

Social Affiliation and Prosociality on Electoral Behavior among Senior Non-Teaching Employees Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka

Nweke, K. O., Anazonwu, C.O., Ndigwe, B. C., Ajaegbu, D. C., & Cyril-Nwuche, O. F.
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2023.7011038>

Received: 30 December 2022; Accepted: 27 January 2023; Published: 04 December 2023

ABSTRACT

The current study looked at affiliation and pro-sociality as determinants in electoral behavior among senior non-teaching employees at Nnamdi Azikiwe University in Awka. For the study, a total of 138 volunteers were chosen at random (males made up 30 percent of the total, and females made up 70 percent). Data was gathered using the electoral behavior and the prosocial behavior scales. Both scales were valid and reliable instruments, and the third variable (social affiliation) was demographically evaluated. The data were analyzed using the multiple regression analysis, enter method. In hypothesis one, Social Affiliation predicted electoral behavior with $F(1,137) = 8.11, p < .05$ and beta value = 2.89, $p < .05$, while in hypothesis two, pro-sociality predicted electoral behavior with $F(2,131) = 5.86, p > .01$ and unstandardized beta values = .13, $p < .05$, however, the interaction effect between social affiliation and prosocial behavior was not significant. It was recommended that contestants should seek electorates that share similar sociological inclinations with them, such as religion, ethnicity, and other social groups at the onset of electoral activities.

Keywords: Social Affiliation, Electoral Behavior, Prosociality, Employees

INTRODUCTION

An election is a method by which citizens elect their representatives using methods established by the constitution (Bello-Iman, 2015). In this view, group leaders are formed in such a way that followers can participate in decision-making through the electoral process. For example, at Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka just ended the senior employee election. The procedure took place over a set amount of time. Contestants had the opportunity to canvass senior administrative staff for votes. As a result, people who lost the election expressed their displeasure in a variety of ways afterward. The election officials and the winners were accused of rigging the election. In this context, the researcher is inspired to investigate the impact of social affiliation and pro-sociality on electoral behavior among federal university senior non-teaching staff in Anambra state.

The current history of the academic study of election behavior, according to Bartels (2010), began immediately before 1940. As a result, many electoral behavior studies have garnered more attention than others (Hutchings & Jefferson, 2018). Similarly, scholars have defined electoral behavior as citizens' efforts to comply with social norms, particularly when their compliance is monitored publicly (Panagopoulos, 2010), during moments of intense competition for control of the government and its resources (Birvatu, Galle, Berge, Miguel, Posner, Tungodden, and Zhang), a civil right in democratic governance (Sindermann, Mottus, Rozgonjuk & Montag, 2021), and the summoning of voters to poll (Gerzia & da Silva, 2021), in a democratic system, and a key feature of public political engagement (Mashud & Amin, 2020). The researcher defines electoral behavior by these characteristics as proof of a citizen's right to change in democratic governance.

Electoral behavior academics have used a variety of theoretical approaches to better comprehend the concept of voting behavior. For example, according to Antunes (2010) and Mahsud & Amin (2020), there are three models of election behavior: sociological, psychological, and rational choice theory. Similarly, the

vast majority of scholars focused on the consequences of electoral behavior, including increased well-being (De Neve, Ungar, & Eichstaedt, 2021; Dolan, Metcalfe, & Powdhlavee, 2008), increased health needs (Fernandez-Navia, polo-Muro, & Tercero-Lucas, 2021), increased structural divisions in political support, and economic development (Herodowicz, Konecka Szydiowska, Churski & Perdal, 2021). There has been a slew of studies on electoral behavior, including a large-scale replication field experiment (Gerber, Huber, & Fang, 2020), field experiment technique (Panangopoulos, 2010), lab in-the-field-experiment Bjorvatn et al (2013), social exchange theory (Gong, Ye, Liu, Yu & Yan, 2021), and the Generalized linear model (Khalvati, Brooks, Reinecke, Rao (2022). Ben-Bassat and Dahan (2011) discovered a link between electoral behavior and social identity (a positive component of social affiliation).

