

Why People Do Not Vote? Major Influencing Factors

A Case Study of Islamabad

Muhammad Imran Khan¹, Raheel² and Anwar Shah³

<https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2021.10.4.2>

Abstract

This study aims to examine the reasons and factors that influence non-voting intentions of individuals living in Islamabad. The study has collected the data through questionnaires, where 200 respondents as a sample size is included. The study has used binary logistic regression model as the dependent variable was in binary form. The study revealed that there is a significant relation between age of respondents and vote casting intentions but there is no relationship between distance and vote casting intentions, but displaced individuals are not intended to cast their vote as they can't manage the time due to schedule conflict. Higher level income community is also not intended to vote because of high opportunity cost. Finally, the study found that trust on system is highly significant to generate willingness to vote for election 2018.

Keywords: Trust on System, Voter Turnout, Voting Intentions, Election

1. Introduction

Democracy is the form of government in which the power is exercised by the people. The power may be directly exercised or indirectly exercised. Indirectly exercised means the people elect the representatives and then these representatives represent them in national or provincial assembly (Merriam Webster). Democracy traces back its roots in the city of Athens back to 3rd century B.C, which transferred to Rome. For four hundred years Rome practiced the embryonic form of democracy till the death of Julius Caesar in 44 B.C. After the arrival of Islam, another form of democracy was practiced, where a group of learned (Shora) functioned as the Electoral College. The modern democracy bases its foundation on the traditions of these civilizations, but it was England where democracy find a fertile ground to nourish and establish as a modern institution.

Magna Carta was the first signed document between the governed and the governors in 1210 and can rightly be called the first step towards democracy in England. The efforts of Cromwell in mid 17th century towards democratization were pushed back by the restoration of monarchy in 1660 by Charles II. The United States of America was the first state implement democracy in the late 18th century but it kept restricted its electoral college only to white landed gentry. The landmark step toward democracy was the adoption of the principle of Universal Adult Franchise which formally began during the era of Queen Victoria in England. Although elections are the very core of every democracy, but an ideal democracy involves much more than direct participation by citizens in public decision making. It is very commonly perceived, that weak democracy is better than an authoritative regime in which they can elect their decision makers and can get rid of them if they dislike, what they do. Any evaluation of democracy must

¹ Ph.D Scholar at AERC Karachi and Associated with Department of Environmental Economics, PIDE Islamabad, Email: bangash_imran@yahoo.com

² National Saving Office Islamabad and Associated with PIDE School of Public Policy, Islamabad

³ Assistant Professor, School of Economics at Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad



include a careful examination and monitoring of its electoral system that how it works and operates. In democracy, population can still influence the decisions to vote based on unknown factors, which are investigated in case of Islamabad. Pakistan is lacking behind in the potential capacity of voter's willingness to strengthen the existing democracy. Although there are several reasons behind the non-voting behaviour of citizens, but it is also very important question that why exactly people do not want to vote, either on national level or at local level.

The study focuses on the reasons behind non-voting behaviour of citizen. It is very critical to study that, either trust on institutions effect citizens intentions to vote or not or the perception about candidate, which is important for voters to cast his/her vote. If the person has positive perception about candidate, he/she will vote for him no matter, which party he is representing, how much the person is educated? A sizable number of individuals in every city do not want to vote due to hidden and un-investigated factors. It is very important for the strengthening of democracy to walk into their streets and ask them why they do not prefer to vote or participate in elections. It simply indicates that government could use this document to know the hidden perceptions of society behind non-voting intentions in capital of the nation.

Table no 1.1 shows that Islamabad has the lowest male vote percent among all the given locals, but Islamabad has the highest vote turnover of 62 percent (ECP, 2013). Despite the fact female vote percentage is highest in Islamabad, which is quite logical, still every second person is not intended to vote in election 2018, which is reasonable and important to examine through a systematic research project.

Table 1.1: Registered Vote in Pakistan

Province / Area	Male Vote %	Female Vote %	Total Vote	Voter Turnout 2013
Islamabad	54	46	695202	62%
Punjab	56	44	55821522	60%
KPK	57	43	14016571	45%
Sindh	55	45	20644304	54%
Baluchistan	58	42	3702440	43%
Fata	62	38	2142552	36%

Source: Election Commission of Pakistan 2017

1.1 Influencing Factors Behind Non-Voting Behaviour

There are several important factors for willingness to vote which influence the vote casting. Vote casting is influenced by many potential factors. Education of the voter can be a tool for voters to let him/her decide more effectively the choice for suitable candidate and political party. Many voters even do not know the city and location of polling station before the election period. Education may also help in reducing the cost of vote casting in terms of finding more convenient transport facility. Education can also realise the value of vote, which can affect willingness to vote of the ¹person.

Furthermore, trust² on institutions also affect the vote casting. Distance from polling station is also important for anyone to express his/her willingness to vote. Most of the time people migrate or live out of their cities, provinces and countries who cannot manage to run back for the only purpose to cast the vote. The benefits of vote casting are also not determined in

¹ The person means, the respondent.

² Example of study, which has used trust as an important factor for vote casting and turn out. Carreras, M., & İrepoğlu, Y. (2013). Trust in elections, vote buying, and turnout in Latin America. *Electoral Studies*, 32(4), 609-619.

Pakistan. Sometime wage workers do not prefer to cast their vote because of the opportunity cost it takes. These all-important issues are beyond the policy reach in many places of the country. However, the factors like party affiliation, reputation of candidate nominated for the seat, and income level of the person defines the vote casting behaviour.

