. Comparing long term and short term influences of voting behavior which directly or indirectly affect the electoral process, Lilleker & Jackson, (2011) state that previously what election studies enlightened were that election campaigns have either very little or no effect on electoral behavior of voters, rather electoral behavior is influenced by long term factors which shape up the political mindset. Moreover, political and economic stability determine the election outcome; they explain this argument as if the economy is going well in a particular era, that candidate may get the benefit and this has nothing to do with what candidates said or did during election campaigns. Contrary to the above, a study on the American presidential elections suggests that election campaigns have an impact, but may not be the primary one in determining electoral behavior, what happens before or during the election campaigns affect the election results (Holbrook, 1996; Campbell, 2000). However, the studies on US elections support this argument.Voting is considered the most important and crucial stage in the electoral process for political candidates and political parties; political campaigns are

designed to achieve maximum vote bank and every political party tries to get voters' favors by running successful election campaigns, and the results of these campaigns are seen more or less during elections.

People make their political choices based on some other psychological factors such as fear, aggression and selfishness. These factors collectively constitute voters' personality. However, whether this is about voters' personality or candidates' personality, both, affect voting choices of individuals. Aldemir & Bayraktaroğlu(2005) investigate the effects of personality traits of voters i.e. rule obedient, self-confident, innovative and reactive, ontheir associated voting behavior. They found that left party, right party and religious party voters tend to exhibit different personality traits. Personality of both, voters and their political leaders, determine voting preferences. Voters tend to find similarity between their personality and their preferred candidates' personality(Vecchione et al., 2011).In Pakistan, political parties are owned and led by few political families. Party leaders dominate the political parties and the leadership travels from one generation to the other in a family i.e. PML-N led by Sharif family and PPP led by Bhutto family (Shah et al., 2019). Shah et al., further investigated the effects of candidate's personality on voting preference of voters from the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and found a significant influence of personality traits,rather than political ideology and political programs of political parties and candidateson Pakistani voters(2019).

In addition, Political candidates used to be connected with their voters and supporter to disseminate party information using interactive media, which helped them in winning favors during elections. Liaqat et al.(2018) evaluated the impact of 'political candidate's connectedness' with their voters as compared to 'the provision of services' on the voting behavior of individuals and found that political candidate's connectedness is more likely to win more votes as compared to the services provided to voters in past.

Rational Choice Determinants of Voting Behavior and their Implications

In the Rational Choice Model, Downs posits that aggregate of public opinion is a building block of democracy and he further claims that electoral behavior can be investigated through voter's self-interest and rational choice (Downs, 1957). According to Downs model, rationality is the center point for both voters and political parties. It emphasizes that both the voters and the political parties act according to their own interests and needs. Political parties do not run election campaigns using amateur techniques but their main agenda is to seek prestige and to win ultimately power and this is possible only if political parties are able to convince their voters about their agenda and are able to win maximum votes. In turn voter's voting behavior demands rational satisfaction of their needs and interests from available political parties (1957).

Merril iii & Grofman (1999) in the book *'A Unified Theory of Voting: Directional and Proximity spatial Models'*,

184

state that voter's choice is based on voter's belief about the utility of the object, policy stance of the candidate, and evaluation of a candidate's policy stance by the voter. The involvement of voters in the electoral process is the basic and key measure to assess voting behavior.The scholarship discussed in rational choice theory is true in societies where true democratic values prevail; people are active members of the political process and vigilantly participate in political activities, and people not only think rationally but act rationally too. In a bi-partisan political scenario, it is very easy to deceive a voter by speech just before elections and then passing the rest of five years enjoying and working on their own interests and ignoring the interests of their voters. As a response to this disappointment, voters turn their focus on other political party repeating the same in the next election. We have witnessed this political deception for decades in Pakistan's political setup, where Pakistan Peoples' Party(PPP) and Pakistan Muslim League (PML) were the only two national-level political parties and have been overcoming power alternatively from 1988 to 2013, (PPP from November 1988 to August 1990; PML from October 1990 to April 1993; PPP from October 1993 to November 1996; PML from February 1997 to October 1999; PML-Q from October 2002 to October 2007; PPP from February 2008 to end of 2012)[3](Adeney, 2017; Hashim, 2013; asiasociety.org). Hence based upon this argument, the implication of rationality seems to become faded and rational voting behavior seems

---

[3]Online article can be accessed from Pakistan: a political timeline | Infographic News | Al Jazeera

workable to some extent in a bi-partisan political setup. However, Downs 'argument can be materialized when there are a number of options available to choose from.