The concept of “social affiliation” refers to a person’s relationship with the group to which he or she belongs. With the development of human civilization, social attachment arose. Social attachment arose as soon as societies around the world began to live in groups. According to Uhlaner (1989), social affiliation is consistent with the group membership hypothesis. Scholars argue that as the wealth gap widens, social and economic institutions, as well as neighborhood and individual material resources – education, food, entertainment, and leisure possibilities – all serve to build barriers between individuals from relatively upper and lower socioeconomic origins (Ridgeway, 2014).

As a result, a group’s members appear to support group decisions (in-group favoritism). As a result, it is critical that whatever social rank one attains becomes a reality. In this view, social affiliation becomes a form of identification through which individuals are rooted in objectively valued social resources like income and education, as well as subjective perceptions of rank about others (Kraus, 2012). As a result, there is a psychological drive to survive as members unite mentally to achieve this common aim. Scholarship, on the other hand, has focused on other aspects of social affiliation, such as how social affiliation influences general behavior, connects people, and promotes closeness, how power and affiliation promote achievement pride, self-affiliation and academic achievement, religious affiliation, and academic performance, and cultural affiliation and academic performance. (Gump & Kulik, 1997, Buechner, 2019, Ajunwo, 2018, Corpus, 2022, Alexitch, 2010).

At this time, it seems that no research has been done on the relationship between social affiliation and voting behavior. However, other researchers have looked into related concepts such as local ties (Schulte-Close & Bauer, 2021), territorial identities and sentiments of local belonging behavior (Fitzgerald, 2018), and political partisanship (Schulte-Close & Bauer, 2021). (Billings et al, 2021). Galen, Gore, and Shults (2021) discovered a link between prosociality and social affiliation.

Definitions of pro-sociality abound in the literature. According to some authors, prosociality is a state in which citizens try to comply with social norms, especially when compliance is monitored and publicity is disclosed (Panagopoulos, 2010), a voluntary belief in which an individual is willing to devote time, energy, and resources to benefit others, including group and society (Eisenberg-Elson et al, 2020; Thielmann, et al, 2010), and feelings or perceptions of connection toward strangers that promote and sustain health (Eisenberg, 1988). Pro-sociality is defined by the researcher in this study as an individual’s ability to selflessly support others without demanding immediate or future benefits. Finally, the current study hypothesizes that social affiliation and prosociality will have a significant effect on the study participants’ electoral behavior.

Statement of the Problem

The favorable association between different ethnic and inter-racial societies on electoral behavior among residents of a country was revealed by scholarship (Satriadi, Yusuf, & Ali, 2021; Adebisi, 2021; Ben-Bassat & Dahan, 2011). What is not clear is whether there is a link between social affiliation and voting behavior. Furthermore, previous researchers looked into the link between prosocial conduct and election outcomes

(Gender et al, 2020; Runhago, & Reuter, 2021; Gong et al; 2021; Taylor, et al; 2018; Barragan et al, 2021, Cutler et al, 2021). The relationship between prosociality and electoral behavior among the study participants is unknown. Furthermore, no evidence of an interaction link between social affiliation and prosociality and electoral behavior has been found in the literature. The current research was motivated by these information gaps.

Theoretical Framework

Ajzen's theory of planned behavior served as the study's theoretical foundation (1991). As a result, attitudes, personality traits, subjective standards, and perceived behavioral control may all influence electoral behavior (which is a goal-directed behavior). The authors of this paper argue that people can transcend subjective standards by developing a positive attitude toward electoral behavior, depending on their personality types. As a result of this, they might be able to start arranging electoral actions. Other independent variable theories were rejected because they did not satisfy the prerequisites for a theoretical explanation of electoral behavior individually or collectively.