Democracy in Pakistan is back by the evidences, which has gain several attentions and recognition worldwide that among most of the Muslim countries in developing world, Pakistan has shown one of better performance, where people have shown strength and some energy to accept the system of a democratic legislative system. It is through popular mass movements' established condemnation of military authoritarianisms. A persistent feature of Pakistani culture, history and politics has been an aspiration for democracy.

Democracy is still existing despite ethnic, social class, religious cleavages, strong authoritarian tendencies and prolonged military rule [Shafqat, S. (1998)]. The impact of cultural and structural conditions don't count much weigh profoundly alongside for the promotion of representative government processes and institutions in Pakistan [Taylor (1995); Embree (1987); Gardezi (1983); Jalal and Ayesha (1995)]. In past literature gaps are still observable to investigate the influencing factors, which contributes to voters vote casting intentions. This relation can be seen as the people with low income level are restricted to avail more sources of learning about election "or" it can be said as, the people with low income level are less exposed to election process, this can decline the voting rate and on the other hand perhaps more wealthy people perceive that they have a greater interest at stake in elections or have to make greater losses.

1.2 Research Question

1. What factors are restricting people from vote casting in Islamabad?
2. Do trust on institutions and Perception about incompetency of candidate affect voting intentions of individuals in Islamabad?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

1. To examine the role of Education, Location, Income, Trust, and Perception about incompetency of candidate, and distance in vote casting at Islamabad.

1.4 Statement of the Problem

This study deals with a specific issue regarding people, who do not vote. This is a serious issue that a sizable portion of registered voter do not vote. This indicates that these people are not interested to take part in election. Now this is very plausible to think that what are the basic reasons behind the not voting behaviour? It is always observed that people living away from the vote casting location or on high distance from vote casting location most of the time miss to vote. Some time it causes high cost to voters to move to polling station. However, it's commonly seen that security threats are most shocking for voters to come out of their doors. The education and party affiliations can turn these non-voters to vote in future. It is important to realise and investigate the factors behind non-voting intentions in society, which are increasing very sharply.

1.5 Significance of the Study

Low interest of civilians in elections has realized policy makers to rethink on incentives to voters or to keep voters bounded to vote during election period. However, it's the study focus of interest to investigate that either the time provided to voters for casting their vote is enough or it may itself can bring variation in voters. So everyone can't possible vote due to mismanagement of time and place, keeping in mind their official duties and work places. To reshape the voter's frequency in Islamabad, it is very important to know, why people do not vote. Pinpointing their restrictive factors can be tackled overtime through proper incentive policy or through policies which keep them, bounded to vote. This research will be a fair

attempt to move a step ahead towards better voters bounding or incentive policies, to make Islamabad highest vote casting point in Pakistan. Maximum participation could insure better decisions for selection of candidates. This will ultimately reduce the issue of vote suppliers and vote costumers.

1.6 Hypothesis

- H1: People do not vote because of perception about incompetency of candidate.
- H2: People do not vote because of negative perception about current voting system.
- H3: People do not vote due to lack of trust, travel cost, temporary displacement and threats.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Importance of Election

Voting process is a complementary part of modern democracy. It is conducted for the purpose to bring out public representative which decide on their behalf and bring development. It is the election which turn public into voters and compel political activists to visit common people at gross root level. This improve state-society relation and build public trust on the system. It is the democratic responsibility of state to conduct a transparent election and empower public to elect their representatives. Without a sustainable mechanism of election and voting process it is almost impossible to establish a peaceful society. In democratic countries there is an institutional arrangement for the conduction of election. Following international practices of democracy, likewise, in Pakistan there is Election Commission responsible for the promotion and conduction of electoral processes across the country. The promotion of democratic culture is inevitable for Pakistan and the role of Election Commission is significant in the maintenance of public trust (Ayres, & Bowen, (1967).

2.1.1 Issues in Electoral Processes

Multiple factors contribute in the operations of elections system. Political affiliation, trust on the system, education level of public, complex voting mechanisms, distant polling stations, indifference of public and voting paradox are some of the contributory factors, which effect electoral participation in democratic countries. The efficiency of democratic culture is measured through voter turnout, which indicate the percentage of voters who cast the vote. Voters turn out is a serious issue which share link with the contributory factor of election process. Political affiliation significantly improves political participation which is an important factor for the operation of political system. Copenhagen K (2012) used cross-sectional data of voters and found that people who are living 5 kilometres or more from polling station are 10% less likely to vote than those who have a polling station near than 5 kilometres. So, the study shows that if the distance is more than the voter turnout will be less in that area.

Moreover, some studies show that bad and poor weather cost more than normal voting and thus effect turnout. The effect of weather differs across various groups of a society, depends on their occupation. In urban areas, rain or poor weather decreases turnout and in rural and agriculture-based areas, the turnout gets less. The poor weather or rain reduces the opportunity cost of people relying on good weather for their daily earnings. So, the effect of weather is heterogeneous across different groups (Kang, Woo Chang, 2015). Public indifference about casting or not casting vote has a deep connection with democratic practices. When it is hard for public to determine their representatives and are indifferent about a set of political candidates then it is more likely that they may not participate in electoral process. The voters keep different intentions and their demands list exceeds the manifestos of political parties.

