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ABSTRACT

The practice of good governance requires active participation in governance activities by the voting public and through the observation of national elections, scholars have mulled over possible explanations to offer an understanding into the manner in which individuals vote and the factors shaping their voter behavior. This study endeavored to create a narrative for predicting patterns of voter behavior contextualizing the 2017 Kenya General Elections and in so doing, determine the inherent factors influencing voter behavior. As such, this study investigated the individual and situational factors that affect voter behavior in Kenya; highlighting the development of electoral politics since independence and as guided by profound debates in literature, explores the roles that clientelism, economy and ethnicity play in shaping voter behavior. We also look at the role of intervening actors such as the international community through election monitors and the diaspora community in shaping electoral discourse in Kenya and the implied effects experienced.

The study adopts a questionnaire analysis involving systematic random sampling of 60 respondents from three constituencies in Nairobi County i.e. Starehe, Lang’ata and Roysambu constituencies, chosen for their unique voting patterns and political affiliations. The questionnaire being the primary data source, secondary sources were used to augment the findings and through SPSS analysis and the conduction of a Pearson’s Correlation test, conclusions were drawn indicating that there was no significant statistical relationship between the variables at play while highlighting the key individuality and self-preservation in decision making noted from the responses collected which means that despite all influences, individuals remain rational and will vote for the person they deem best for that political office. These findings guide the study to make recommendations for a more comprehensive electoral law system and the strengthening of rule of law as regards governance as well as a rigorous approach to civil education through partnership of government and relevant organizations to ensure the Kenyan masses remain politically aware and actively involved in the discourse that shapes their government.
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CHAPTER ONE: GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.0. Introduction

Democracy today, as pursued by most governments in the world, implies a type of governance that works and runs under the authority granted by the citizenry, who by direct participation in the governance systems, determine the kind of leaders holding office and the form of authority they will be guided under. Quoting the infamous Gettysburg address in 1863 by American President Abraham Lincoln where he described democratic government as “a government of the people, for the people and by the people”, the last section highlighting the required participation and expression from the people in the formation of the government and its operations. (Lincoln, 1863)

These sentiments are reiterated by Key when he describes the basic differential characteristic between democratic regimes and other forms of governance as the expression of effective choice by the mass of the people in elections through the act of voting. And further describing elections as a formal act of collective decision occurring in connected antecedent and expected behavior arising subsequently. Elections however, are not so clear cut given the different models adopted in different countries, and even then, the dimensions of democracy and inclusion vary from the reality experienced on the ground. (Key, 1955)(Wanyande, 2006)

The final action of voter choice, heavily influenced by events leading up to the elections acts as the determinant that shapes the government; thus putting emphasis on a need to understand the elections and the elective process as a reflection of the democratic whole and the subsequent influence of the stimulus shaping the electoral period. The pursuit of elections as a democratic
ideal is especially unpredictable and peculiar in states transitioning from a previously authoritarian background to adopt a more democratic model. The history and lessons from the past do a great deal to shape the decisions ultimately made by voters. (Key, 1955)(Wanyande, 2006)

The International Convention on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) of 1966 under Article 25 (b) makes provisions for the fundamental right to participate in government by way of free and fair elections, in turn calling upon governments to uphold their part and ensure that all elections are inclusive, free and fair. While many states have made active efforts to ensure transparency and inclusivity in their electoral procedures, the question what truly makes an election free and fair has often been questioned. In ancient Greece for example, the birthplace of modern-day democracy, only full blooded Athenians who owned property were eligible to cast their votes; omitting women, slaves and immigrants. (Bertrand, Briquet, & Pels, 2007)(Nations, 1966)

With time, suffrage was resisted, gradually allowing men from different classes to vote; then came the inclusion of women and finally the extension of the right to vote to migrants and naturalized aliens. McCormick (1959) looks at the extent to which suffrage in early-democratized America affected the type of leadership brought in and whether the continued expansion of inclusion to allow more people to vote acted as incentive to show up and vote, affecting the margins of response for political candidates or not.

Suffrage was felt, not only in terms of inclusion and access to voting apparatus, but also in tight-noosed one-party regimes where political candidates were carefully singled out with regard to their placement in the hierarchy of preference, and elections were merely a formality meant to symbolize legitimacy for an authoritarian government. Wanyande notes this was the case in
Kenya from the period of independence up until 1992, where the repeal of Section II of the constitution once again allowed for a multi-party system in Kenya. However, the county continued to be under the leadership of President Moi, given the opposition failed to unite under a single candidacy up until 2002 where a new government was instated after 24 years under President Moi. (2006) (Maathai, 2006)

1.1. Background of the Study

Kenya, like many countries that consider themselves part of the democratic movement, is slated to hold general elections in the month of August, 2017. The period leading up to the elections where aspirants will face off for all of the leadership positions available has been filled with all the pomp and drama expected from political rallies and campaigns as they run to drum up support for their agendas from the voting public. This is not a new trend in Africa and even less in Kenya seeing as the country has had ten elections since achievement of independence in 1963.

The electoral apparatus in Kenya as defined by the Kenyan Constitution (2010) operates on a multiparty democracy and presidential system where the President, Senate and National Assembly are directly elected into office by the voting citizenry. The two-round system provided for requires a presidential candidate to receive 50% +1 of the total vote as well as 25% of votes in at least twenty-four counties. Furthermore, the apparatus makes provisions for the manner in which candidates for senatorial, gubernatorial and parliamentary seats are elected into office. With the constitution further embodying the right to participate in free and fair elections as directed by the ICCPR, suffrage is well distributed. (Kenya, 2010)

This however was not always the case, given the colonial heritage that Kenya emerged from and the ensuing one-party system put in place in 1969, lasting about 23 years until the repeal of
Section 2A of the constitution in 1992 which once again, allowed for a multi-party system and equal suffrage. After 24 years under President Moi and continuous failed attempts by the opposition to oust him, the Opposition won the 2002 elections under a united front and a single candidate, restoring hope and belief in the power of the vote to the general masses. (Maathai, 2006) (McCormick, 1959) (Wanyande, 2006) (Kenya, 2010)

The electoral process has not however, been smooth for Kenya as characterized by the post-election violence after the 2007 general elections where citizens took up arms in a bitter ethnic fuelled rivalry catalyzed by disputed election results between the then incumbent President Mwai Kibaki and opposition leader Raila Odinga. The accusations of electoral fraud incited violence that left roughly 1000 people dead and thousands more displaced from their homes as well as millions of shillings worth of damage to infrastructure and property. The international community intervened under the direction of a panel of Eminent African leaders and later, through mediated negotiations with the then United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan. The talks between the conflicting parties saw Mwai Kibaki retain the Presidency with Raila Odinga taking the position of Prime Minister which had not been held since the year 1964.

Having characteristically tense electoral politics, the 2013 general elections were under strict observation by both locals and the international community, with fear of yet another bout of post-electoral violence running high given the tension between the contending parties and the continued pressure arising from the cases against two of the contenders at the International Criminal Court on charges for inciting the 2007/8 post-election violence. (Cheeseman, Lynch, & Willis, 2014)
These past experiences as well as the influence from international observers and the involvement of other countries in the elections have left the individual Kenyan voter in a peculiar situation; riddled with memories from the past and constantly plagued by messages from the politicians as well as the constant highlight of the run-up to the polls by the media. All these factors work in unison to influence the kind of choices that are to be ultimately made by the voter in the August 2017 general elections and the final votes that they cast. (Bower, 2008)

Bower suggests that while political identities and candidate perception play a great role in influencing the way people vote, their individual traits and arising issues play a far greater role in shaping their final decisions. Key also advances this understanding, describing the voter as a politically aware who continues to make decisions based on their individual preferences and their ideals. These decisions may be to some extent be reinforced or diminished by situational factors in the period running up to the elections and thus highlights two key influencers of voter behavior i.e. individual factors and arising situational factors. (Bower, 2008)(Key, 1955)

The combination of occurrences, stimuli and events create a truly interesting situation, which coupled with the peculiar behavior exhibited when it comes to the actual voting exercise, begs the question; what influences voters choices? Taking the Kenyan voter as the main study subject, this study looks at how individual centered factors i.e. upbringing, education and income, and arising situational factors i.e. strikes and increased insecurity affect the way in which Kenyans make political choices and how they ultimately cast their vote come the election day as a template for predicting the 2017 general elections and offering insight on how the elections might play out.
Previous studies such as the dissertation by (Wafula, 2014) and (Kimenyi & Gutierrez, 2008) highlight the primacy of economics, post-election trauma and political partisanship in shaping voter behavior as well as the lasting effect that they pose. This study goes deeper, taking on the individual voter as a definitive actor, and seeking to understand how issues linked to their growth and adaptation and socialization as well as sudden arising factors in the society affect their perceptions and who they choose to vote for.

### 1.2. Statement of the problem

Aspirants vying for political seats and campaign managers in Kenya have for years, studied patterns of interest to shape their strategies and campaigns in a way that would be appealing and representative of what people want. Kenyan research giant Synovate (2013) has as well conducted numerous polls, determining through the results who the more popular candidates are, the margins with which they lead at the polls and who is likelier to emerge victorious in the final elections.

The methods used to conduct the research are mostly wide-scale, survey based and use small numbers to represent a larger whole and are quite similar to business advertising and customer branding done by corporations that are designed to draw in customers, or voters in this case, and show them that the candidate in that field is much better and will serve them better than all the others.

While these methods have no doubt aided the campaign process and largely helped predict voting patterns for many elections, the main motivational factors behind the choices that individuals make remains elusive and it is for this reason that this study puts the individual in the
primal position of main actor, investigating the stimuli at play during campaigns and the days leading up to the election that ultimately makes them vote in the manner that they do.

This study develops a predictive model of voter behavior, through investigating influences on voters, looking at the manner in which individual centered factors i.e. education, social-class, political affiliation etc., and arising stimuli such as the recent doctor’s strike and drought in the country affect the political choices made by voters while casting their votes during elections. Through these groupings we identify the patterns of study, shaping the study objectives and research hypothesis and mold the literature review to reflect the ideals pursued.

1.3. Research Questions

Guided by the title of the study, this paper conducts an investigation into the factors influencing voter behavior, with special focus on how individual centered factors and arising situational stimuli influence voter behavior with the 2017 Kenyan general elections as the main case study.

Thus the main objectives of the study prove to be:

- To interrogate the extent to which individual centered factors influence voter behavior in Kenya
- To interrogate the influence of arising situational stimuli affect voter behavior in Kenya

These objectives lay the foundation for the study, shaping the research design to be applied and the data collection methods as well as the final analysis of the findings.
1.4. Significance of the study

Munsey (2008) describes the act of voting as a pointless, time-consuming and inconvenient exercise given that while voters queue for hours and cast their ballots, the system is already overrun with powerful individuals who have been campaigning since the conclusion of the previous election and have already ensured their victories and as such the results will be in their favor. These arguments are backed by Chomsky (2009) who presents the paradox of thought-control, saying that people need to be told what to believe in, and that while the public may very well believe they actually played a role in selecting their leaders, the truth remains that it is the elite who determine who holds office and who is cast out. These arguments showing the ineffectiveness of overall voting borrow from classical realism as advanced by John Locke and the power play that is characteristic of politics. (Smith, 2003) (Chomsky, 2009) (Munsey, 2008)

While the arguments propagated by realists hold a lot of weight and have proven to be true in some cases, it is nearly impossible to overlook the overwhelming impact that voters have had, through their vote, in changing the course of history and in the making of monumental decisions such as with the 2002 elections in Kenya that saw the end of a 24 year authoritarian rule, and the 2010 referendum that voted in the new constitution.