The effect of skin tone, race, ethnicity, and intergroup preferences on interpersonal judgments and voting behavior was investigated by Chirco and Buchanan (2022). The study's findings show that participants with a negative attitude were less likely to vote for underrepresented black candidates than those with a positive attitude and that lighter skin tone predicted voting behavior. A study on social identity and voting behavior was published by Ben-Bassat and Dahan (2011). The results show that group size and voter turnout have an inverted-u shape connection (Borderline significance). To improve public political engagement in Indonesia, Satriadi, Yusuf, and Ali (2021) published a study on voter behavior. People vote based on sociological considerations, according to the findings (ethnicity, religion, family). Adebisi (2021) presented findings from a study on voting patterns and the 2019 general election in Nigeria. The results of the descriptive analysis demonstrated that psychological factors such as ethnic concerns and party identification influenced voting patterns in the 2019 general elections in Nigeria. A study on local candidates, place-based identities, and political performance was published by Schulte-Cloos & Bauer (2021). Even when local candidates are not competitive, the results reveal that voters have a considerable tilt in favor of them. A study by Billings, et al., (2021) looked at the long-term consequences of ethnic diversity in schools on political identification. According to the findings, a ten percent increase in the number of minorities in a white student's assigned school reduced their likelihood of registering as a Republican by 12%. As a result, schools play a key role in fostering partisanship in children. A study on the political determinants of voting behavior in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan, was published by Badshah, Reliman, and Muhammad (2018). The study discovers a link between voting behavior and political party affiliation, party leadership affiliation, and party ideology.

Voting behavior is unaffected by small linguistic cues: evidence from a psychologically realistic replication, according to Gerber, Huber, and Fang (2020). During the 2016 presidential election, the researchers conducted a large-scale, pre-registered replication field experiment. The findings revealed that noun and verb phrasing (components of prosociality) did not affect electoral behavior. A study on elections and selfishness was published by Bjorvatn, Galle, Berge, Miguel, Posner, Tungodden, and Zhang (2013). A total of 1000 people from Kenya and Tanzania took part in the study. Selfishness (a component of negative prosociality) was found to be a factor in the study when individuals are primed with election thoughts, negative prosociality increases. Tell me whom you vote for, and I will tell you who you are. according to Grunhage and Reuter (2021).

The relationship between political ideology and personality and prosocial behavior, as well as the potential for evolutionary techniques. The findings demonstrate a favorable link between political orientation (a component of electoral behavior) and the human condition (prosociality). How can social currency influence prosocial behavior, according to Gong, Ye, Liu, Yu, and Yan (2021)? The importance of collective self-esteem and the heterogeneity of communication networks. The study used 497 We chat user questionnaires

as participants. In a separate study, the results show that social currency (a positive component of electoral behavior) is positively connected with prosocial behavior. Taylor, et al., (2018) published a study that looked at the impact of political conflict on teenage pro-social behavior trajectories: implications for civic involvement. A total of 999 adolescents aged 10 to 20 years old took part in the study. The findings revealed that pro-social behavior patterns were positively related to later political engagement (a component of electoral behavior). Areal (2021) published a study on the impact of personality traits, cooperative behavior, and government trust on the outcome of the Brexit referendum. The readiness to work with others was linked to a lower likelihood of voting for Brexit, according to the findings. Voters' personality profiles, pro-social behavior, and perspectives on trust in politicians/government institutions, as well as socio-demographic characteristics, were studied. Positive affect and positive orientation play a role. An intense longitudinal study design was used to collect data for the investigation, which included seven daily measures on a sample of 181 students and 119 daily observations. Personality factors predict pro-social behavior, according to the findings.

In a related study, Barragan, et al., (2021) reported a study on identifying with all humanity (a component of prosociality) predicts cooperative health behaviors (a component of electoral behaviors) and helpful responses during Covid-19. The data for the study was gathered from a global online study of 2,537 people who participated in four WHO-recommended health behaviors and four moral dilemmas connected to pandemics. Prosociality was found to be a significant predictor of electoral behavior. In a related study, Cutler Nitschke, Lamm, and Lockwood et al. (2021) found that elderly persons around the world have enhanced prosocial behavior while simultaneously having higher in-group preferences (a component of electoral behavior). A total of 46,576 participants aged 18 to 99 years old from 67 countries took part in the study. Age was found to be a favorable predictor of prosociality. Tell me whom you vote for, and I'll tell you who you are, according to Grunhage and Reuter (2021). The relationship between political inclination and personality and pro-social behavior, as well as the validity of evolutionary techniques. The findings show that political orientation is deeply rooted in human nature.