2.2 Political Affiliation and Vote Casting Behavior

Every party has a democratic structure where members perform political activities for their part agenda. It is a common fact that those people who keep political membership or affiliation are more eager to participate in political process (He, B. 2006). The reason is that people with political ground keep political patronage and share intermingled interests with political parties which give him a rational to participate and support their party. It is also a common observation that affiliate members of political parties invest their time, energy and resources for the fulfilment of party interest. Some members even sell their property to get money for political campaign. Blais and Rubenson, (2013) argue that, in Italy, the proportion of voters who think parties do not care about people's opinion. The percentage raised from 68% in 1968 to 90% in 2013. This fraction is high today in most advanced democracies, and citizens expressing such discontent systematically report a significantly lower propensity to vote.

2.3 Public Trust on System and Vote Polling

Studies indicates that Public trust is an important factor which effect political participation and vote casting behaviour. It is the responsibility of state to generate public trust on institutions through efficient service delivery. The maintenance of Public trust is at the centre of democracy and state institutions. The efficient delivery of public needs and services enhance people trust on institutions and make them a responsible citizen by rebuilding their narrative regarding the importance of political participation (Han, et al, 2016). If people realize that the election processes are transparent and keep the potential to change their future for better, then there are higher chances that people will vote. Hopelessness from democratic process have further widen the gap between state-citizens relation which generate distrust of public on institution. Such situation creates an environment where the voter get aside from the system. Hopelessness from system create distrust which crate a sort of political alienation among public. Pawell (1986) pointed to one of the main reasons behind the non-voting behaviour is the realization of public about the backbiting cycle of election processes, which lead to same outcome in different (ways) manners. It is a common fact that repeating trends in political processes produce public detachment from political participation. This study suggests that the generation of public trust on institutions is the key to govern and maintain political space. Teixeira (1987, 1992) contended that, the sole purpose of competition in the political system is to generate public trust and govern well, which is dependent upon the level of civic duty sense in the community. The analysis of literature on voting behaviour confirms that trust in electoral process has a positive impact on turnout, and also satisfaction on democracy increases turnout. These effects are especially high when aggregated at a country level. At individual level, trust in democracy increases the likelihood of voting (Grönlund, K., & Setälä, M., 2007). Schattschneider Dalton (2008) argues that low participation in vote casting shows that people shows less trust on government as they have detached themselves from voter participation.

2.4 Education and Political Participation

Education is an important tool to build an informed and responsible citizen. The participation of educated people in politics can bring real change because they are more aware about challenging issues of the society. The incorporation of educated people in political structure increase the probability of sustainable democracy. Education improve the probability of political participation. It can also reduce participation if the system is not efficiently working on public behalf. Democracy need informed and educated citizens for efficient operation. Literature shows that educated society breed responsible democratic culture where political representatives are liable to deliver public service through better policy. Through the power of vote, educated society elect competent leaders who enhance human development and promote democratic values.

Snyder, Roy and Edward (2011) argue that education and political knowledge are important determinants of voting behaviour. The study shows that political knowledge and education

affect the vote casting positively. But in some cases, education is not that much important, eg: if the economy of the state is worse than education does not get the effective position.

2.5 Voting and Public Indifference about Political Candidates

Voting behaviour has a link with public indifference about political candidate. Political participation can decrease either because of multiple candidate's problem or incompetence of political candidates. When there is a choice among a set of differently competing indistinguishable candidates in the political spectrum then it is more likely that voters may not participate in the democratic process. If the voter realize that the same candidate is repeating different strategies for winning election rather than acting in public interest, then it can turn their interest against electoral participation. Moreover, the incompetence of candidates can also make public indifference in political participation which further increase the chances for voter's refrainment from political participation.

Local election is an important element of general elections. Literature shows that 10% people do not care whom they vote, whereas 48.4% do some little research about the candidate's former doings, and 28.7% people said that they are inspired by the ideology and manifesto of the candidate. And as the level of education increases, the concern of people with candidates increase (Kurtbaş, İ, 2015.) Voter's paradox: According to Downs (1957) there exists a wide gap between what people expect from politics and what system deliver. This create a paradox for public to participate in election process and cast vote. Due to incompetent political mechanism and corrupt practices in democracy it become very unlikely for public to participate in democratic system to fulfil their national duty. One of the main reason behind decreasing voter's turnout is that the public is losing trust on democratic practices and consider election as a power play among political elites. The adverse intentions of public regarding democratic process can damage state-society relation and also negatively affect the efficient performance of democracy. Democracy is a system of trust which is maintained through electoral process but the unfortunate malpractices of it has distorted public trust. Observing political candidates who make money in a short span of time create a rational for public to avoid democratic participation.

2.6 Literature Review Gap

The literature is very rich on studies, which explore the determinants of voting behaviours and voter's perceptions. The answer to vote casting interest or their non-voting behaviour can be seen in many studies in different contexts and in different areas. Butt, J., & Awang, M. (2017), conducted a study on voting intentions in relation with social media influence and religiosity. But in case of Pakistan, I couldn't find any published study, which has taken important determinants like Trust, Distance, Displacement and party affiliation in relation with vote casting in Pakistan. However, Larreguy, H., Marshall, J., & Querubin, P. (2016) has associated voter turnout with voter mobilization and party monitoring capacity. So, it is important and quite conceivable to conduct a study for capital of Pakistan (Islamabad). Because Islamabad is a place, where every sect, every religion and people from every part of the country could be found. The detail explanation of each variable in context of current study is given in section 1.1

3. Theoretical Frame Work

3.1 Introduction

This chapter covers the theoretical background to proposed set of questions and stated objectives. This chapter initiates with broader idea of non-voting behaviour of individuals, connecting the idea with intentions vote casting factors.