The predictive model adopted by this study facilitates an understanding of the key influences on the individual Kenyan voter behavior, which further strengthens the manner in which the government and leaders understand the priorities that the people have as well as the matters that motivate them, in turn, influencing the strategies used by government in improving the lives of the people and formulating appropriate policies and profiles.
The data collected and analyzed from this study, as well as the final findings and recommendations add to the existing body of knowledge in the matter and boosting Kenyan academia to enable future researchers understand the manner in which the Kenyan electoral apparatus works and offering more defined variables of study and a set of recommendations that is applicable to governance, policy and education development for a better understanding of voter behavior in Kenya specifically.

1.5. Literature review: Inspecting the Literature Debates

The study of electoral processes and voter behavior in particular has grown tremendously since the pioneering study by Paul Lazarsfeld and the Columbia school in 1966 that used survey method to study the factors influencing voter behavior during presidential elections. The study was largely based on a sociological point of understanding and later facilitated Lazarsfeld’s conception of the two-step flow theory that summed up opinion shaping in two main steps, starting from the communication by mass media and its reception and influence on opinion leaders to later be transmitted to the less aware public. The inherent subjectivity used to call out the opinion leaders was outlined as one of the main mistakes of the study but despite that, the findings from the survey played a monumental role in shaping future discourse on electoral behavior and research tools used.

Since then, scholars from different disciplines resolved to study voter behavior using different theoretical models and the dominant debates that have truly taken root over the years have been clientelist-patronage debates, ethnicity ideologies and economic models of voting. Each of these debates is thoroughly interrogated, showing the main ideas that they operate on and how they
have impacted the Kenyan voting scene and the influence they continue to have of voters and the political and electoral scene.

The analysis of the debates as well provides pointers used to draft the questions in the questionnaire tool of data collection and guide the selection of the supporting qualitative data and in doing so, guide the research design and analysis.

1.5.1. Clientelism-Patronage as guiding Voter Behavior

The term clientelism and patronage immediately evoke thoughts of a mutually beneficial relationship between two of more parties. When it comes to the study of electoral behavior, the clientelist-patronage debate is one of the most prolific and numerous works have been done on the subject to prove its validity and practicality. While various definitions have been thrown around, scholars have agreed that clientelism operates on the main premise that there is an exchange of selective benefits for political allegiance with the political candidates being the patrons and the voter the clients. (Roniger, 2004)

Daniel Young (2009) goes further with the definition, noting the existence of many forms of clientelism such as involving personal exchanges or the provision of public goods to the people despite these goods having previously been allocated to the very same constituents. His ideas are supported by Robinson and Verdier who suggest the inculcation of loyalty and unconditional support to patrons. (2013)

In the past, clientelism may have thought to be inspired by the fear that the voters felt for the patrons in the event that they received goods and favors and failed to in-turn fulfill their end by voting for the individual in question. This was thought to be especially true in the African context where political leaders in the past employed the use of middle-men whose main job was
to make sure the clients followed through with casting the right votes. This was achieved in various ways but over the years, the concept of forced compliance has been eroded by reduced suffrage and technological evolution, such that while there may still be a fear arising from non-compliance amongst the people, the reality is that it is very difficult for the said middle-men or the politicians themselves to truly follow each client and ensure they cast their vote properly.

Such are the ideas championed by Lawson and Greene in Making Clientelism Work (2014) where they study reciprocity and loyalty among voters and the contexts in which many elections take place and ultimately conclude that coercion does not guarantee compliance from clients but rather, that incumbents are more likely to maintain support and gain more votes from the public that has already created a connection with them and therefore supports them despite the lack of incentives and public or private goods. New aspirants gain margin and support through championing long-term beneficial policies and that ultimately, clientelism can only be stopped through an aware public that makes political decisions along items and ideas beneficial to the community as a whole as opposed to selfish, individual needs or clientelist affiliations. (Gans-Morse, Mazzuca, & Nichter, 2014)

Many African countries have visibly clientelist political relations with the citizens primarily being clients of the political candidates who in turn use their positions of power to provide, bolster or withdraw public and private goods from the people depending on how the people respond to them. Daniel Young studies the reach of clientelism in African elections in ‘Is Clientelism at work in African Elections? (2009), conducting studies in Kenya and Zambia and looking at the relationship between members of Parliament (MPs) and their constituents and concluding that ultimately, voters are drawn to the client-patron relationship between them and their representatives but that while incentives increase voter turnout, the results are not always in
favor of the patron in question which highlights the centrality of the informed African voter on making sound political choices. He notes the growing individuality in voter’s actions, who are more concerned with local public goods beneficial to the entire community as opposed to small incentives offered to individuals that ultimately have no impact on the situation on the ground. This of course relates to the main question in this paper, seeking to understand what it is that truly influences voters to make the decisions that they do despite the incentives offered.

Kenya as a nation has been observed to highly clientelist given the relationship between the leaders and the citizens. During campaigns, aspirants and incumbents alike go to the people, charged up with promises of development and overall life improvement should they be voted into office in what is usually a show of great charisma meant to awaken support and loyalty within the people. Many times, leaders will go on the campaign trail with hand-outs having assessed where the people’s needs lie and in doing so, create an impression of truly understanding the people’s needs and being the definite person to be put into office as their representative. (Gibson & Long, 2009) (Kramon E., Where is Vote Buying Effective? Evidence from a lst experiment in Kenya, 2016)

Kramon (2013) assesses the true impact of vote buying aspect of clientelism in Kenya and notes that observed results indicate Kenyan voters prefer candidates who offer cash or other incentives to prompt voter turnout as opposed to those who do not employ such tactics. In the view of the voters, the ability of the political candidate to buy them out inspires a blind faith and raises expectations of increased patronage with additional private benefits in the future should the succeed and get into office. Kramon further reports that the operational premise of vote buying in turn reinforces ethnic voting and growing support for co-ethnic candidates as opposed to those in different tries. The ethnic debate will be analyzed in subsequent sections of this chapter but it is
important to note the interconnectedness of the ideas. Despite the popularity of the clientelist tactics, some politicians still prefer to campaign on platforms of policy and long-term benefits and thus appeal to the more enlightened public as noted by Weitz-Shapiro (2012) in her assessment of the use of clientelist elements by political candidates including Kenyan politicians.

1.5.2. Exploring the Ethnicity Debate in Voter Behavior

The term ethnicity and ethnic affiliation almost immediately evokes images of alliances between people united under a shared tribe or language. A subset of the larger racial divide, ethnicity goes deeper and has had a greater impact in societies. In African countries, ethnicity is a rather sour topic given the resource distribution, political representation and general allocation of public goods within the country is ethnically influenced and that ethnic groups with a stronger footing take home the most spoils; such is the same when confronting the subject of elections in African countries. (Fearon & Laitin, 2000) (Long & Gibson, 2015)

Kenya, like many African nations has a large and diverse number of ethnic groups that have leaders who vie for political office and has for a long time been regarded as having very ethnically charged elections. Anders Narman in Elections in Kenya (2003) notes that while Kenya may have seemed like a ‘haven of harmony’ on the surface, the political occurrences of the 1990s prove otherwise. Under the dictatorial rule of President Daniel Moi, various opposition groups were formed that fought and had multi-party democracy restored in 1992 with the repeal of Section 2A of the constitution. However, the challenge manifested in the coming elections where none of the opposition groups formed garnered enough votes to remove Moi from office. And that is what Narman identifies as the crux of the ethnicity problem in Kenyan elections and general politics. (Oyugi, 1997) (Weinreb, 2001)
Kenyans failed in two consecutive elections to unit under a common head because of the tribal disenfranchisement and thus Moi continued to rule until the pivotal moment in 2002 when all opposition united under the common head of Mwai Kibaki in what was known as the National Rainbow Alliance (NARC) and were finally able to take back control of the country from Moi.

Studies by both Long and Kramon back up the key assumptions made by Narman on the ethnic debate, indicating that political candidates always receive substantial backing from voters hailing from a similar ethnic group. While the major ethnic tribes in the country can boast of representation in the main government, there remains concern about voters who come from the smaller and less vocalized ethnic tribes and how they play into the ethnicity dynamic as defines their voter behavior. This is where Narman sheds light on the trend of alliances and how smaller ethnic groups are absorbed through their leaders into alliances with bigger ethnic groups with the assurance that they will receive benefits and increased resource allocation and public goods should their support get the political candidates into office. (Kramon E. J., 2013) (Long & Gibson, 2015) (Narman, 2003)

Since the 2002 general elections in Kenya, the political alliances have undergone drastic shifts with old foes becoming partners vice versa all in a bid to ensure their ethnic community gets the top seat and remains dominant and in control of the country’s politics and resources. This is physically manifested through evidence of how the home towns of major political players continue to get more developed and experience increase in incomes and flow of resources while others remain starved and marginalized. (Gibson & Long, 2009) (Weinreb, 2001)

Werghost and Lindberg (2013) relate the question of ethnicity to swing voters, who in this case are the voters from the marginalized tribes without a strong leader in national government and
would thus be swayed in whichever direction depending on where their alliances lie. Thus, voters without co-ethnics will be prompted to make decisions and vote for the alliance and policy that will yield the most benefits for them and this shows the connection between ethnic, patronage and economic models of voting.

1.5.3. Econometric Model of Voter Behavior

The rational-choice theory asserts that individuals make decisions after careful contemplation of all available options and ultimately select the option that is the most beneficial to them. Such is the operating mechanism of economic models of voter behavior which suggest that a voter will make decisions based on maximum benefit expected as well as on the basis of the performance of the current administration as it relates to increased benefits for them both in the private and public sphere. (Arriola, 2007) (Quattrone & Tversky, 1988)

Through the years voters in Kenya have grown increasingly aware of the politics in the country and the manner in which public funds are spent and through the media have monitored the performance of the government administration, speaking out against corruption and misuse of public resources and vowing to take a stand against corrupted institutions. Such is what drives one to believe that the economic-performance debate has more validity that the ethnicity and patronage debates before it given the centrality of the issues and the fact that voters focus more on what is beneficial to them as opposed to what ethnic ties and clientelist relations might present. (Kimenyi & Romero, 2008) (Kinder & Roderick, 1979) (Monroe, 1979) (Welch & Foster, 1992)

Kimenyi and Romero (2008) further note that after the post-electoral violence of 2007, Kenyans have become less willing to lose themselves in the throes of fanaticism and partisanship and
instead have increased focus on development goals and economic growth of the country as a whole rather than that of a small group. Corrupt activities and scandals in government institutions are looked down upon by the large majority of the population and demands for accountability made with demands lined with economic interests.