Hypotheses

Having explored the above-related concepts, theories, and empirical works concerning dependent and independent variables, the following hypotheses were formulated to guide the study:

1. Social affiliation will significantly predict electoral behavior among senior non-teaching employees of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.
2. Prosociality will significantly predict electoral behavior among senior non-teaching employees of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.
3. There will be a significant interaction effect between social affiliation and pro-sociality on electoral behavior among senior non-teaching employees of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

METHOD

A total of 138 participants from a randomly selected university in Anambra state volunteered for the study. Using a simple random sample method, one federal institution was randomly selected among two federal universities in Anambra state to participate in the study (deep stick). Nnamdi Azikiwe University in Awka was the university chosen at random. The participants ranged in age from 23 to 62 years old, with a mean age of 36.6992 years and a standard deviation of 7.9467 years. Females made up 70% of the participants, while males made up 30%. There were 105 (76.1%) married people, 31 (22.5%) single people, 1 (0.7%) separated people, and 1 (0.7%) widowed people among the participants. Additionally, 133 (96.4%) were Christians, 3 (2.2%) were Muslims, and 2 (1.4%) were neither Christians nor Muslims. 1 (0.7%) of participants had a senior secondary certificate, 3 (2.2%) had an ordinary national diploma (OND), 6 (4.3%)

had a National Certificate of Education (NCE), and 128 (92.8%) had a Bachelor of Science, Higher National Diploma, or Masters. Furthermore, 122 (88.4%) of the participants were registered voters, whereas 16 (11.6%) were not. In addition, 27 (19.6) people were registered as members of a political party, regardless of which party they belonged to. In addition, 71 (51.5%) were members of a social group, whereas 67 (48.6%) were not. One hundred and eight people (66.3%) were members of religious organizations, whereas 30 people (21.7%) were not.

Nweke et al (2022) developed the electoral behavior scale (EBS). The electoral behavior scale is a seven-item scale that assesses several facets of people's electoral activities. Items on the electoral behavior scale are measured on five Likert scale dimensions, such as strongly agree-5, to strongly disagree – 1. Some of the items on the scale include: within the past 12 months, I have frequently volunteered for political organizations, and within the past 12 months I have frequently voted. Nweke et al (2022) reported an alpha coefficient of .86. Electoral behavior was positively connected with the life satisfaction scale ($r=.030$, $p < .05$), the indicator of self-esteem ($r = .49$, $p < .05$), organizational frustration ($r = -.45$, $p < .05$), and the trait anxiety inventory ($r = -.32$, $p < .05$).

Social affiliation was demographically measured. Thus, participants were requested to provide information about their status with any social group. Therefore, the question was “are you a registered member of any social group?”. The answer to the question was dichotomous (yes or no). Response to this revealed that 71(51.5%) answered yes, while 67 (48.6%) were not.

The prosocial Behavior Scale was developed by Afolabi (2013) to measure prosocial behaviors among undergraduates. The PBS is a 12-item scale. The response pattern is a 5point Likert format which ranged from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree. Examples of the items include: “I enjoy helping others”, and “I do things that make others happy”. Items on the PBS are positively scored except items 2 and 9 which are reversed scored. Afolabi (2013) reported a 0.81 Cronbach alpha coefficient and .77 test-retest and .72 split-half reliability among the Nigerian sample. The scale has been used by different authors in different works within the country (Onyenecho & Afolabi,2018; Afolabi, 2014).

For the study, the researchers conducted a random sample of federal universities in Southeast Nigeria, and Nnamdi Azikiwe University was selected. Furthermore, the sample of the study was obtained by applying the Smiths (2013) determination of sample size formula. Furthermore, a proposal for the study was sent to the humanities and ethics committee for approval. With a copy of the introduction letter in hand, the researchers met with the Registrar of Nnamdi Azikiwe University for a formal introduction in which the researchers' goals were revealed. The researchers were permitted to conduct the study, with the request that relevant administrative heads assist as necessary. During the lunch break, the researchers visited several offices in Administration Building A&B. The researchers formally introduced themselves to the senior non-teaching personnel, handed out questionnaires, and explained how to fill them out to the respondents. Some participants, needed extra time (a day or two) to answer the questionnaire due to restricted break time, tight work schedules, and the huge number of participants to be covered. To such participants, their requests were granted. Two hundred and ninety-five questionnaires were delivered to eight administrative block A units, five administrative block B units, and four faculty departments including the dean's office, of social and management sciences Only 133 questions were properly filled, 127 were not returned, and 35 were incorrectly filled after the questionnaires were collected. Thus, only 133 senior civil service employees who were correctly filled were used for data analysis. A correlation design was used in this investigation. The descriptive, zero-order correlation, and multiple linear regression enter methods were used to analyze the data. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22.0 was used to manage the data.