3.2 Conceptual Framework

According to Downs (1957), why would a person bother to spend his important valuable time and precious resources for the only purpose, of vote casting, this vote paradox theory explores that people have rational choices to go with. While the paradox of indeterminacy emphasis on the behaviour of voter's is not determining to even bother about caring, whom they don't know Kirchgassner (1992).

These theories still hold their moral and ethical grounds in this domain. The study investigates major influencing factors behind the adverse voting intentions of individuals in Islamabad. The election is coming soon so it's very important to investigate the upcoming social intentions regarding vote casting. The concept is, why people do not vote? The study undertakes the task to answer this type of potential question to overcome the policy weaknesses. This is very common that people committed to political parties are more active as compared to those without party's affiliation. However, this might be the case, that even party affiliated individuals remain non-voter due to some specific reasons. This refers to non-active workers. Likewise, the cost of voting, high distance from polling station is also predicted, to be the adversely associated with voting intention. In other words, most of the lower income individuals do not vote because they don't have enough time or money to spend on renting a car to vote for a person in case of unavailability of transport facility, who has never been seen after success. This indicates that lack of trust on candidates, institutions, and uncertainty, or negative perception about system and candidates can also affect the voting intentions of voters and can easily make them non-voters. Current study has also highlighted implication of these studies and theories, which are supported through current study findings

The next diagram 3.1 shows, driving factors of non-voting intentions, where the variables on right hand side of the figure are positively associated with a person non-voting intention and the variables on left hand side of the figure are negatively associated with adverse intentions of vote casting. This indicates that left hand side variables are encouraging for vote casting behaviour, which also indicates that trust on candidate and trust on system increase the chances of voters vote casting, even the person is affiliated with any type of political party.

Figure 3.1 Non-Voters Driving Factors



4. Data and Methodology

This chapter consist of study area, data details and the techniques, which is used for the analysis of collected data. It also includes the data analyses methods and models developed for different dependent variables to answer the above mentioned research questions.

4.2 Study Area Description

Islamabad is the area, under current research. The capital of Islamic republic of Pakistan is quite educated and aware nation regarding the vote casting. Islamabad is a place, where people from different casts, system, ethnic groups and people of different languages live together. The security of city is appreciable in every polling station. We can see that, Vote of Islamabad is around 0.7 million, but interesting thing is that female vote percentage is highest of all in Islamabad as compared to other provinces but as compared to other places the male voting percentage is lower in Islamabad, which indicates many dimensions to explore. It indicates the induction of gender variable in the current study, which seems important for variation in vote casting ratio across locations. It seems plausible to study, why people do not vote even they know their vote is registered and it's important to vote.

4.3 Data

This paper is based on primary data, which was collected through questionnaire. The person who has not casted his vote in past election of 2013 and whose vote is registered but he/she doesn't want to cast his/her vote. It also includes the same number of sample from those who are not willing to vote in coming election and have voted before. The information collection from both types of individuals from prospects of vote casting is critically important to keep the balance of selected observation and to avoid the biasness in the sample selection. The data is first collected from few respondents to check the validity of questions. Some important diagnostic tests are applied to avoid misleading results. And finally, the data is used for further analysis to draw policy-oriented conclusion for the proposed questions.

4.4 Sampling Technique

The sampling method includes purposive sampling technique, where the respondents were randomly selected from different types of groups. During data collection, I went to groups of students or worker or other households, where first I asked them, that who is not intended to vote, 3 out of 5 persons group would rise their hands and I must select one respondent from whole group randomly. Same process was conducted on other respondents' selection and we conducted the survey included 200 respondents. The information regarding past elections were also asked from same respondent, if he/she his voted or not.

4.5 Sample Size of the Study Area

Sample size is derived through statistical tools to determine that how many people should be taken as respondents to get results that reflects targeted population. Formula used for sample size is as follow

$$SS = \frac{Z^2 * (p) * (1-p)}{C^2}$$

Where, Z= Z value which is equal to 1.96 at 95% confidence level. P= Percentage picking a choice (.10 used for sample size) C= Confidence interval (10%)

The sample calculated was 96, which was increased to 200 respondents where respondents were purposively selected from different inhabitants of Islamabad. Respondents were asked about vote in previous election voting in 2013 and intention to vote in 2018 election, where 128 respondents replied they are not intended to vote in 2018 election and 71 responded that they are intended to vote. One observation was contradictory and was dropped from the analysis. The study has included 199 observations as sample size, for model why people do not vote?

4.6 Construction of Variables

Variable name	Sign	Construction
Age	AG	Number of years continues
Income	INC	Pakistani rupees (1000s)
Education	ED	Number of years
Gender	GN	Male = 1 otherwise zero
Distance to polling station	DP	The distance from the polling stations is taken in Kms
Party affiliation	PA	If the person is affiliated with a party takes value 1 otherwise zero
Perception about candidate	PC	If the person doesn't not like candidate takes value 1 otherwise zero
Trust on candidate and system		If the person doesn't vote due to lack of trust on candidates and existing system of vote casting
Perception about system	PS	If the person doesn't like to vote due to system takes value one otherwise zero
Displacement from vote location	DVL	If the person hasn't voted because of displacement takes value one otherwise zero
vote non-casting	VNC	If the person does not cast his/her vote takes value 1 otherwise zero If the person did not cast his/her vote in 2013 election takes value one otherwise zero
Health status	HS	If the person has good health status at election 2013 takes value one otherwise zero

4.7 Model of the Study

The model of the study is binary logistic regression, where dependent variable is in binary (1, 0) form. The current research objectives states Logit model is appropriate techniques to determine the true determinants of non-vote casting behaviour of respondents for both the elections of 2013 and 2018. The study has estimated binary logistic regression to present more effective results for the given set of variables.