While the wave of econometric voting models continues to surge and gain traction, Long and Gibson observe that while government performance continues to grow in terms of influencing voter behavior, a great majority of voters will still prefer to vote for co-ethnics and incumbents despite the evidence before their eyes because of an embedded loyalty and ethnic ties. Through conducting a survey poll, they note that voters would easily forgive the indiscretions and misgivings of incumbents or aspirants who hail from their ethnic group just to keep them in office and maintain an element of comparative advantage against other ethnic tribes even if this keeps working to their personal detriment. (Long & Gibson, 2015)

Presently, the economic situation in Kenya has gone from bad to worse leaving no flow of monies within the system, billions of shillings lost and unaccounted for in corrupt activities, a raging famine and food shortage in the country and an international debt that has increased ten-fold over a period of five years. Polls and surveys conducted by media houses and research groups to gauge the general feeling amongst the people denotes frustration with the Jubilee Government administration and an urge to go to the polls and remove them from power given that cronies aligned to the government to officials have continued to amass great wealth at the expense of the common citizen which then reduces the percentages of loyalty and ethnic solidarity.
In addition to the three key debates i.e. clientelism-patronage, ethnicity and economic-performance models of voter behavior, there are other subliminal issues that play a great role in shaping voter behavior and as indicated by (Healy, Malhotra, Mo, & Laitin, 2010), they might not even be issues relating to the politics of the country. The main ideas asserted by the three key debates make important points but it is also important to note that a combination of all three would present a more sturdy explanation for what truly influences voter behavior.

1.6. The Role of Election Observers and Monitors

The right to universal suffrage and political participation through active voting was codified in the ICCPR of 1966, with Article 25 going further to make provisions and justifications for the need for election observation. The concept of free and fair elections varies in terms of interpretation from one country to another, especially in the cases of countries under or recently emerging from authoritarian rule where a small elite control all political processes of the government.

The need to maintain impartiality and smooth transition of power from one government to another creates the need to have independent and neutral observers on the ground to ensure the entire election period is smooth and transient, from the initial voter registration drives up until the counting of the ballots. This is where both international and domestic election monitors come in; with a scope very precisely defined and their duties carefully described and delegated to maintain the standard of procedure throughout the process.

Given the nature of their work, election observers are required to remain neutral and validate the electoral results without any hint of foul-play or bias, thus they are ordinarily made up of non-governmental civic organizations, or externally sponsored professionals who work in hand with
the constitutionally approved local electoral oversight body which sets the rules for the conduction of elections, nominations of political candidates and the manner in which the final votes will be counted, tallied and recorded. Such was the case in Kenya in 2013 when the Kenya Domestic Observation Program (K-DOP) made up of civil society and faith-based organizations that rallied together to support the election observation exercise in the country. (Nevitte & Canton, 1997) (O'Grady, Lopez-Pintor, & Stevens, 2015)

The roles played by election monitors as mentioned above range from the promotion and upholding of the constitutional laws of elections, ensuring voter registration drives and the achievement of free and fair elections as well as validating the results and declaring that the winner is as represented by the results. They provide legitimacy to the electoral process. (Kelley, 2009)

Kenya has had an especially tumultuous journey with election observation, rooted in the fact that the state was under authoritarian rule and despite having routine elections, the sole purpose of these state-run elections was to provide a sense of government legitimacy and maintain the guise of ‘free and fair elections’. After the repeal of Section 2a of the constitution in 1992, which restored the country to a multi-party democracy, the need to have external observers was fuelled by the desire of the people to see new leadership in the country as well as the fear of manipulation of the results by the existing presidency.

Once again a multi-party state, Kenya ran two elections in 1992 and 1997 which were marked by waves of pre-election and post-election violence given the might of the incumbent and the inability of the opposition to fully revolt and maintain their stand. Such situations highlight the difficult task expected of monitors, who, despite being required to provide legitimacy and
validate the election results, often find themselves in a difficult position in authoritarian countries and are often forced to favor the incumbent to keep the peace and put an end to any election violence that arises.

The need for monitors to remain impartial and abstain from taking sides during elections is often derided from in situations where the monitors feel the levels of violence in the aftermath are too high, and would be better controlled by the incumbent who ipso facto has more power and control than the opposition. Kelley (2009) notes that this was the case in Kenya during the elections in the 1990s, observing that scholars continued to criticize international monitors for not renouncing the blatant fraud in the 1997 elections which brings in the question many monitors are faced with. Similarly in the post-election violence in 2007, election monitors from the European Union initially made positive remarks about the results but then later denounced the elections as violence continued to escalate. This move was prompted by an immediate need to put a stop to the violence as more durable solutions were being formulated as with similar cases in Cambodia in the 1990s when monitors supported the incumbent over fear of rapidly spreading bouts of post-electoral violence (Kelley, 2009) (Kelley, 2012). (Beaulieu & Hyde, 2009)

In the months leading up to the 2017 general elections in Kenya, new concerns have been raised over the role that international, and local sponsored monitors truly play in the electoral process. Allegations over European sponsored monitors out to rig the ballots in favor of certain candidates have been thrown around with the current president warning foreign countries against interfering with the elections, a move that caused tension between Kenya and the United States of America on allegations of funding a covert monitoring group that was working against the government of the day.. (Group, 2016) (Nevitte & Canton, 1997)
Such issues will no doubt affect the perception of the Kenyan people about the need for the presence of election monitors and observers with some citizens sharing the sentiments of the government and viewing their presence as a stumbling block, while others of a different opinion uphold the need to have neutral observers to guarantee that the elections will indeed be a free and fair exercise as intended.

Despite the mixed perceptions regarding the need and role of election monitors, both local and international, it is impossible to take into account the impact that their presence has had on the institution of democracy and in the upholding of the norms of participatory governance. By ensuring the legitimacy of a chosen government and the leaders that it is comprised of, election monitors have nudged along the norm of participatory governance, ushering countries from authoritarian, tight-noosed rule to a more practical adaptation of democracy and in so doing, held governments and leaders accountable, shaping international discourse on what determines free and fair elections, how to achieve them and what would be termed as biased or irregular ballots. (Hyde & Marinov, 2014)(O'Grady, Lopez-Pintor, & Stevens, 2015)(Nevitte & Canton, 1997)(Teshome, 2008)

1.7. Theoretical Framework

Through the years scholars have used various theories and ideologies to explain the patterns and analyze voter behavior, with some of the suggested theories gaining preference over the others. Some of the theories that have been used to explain voter behavior range from psychological, sociological and from the realist school of thought. One such theory is that of attribution, which (Yalch, 1975) describes as the pattern of voters is continually being drawn to leaders who reflect
their personal attributes and ideals and thus, making them their preferred choice given the shared similarities.

This study relied on two main theories to explain voter behavior as related to the Kenyan case study i.e. rational choice theory and psycho-social theory as explored further below.

1.7.1. Rational choice theory of voter behavior

A rational being is one who is ordinarily described as being of sound mind and able to make decisions that have been thought through and thoroughly weighed as regards the merits and demerits. When it comes to voting, Blais (2000) describes rational electoral choice as being a replica of a cost-benefit analysis of the options but where the individual focuses more on expected benefits as opposed to potential benefits, denoting the element of expected immediate advantage upon the political candidate’s victory.

The rational choice model is quite similar to realist theories which as explained by Downs (1975), guides voter behavior along maximum gains and comparative advantage acquisition over other groups or individuals. In the Kenyan political process, this can largely be described as the narrative; given the noticeable tribal trends in voting i.e. individuals will choose to vote for candidates with whom they share an ethnic background as a power move to guarantee maximum gains for their community. Given the large ethnic composition of the country, the more dominant tribes are at the fore while `smaller` ethnic groups form alliances with and support the bigger groups in a self-sustaining effort.

Myatt (2011) further notes the influence of rational thought in guiding patterns of voter turnout at the actual polls when all indications highlight the fact that their vote may not necessarily have as great an impact on the polls as they imagine. Jeffersen drives this point home, noting that in
many instances, voter turnout is directly related to the imagine costs and benefits and as such, if voters feel that their ballot will not make any actual difference or that the process is already flawed, they would choose to abstain from the voting action. Voters’ rationality also lies in the depth of their partisanship and support for the candidate or the political party; such strong affiliations and feelings of attachment present the singular act of voting as a rational and unavoidable action for the voter. (Merrifield, 1991)

Supporters of the theory, Green and Shapiro base the model on three core assumptions (i) all decisions are rational, (ii) democracy implies consistency to support predictions and, (iii) the democratic system assumes a level of uncertainty to allow different opinions. They also draw from the maximization of action’s utility, consistency of voter thoughts, uncertainty over final actions, spatial representation of interests and strategic voting patterns. (1994)

Kenyan voters have been regarded as some of the most forward thinking, who despite tribal inclinations and fierce political partisanship, remain rational thinkers, weighing out the pros and cons of the candidates presented before then before making final decisions on who they will cast their votes for. As renowned political analyst Professor Macharia Munene puts it, there is a big difference between ethnic identities and ethnic affiliation. (Macharia, 2017)

1.7.2. Psycho-social Theory of Voter Behavior

This model is attributed to the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan as pioneered by Campbell and Kahn (1952) in `The People Elect a President`. It represents an all-encompassing wave of factors drawn from constructivist, sociological and psychological models of thought. The psycho-social draws from three primary spheres of influence to ultimately
provide cohesion between the psychological and social factors regulating voter behavior as described below:

a.) Partisanship

Campbell and Kahn describe partisanship as arising out of psychological affinity for stable and lasting relationships with a political party that does not necessarily translate into concrete links. It borrows from reference groups concept where individuals join a new group and begin to act in a manner they think is befitting to the new group. Partisanship is most often drawn from the socialization in the family with varying degrees of involvement. However, it does not always match the voter’s ultimate decision. (1952)

b.) Funnel of Causality

This represents the chain of events that contribute to the vote of subjects and the difference between proximal i.e. friends’ influence, government action; and distinguishing factors such as socio-economic factors, religion and residence. Popkin compares sociological and social factors plus partisanship to determine the ultimate choice prompt, but does not stress on social factors and the impact of communication. (1994) (Campbell & Kahn, 1952)

c.) Proximal and Distal Factors

Changes in individual preferences are attributed to adjustments in life such as new environments, interactions or due to sudden fall of long-standing rule such as the fall of the Soviet Union. Short-term changes also have equal capacity to influence thought and
are reflected in attitudes toward policy proposals, candidates and group benefits as described by Harrop and Miller (1987). They influence and cause sudden changes in voting patterns without affecting the original loyalty and partisanship. This then presents an opportunity to understand voters through information processing and rationality and dynamicity of electoral processes rather than through psychosocial variables which do not have sufficient empirical backing. (Campbell Ibid.) (Popkin, 1994)

Bringing the theory home and applying it to the Kenyan setting immediately shows the influence that partisanship, causality and proximal factors have had and continue to have in terms of influencing voter behavior. Kenyan voters ordinarily exhibit strong political ties to leaders and the ideologies that they champion thus bringing into play the element of partisanship and the funnel of causality being drawn from the situations they are bred in and exposed to and they beliefs that they are firmly rooted in.