RESULTS

The focus of this chapter is results analysis. The presentation will assume the following order: table 1 Zero-

order correlation coefficient, and table 2, the standardized beta coefficient results for social affiliation, prosociality, and electoral Table.

Table 1: Zero-order correlation Matrix using the raw data

		1	2	3
1	Electoral behaviour	1		
2	Social affiliation	-.24**	1	
3	Prosociality	.13*	0.11	1

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 1 reveals the zero-order correlation coefficient of the studied variables. There was a significant negative correlation between social affiliation and electoral behavior at $r = -.24, p < .05$, and a positive correlation between electoral behavior and prosociality at $r = .13, p < .05$.

Table 2: Standardized beta Coefficient results for independent effects of social affiliation and prosociality on electoral behavior.

Predictor variable	Adjusted R ²	Df1(df2)	F		Std. Error
Model 1 EB	0.051	1(131)	8.11*	2.89	1.015
Model 2 EB	0.069	2(131)	5.86*	0.13	0.065
Model 3 EB	0.070	3(131)	4.32	0.151	0.137

Model 1 in Table 2 shows that hypothesis one was significant, (F -ratio) shows that the adjusted R^2 values was significant at $F(1,137) = 8.11, p < .05$, specifically, the unstandardized beta coefficient value was $\beta = 2.89, p < .05$. In the second model, adjusted $R^2 = .069$, which means that the model contributed 6.9% to understanding of electoral behavior. The ANOVA summary, (F -ratio) shows that the adjusted R^2 values were significant at $F(2,131) = 5.86, p < .01$. specifically, the unstandardized beta values $\beta = .13, p < .05$. And the third model (interaction effect between social affiliation and prosociality) showed that adjusted $R^2 = .07$, which means that the model contributed 7% to the understanding of electoral behavior. The ANOVA summary, (F -ratio) shows that the adjusted R^2 values were significant at $F(3,129) = 4.32, p > .05$, the unstandardized beta coefficient $\beta = .15, p > .05$.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The study looked at social affiliation and pro-sociality as determinants of electoral behavior among Nnamdi Azikiwe University’s senior non-teaching workers in Awka. The findings supported hypotheses 1 and 2, but not hypotheses 3. The first hypothesis claimed that the study participants’ social affiliation would predict their electoral behavior. The findings were backed up by previous research (Chirco & Buchanan, 2022; Satriadi et al 2021; Adebisi, 2021). The identification hypothesis was confirmed by the results of this research. Furthermore, social interactions among individuals belonging to the same ethnic, religious, racial, or other social groupings were found to predict electoral votes and other political activities. It went on to demonstrate that these socialization processes have a significant impact on logical thinking and mental processes, even when the candidate appears to be unprepared. As a result, according to Tagfel (1986), the cause for ingroup favoring. According to Afzen (1991), the theory of planned behavior reveals an understanding of the observed association. According to Ajzen (1991), attitude and personality qualities have an indirect impact on one another. For example, people from the same sociological background may

have comparable perspectives on environmental issues.