4.6.1 Logistic Regression Model 2013

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{LOGIT}[P(\text{didn't cast vote NVC} = 1)] \\
 &= \beta_0 + \beta_1(INC) + \beta_2(ED) + \beta_3(Age) + \beta_4(\text{Trust on system}) \\
 &+ \beta_5(\text{Displacement}) + \beta_6(\text{lack of trust on candidate}) \\
 &+ \beta_7(\text{travel cost}) + \beta_8(\text{health status}) + \mu_i
 \end{aligned}$$

4.6.2 Logistic Regression Model 2018

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{LOGIT}[P(\text{Not Inteded VC} = 1)] \\
 &= \beta_0 + \beta_1(INC) + \beta_2(ED) + \beta_3(Age) + \beta_4(GN) + \beta_5(DP) \\
 &+ \beta_6(PA) + \beta_7(CV) + \beta_8(PC) + \beta_9(PS) + \beta_{10}(DVL) \\
 &+ \beta_{11}(TRTs) + \mu_i
 \end{aligned}$$

More: The logistic distribution constrains the estimated probabilities to lie between 0 and 1. The estimated probability is:

$$p = 1/[1 + \exp(-\alpha - \beta X)]$$

If you let $\alpha + \beta X = 0$, then $p = .50$

As $\alpha + \beta X$ gets big p approaches 1

As $\alpha + \beta X$ gets small, p approaches 0

4.6.3 Justification of Variables Used in the Model

These variables are used in context of Pakistan; however, the selection of study important variables is the contribution to existing past literature, which is very limited in case of Pakistan for specific subject matter. Most of the selected variables for this study are taken from literature. These variables are suggested by different studies, where distance, trust, schedule clash and education are very frequently discussed but some of the variables, considered in this study are very rarely discussed in past studies. This study has used two models, where in both the models the dependent variables are in binary form, in model one the study has tested the dependent variable as if the person did not cast his/her vote in election 2013, previously takes value one otherwise zero. And same model of binary logistic was used on another dependent variable in second estimation, where dependent variable is taken as if the person is not intended to vote in election 2018 takes value one otherwise zero.

5. Results and Discussion

5.1 Introduction

This chapter included the descriptive statistics of important variables, followed by the results of empirical estimations for logistic regression. The results are organized according to objectives of the study. This chapter focus on only results presentation in table and graph form with statistical and policy relevant interpretations.

5.2 Descriptive Statistics

Table 5.1 shows that the lowest age respondent for this study was 20 years old¹, whose vote was registered for the election of 2018. ² Average age of study respondents was 39 years and maximum age was 59 years for current study. Minimum Monthly Income of the respondents was ten thousand, while the average monthly income of the respondents was 60000 thousand and maximum monthly income of the respondents was one lac twenty thousand. The study has included almost literate and educated respondents, where average education of the study respondents was 10 years and maximum education was 21 years, it indicates that study has also included PHD scholars as respondents of the study. However, some of the respondent were uneducated with zero-year education status. Average number of household members were almost eight with 7.8 actual figure. Maximum number of household members were 18 members at a single household and there was only one member in a single household, which was minimum household size in the collected data sample. The statistics of socio economic characteristics show quite normal picture of study respondents. These variables are linked with the hypothesis of current study in context that, age of the person can affect his/her intentions to vote as we can see few respondents of our study were even not eligible in previous election of 2013 and they were even not intended to vote, on the other side very old age respondents are also restricted due to health issues and do not even intend to vote in election 2018. Age of the respondents is associated with dependent variables of the study

Table 5.1: Socio-Economic Characteristics of Respondents

Descriptive Statistics					
Socio-economic Characteristics	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age	200	20.00	59.00	39.505	8.94876

¹ Respondents with lower age, that were not eligible in 2013 election were dropt from the analysis in model estimation

² Average age is calculated by addition of all the observations age and divided by number of all the observation

Monthly Income	200	1.00	12.00	6.4650	2.93117
Education	200	.00	21.00	10.735	6.06620
Household Members	200	1.00	18.00	7.8950	3.15973
Valid N (Listwise)	200				

5.2 Respondents Vote Status for Election 2018

It is important to know the voter status before answering the question, why people do not vote? The table 5.2 shows how many respondents were intended to vote and how many were not intended to vote in election 2018, where 71 respondents, out of 200 were intended to vote and 129 were not intended to vote in election 2018. Now these statistics show, that maximum respondents of this study were not intended to vote in election 2018. The reasons behind non-voting intentions of respondents are briefly elaborated in upcoming results, with respect to its determinants accordingly.

Table 5.2: Vote casting intentions in Election in 2018

Choice of vote	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Intended	71	35.5	35.5
Not Intended to Vote	129	64.5	100.0
Total	200	100.0	

5.3 Vote Casting Status of Respondents in Election 2013¹

The results show that in GE 2013 out of 200 respondents only 180 were eligible for vote casting, where only 80 respondents have casted their votes in 2013 election and 100 respondents did not prefer to vote in 2013, which is significant number of non-voters. The study results show that previously 55.56 percent respondents did not cast their vote, where in election 2018, shown in table 5.3 indicates that 64.5 percent are not intended to vote, which is increasing trend of non-voting in same data set.