The proximal and distal factors in the Kenyan case would be matters such as the doctors’ strike and the on-going drought experienced in many parts of the country. These issues in addition to routine scandals that break out about the political leaders and the manner in which the media portrays them similarly have a great impact on how the people will choose to vote come the election.

The use of these two theories in particular fuse together to reflect the ideals pursued by the research questions in this study and show the influence they exert both in individual and combined capacities. While rational choice theory suggests that all actions and decisions are guided by sane and logical thought, explanations from psycho-social theories suggest that there
is an underlying element of influence arising from stimulating factors within the environment an individual is in as well as the situational factors that arise occasionally to sway what would be the swing voter in this case.

1.7.3. Contrasting Rational Choice and Public Choice Theory

Public choice theory essentially asserts that individuals are essentially motivated by self-interest and all their actions are guided by efforts to maximize their personal gains. This model of thought, much like rational choice and realist theories, assume that at the core of decision-making is the primacy given to self-sustenance. Developed as a branch of economics by James Buchanan and Gordon Tullock, public choice theory has over the years been used to analyze and explain people’s behavior in decision-making processes. Similarly, John Mbaku (2004) has used the theory to describe how individuals can maximize benefit through interest groups and ensure equitable distribution of resources. However, the corrupted and failed institutions in many African countries present a challenge for the proper implementation of these strategies. An established underpinning of the public choice theory in its application to voter behavior is that the lack of incentives that allows proper monitoring of government by voters is detrimental and as such, the voter remains largely aloof in political issues through rational ignorance. Rational choice theory however asserts the constant awareness of individuals and that the information they possess at hand is what guides their decision making processes.

As Mbaku (2004) points out, public choice is centered around the attempts by both individual voters and the politicians to maximize their own benefits and as such, is heavily tied to economic models of behavior and rationality. The parameters put in place by the tenets of public choice thus ensure that the government does not have too much control over economic activities and
leaves an opening for interest groups and individuals to pursue ideals and keep checks and balances on governmental activities. A more transparent institutional system ensures efficient running of all sectors in the country.

Using public choice theory concurrently with rational choice theory indicates a higher level of reasoning within individuals in the decision-making process where it is observed that self-interest and maximum gains are the primary driving force behind many of the political decisions made by individuals. In the case of explaining voter behavior, these two theories tie extensively with the econometric debate around voter behavior, showing that ultimately individuals are self-preserving and will only make choices and vote for political aspirants who mirror the ideals they pursue for themselves.

These theories explain why seemingly rational individuals would be swayed by the humdrum of political party fanaticism despite their status and levels of exposure through deconstructing the manner in which these forces correlate, molding the process of thought formation and ultimate decision making in individuals as regards to making political choice and voting for their preferred candidates.

1.8. Methodology

This study sought to understand the deeply embedded factors that play major roles in shaping how individual voters make their final decision and dictated that the research designs to be used in collecting data are wide and flexible enough to accommodate statistics and more flux data and as such employed a mixed methods approach to data collection.
This study uses primarily quantitative methods of data collection to amass the necessary information, analyze and represent it in a manner representative of the study area with the main rationale for this specific design being that it offers new data to capture the changes in opinion during the coming election and still incorporating past findings to substantiate these findings. The key instruments of data collection are structured questionnaires and secondary data from pre-existing literature is used to back up the findings from the qualitative study.

This study uses as the primary site, the county of Nairobi which is by far the most representative of the national demographic and cuts across the board as regards the spectrum of voter representation in terms of age, political party affiliation, ethnic tribes, economic status and religious orientation. In addition, Nairobi County has the second highest number of registered voters, coming second after Kiambu County. Elections are naturally a very participatory exercise, invoking both mental and physical awareness and participation of the citizens and as trends continue to indicate, Nairobi continues to be the hotbed of political activity especially in the three main constituencies where the data was collected i.e. Starehe, Lang’ata and Roysambu Constituencies where a distinctive voting pattern has been observed through the elections.

The diversity in the county of Nairobi in terms of age, education levels, social stratification, political exposure and ethnic representations produces a vibrant and complex study sample for this research paper and as such the study is all-representative, seeking the voices of people from all walks of life notwithstanding age, political party affiliation, ethnic background and placement within the social strata.
1.8.1. Data collection methods and analysis

This study uses a primarily qualitative method of data collection through the use of structured questionnaires administered to respondents and the employment of previously recorded findings to further strengthen and validate the arguments presented by the quantitative data.

The analysis methods rely extensively on statistical testing of variables and establishment of the type of cause-and-effect relationship and ultimately providing measurable facts and data that will aid future research in the subject area. Respondents will be required to answer a set of questions formulated from the key aspects embodied in the objectives and from their responses, this study conducted statistical tests to assess the extent and significance of these variable and voter behavior.

Kenya is a country that has had a tumultuous political climate with a post-election violence in the near past and continued tensions between political and ethnic groups and as such, studying voter behavior may pose a significant challenge when it comes to willingness of individuals to respond. Taking this into consideration, the questionnaires administered to respondents are shaped in a manner that they address very direct issues without coercing the subject to divulge compromising information or placing them in any unethical or conflicted position from their view point. Each respondent will be fully informed of what the research is for and through anonymity, assured of protection during publication and the total and complete respect of their boundaries and personal lives.

1.8.2. Ethical safeguards and limitations

The people of Kenya are one of the most expressive and opinionated people by any measure of standard, especially on matters relating to politics and how the government is run and given the nature of the study it was important to ensure the data collection tool was framed in a manner
that allowed the respondent to give information without over-indulging or being concerned over any possible implications arising from their participation in this study. As such, the structured questionnaire catered for the detail, restricting respondents to a set of choices but still adequately covering the main issues relating to the study and as such, maintaining quality and preventing possible distortion of responses.

The nature of the study is very large and given different conditions, would require responses from all citizens of voting age in the entire country to fully reflect what the voter behavior inclinations of the masses truly are. Previous studies done by scholars such as Cheeseman (2014), Hornsby (2012), and Long (2015) among others have conducted state-wide surveys in order to collect nationally representative data with plausible findings. This study however, given logistical, time and size implications could not conduct as large a survey as has been previously done and opted for a smaller but equally representative sample size of 60 respondents that would still offer a statistical edge and valid findings.

Through the data collection and the analysis, this study ensures anonymity and protection of the respondents and through the testing and analysis of their responses, presents statistically relevant findings to uphold or disparage the key assumptions of this research paper.

1.9. Organization of the Thesis

Chapter one looks at the development of voting rights both internationally and the progression of voter action in the Kenyan political space, tracing the events shaping the manner in which elections have been carried out in the country since independence. The background of the study looks at the electoral trajectory, assessing a number of issues that have influenced voter behavior in Kenya. An overview of the role of the international community, the diaspora and election
monitors as well as past trends helps lay an understanding of the current context in which the 2017 general elections will take place.

This chapter presents existing literature on the subject, showing existing thought and understanding on the subject of voter behavior which is grouped according into three major debates. The exploration of the overall significance of the study follows the literature debates as well as the identification of the groups of individuals who will benefit from the research conducted in this paper. The research questions map out the key study area and consequentially shape the research design, the tools to be used and the methods of analysis to follow. This chapter lays the foundation for the next chapters, mapping out the key ideas that will be expanded in subsequent chapters.

Chapter two takes cue from the introductory chapter, going into deeper detail in analyzing the Kenyan political scene as guided by the key ideas mapped out in chapter one. As guided by the three key literature debates presented in chapter one, we explore the history of elections in the country and the current political scene in the run up to the August 2017 elections and how the citizenry has responded to shifts in political partnerships, the rise of independent candidates and how the scandals in the current government have shaped the attitudes of voters and the possible implications on the voter behavior. The issues relating to post-election violence and the voices from the diaspora are as well further assessed as relating to the research objectives.

Chapter three goes deeper into the research design, laying out the methodology in deeper detail and defining the tools to be used in data collection, and how the collected information is to be analyzed. The chapter explores the process followed during profiling the study site as well as explaining the reasoning for the tools used as opposed to data collection methods previously
used. A questionnaire sample will be provided, showing how the questions formulated correlate with and represent the research objectives. The findings from the data are statistically analyzed through numerical coding and data entry with a Pearson’s correlation test conducted to show the relationship between the key variables and how the independent and dependent relate with the control variable. The findings are then presented in a manner veritable for theoretical analysis to be made in further chapters.

Chapter four presents the results achieved from the methodology chapter, presenting them systematically as aligned with the specific research objectives they were relating to and showing the results from testing the hypotheses generated from the objectives. The results of the analyses will then be compared to previous findings in literature and the theoretical frameworks previously explained in prior chapters. The chapter will as well describe some of the challenges experienced during the data collection process, the maneuvers employed to deal with the problems and the ultimate results.

The final chapter offers a summary of the entire paper, reminding the reader of the initial purpose of the study, the processes of data collection and analysis and the major findings and the statistical output generated from the correlation tests done on the primary data collected. In addition, chapter five offers policy, programmatic and educational recommendations in line with the results and the research questions and key points to be taken into consideration by scholars and researchers in this study area. This chapter ties all the ideas in the paper, with the conclusion answering the main question that prompted the study.
CHAPTER TWO: UNDERSTANDING THE ELECTORAL FRAMEWORK IN KENYA

2.0. Introduction

The main aim of this study was to conduct an analytical assessment of voter behavior in Kenya and define the main factors that influence and shape this phenomenon. Given the composition and location of the country Kenya, this study is truly intrinsic, requiring an understanding of the electoral and political processes in the country since the achievement of independence and through chronological order, note the key events and occurrences that have shaped the present-day political scene in Kenya and influenced how the voting public makes electoral choices.

This chapter as guided by the literature review and the interrogation of the key debates in chapter one goes on to look at the operation of elections in Kenya, tracing them through the years and taking note of some of the key events that have shaped the electoral process such as the 2007/8 post-election violence, the state of the economy and the influence of the diaspora community and constantly shifting political alliances and their impact on the attitudes of voters. The present administration has had a particularly difficult stint at the office with a failing economy, a more disgruntled people and a tough international disposition and we analyze how all these issues influence the perception of voters and their subsequent actions while casting ballot.

The information assessed and garnered in this chapter molds the research design and the tools used for data collection in subsequent chapters as well as offering a basis from which the results can be analyzed and conclusive results and inferences drawn from the findings having
understood the history of electoral politics in the country and the changes they have gone through in the past years.

2.1. Elections in Kenya

The main aim of this research paper is to find out the main factors that influence behavior in the forthcoming 2017 general elections. The previous chapter gave an overview of the development of the electoral system in Kenya and some of the key moments in the history as well as noting the impact of additional factors such as the international community. In this section we go deeper into the subject, tracing the history and analyzing the impact of the aforementioned key historical moments on the lives of voters and the politics in the country and the impact of past events such as the post-election violence, the diaspora community and ever-increasing government scandals. We also look at the body mandated with conducting elections i.e. the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission (IEBC), the constitutional framework giving its mandate and some of the challenges it has encountered in attempts to run peaceful free and fair elections in Kenya through the years.