As a result, individuals may begin to appreciate and comprehend social challenges. As a consequence, their attitudes become increasingly similar. As a result, people's likes and dislikes of such situations appear to be consistent. On this hypothesis, cognition has the potential to influence aspects of personality. According to the theory of planned behavior, such a relationship can impact subjective norms, whereas positive feelings (attitude) can influence individual norms. As a result, those with a positive attitude may be able to overcome problems posed by the subjective norm. As a result, this may lead to a sense of behavioral control. Individuals within the same social nexus begin to make strategies for how and when to participate in electoral behavior at this point. As a result, Nnamdi Azikiwe University's senior non-teaching personnel are more likely to engage in electoral behavior. Pro-sociality was found to be a predictor of electoral behavior among study participants in hypothesis two. Previous research backs up the findings of the current study (Gerber, et al, 2020; Gong et al 2021). Pro-sociality is an important driver of electoral behavior, according to this research. The recognition that electoral behavior can be attributed as helpful behavior makes sense. As a result, it has evolved into a form of social welfare that pursues the greater good of society. The idea of planned behavior, on the other hand, explains the results of the experiment. For example, there are several shades of opinion about electoral behavior. Some may regard it as a tool for better behavior, while others may see it as a setting for uncultured individuals, and still, others may see it in a variety of ways. Whatever component of the individual's perception becomes reality, the baseline is that attitude will predict higher prosocial tendencies if it rises, and the baseline is what attitude toward electoral activity will indicate higher prosocial tendencies if it rises. As a result, by the notion of planned behavior's dual impact. Pro-sociality can be thought of as a personality trait. As a result, both attitude and pro-sociality have a reciprocal influence. As a result, the ability to transcend subjective norms and raise the feeling of behavioral control will be determined by a greater attitude leading to increased pro-sociality. As a result, individuals are more likely to make concessions in their electoral behavior.

The interaction effect of social affiliation and pro-sociality on electoral behavior, on the other hand, was not significant. As a result, this finding will necessitate further investigation to determine the mediator responsible for such an effect. To that end, such a result could be the product of some unrelated variables interfering with the combined effects of the two independent variables, which already predicted electoral behavior independently.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

1. It was recommended that contestants should seek electorates that share similar sociological inclinations with them, such as religion, ethnicity, and other social groups at the onset of electoral activities.
2. It was recommended that contestants should find ways to develop sociological factors with non-ethnic before engaging with electoral processes to enhance electoral partisans.
3. Contestants should demonstrate elements of pro-sociality before the electoral activities to earn the trust of the electorates before the electoral processes.

According to the researcher, more research is needed to determine the generalizability of the current findings to larger groups. Other studies could look into the mediator in the outcome of the current study's interaction effect, specifically to figure out why both social affiliation and pro-sociality fail to predict electoral behavior. The implications of the study are as follows: Social affiliation is a significant and positive predictor of electoral behavior among the study participants. The study appears to be the very first among participants in a federal university. Pro-sociality is a positive and significant predictor of electoral behavior. The interaction effect between social affiliation and pro-sociality failed concerning present participants.

CONCLUSION

Previous research looked at other concepts related to electoral behavior through the lens of rational choice theory and social exchange theory. The theory of planned behavior was used to investigate the concept of electoral behavior in this study. The impacts of social connection and pro-sociality on senior non-teaching workers at Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, were investigated. The findings showed that social affiliation and pro-sociality both predicted electoral behavior independently, but there was no interaction impact. Conditional processes, according to the researcher, may be to blame for the fall in the interaction effect.