Downs's standard rational choice model was adopted by many other scholars and implemented as an extension in their studies. Riker & Ordeshook(2009) took Down's idea to design a model for a voting decision whose primary assumption was that individuals vote when they think that their expected benefits from 'voting' are higher than their expected benefits from 'not voting'. Farber(2010) developed Rational Choice Model based upon Downs' standard model to analyze voting behavior in union representative elections. Using available data from elections 1972-2009, he found consistency in most of his findings with Downs' model. In addition, he suggests that over 80% of the individuals vote in the elections without considering that their vote will be pivotal and among others and the likelihood of voting increases when there is expected closeness in election results. Nevertheless, this argument also, cannot be ignored that an individual's voting behavior is influenced by the motivation that participation in the online campaign and electoral process will eventually make a difference and their vote can bring change (Delli Carpini, 2000). Establishing theoretical bases on the rational choice model, A. Chaudhry, (2018) analyzed the relationship of voting turnout with literacy, households' satisfaction with parties' service delivery, and households' economic perception as compared to previous years and found increasing voters' turnout with

increasing literacy and strong perception about economic betterment.

Empirically supporting the rational choice model, Dalton & Wattenberg(1993) suggest that voters' choice of a particular political candidate is influenced by rational thinking that the party's objectives should be compatible with their own. However, this seems not to be a rational approach in an economic sense,rather a political rationality. However, this is explained also as "semi-rationality" a blend of rational choices with psychological influences which are termed as "mental constructs (Visser, 1996, pp. 43–52). Merrill Iii & Grofman, (1999) also analyzed the electoral behavior of voters in terms of voters' preferences and candidates' strategy. They put bases of their analysis on Anthony Downs' Proximity Spatial Model, which describes need-based interdependence between decisions of political parties and of voters.McGann(2016)put great emphasize on rational choices of voters to strengthen democracy and to hold politicians accountable. He divides the implications of rational choice as individual voting choice and collective voting choice and concludes thatin case of individual voting, voters' choices are rational i.e. rationality based on voter's agreement with political party or on party's economic performance. However, in case of collective voting, voting preferences arelinked with political outcomes i.e. policy outcomes are the consequence of collective rationality. Lee et al.(2017)'s empirical findings also endorse rational choice model and suggest that voters are mostly rational but they make, sometimes, irrational decisions.

Downs's thesis seems to be very scholastic and based upon ground realities in most of the democratic political setups. Nevertheless, it was not exempt from criticism. For example, Blais et al.,based upon strong methodological grounds in his study, presented another scholarship. He states that half of the voters cast their votes without doing cost and benefit calculation, but they consider it a duty. And those who, even, do not consider it a duty does not pay attention to the cost and benefits of voting; hence rational choice model weakens (2000, pp. 181–201).

However, the argument, for example, partisanship influences the voting behavior of an individual when there is homogeneity in party affiliation and the policy proposals of a political party, can not be ignored (Harrop & Miller, 1987). They put the bases of political partisanship on rational choices of voters. It cannot be underestimated that if speech content, policy proposals, or even the candidate himself is entirely opposite to what a voter thinks about his interests and needs, then there is a greater tendency that a voter may go for an alternative political option. In this situation, however, we propose that the role of partisanship in voting behavior should be reevaluated in reference to the rational choice model. Nonetheless, the psychosocial model, at this point, takes a firm stand that, even in this scenario, this circumstantial and situational change in voting behavior will not change partisanship; hence, they keep their identity.