2.2.1. Definitive moments in Kenya’s Electoral History: 1963-2013

Kenya has had a colorful and tumultuous political past and these events have shaped the current political scene and the manner in which elections and politics are conducted in the country. Taking a chronological view, we start out in 1963 where Jomo Kenyatta won Presidency in the first ever elections in the country post-independence. He held the top position until his death in 1978 when Daniel Arap Moi took over the presidency and would hold the position for 24 year until 2002. During the period between 1963 and 1978 however, there arose disgruntlements within government that saw former Prime Minister Jaramogi Oginga Odinga leave the main
political party KANU to form his own opposition party KPU in a move that set the parameters for future political party formation. In addition to the public opposition, a popular minister Tom Mboya was murdered and the aftermath heightened existing ethnic tensions.

After Kenyatta’s death in 1978, Vice president Moi took over unopposed and ruled smoothly until an attempted military coup in 1982 by Military leader Hezekiah Ochuka. Despite being unsuccessful, the coup prompted President Moi to take drastic measures and later in the year, parliament declared Kenya a one-party state. The immediate impacts of this meant that any political party outside of the ruling KANU was illegal and the country was under authoritarian rule.

There were more state-run executions and detentions of opposition leaders that many times prompted the international community to step in to try and remedy the situation and guide the country to democratic governance. In 1992, a breakthrough for the opposition parties came through in the form of the repeal of Section 2A of the constitution which re-instated multi-party governance and in so doing, gave a standing chance for the realization of democratic governance in Kenya. Later in the year, the first multi-party elections were held but President Moi still won and retained the seats due to the scramble for power by the opposition groups which disparaged the votes and left Moi a clear margin for victory. The situation repeated itself again in 1997 due to the largely divided opposition with Moi winning again and the country falling into a bout of ethnic, post-election violence. (Charles, 2012) (Oyugi, 1997)

In the 2002 general elections, Kenya experienced what Narman (2003) describes as a turning point. After months of deliberations and consultations among the opposition groups, a super alliance was born consisting of the most prolific members of each opposition group with Mwai
Kibaki as the sole presidential candidate to take back the country from Moi’s dictatorial regime. The selection of Kibaki as a sole candidate also changed the ethnic debate in Kenya, with him now being seen as a national leader as opposed to the initial perception of him as a Kikuyu leader. Moi as well fronted Uhuru Kenyatta, son of first president Jomo Kenyatta as KANU’s presidential candidate as a move to cede power while still remaining a key part of the ruling government.

The NARC alliance won the election with a landslide victory given the unification of several tribes and the country finally had a taste of democratic, free and fair elections. The new government came with many promises such as free primary school education, improved healthcare systems and a vow to break down the gaps between ethnic groups for a more united and prosperous Kenya. In 2005, President Kibaki presented a draft constitution to parliament which experienced a great vote against it and put Kibaki’s legitimacy under question. This would be the first of many tests that the Kibaki administration would go through in addition to the increased claims of ethnic favoritism and corruption in government. (Cliffe, 2003) (Weinreb, 2001) (Charles, 2012)

One of the most pivotal moments in Kenya’s electoral history came in December of 2007 during the general elections. Relations between members of the initial NARC alliance under the leadership of President Kibaki had grown sour through the years and there was a heightened tension in the air as the election drew closer. Raila Odinga broke away from NARC alliance to form his own Orange Democratic Party (ODM) to serve as his ticket for the presidential seat while Kibaki sought re-election under the Party of National Unity (PNU). After the casting of ballot in December 2007, the tension grew thicker as the citizens waited for the results to be announced amid claims of electoral fraud, ballot rigging and ethnic targeting and when Kibaki
was declared winner and sworn in in secrecy, all out violence broke out in what would be the worst bout of violence the country had seen since the clashes in the 1990s. (Charles, 2012) (Gans-Morse, Mazzuca, & Nichter, 2014) (Oyugi, 1997)

The uncharacteristic violence of the post-election violence drew international attention and emissaries were sent in quickly for fear of another genocide erupting in Africa like the Rwandan catastrophe in the early 1990s. A panel of eminent African personalities was sent in to negotiate peace between the two warring parties and quell the violence. The then United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan then stepped in as the main mediator between President Kibaki and Raila Odinga, negotiating a treaty between the two that would see the country get a devolved government and second Prime Minister since independence. (Amadi, 2009) (Klopp & Kamungi, 2008) (Charles, 2012)

A probe into the perpetrators of the post-Election violence came later, spear-headed by the local Waki Commission whose findings were forwarded to International Criminal Court (ICC) Prosecutor Luis Moreno Ocampo for further investigation and prosecution. The findings by Ocampo outlined six main suspects to be held culpable for the Post-election violence and the murder of thousands of Kenyans and among these were Uhuru Kenyatta, son of first President Jomo Kenyatta, William Ruto, an ally to Prime Minister Odinga and four others. In 2010 a new constitution was signed that created a devolved form of government and created new positions in government by breaking down the provinces into 47 counties. While the country struggled to adapt to the new devolved system, the cases against the PEV perpetrators were lodged at the ICC and two of the three defendants had formed a new alliance and were seeking presidency in the forthcoming 2013 elections. (Charles, 2012) (Nation, 2013)
The country struggled with having two aspirants seeking office being indicted at the ICC as they went into elections and surprisingly, the Jubilee Alliance sailed through and took office despite the ICC giant looming behind them and the electoral period being marked with heightened sense of tension and a wide fear of another bout of violence and continued culture of electoral fraud.

2.2.2. The Run-up to 2017 General Elections

From the last months of 2016 to the first half of 2017, the air in Kenya has been charged with excitement and anticipation for the forthcoming August 8th elections with most media houses airing daily shows that track the political scene and the countdown to the election date. Past concerns such as the Post-election violence of 2007-08 and the increasing ethnic tension through hate-speeches by reputable leaders continue to be raised and the more informed populace continues to question the legitimacy and efficiency of the current government even as they mull over the candidates that have come forth through the months seeking office and an opportunity to serve and represent the people in the manner that previous leaders have failed to.

To understand the complexity of the forthcoming election it is important to look over some of the key concerns held by the citizenry as regards the elections starting with past experiences, the electoral body mandated to oversee elections and the role of the diaspora community.

2.2.3. Lessons from the Post-Election Violence

Despite Kenya seeming very calm on the surface, the country has had underlying tensions as observed in the ethnic-based violence in the 1990s and until the 2007 post-election violence, the ethnic division and tribalism was viewed as a dormant volcano, present but ultimately harmless. The violence however showed a different side to the peaceful and adaptable Kenyans than the world had seen before and exposed the frustrations held by the common citizen for whom the
tribalism, corruption and corrupted resource distribution was the embodied in neighbors belonging to different tribes. As Murunga (2011) puts it, the electoral fraud was only a catalyst that set off an eruption deeply embedded in the Kenyan citizens who were tired of government officials and single tribes benefitting at their expense. The electoral fraud and weak institutions spurred violence as an alternative to seeking government legitimacy. (Kanyinga & Long, 2012) (Murunga, 2011)

While the 2013 elections seemed to have passed by with a relative sense of peace, the violent history continues to haunt Kenyans especially during the electoral period. The violence created a rift between tribes that has since remained un-mended and continues to be prodded by the hate speeches being made by leaders concerning the coming elections and their desire for their candidates to take the top seats to afford them a chance to ‘sit at the big table’ so to speak. Nation Media Group (2017) ran several articles on hate speeches made by political aspirants speaking in native tongue to supporters and urging them to take up arms and fight for their rights should the results not go in the way they expect. An embodiment of this was seen during the party primaries where political parties held elections for aspirants to get votes from the people to support their bids and where aspirants did not agree with the results, violence broke out. This was largely seen as an attempt to bring legitimacy and transparency to the political race through having the voters choose the candidate they felt would be the best representative for them to the government. (BBC, 2017) (Nation, 2017)

2.2.3. Diaspora and Homeland Elections

In 2011, citizens of the Southern region of Sudan living both within the country and in other states cast a decisive vote that would see the birth of the world’s youngest nation, South Sudan in the culmination of a long fight for self-determination. The world rejoiced with the people of
South Sudan, and for many African nations, it was a lesson in the great impact that the diaspora can have on pushing and realization of national agendas in addition to the usual remittances sent home. (Whitaker B. E., 2011)

In Kenya, citizens in the diaspora had for a long time fought for the right to take part in political processes back home and especially in choosing leaders during general elections. Over years, as more governments extended dual citizenship and voting rights to nationals based abroad, the pressure for the Kenyan government to do the same grew insurmountable and finally in 2010, the newly promulgated constitution extended both dual citizenship and an official election participation structure for diaspora citizens in a move to increase political support as well as avoid direct political competition. (Kramon & Posner, 2011) (Nation, 2013) (Charles, 2012)

The entry of the diaspora vote brought new concerns with it as regards the voting patterns and alliances that the abroad-based nationals would form and the issues likely to influence their voting behavior. The question of which debate would likely influence their voter behavior was raised and politicians grappled with whether they would be ethnically driven and vote along ethnic blocs or whether it was driven by self-interest as with the econometric models or, if they would vote as regards the information they had been presented with, using cues to identify desirable candidates. In 2013 only Kenyans living within the East African Community were allowed to vote and amid cries of indignation from the other members of the diaspora, the results of the diaspora vote showed that there were significantly lesser chances of ethnic and clientelist patterns of voting, with most individuals voting along policy lines and overall country development. Whitaker and Inyanji attribute this behavior pattern to the thin exposure to ethnic ties thus weak ethnic identification and the fact that these individuals would be unlikely to benefit from the patronage-clientelist relations and are thus more interested in how the country
will benefit in the long-term. This ultimately proves that given different exposure and more awareness, voters are not guided by rudimentary thought and will exercise rationality in decision making. (Secretariat, 2013) (Whitaker & Inyanji, 2015)

2.3. The Electoral Body in Kenya

One of the key pillars of democratic governance systems lies in the representation of people and their ability to exercise their political rights and cast ballot in favor of their preferred candidate. The right to political participation is enshrined in Article 25 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) of 1966 and in Chapter seven of the 2010 Kenyan Constitution. In order for citizens to fully realize the full reach of their rights, there needs to be an established system and government institutions that work to preserve these rights. In the case of Kenyan elections, the body in charge is the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission (IEBC), established in 2011 by the Constitution of Kenya to function as an independent regulatory agency through conducting and supervising all electoral activities in the country. Some of the main tasks carried out by the IEBC include registration of voters, settlement of electoral disputes and candidate registration among others. (2010)

Before the IEBC became the sole election coordinator, the main body mandated to cover elections was the now defunct Electoral Commission of Kenya (ECK) which under Chairman Samuel Kivuitu had run several elections in the 1990s, in 2002 and a referendum in 2005. The old constitution had made provision for the ECK and outlined the main roles it was to play which included voter education and registration, conducting free and fair elections and validating election results. The commission had run the program smoothly until the unrest after the 2007 elections and the decision by chairman Kivuitu to swear in the president in an uncharacteristic
manner. That led to a call for a complete overhaul of its system and replacement by an Interim Independent Electoral Commission (IIEC) in May 2009 with a duty to reform the electoral systems in Kenya and ran successful operations for 12 months after which the new constitution instated the IEBC as the primary election-conducting body. (EACLJ, 2011)

After coming into operation in 2010, the IEBC set operations and continued voter registration and preparations for the next general elections in 2013. During these elections, the commission conducted voter registration for 30 days, using Biometric Voter Registration Kits (BVR), designed to increase efficacy and keep better records of registered voters in the country. Scandal however broke out when many of the kits that had cost taxpayers millions in shillings were dysfunctional, broken or simply lost. This set poor precedence for the commission with claims of corruption and schemes of electoral fraud by the commission. In addition, due to time and logistical constraints, the IEBC cut short the registration of Kenyans living in the diaspora except for those within the East African Community, a move that was met with more public outcry. (Secretariat, 2013)

The elections came and were conducted peacefully despite heightened tension amongst the people and several mishaps in polling stations across the country. When the results were announced declared Uhuru Kenyatta and William Ruto of the Jubilee Alliance as the victors, the opposition filed cases seeking a recount of the votes which was ruled out in court, officially granting victory to President Kenyatta.