Table 5.3 vote casting status in 2013 election

Vote casting status 2013	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Vote Casted	80	44.4	44.4
Vote Not casted	100	55.56	100.0
Total	180	100.0	20 were not eligible for vote in 2013 election

5.4 Trust on System

The results in table 5.4 show that most of the candidates, do not trust system, which specifically indicates that their voting intentions might not be positive to vote in election 2018. The word “system” was defined and explained for every respondent before asking about this question. It also includes, the overall influence of securities and law enforcement agencies, which was highlighted by more than 50 respondents, that “I am not intended to vote because I don’t trust system, and specifically the system is in law enforcement agencies hands, this time and there is no value of our vote this time.”²


¹ In election 2013 180 respondents were eligible for vote casting and their vote was registered

² We asked in URDU and Even also in Pashto from Pathans

Table no 5.4: If the person trusts the system takes value one otherwise zero.

Respondents Response	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Doesn't trust	80	40.0	40.0
Trust	120	60.0	100.0
Total	200	100.0	

The figure 5.1 shows, two colored diagrams, where red color represents, not intended to vote and light blue color shows trust on system, where both together in a single diagram shows, correlation between these two variables. It can be observed, that most of the respondents do not trust on system but they are intended to cast their vote. These variables are correlated, as we can see most of the respondents do not trust on existing electoral system and they are not intended to cost their vote, and some of these respondents can also be observed that the respondents trust the existing system, but they are not intended to cast the vote in election 2018. This indicates that there are some other factors, which contributes to reduce the intention of voter to cast vote. Only trust on system is not enough to convince most of the individuals to cast the vote.

Figure 5.1 Correlation between Trust on System and Not Intended to Vote (2018)

5.5 Empirical Results Vote Casting 2013 Election

5.5.1 Influencing Factors of Vote Casting in 2013 Elections

The study result shows, that education, income and age of the respondents are statistically not associated with not casted vote in 2013 however, it indicates positive association with income age and education of the respondents in 2013 election. Displacement of respondents is significantly associated with not casting the vote in election 2013. It entails that the respondents, who were displaced in 2013 election from their specific polling stations, did not vote in 2013 election. Trust on system is negatively associated with not vote casted in election 2013 but in our case this variable is statistically not significant.

This study also found that due to lack of trust on candidate, most of the respondents haven't casted their vote in 2013 elections. It also indicates that there are significant chances of vote

non casting in election 2013 for those respondents who do not trust candidates during election 2013. Current study results shows that higher travel cost faced by candidates in 2013 have most probably not voted in 2013 elections. Travel cost is positively associated with not voting in 2013 elections, which is statistically significant in our case and finally better health status of the respondents in 2013 elections indicates adverse chances of not voting in 2013, which means that, people with good health status have most probably voted in 2013 elections.

Table 5.5 Vote Not Casting in 2013 Elections

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: VOTE NOT CASTED			
Method: ML - Binary Probit (Newton-Raphson / Marquardt steps)			
Coefficient covariance computed using the Huber-White method			
Variable		Coefficient	Std. Error Prob.
Education		-0.004193	0.026649 0.8750
Income		0.038633	0.091250 0.6720
Age		0.029908	0.046645 0.5214
Displacement		3.693802	0.391396 0.0000
Trust on System		-0.057057	0.606797 0.9251
Lack of Trust on Candidate		2.012122	0.480184 0.0099
Travel Cost		1.221812	0.339058 0.0003
Health Status		-2.387888	0.810617 0.0032
Mean dependent var	0.592784	S.D. dependent var	0.492587
S.E. of regression	0.182267	Akaike info criterion	0.347046
Sum squared resid	6.179140	Schwarz criterion	0.481803
Log likelihood	-25.66345	Hannan-Quinn criter.	0.401613
Deviance	51.32690	Restr. Deviance	262.2218
Avg. log likelihood-0.132286			

5.6: Empirical Results Why People Do Not Vote?

5.6.1 Determinants of Not-Intended to Vote in Election 2018

Table 5.6 shows empirical results of the study, where the dependent variable is not intended to vote. The dependent variable is a dummy variable, in binary form, constructed as: if the person is not intended to cast vote in coming election takes value one otherwise zero. Result shows that increase in age level leads to increasing probability of non-intended to vote, which is statistically not significant in our case, because the p value is greater than 0.05. This indicates that there is no significant relation between age and pessimistic intentions for vote casting, for individuals, whose vote is registered, and they know it.

However, it is possible at very high age limits, when senior citizens are not enough energetic and healthy to go to a polling station and cast the vote. Past Experiences of vote casting is negatively associated with not intended to vote, which indicates that the person with an experience of vote casting in previous election has lower probability that he/she will not cast his/her vote in election 2018.

High experience voters are expected to cast their vote, because these respondents are aware of the process and may not face any issues as compare to less experienced voters. While talking to respondents, it was clearly observed that respondents, with experience were exited to cast their vote in 2018 election, but opposite thinkers were also found in same group of people with experience of vote casted in previous elections.

The study results show that, if the person is female, there are high chances that, she will cast her vote, because the probability of not intended to vote are negatively and significantly

associated with gender in our case. Consequently, it is expected if the person is female higher probability is to vote in election 2018. House hold size has no relation with not intended to cast vote in election 2018 but the sign is negative, which might be because large number of family members provide space and time for others to conduct their activities. Income of respondents is positively associated with the probability of not intended to vote but it is statistically not significant in our case. Positive association of these variables are associated with opportunity cost of respondents. Awareness of respondents from the background is not significant in our case because awareness about candidates can be on both sides information, negative and positive sides of candidates. This information can lead to both intentions of vote casting and not costing.