Conclusion

From the above analysis of many pieces of research, we conclude that caste and biradri still continue to occupy a very significant

place in the electoral process of rural areas in Pakistan. However, now it seems that the situation has a bit changed in urban areas because of the changing established social order or dominance, weakening influence of feudal lords, and because of the intervention and greater subversive power of mainstream media, in general, and social media, in particular, in creating awareness and undermining social evils. Political partisanship is a very strong determinant of voting behavior in political setup of Pakistan. Michelson (2003) determines that increased voters' turnout is observed under conditions when canvasser and other members of the group have the same ethnicity and political partisanship (a mix of sociological and psychological behavior).We, somehow, believe that generally, the voting behavior of an individual is an outcome of, more or less, the combination of all three models of voting behavior. By and large, the political personality of a voter is inclined towards sociological, psychosocial, and economic factors.

References:

Adeney, K. (2017). How to understand Pakistan's hybrid regime: the importance of a multidimensional continuum. *Democratization*, *24*(1), 119–137. https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2015.1110574

Ahmad, A., Bhatti, M. I., & Yousaf, F. N. (2020). Whom to Vote? Socio-Psychological Factors Influencing Voting Behavior in Rural Punjab, Pakistan. *Sir Syed Journal of Education & Social Research*, *Vol. 3*(Issue 2(April – June)).

Ahmad, Akhlaq, Bhatti, M., I., & Yousaf, F., F. (2020). Whom to Vote? Socio-Psychological Factors Influencing Voting Behavior in Rural Punjab, Pakistan. *Sir Syed Journal of Education & Social Research*, *3*(2), 9–15.

Ahmed, A. (2014). *Gender and Voting Behavior : A Study of Biradari Based Politics of Punjab*. *II*(8), 10187–10195.

Ahmed, M. (2008). Voting behaviour in rural and urban areas of Punjab. *Journal of Political Studies*, *14*(Winter), 45–56.

Akbar Leghari, M. F., Gillani, A. H., & Abbas, M. W. (2020). Modern Trends and Voting Behaviours in Politics of District Dera Ghazi Khan, Pakistan. *Global Regional Review*, *V*(I), 323–331. https://doi.org/10.31703/grr.2020(v-i).35

Akhtar, M. J. (2012). Elections of Pakistan and Response of Social Scientists: A Historiographical Survey of Theoretical Perceptions. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)*, *32*(2), 283–295. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/5c30/ded41a39823dea220fc5abf4e866f3dede04.pdf

Aldemir, C., & Bayraktaroğlu, G. (2005). *DETERMINING EFFECT OF PERSONALITY TRAITS ON VOTER BEHAVIOR USING FIVE FACTOR PERSONALITY INVENTORY 1 **. *5*(2).

Antunes, R. (2010). Theoretical models of voting behaviour. *Exedra*, *4*(June), 145–170.

Baxter, C. (1971). Pakistan Votes. *Asian Survey*, *Vol. 11*(No. 3), 197–218.

187

Berelson, B. R., Lazarsfeld, P. F., & McPhee, W. N. (1954). *Voting: A Study Of Opinion Formation In A Presidential Campaign*. University of Chicago Press.

Blais, André, Galais, C., & Coulombe, M. (2019). The effect of social pressure from family and friends on turnout. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *36*(9), 2824–2841. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407518802463

Blais, AndrÉ, Young, R., & Lapp, M. (2000). The calculus of voting: An empirical test. *European Journal of Political Research*, *37*(2), 181–201. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.00509

Bond, R. M., Fariss, C. J., Jones, J. J., Kramer, A. D. I., Marlow, C., Settle, J. E., & Fowler, J. H. (2012). A 61-million-person experiment in social influence and political mobilization. *Nature*, *489*(7415), 295–298. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11421

Bond, R. M., Settle, J. E., Fariss, C. J., Jones, J. J., & Fowler, J. H. (2017). Social Endorsement Cues and Political Participation. *Political Communication*, *34*(2), 261–281. https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2016.1226223

Burki, S. J., & Baxter, C. (1975). The Not So Simple Act of Voting. Socio-Economic Indicators of the People's Party Vote in the Punjab: A Study at the Tehsil Level. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, *Vol. 34*(No. 4), 913–930.

Butt, J., & Awang, M. (2017a). Intention for Voting IN PAKISTAN: THE role of Social Media, Ethnicity, and Religiosity. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, *4*(5), 1. https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v4i5.88

Butt, J., & Awang, M. (2017b). *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding Intention for Voting in Pakistan : the Role of Social Media , Ethnicity , and Religiosity*. 1–15.

Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., Miller, W. E., & Stokes, D. E. (1960). *The American voter*. John Wiley.

Chaudhry, A. (n.d.). *How Socio-Economic Conditions Affect Voting Turnouts in Pakistan ? A District-Level Analysis*. 0–20.

Chaudhry, A. G., Ahmed, A., Khan, S. E., & Hussain, S. (2014). Perception of Local Community and <i>Biradari</i> on <i>Panchayati</i>: An Exploratory Anthropological Study of <i>Biradari</i> in Village <i>Saroki</i>, District Gujranwala, Pakistan. *Advances in Anthropology*, *04*(02), 53–58. https://doi.org/10.4236/aa.2014.42008

Dalton, R. J., & Wattenberg, M. P. (1993). The Not So Simple Act of Voting. In A. Finifter (Ed.), *The state of the discipline* ((2nd ed.), pp. 193–218). American Political Science Association.

Delli Carpini, M. X. (2000). Gen.com: Youth, Civic Engagement, and the New Information Environment. *Political Communication*, *17*(4), 341–349. https://doi.org/10.1080/1058460005017

188

8942

Downs, A. (1957). *An Economic Theory of Democracy*.

Durre-E-Shawar, & Asim, M. (2012). Voting behavior of people towards different political parties in District Faisalabad, Pakistan. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *3*(2), 85–91. https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2012.v3n2.85

Edwards, K., Saha, L. J., & Print, M. (2006). *Report 3: Youth, the Family, and Learning about Politics and Voting*. 1–34.

Farber, H. S. (2010). *Rational Choice and Voter Turnout: Evidence from Union Representation Elections* (No. w16160).

Fogg, B. J., & Eckles, D. (2007). The behavior chain for online participation: How successful web services structure persuasion. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (Including Subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, *4744 LNCS*, 199–209. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-77006-0_25

Fogg, B. J., & Iizawa, D. (2008). Online persuasion in facebook and mixi: A cross-cultural comparison. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (Including Subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, *5033 LNCS*, 35–46. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-68504-3-4

Gelman, A., & King, G. (1993). Why Are American Presidential Election Campaign Polls So Variable When Votes Are So Predictable? A N D R E W G E L M A N A N D G A R Y K I N G *. *British Journal of Political Science*, *23*, 409–451.

Gidengil, E., Wass, H., & Valaste, M. (2016). Political Socialization and Voting: The Parent–Child Link in Turnout. *Political Research Quarterly*, *69*(2), 373–383. https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912916640900

Glasgow, G., & Alvarez, R. M. (2005). Voting behavior and the electoral context of government formation. *Electoral Studies*, *24*(2), 245–264. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2004.05.003

Haider, S. K. (2017). *Punjab Caste-System and Voting Behavior*.

Harrop, M., & Miller, W. L. (1987). *Elections and Voters: A Comparative Introduction*. Meredith Press.

Jacobson, G. C. (2015). How do campaigns matter? *Annual Review of Political Science*, *18*, 31–47. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-072012-113556

Jamil Ahmed, S., Syeda, S., Shahid, B., & Riffat, N. (2010). Voting Behavior and Elections in Pakistan (A case Study of Pakistani Election Methods and Methodology). *The Explorer Islamabad: Journal of Social Sciences*, *0132*(12), 449–456.

Jones, J. J., Bond, R. M., Bakshy, E., Eckles, D., & Fowler, J. H. (2017). Social influence and political mobilization: Further evidence from a randomized experiment in the 2012 U.S. presidential election. *PLoS ONE*, *12*(4),

189

1–9. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.01 73851

Katz, E., & Lazarsfeld, P. F. (1955). *Personal influence: the part played by people in the flow of mass communications*. Free Press.

Kennedy, C. H. (2016). *The Politics of Ethnicity in Sindh Author (s): Charles H . Kennedy Source : Asian Survey , Vol . 31 , No . 10 (Oct ., 1991), pp . 938-955 Published by : University of California Press Stable URL : http://www.jstor.org/stable/2645065 All use subject to*. 31(10), 938–955.

Kudrnáč, A., & Lyons, P. (2017). Parental Example as a Motivation for Turnout among Youths. *Political Studies*, 65(1_suppl), 43–63. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321716644 614

Lazarsfeld, P. F., Berelson, B., & Hazel, G. (1944). *The People's Choice How the Voter Makes Up His Mind in a Presidential Campaign*. Columbia University Press.