The experience has been quite different for the IEBC in preparing for the 2017 elections with increased ethnic and political tensions, the failure of proper conduction of party primaries, trouble with registration of candidates, the high scrutiny by international election monitors and
the Kenyan media and the allegations of ineptitude made against the commission as a sign of lack of faith in their ability to conduct truly free and fair elections. These claims also serve to affect the opinions voters and whether they choose to turn up on Election Day depending on whether they believe the body mandated to conduct elections will serve them well. (BBC, 2017)
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN

3.0. Introduction

This chapter is where the main ideas of the paper and the research questions are tested out through the use of data collection tools, designed to test and validate the results of the questions derived from the research questions of the study. This chapter covers matters of research design, data collection methods and tools, methods of data analysis and concludes with challenges faced in the process of collecting the data for the research.

The main purpose of this research paper was to investigate the factors influencing voter behavior with the case study being Kenya 2017 general elections and in so doing attempt to predict the manner in which the 2017 general elections will play out in Kenya. The study of human behavior is a vast and widely faceted discipline of study and as such there was need to further break down the main research topic into measurable and testable research questions; thus, the two main areas that influence voter behavior that this paper looks at are the individual centered factors and the arising-situational factors. In order to present these two questions in a manner proficient for testing, we look at what makes up each element and the key derivatives that will shape the research design.

The established norm of investigating voter behavior and elections has been done on a primarily large scale using national surveys and exit polls that present nationally representative data for analysis given the scale of the study. Long and Hoffman (2013) used a nationally representative exit poll survey with a total of 4,022 respondents drawn from each region in the country. Similarly, Kramon (2013) used a large-scale survey with responses from 2000 Kenyans selected
from 141 of the 210 constituencies in the old constitution. Studies by Whitaker (2013), Young (2009), Werghost and Lindberg (2013), Wantchekon (2003) and Arriola (2007) demonstrate a similar use of nation-wide surveys through administered questionnaires as the primary data collection method for the research they have conducted. Wafula (2010) conducted a similar study, narrowing down the number of survey respondents to a total of 600 individuals drawn from regions with substantial political representation and leadership in the government. The studies previously done indicate that a survey method of data collection is best for such a study and in order to yield nationally representative results. In this case, the study conducted was of a much smaller scale, singling out respondents from two constituencies in one county as guided by the sample population selected as further described below.

3.1. Site Description

This study was conducted in the county of Nairobi; this is because of the overall representativeness of the county, having the most constituencies in the entire country as compared to other counties and an existing partisanship to the two main political party alliances vying for seats in the general elections. Out of 17 constituencies, the Jubilee party holds 9 seats and the CORD faction 8 in an ever developing rivalry. In addition, residents of Nairobi County have continued to demonstrate peculiar voting patterns, leaning more towards economic development and policy driven voting behavior that still maintains a deeply embedded ethnic imprint.

According to Infotrak Kenya (2016), Nairobi County has an estimate population of 3.2 million people out of which, 2.2 million have been registered as voter by the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission (IEBC). This is the county with the highest number of registered voters, followed closely by Kiambu with 1.1 million and is the county with the strongest voice in the
country, thus asserting its importance for this study as well as the convenience and accessibility for data collection.

3.2. Study Design

Bryman describes research design as the provisional framework for the collection and analysis of data and gives an understanding of the prioritization of issues in the research process. (2012) And in so doing expresses connections between defined variables, prescribes appropriate data collection tools and appropriate analysis methods.

This study adopts a descriptive and interrogative design with the main aim being to understand the political behavioral characteristics of Kenyan voters during general elections and determine the extent to which these characteristics subsequently shape behavior. For the most part, scholars investigating political behavior have relied on cross-sectional studies spanning wide regions for reflective representation, using surveys and exit polls as the main data collection tool. The micro-analysis of this study offers new insights by selecting a study group that is widely representative of the large majority and that will provide results applicable to wider groups of study. (Shaw & Wright, 1967)

While the methods of understanding and investigating voter behavior are numerous, the easiest and most efficient methods relies on asking the people directly and as such, this study employed the use of a quantitative study questionnaire, targeting 100 respondents chosen with regard to representativeness within the entire population. Questionnaires collect responses from an identified target group with each respondent providing their response only once and then feedback is analyzed statistically to identify patterns in the data and relationship between the described variables. Surveys are used for larger study samples and in this case, a questionnaire
provides a sample for analysis within the required population that can be evaluated against larger data collections.

This study used both quantitative and qualitative methods, with the questionnaires bringing in the statistics and the numbers and the qualitative element coming from previously published information and data to validate the findings of the primary data collected. The combination of tools on this study was a strategy designed to increase representativeness and precision as well as gain deeper insights on voter behavior during general elections and what issues truly play a dynamic role in terms of influence. (Henn, Weinstein, & Foard, 2007) (Olsen, 2012) (Mugenda, 1999) (Somekh & Lewin, 2005)

3.3. Study variables

Variables are described as attributes on which cases vary and can either be independent or dependent in terms of their measurement properties. Independent variables are usually known to have an effect on dependent variables and are both used in determining internal validity and causality in research. (Bryman, 2012)

The independent variables used in this research study were those thought to relate to individual centered factors i.e. education, age, ethnicity, political party affiliation, leadership traits, economic status and those arising from situational factors i.e. scandals within government regarding political aspirants. The dependent variable was voter behavior. The intervening variables were analyzed and the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to establish the relationship between the independent and dependent variable. The results from the assessed relationships are outlined and discussed in chapter four.
3.4. Population

Wafula (2014) defines population as an aggregate of people, things or an entire set of relevant cases that a researcher picks out to obtain a sample to study and give answers to the outlined research objectives. The targeted population in this study was comprised of registered voters in the county of Nairobi for the 2017 general elections. Further breaking down the study population, the respondents were chosen from 2 of the 17 constituencies in Nairobi i.e. Starehe and Lang’ata, given the levels of partisanship and political fanatics witnessed in these constituencies and their dynamic political behavior.

3.5. Sample and Sampling Procedures

A sample is a smaller representation of the entire selected population, thought to exhibit the required characteristics for the purposes of the research being conducted. The study of voter behavior would require that the data set have all registered voters in the country however, the logistical and scientific considerations, the most representative sample was chosen as a reflection of the greater population.

Given operational precedence, the sampling strategy chosen was purposive sampling which allows for the selection of candidates by the researcher given their close relation to the matter being studied. The county of Nairobi and the 2 constituencies were chosen on the basis of representativeness of the county in terms of demographic, economic status, education and employment as well as the observed uniqueness in voting patterns through the years.

Respondents would be randomly selected within the county to respond to the questionnaire, to prevent bias in response and be fully notified of the purposes for which the research is being
conducted and guaranteed of anonymity and protection of identity to ensure they responded to the questions with clear minds and full awareness of their role in providing data for this study.

3.6. Data Collection

Primary data served as the main basis for the conduction of the study and the attempts to find measurable answers to the research questions with regard to the impact of individual and situational factors on voter behavior in general elections. Supplementary secondary data had been used to boost the study findings where necessary and as such, the data came from two main sources, administered questionnaires and previously published information and records.

An administered questionnaire was used to collect the primary data, designed with close ended questions to ensure maximum statistical representation and to reduce the amount of time to be spent in coding as opposed to have a mix of close and open ended questions on the questionnaire. Given the small number of respondents, the questionnaire was printed out in the English language under the assumption that all respondents had a basic level of proficiency in the language. Where respondents experienced difficulty in terms of interpreting the questions, the researcher broke down the meaning into a simplified form to ensure they understood what kind of response was required from them.

The rest of the information came from secondary source i.e. published reports, theses and dissertations and polls run in the country with the study adopting a reliable triangulated method that benefited from all facets of information gathered.

3.7. Techniques of Data Analysis

The collection of data is followed by what is described as data analysis, a process of systematic processing and interrogation of the information collected from the research done in the field. In
this study, the SPSS data analysis tool was used to and code the quantitative data collected then process, interpret and present the findings made from the relationships observed. A Pearson correlation test was done to assess the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, showing the extent to which their interaction affected voter behavior.

The qualitative data from the interviews was also coded according to the arising themes in the conversations and an analysis of the extent of their relationships with the variables in the context of voter behavior and used to draw conclusions and make recommendations in chapter five.

3.8. Challenges in the Fieldwork Process and Their Solutions

The data collection process was tumultuous and riddled with many challenges, the first of which were the financial implications given the self-sponsored nature of the researcher. Despite the study having been localized to Nairobi County, traveling from one constituency to the other to collect data was a challenge in terms of transportation cost and development and printing of the questionnaire stretching out the duration of data collection.

In addition, the nature of the study awakens curiosity and suspicions among the respondents, given the violent election history and the visible tension in the air as the 2017 general elections approach. Thus there was a need to fully brief many respondents on why their participation was vital for the study and convince them of their maintained anonymity, as well as assuring them that the research was for academic purposes only. A small group of respondents demanded compensation for answering the questionnaire which put the researcher in a conundrum and a number of the questionnaires were not returned, requiring the researcher to reprint and re-distribute more copies to take the place of the lost copies.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction.

Through the examination of previously existing literature and the collection of data from questionnaire respondents, the primary focus of this research study was to interrogate the factors affecting voter behavior in Kenya’s 2017 general elections. The findings derived from the data collected would then guide in the prediction of the events and results of the 2017 general elections. The previous chapter outlined the manner in which the research was designed and the methods and tools used to collect data and the specific variables that were at play as well as their functionality and interaction. The results derived from the study have a direct implication in the upholding or extermination of the initial concept broached in this study, i.e. that there is/or isn’t a strong influence on voter behavior from individual and situational factors.

Therefore this chapter presents the results and findings of the study of the research questions with respect to the data information collected from the respondents. The results from the analysis are interrogated in correspondence with the research questions outlined in the introductory chapter; calling for the examination of the relationship between individual and situational centered factors with the anticipated voter behavior in Kenyans. The chapter begins with the analysis and reports on General information with respect to the respondents; consequently second part looks on the reports of the analysis of the voter behavior , the third part covers on the report of the analysis of the influence of the individual centered factors, the forth part covers on the analysis and report of the influence of the arising situational stimuli and finally the last part covers on the correlation tests to test the statistical significant relationship between the variables of the study and ties up the findings in a summary of the entire chapter.
4.2. General Information

The first section of the questionnaire contained questions that would guide the classification of individuals and the respondents provided their general information based on gender, age, education, employment status and the average monthly income; these issues having been identified as the most definitive and effective to use for grouping purposes.