Displacement of respondents from their polling station is positively associated with intentions of not voting in election 2018, which is statistically significant. The logic behind this is quite clear. All the displaced respondents, argued that it is very hard to travel for vote casting, which is not cleared in terms of results, and benefits. Most of these respondent's emphasis on cost factor associated with it.

Significant amount of respondents not intended to vote argued that because of thesis, projects and other deadlines they cannot risk their careers to travel back for vote casting to their own polling stations and they also suggested if the system is shifted to biometric, it will be easy to vote, no matter wherever the person is and how important projects he/she is involved in, because neither It cost people in monetary terms and nor it has non-monetary costs for respondents.

Other important variable is party affiliation of the respondents, if the person is affiliated with any political party, the chance of non-intended vote reduces but not significantly. Most of the times party workers are disappointed and have less enthusiastic nature for vote casting and care about parties and it is often seen, when people are only affiliated to parties not active to work for parties. This is because, every worker of the party is not free man, and most of these are very poor households, very much busy and engaged businessmen, hardworking labors and students in last stage of their research, projects.

The daily activities background of respondent is more important than party affiliation of a person for the intentions to cast vote or not in election.

Trust on system is very important for voters to intend for vote casting in election. This variable is negative and statistically significant with the probability of not vote casing intentions of a person. If the person trusts the system, there are very less chances that he/she will not vote in election. Trust on system can reduce the nonvoter significantly but the real question is, how to create trust on institutions?

The issues of access to polling stations. This is very common that long distance positively influences non-voting intentions, but in this case, there is no relation between long distance with-in the district, and non-voting intentions. It indicates that, no matter how long distance is, if the person is in home city, there are very less chances that the person will not case his/her vote. This indicates that people prefer to vote, when they are in their home city. The main problem is displacement of the individuals from their home towns and polling stations facilities to displaced people.

Table 5.6: Determinants of Non-voting

Dependent Variable: Not-intended to vote Method: ML - Binary Probit (Newton-Raphson / Marquardt Steps)			
Variable	Coefficient	Standard. Error	Prob.
Age	0.019583	0.011614	0.0918
Voting Experience	-0.044468	0.021936	0.0426
Gender	-0.861340	0.453652	0.0576
Household Size	-0.009563	0.035006	0.7847
Income	0.072843	0.054196	0.1789
Awareness about candidate	-0.453771	0.327139	0.1654
Displaced location	0.696213	0.200041	0.0005
Party affiliation	-0.357164	0.277996	0.1989
Trust on system	-0.699018	0.232012	0.0026
Distance from Station	0.049448	0.240069	0.8368
Mean dependent var	0.562814	S.D. dependent var	0.49729
S.E. of regression	0.439336	Akaike info criterion	1.21160
Sum squared resid	36.48010	Schwarz criterion	1.377100
Log likelihood	-110.5549	Hannan-Quinn criter.	1.278586
Deviance	221.1098	Restr. Deviance	272.7236
Avg. log likelihood-0.555552			

5.7 Summary of Findings

The study found that voters are not intended to vote, which are dislocated from hometowns or displaced from polling stations, where their vote is registered.

People's intentions to cast vote in election, is positively associated with trust on system but adversely associated with awareness about candidate.

The interesting fact about this study is, that distance from house in hometown doesn't matter for adverse intentions to cast a vote. No matter how long the distance is, respondents will reach to polling stations, if they are not gone out of their cities or villages, which is termed as displaced in current study. The research also found that party affiliation reduces the chances of non-vote casting intentions of respondents, which also indicates that there are less chances of adverse intentions to vote casting if the person is associated with a party, because these days party workers are active in the process of election. The study found that age and income is positively linked with voter's adverse intentions to vote but statistically it is not significant in our case.

6. Conclusion

This study has empirically investigated, peoples' intentions regarding vote casting in elections 2018. The basic concern was to explore the determinants of adverse voting intentions. However, it is the consequence of trust building, where today, People do not want to vote due to certain logical reasons. The most important factor to determine willingness to vote is "trust on system", which encourages voters to cast their vote. Trust on electoral system is perceived very significant in context of vote extrinsic value, which is the end concern of voters. There are several other important reasons and socio-economic barriers, which restricts voters to bother to spend their time and money on vote casting. The information regarding candidate play quite important role in generating willingness to voter among common masses. Rumors against candidates and negative waves flows during elections month, which also influence willingness to vote and most of the time voters remain indoor on vote casting day, being in doubted of controversial choice.

Party affiliated individual is more like to cast his/her vote, if the person is active worker, or semi active worker and if the person is silent or non-active worker, there are negligible chances, which he/she would bother to cast vote. It is critically important that party affiliated individuals should cast their vote no matter, he is active or a silent worker. For a poor person, running to a polling station is a day, to bear intensity of hunger or burning eyes of creditors, not voting is enough convincing rational choice for the community with low income, because without vote buying intentions, no one pays a poor person for his own choice vote casting. On the other hand, high income class has also an irrefutable reason of adverse intentions for vote casting, which is high opportunity cost. Study concludes on the final argument that “voting paradox and indeterminacy paradox hold significant ground realities in Islamabad, when it comes to adverse intention of vote casting or willingness to vote. These paradoxes pass on from generation to generation, contingent to their level of education and laws proved space.