Lee, I. C., Chen, E. E., Yen, N. S., Tsai, C. H., & Cheng, H. P. (2017). Are we rational or not? The exploration of voter choices during the 2016 presidential and legislative elections in Taiwan. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8(OCT), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.017 62

Liaqat, A., Callen, M., Cheema, A., Naseer, F., & Shapiro, J. N. (2018). *Political Connections and Vote Choice :*

Lilleker, D. G., & Jackson, N. A. (2011). Das Internet im Wahlkampf. *Das Internet Im Wahlkampf*, 2003–2004. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-92853-1

Martin, N., & Picherit, D. (2020). Special issue: electoral fraud and manipulation in India and Pakistan. *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, 58(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/14662043.2020. 1700016

McGann, A. (2016). Voting Choice and Rational Choice. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*, August 2016, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/978019 0228637.013.79

Merrill Iii, S., & Grofman, B. (1999). *of Voting Proximity Spatial Models*. http://www.cup.org

Michelson, M. R. (2003). Getting out the Latino vote: How door-to-door canvassing influences voter turnout in rural Central California. *Political Behavior*, 25(3), 247–263. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:10251676073 69

Miller, W. E., & Shanks, J. M. (1996). *No TitleThe New American Voter*. Harvard University Press.

Nickerson, D. W. (2007). Does email boost turnout. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 2(4), 369–379. https://doi.org/10.1561/100.00007032

Palmer, N. D. (1975). *Elections and political development: The south Asian Experience*. Duke University Press.

Qorri, F. (2018). *The Psychology Behind Voting Behavior*. 22, 2–7.

Rais, R. B. (1985). Elections in Pakistan: Is Democracy Winning. *Asian Affairs*, *12 (3)*, 43–61.

190

Riker, W. H., & Ordeshook, P. C. (2009). A Theory of the Calculus of Voting Author (s): William H . Riker and Peter C . Ordeshook Source : The American Political Science Review , Vol . 62 , No . 1 (Mar ., 1968), pp . 25-42 Published by : American Political Science Association Stable URL : ht. *Political Science*, *62*(1), 25–42.

Sadiq, F., Karim, J., & Dildar, S. M. (2014). Biradrism As Stronger Determinant Of Voting Behavior; Exploring The Voting Behavior Of People Towards Different Political Parties During Election 2013 In District Layyah. *International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies*, *9*(4), 1773–1777.

Shah, H., Shah, Z., & Khattak, W. M. (2019). Candidates Personality and Voting Preferences in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. *Global Regional Review*, *IV*((I)), 29–42.

Sinclair, B., McConnell, M., & Michelson, M. R. (2013). Local Canvassing: The Efficacy of Grassroots Voter Mobilization. *Political Communication*, *30*(1), 42–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2012.737413

Sokhey, A. E., & McClurg, S. D. (2012). Social networks and correct voting. *Journal of Politics*, *74*(3), 751–764. https://doi.org/10.1017/S00223816120 00461

Tufail, S., Baneen, U., Akram, B., & Sajid, R. (2015). Impact of social media on political efficacy and vote intention: A case of educated youth. *Journal of Independent Studies & Research:*

Management & Social Sciences & Economics, *13*(1), 15–28. https://librarylink.uncc.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=117676323&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Vecchione, M., González Castro, J. L., & Caprara, G. V. (2011). No TitleVoters and leaders in the mirror of politics: Similarity in personality and voting choice in Italy and Spain. *International Journal of Psychology*, *46*(4), 259–270.

Visser, M. (1996). Voting: A Behavioral Analysis. *Behavior and Social Issues*, *6*(1), 23–34. https://doi.org/10.5210/bsi.v6i1.278

Waseem, M. (1994). *Politics and the State in Pakistan*. National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research.

Wilder, A. R. (1999). *The Pakistani Voter: Electoral Politics and Voting Behaviour in the Punjab*. Oxford University Press.

Ziring, L. (1977). Pakistan: The Campaign before the Storm. *Asian Survey*, *Vol. 17*(No. 7), 581–598.