4.2.1 Age.

Research was done to investigate the age group of the respondents and it was found that 42.4% were between 18-24 years, 25.4% were between 25-30 years, 20.3% were between 31-40 years and 11.9% were 41 years and above.

Thus the majority were between 18-24 years as shown in the figure 4.1 below.

Figure 4.1: Age.
4.2.2 Gender.

From the general information it was found that 49.2% were males and 50.8% were females. Thus majority of the respondents were female as shown in the figure 4.2 below.
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**Figure 4.2: Gender**

4.2.3 Education.

From the general information provided by the respondents based on level of education, it was found that 3.4% had high school as the highest level of education, 8.5% had technical college certificates as the highest level of education, 55.9% had university degree as the highest level of education, 27.1% had master’s degree as the highest level of education and 5.1% had doctorate degree as the highest level of education.

Thus the majority of the respondents had university degree as the highest level of their education as shown in the figure 4.3 below.
4.2.4 Employment Status.

Research was done to investigate the employment status of the respondents and it was found that, 38.6% were students, 14% were self-employed, 17.5% were unemployed and 29.8% were employed. Thus the majority of the respondents were students as shown in the figure 4.4 below.
4.2.5 Average Monthly income.

The employed respondents were asked their average monthly income and it was found that 9.1% were earning below 10,000 shillings, 18.1% were earning between 10,000-40,000 shillings, 18.2% were earning between 40,000-80,000 shillings, 31.8% were earning between 80,000-12,000 shillings and 22.7% were earning above 120,000 shillings per month. Thus the majority of the respondents had an average monthly income of between 80,000-120,000 shillings as shown in the table 4.1 below.

**Table 4.1: Average Monthly income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>[VALUE]</td>
<td>[VALUE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>[VALUE]</td>
<td>[VALUE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>[VALUE]</td>
<td>[VALUE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>[VALUE]</td>
<td>[VALUE]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.4: Status of Employment.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below 10000</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10000-40000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40000-80000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80000-120000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 120000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.6 Religion.

From the general information based on religion it was found that 88.9% were Christians, 5.6% were Muslims and 5.6% were Atheists as shown in the figure 4.5 below.

![Figure 4.5: Religion.](image-url)

4.3 INDIVIDUAL CENTERED FACTORS.
The second section of the respondent questionnaire related to factors central and definitive to an individual. Having used the previous section on general information to categorize the respondents, this section prompted the respondents on the extent to which they felt these distinctive individual traits affected the manner in which they chose to vote. These questions were more intuitive rather than objectified.

4.3.1 Education and Exposure.

Research was done to investigate the opinion that **education level and exposure affects how an individual makes political decisions**. It was found that 13.6% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 76.3% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 10.2% were neutral about the opinion.

Thus the majority (76.3%) of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.2 below.

**Table 4.2: Education and Exposure.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2 Religious Beliefs

Research was done to investigate the opinion that religious beliefs guide one in choosing a candidate to vote for. It was found that 39% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 32.2% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 28.8% were neutral about the opinion.

Thus the majority (39%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.3 below.

**Table 4.3: Religious Beliefs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.3. Parents, Peers and Relatives.

Research was done to investigate the opinion that **one may support the same candidates that parents/peers and relatives support.** It was found that 69.5% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 18.7% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 11.9% were neutral about the opinion.

Thus the majority (69.5%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.4 below.

**Table 4.4: Parents, Peers and Relatives.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.4. Performance records and Policies

Research was done to investigate the opinion that one may be guided by performance records and policies of the political candidates to vote for them. It was found that 8.6% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 81% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 10.3% were neutral about the opinion.

Thus the majority (81%) of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.5 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.5. Practical Goals

Research was done to investigate the opinion that candidates who have practical goals are more appealing than those who make unfounded promises. It was found that 10.3% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 81.1% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 8.6% were neutral about the opinion.

Thus the majority (81.1%) of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.6 below.

Table 4.6: Practical Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Arising Situational Stimuli

When putting into consideration what could be classified as an `arising situational stimulus`, the research questions of this study were brought into focus. In the Kenyan context this would mean highlighting key events that have made national news as regarding the government administration and the development of the nation or the lack thereof. As such, these factors could best be described as phenomena that attracted nation-wide attention, prompted a change in the opinion of the citizenry and/or revolved around controversy with key figures in governance.

4.4.1. Lack of Food Resources.

Research was done to investigate the opinion that the current state of the economy and lack of food resources has changed minds about who to vote for. It was found that 13.6% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 74.6% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 11.9% were neutral about the opinion.

Thus the majority (74.6%) of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.7 below. **Table 4.7: Lack of Food Resources.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.2 Independent Candidates.

Research was done to investigate the opinion that the increasing number of independent candidates will bring better leadership than old politicians. It was found that 44.1% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 28.8% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 27.1% were neutral about the opinion.

Thus the majority (44.1%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.8 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8: Independent Candidates.
4.4.3. Bribes.

Research was done to investigate the opinion that candidates who offer bribes in exchange for votes should still be allowed to vie for political positions. It was found that 86.4% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 3.4% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 10.2% were neutral about the opinion.

Thus the majority (86.4%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.9 below.

Table 4.9: Bribes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.4 Election Fraud

Research was done to investigate the opinion that **the claims of election fraud and irregularities have changed peoples’ mind about voting in the general elections and who they should vote for.** It was found that 54.2% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 25.4% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 20.3% were neutral about the opinion.

Thus the majority (54.2%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.10 below.

**Table 4.10: Election Fraud.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5 VOTER BEHAVIOUR

Out of the questions on the respondent questionnaire, two direct groupings were derived from the framing of the questions; one set directly questioned the manner in which an individual would vote i.e. ‘I am more willing to vote for...’, while the second set investigated the preferences and opinions that individuals have when it comes to elections and the intervening factors i.e. ‘individuals indicted in corruption scandals should not be allowed to run for political office’.

4.5.1 Political Party.

Research was done to investigate the opinion that the political party one support has his/her guaranteed vote, regardless of performance and development record. It was found that 42.4% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 38.9% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 18.6% were neutral about the opinion.

Thus the majority (42.4%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.11 below.

**Table 4.11: Political Party.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.2 Gender.

Research was done to investigate the opinion that one may be more inclined to vote for candidates of the same gender. It was found that 58.6% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 20.6% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 20.7% were neutral about the opinion. Thus the majority (58.6%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.12 below.

**Table 4.12: Gender.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.3. Economic Status and Benefit

Research was done to investigate the opinion that one may be more inclined to vote for candidates who will protect and grow his/her economic status and benefits. It was found that 8.5% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 86.7% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 5.1% were neutral about the opinion.

Thus the majority (86.7%) of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.13 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13: Economic Status and Benefit
4.5.4. Re-Election.

Research was done to investigate the opinion that one may be more willing to vote for candidate seeking re-election than a new aspirant on the same seat. It was found that 52.6% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 15.8% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 31.6% were neutral about the opinion.

Thus the majority (52.6%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.14 below.

**Table 4.14: Re-Election**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.5. Touring.

Research was done to investigate the opinion that one may vote for a candidate who has toured his/her neighborhood and related with the people on the ground. It was found that 28.8% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 42.3% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 28.8% were neutral about the opinion.

Thus the majority (42.3%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.15 below.

Table 4.15: Touring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.6 Changing Political Parties.

Research was done to investigate the opinion that *If someone’s preferred candidate changed political parties, he/she would still vote for him/her*. It was found that 6.8% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 74.6% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 18.6% were neutral about the opinion.

Thus the majority (74.6%) of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.16 below.

**Table 4.16: Changing Political Parties.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.7. Corruption Scandals.

Research was done to investigate the opinion that If someone’s preferred candidate has been implicated in corruption scandals, he/she would still vote for him/her. It was found that 86.4% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 8.5% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 5.1% were neutral about the opinion.

Thus the majority (86.4%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.17 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.8 Hate speech

Research was done to investigate the opinion that if someone’s preferred candidate has been accused of hate speech and inciting violence, he/she would still vote for him/her. It was found that 78% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 8.5% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 13.6% were neutral about the opinion.

Thus the majority (78%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.18 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.9. Support of the Party Leader

Research was done to investigate the opinion that **people will still vote for their preferred candidate even if they do not have the support of the political party leader.** It was found that 11.9% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 71.2% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 16.9% were neutral about the opinion.

Thus the majority (71.2%) of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.19 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.19: Support of the Party Leader
4.5.10. Bribed To Vote.

Research was done to investigate the opinion that **If offered a bribe in exchange for the vote, one may be more inclined to vote for the candidate who offered the money.** It was found that 78% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 8.5% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 13.6% were neutral about the opinion.

Thus the majority (78%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.20 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.11. Current Administration.

Research was done to investigate the opinion that **people would rather vote for the current administration than put faith in a new leadership**. It was found that 52.5% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion, 22.1% agreed and strongly agreed with the opinion and 25.4% were neutral about the opinion.

Thus the majority (52.5%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the opinion as shown in the table 4.21 below.

**Table 4.21: Current Administration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 Correlation Test.

A Pearson correlation test was done to investigate if there is a statistically significant relationship between arising situational stimuli, individual centered factors and the voter behavior. It was found that there is no statistical significant relationship between arising situational stimuli and voter behavior because the Sig (2-tailed) value of the voter behavior and situational stimuli is (0.547) greater than the 0.05 level of significance.

It was also found that there is no statistical significant relationship between individual centered factors and voter behavior because the Sig (2-tailed) value of the voter behavior and individual centered factors is (0.917) greater than the 0.05 level of significance.

**Table 4.22: Correlation Test.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voter Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arising situational stimuli</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Centered Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This chapter has presented the results and findings of the study through the use of frequency tables and graphs/figures with the presentation being aligned to the research questions and covering the reports of the extent to which individual centered factors influence voter behavior in Kenya and the influence of arising situational stimuli affect voter behavior in Kenya. The final correlation test demonstrated that there was no significant statistical relationship between the variables under investigation by the study as will be further analyzed and explored in the next chapter through a discussion on the findings, the conclusions drawn and the most appropriate recommendations to be made by this study for future investigations of a similar nature.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0. Introduction

This study interrogated the individual and situational factors influencing voter behavior in the 2017 general elections in Kenya and the implication that these factors have in portraying the needs of the Kenyan people and their preferred candidates when casting their votes. The results from the data analysis bear a deeper message, establishing the patterns of preferences that the average Kenyan voter has and if further explored in a wider context would guide the formulation of a suitable framework for assessing the possible outcomes of future elections to come. The subsequent sections in this chapter deconstruct the findings made during the analysis, highlighting the major findings, drawing guided conclusions and implications and making recommendations for future electoral policy, campaigns and further research.