REFERENCES

1. Adebisi, O.M. (2021). Voting pattern, Nigeria's 2019 general election humanities, arts, and social sciences studies, 21.
2. Ajunwo 2018. Relationship among self-affiliation, social maturity and academic achievement among business students in Rivers State University. *International journal of innovative social and science education research* 6(3):42-51. www.seahpai.org.
3. Antunes (2010). Theoretical models of voting behavior
4. Badshah, L., Rehman, A.U., & Muhammad, N. (2018). Political determinants of voting behavior in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *Liberal Arts and Social Sciences International Journal*, 2(1): 1-10.
5. Bartels (2010) The Study of Electoral Behavior DOI:1093/OXFORDHB/9780199235476. 003.0014
6. Ben-Bassat, A. & Dahan, M. (2011). Social identity and voting behavior. *Public choice*,
7. Billings, S.B., Chyn, E. & Haggag, K. (2021). The long-run effects of school racial diversity on political identity. *AER: INSIGHT*, 3 (3): 267-284.
8. Carol & Randall 2002. The development of a measure of prosocial behaviors for late adolescents. *Journal of youth and adolescence*. Doi:10.1023/A:1014033032440.
9. Chiro, P. & Buchanan, T.M. (2022). Dark faces in white spaces: the effect of skin tone race, ethnicity, and intergroup preferences on interpersonal judgments and voting behavior. *Analysis of social issues and public policy*, 22 (1): 427-447.
10. Costas Panagopoulos (2010). Affect, Social Pressure and Prosocial Motivation: Field Experimental Evidence of the Mobilizing Effects of Pride, Shame and Publicizing Voting Behavior. *Political Behavior*32(3):369-386
11. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.36902/sjesr-vol3-iss3-2020\(65-73\)](https://doi.org/10.36902/sjesr-vol3-iss3-2020(65-73)). DOI:1007/s11109-010-9114-0
12. Dolan, Metacalfe & powdhavee (2008) Electing Happiness: Does Happiness Affect Voting And Do Elections Affect Happiness?
13. Dolan, Metacalfe & powdhavee (2008) Electing Happiness: Does Happiness Affect Voting And Do Elections Affect Happiness?
14. Fitzgerald, J. (2018). Close to home: local ties and voting radical rights in Europe. *Cambridge studies public opinion and political psychology*. Cambridge London: Cambridge university press.
15. Gallen, Gore & Shults (2021). Modeling the effects of religious belief and affiliation on prosociality. Doi:10.5334/snr.128.
16. Gong, ye, lu, yu and Yan 2021. How Does Social Currency Influence Prosocial Behavior? The Role of Collective Self-Esteem and Communication Network Heterogeneity
17. Herodowicz, Konecka-Szydłowska, Churski & Perdał Political Divisions and Socio-Economic Disparities in Poland: A Geographical Approach DOI:10.3390/su132413604
18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2021.102012>
19. <https://www.york.ac.uk/media/economics/documents/discussionpapers/2008/0830.pdf>
20. Hutchings, V. L. & Jefferson, H. J. (2018). The sociological and social-psychological approaches. In J. Fisher, E. Fieldhouse, M. N. Franklin, R. Gibson, M. Cantijoch, & C. Wlezien (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Elections, Voting Behaviour, and Public Opinion* (pp. 21-29).

21. Kraus, Piff, Rhein.schmidt, Mendoza-denton & keltner 2012. Social class, solipsism and Contextualism: how therich are different from the poor. Doi: 10.1037/a0028756
22. Matthew P. H. Kan Leandre R. Fabrigar,(2017). Theory of Planned Behavior **DOI:** https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-28099-8_1191-1.
23. Navi, polo muro, & TerceroLucasa 2021. Too Afraid to Vote? The Effect Of COVID-19 On Voting Behavior. *European Journal of Political Economy*. elsevier.com/locate/ejpe
24. Noor Hamid Khan Mshud & Husnul Amin (2020). Theoretical Approaches to the study of voting Behavior: A comparative Analysis. *Sir Syed Journal of Education & Social Research*
25. Nweke, K.O., Ndigwe, B.C., Ajaegbu, D.C., Udemezue, D.N. (2022). Nexus between personality traits and electoral behavior of senior-non-teaching-employees of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. *Nigerian Journal of Social Psychology* 5(2).
26. Rideway (2014). why status matter for inequality. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122413515997>. Sage journals
27. Satriiddi, Y., Yusuf, S. & Ali, S. (2021). Understanding the voter's behavior as an effort to increase public political participation in Indonesia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Science*, 2:960-972.
28. Schulte-Cloose, J. & Bauer, P.C (2021). Local candidates' place-based identities, and electoral success. *Political behavior*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/511109-21-09712-y>.
29. September 2021 | <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.672505>
30. Sindermann, Möttus, Rozgonjuk & Montag(2021) Predicting current voting intentions by Big Five personality domains, facets, and nuances – A random forest analysis approach in a German sample. [io/gwkn4/ DOI:10.31219/osf.io/795xd](https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/795xd)
31. Twenge, Baumeister, Dewart, Natalie & Bartels (2007). Social exclusion decreases prosocial behavior. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.56.
32. Uhlaner, C.J. (1989). Rational turnout is the neglected role of groups. *American Journal of Political Science Studies*, 21.
33. Yildiz, Senel & Sahan 2015. The relationship between prosocial and anti-social behaviors in sports, general self- efficacy &academic self-efficacy: study in department of physical education & sport teacher education. *Journal of human sciences*. Doi:10.14687/ijhs.v12i2.3202.