6.1 Policy Recommendations

The study suggests following policy insights based on the major findings of research. The research suggests, initiate trust building measures in electoral system, which can reduce the adverse intentions towards vote casting. The study suggest that the election commission of Pakistan should allocate polling stations on such venues which are in easy access to maximum population. Sometime polling stations are stationed away from a section of population where old and handicap people cannot easily manage to reach there. Biometric system for vote casting is better alternative to increase the voter turnout in Pakistan.

References

- Bhatti, Y. (2012). Distance and voting: Evidence from Danish municipalities. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 35(2), 141-158.
- Blais, A., & Rubenson, D. (2013). The source of turnout decline: New values or new contexts? *Comparative Political Studies*, 46(1), 95-117.
- Butt, J., & Awang, M. (2017). Intention for Voting in Pakistan: The role of Social Media, Ethnicity, and Religiosity. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 4(5), 1-15.
- Campbell, D. E. (2006). *Why we vote: How schools and communities shape our civic life*. Princeton University Press
- Carreras, M., & İrepoğlu, Y. (2013). Trust in elections, vote buying, and turnout in Latin America. *Electoral Studies*, 32(4), 609-619.
- Coffé, H., & Theiss-Morse, E. (2016). The effect of political candidates' occupational background on voters' perceptions of and support for candidates. *Political Science*, 68(1).
- Dalton, Russell J. (2008). *The Good Citizen: How a Younger Generation is Reshaping American Politics*. CQ Press: Washington D.C.
- Douglas, J. A. (2013). The Foundational Importance of Participation: A Response to Professor Flanders. *Okla. L. Rev.*, 66, 81.
- Downs, A. (1957). An economic theory of political action in a democracy. *Journal of political economy*, 65(2), 135-150.
- Election Commission Pakistan (2017) <https://www.ecp.gov.pk/>
- Embree, Ainslie (1997) Statehood in South Asia. *Journal of International Affairs*. 51:1, Summer. 10-15, 1-18.
- Fishburn, P. C. (1974). Paradoxes of voting. *American Political Science Review*, 68(2)
- Flores, T. E., & Nooruddin, I. (2012). The effect of elections on postconflict peace and reconstruction. *The Journal of Politics*, 74(2), 558-570.

- Frey, B. S. (1971). Why do high income people participate more in politics? *Public Choice*, 11, 101–105
- Gardezi, Hasan Jamil Rashid (ed). (1983). *Pakistan: The Roots of Dictatorship*. London: Zed Press.
- Glaeser, E. L., Ponzetto, G. A., & Shleifer, A. (2007). Why does democracy need education?. *Journal of economic growth*, 12(2), 77-99.
- Grönlund, K., & Setälä, M. (2007). Political trust, satisfaction and voter turnout. *Comparative European Politics*, 5(4), 400-422.
- Grönlund, K., & Setälä, M. (2012). In honest officials we trust: Institutional confidence in Europe. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 42(5), 523-542.
- He, B. (2006). A survey study of voting behavior and political participation in Zhejiang. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 7(3), 225-250.
- Highton, B. (2000). Residential mobility, community mobility, and electoral participation. *Political Behaviour*, 22(2), 109–120
- Jalal, Ayesha (1995) *Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia: A Comparative and Historical Perspective*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications. 9– 25, 48–62.
- Kelley, S., Jr., Ayres, R. E., & Bowen, W. G. (1967). Registration and voting: Putting first things first. *American Political Science Review*, 61(2), 359–379
- Kim, J., Petrocik, J. R., & Enokson, S. N. (1975). Voter turnout among the American states: Systemic and individual components. *American Political Science Review*, 69(1)
- Kurtbaş, İ. The Factors Influencing Voting Preferences in Local Elections “An Empirical Study”, 2015
- Larreguy, H., Marshall, J., & Querubin, P. (2016). Parties, brokers, and voter mobilization: How turnout buying depends upon the party’s capacity to monitor brokers. *American Political Science Review*, 110(1), 160-179.
- Miller W.E.(1992). The puzzle transformed: Explaining declining turnout. *Political Behavior*, 14 (1), 1– 43. New Haven, CT: Yale UP.
- Penar, P., Aiko, R., Bentley, T., & Han, K. (2016). Election Quality, Public Trust are Central Issues for Africa's Upcoming Contests.
- Powell, G. B. (1986). American voter turnout in comparative perspective. *American Political Science Review*, 80(1), 17-43.
- Rosen stone, S. J., & Hansen, J. M. (1993). *Mobilization, participation, and democracy in America*. New York: Macmillan
- Shafqat, S. (1998). Democracy in Pakistan: Value change and challenges of institution building. *The Pakistan Development Review*, 281-298.
- Snyder III, R. E. (2011). The impact of age, education, political knowledge and political context on voter turnout.
- Squire, P., Wolfinger, R. E., & Glass, D. P. (1987). Residential mobility and voter turnout. *American Political Science Review*, 81(1), 45–66
- Taylor, David (1992) *Parties, Elections and Democracy in Pakistan*. *Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative Politics* 30:1 96–115.
- Teixeira, R. A. (2011). *The disappearing American voter*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Teixeira, Ruy A. (1992). *The Disappearing American Voter*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Teixeira, Ruy A. 1987. *Why Americans don’t Vote: Turnout Decline in the United States, 1960 – 1984*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.