5.1. Summary of Key Findings

The results of this study were previously presented in chapter four. The chapter was organized according to the sections in the questionnaire which was the main data tool. The first section covered general information about the respondents such as age group where majority of the respondents fell under the 18-24 age group, the gender classification where majority respondents were female, the question of levels of education where majority were university degree holders, on employment status where majority of the respondents were students and of those who were employed, most earner a total of Kshs.80,000-100,000 each month; and lastly, the religious group the respondents ascribed to where majority were Christians.
This section was to provide a definitive idea of the different demographic and social groups that
the respondents belonged to and would then offer a platform for analyzing their voter behavior
based on the characteristics they possess. This study targeted specifically registered voters and as
such, did not include the question of whether the respondents were registered or not, having been
previously used to distinguish the respondents who the questionnaire would be administered to.

The second section of the data collection tool had questions relating to individual centered
factors as influencing perceived voter action and subsequent voter behavior i.e. the questions
interrogated respondents on how individual traits such as education and exposure, religious
belief, family and peer pressure influence their voter preference and how other issues such as
performance records, practical goals and relevance determined how they would ultimately cast
their votes.

The third section of the questionnaire addressed issues arising from specific situations as they
developed in the political atmosphere and how they interacted with the articulated preferences of
the respondents and shaping their voter behavior. The questions revolved around issues of
corruption scandals, hate speech, bribery and vote buying, the rise of independent candidates and
validity of the Kenyan electoral body.

As mentioned in chapter three, a Pearson correlation test was conducted on the results to identify
whether or not there a statistically significant relationship exists between the variables identified
in the study. The tests conducted highlighted that there is no statistically significant relationship
between arising situational stimuli and voter behavior as indicated by the Sig (2-tailed) value of
the voter behavior against the (0.547) of the situational stimuli and showing the 0.05 difference
in level of significance.
In addition, there was no statistically significant relationship between individual centered factors and voter behavior as detailed by the Sig (2-tailed) value of the voter behavior with the individual centered factors was (0.917) and was greater than the 0.05 level of significance.

5.2. Significance of Findings to Kenyan Voter Behavior

The major conclusions of this study are presented by deconstructing and examining the outcomes of each hypothesis derived from the research questions formulated in chapter one. The two main research questions looked at how individual centered factors and arising situational factors influence voter behavior and while the analysis conducted in chapter four indicated that there is no statistically significant relationship between each of these factors and voter behavior, the implied effect is still present and important to note.

This study sought to prove that there is a relationship between what we have termed as individual and situational centered factors and the manner in which Kenyan voters choose to behave at their polls as represented by their votes. Despite the analysis proving that there is no statistically significant relationship between the variables and voter behavior, the results from the respondent questionnaires demonstrated the preferences that individuals have when it comes to politics and how individual factors shape the way they vote. The section below further explores these issues, grouping them into representational clusters to show the impact of each group on the thought formation and voter behavior of individuals as derived from the data collected.

5.2.1. Individual Centered Factors

The first research question aimed at interrogating the extent to which individual centered factors influence voter behavior. These factors were further broken down into measurable groups to be
used for assessment as framing the questions in the respondent questionnaire i.e. education level, religious beliefs, family and peer influence, and gender.

The first hypothesis drawn from these factors is: the education level of an individual determines their voter behavior. The findings of the study demonstrated in Table 4.2 indicated that a great majority of people agreed that their level of education and exposure played a great role in shaping their political opinion and voter behavior. Education is without a doubt a very definitive aspect and notably the more education and exposure an individual acquires, the more critical he would be of political matters and exercising political choice in that respect.

The second hypothesis states that: religion and religious beliefs influence how individuals vote. While religion is a very salient factor and extensively shapes voter behavior, it is subject to amendment and influence from other areas as shown where majority of respondents disagreed with the notion of religion playing a definitive role in shaping how they vote.

The third hypothesis states: parents and peers influence the leaders individuals choose to vote for. The results from the data analysis however indicated that this is not the case and individuals make their political choices of their own accord without succumbing to any pressures from family, friends or any parties they are affiliated with despite the insurmountable pressures.

The data mined from this group of investigative questions indicate that people are ultimately individual beings, relying on more than blood bonds, religious affiliation and institutional exposure to make political choices during elections.

5.2.2. Economy and Policy Centered Issues

Issues relating to the growth of the economic center and policy development are key highlights during political campaigns and subsequently shape voter rationale and their behavior while
casting ballot. The hypothesis drawn from the research questions touching on the subject of policy and economy is that **individuals’ voter behavior is to a large extent influenced by rationale on economic growth and public policy.**

As demonstrated in Tables 4.5, 4.6, 4.7 and 4.13 in Chapter four, majority of respondents heavily asserted the role that policy, practical goods and improvement of the economy play in guiding the manner in which they vote.

5.2.3. Governance, Partisanship and Rule of Law

The entire practice of elections is hinged on the prospect of good governance, transparent and accountable leaders who propagate and uphold the rule of law, while maintaining a level of neutrality even where their political parties are involved. Citizens aiming at choosing a new breed of leaders will no doubt take into account the levels of importance of each of these factors, weighing them out to make sound, rational political choice while voting.

The hypothesis drawn from this context is that **the promise of governance and rule of law plays heavily influences voter behavior.** As observed in Tables 4.5, 4.6, 4.9, 4.10, 4.17, 4.18 and 4.20, issues relating to good governance and rule of law such as bribery, electoral fraud, vote buying, hate speech and corruption implications register very high as shaping voter behavior and the leaders that individuals choose to put in office. In the context of partisanship and affiliation to political parties, further evidence in chapter four notes that majority of individuals have lesser ties to political parties as opposed to their leaders of choice, with a majority reporting continued support for candidates regardless of the political party they were affiliated to.
5.2.4. New Regimes

The increasing numbers of aspirants for political office rising in the capacity of individual candidates has awakened a new debate among the Kenyan voting populace, prompting the question of whether candidates with no affiliation to larger political brands will offer better leadership and servitude to the public masses and in this study raised the hypothesis that **continuing regimes are ultimately better than new administrations.** As indicated in tables 4.8 and 4.21, the majority of the populace believes that independent candidates do not differ from the current crop of leadership but still asserting their openness to new administrative regimes.

This analysis thus concluded that despite the lack of a statistically significant correlation between the variables, the significant predictors of voter behavior were aligned along econometric models, policy and governance as opposed to the long standing debate on ethnic and clientelist/patronage voting models.

The overall conclusion drawn from this study indicates a greater majority of voters being aligned to policy, economy and sustainable growth models of behavior as guiding their voter behavior and as such it is possible to conclude that in the 2017 general elections in Kenya, majority of the voting outcome will indicate a greater turnout for leaders with good development track records as opposed to those implicated in theft and scandals. The individual and situation centered factors that guided the data collection can be used as a template for further exploration of their effects on voters in subsequent elections as well as a guide for campaigners and political aspirants to shape their manifestos and campaign strategies.
5.3. Comparing Research Findings with Election Results

The findings from this study demonstrated that there was no statistically significant relationship between the variables and voter behavior. The analysis of arising variables from the study however provides a substantial basis for understanding that these factors may have an implied influence in the thought formation in individuals regarding how they choose their leaders.

In Nairobi County, which was the central area of study for this investigation, the voter behavior witnessed in the three case constituencies prove the existence of some of the factors described throughout this paper and their implied influence on voter behavior. Two out of the three case constituencies i.e. Starehe and Lang’ata constituencies, witnessed a change in leadership with only the Roysambu representative retaining his representational seat. (IEBC, 2017)

The dynamics at play in these three constituencies indicate a need for newer leadership and the strong ties to political partisanship. Despite respondents marking low on the question of political partisanship, the results indicate that it heavily influences voter behavior, and coupled with the idea of new and improved representation, serves to compel the voter to pursue different political ideals. It is also key to note that the newly elected leaders had promises relating to better service to the youth who made up more than half of the voting demographic. The situation in Roysambu can be attributed to long-standing ties between leader and his constituents, as well as the performance record that the incumbent has maintained over the years. (IEBC, 2017)

With these results, an application of the framework established by the definitive factors presented in this study to the greater national scale would help in explaining some of the monumental changes witnessed during the election and offer insight for predicting future election trends in the country.
5.4. Recommendations

This study endeavored to interrogate the factors influencing voter behavior, specifically taking into context the Kenya 2017 general elections with primary focus on individual and situational factors. The recommendations made here are derived from the key findings of this research study as guided by the objectives in chapter one and the results from the data analyzed. The definitive impact of economic growth, proper policy formulation and governance as evidenced by the preceding discussions, summaries, data and results, and conclusions were given central consideration. As prescribed by the foregoing conclusion and evidence implications, this study offers a number of recommendations to best navigate the practice of influencing voter behavior through improving governance and bolstering economic practice and policy, as such, the recommendations made fall into these three categories as well as an additional suggestions on the research gaps identified.

5.4.1. Governance Recommendations

The Kenyan voter is a highly exposed and politically aware individual and the advent of technology and social media further propagates their access to information especially on matters involving the government and the state of the nation. As due diligence to the citizens and by extension the entire nation, it is recommended that:

i. A comprehensive overhaul of the current electoral schematics and civic education models to better equip common citizens with the means to understand the importance of their political participation as well as how to maneuver through situations lacking in fundamental ethics.
ii. The government administration in charge should provide the required resources to the presiding electoral body, refraining from interference, discretization and undue opposition of the electoral apparatus, allowing the full functionality and achievement of the set mandate of the body for the conduction of free and fair elections.

iii. A more rigorous approach to dealing with the trauma relating to the 2007/8 post-election violence that continues to remain embedded in the people of Kenya. It is not enough to simply call for peace and criticize hate speech, there is need for Parliament to pass a bill fully detailing what is regarded as hate speech and the necessary legal action to follow as a move to protect the country from future violence incidences related to elections.

5.4.2. Policy Recommendations

As evidenced in the data findings, the Kenyan voter is strongly attached to concepts of a bolstered economy and the assurance of human security in a space for maximum individual efficiency rather than social, religious or partisan bonds and as such it is recommended that:

i. The state actors in partnership with the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission (IEBC) and the Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD) develop a comprehensive curriculum centered on voter education with focus on the main action points identified in this study to promote a conscious civil society and create awareness on the key points described as being of most importance to voters.

ii. A call for aspirants of political seats to present practical manifestos detailing their plans of action and their main agendas for running for political office, this allows the voters to fully understand what these candidates are offering and whether or not they are fit to hold political office in the country.
iii. There should be stricter regulations regarding the eligibility of the aspirants given the rise of independent candidates and individuals linked in corruption and pilfering of state resources. Aspirants for political office should have clean records and be individuals of high repute to thwart the continuing poor standard of leadership being experienced in the country.

5.4.3. Programmatic Recommendations

As suggested by the analyzed evidence, the majority of voters are guided by what would be considered the most important factors in the definition of their voter behavior. While the numbers are encouraging, a great many voters remain aloof and misguided by what can be categorized as primordial solidarity, political party fanaticism and lack of crucial voter and civic education. Accordingly, it is recommended that:

i. The concept of leadership acquired through qualification and merit should be advanced from early stages of education as well as in religious institutions to erode the ethnic and clientelist culture that has prevailed within the Kenyan populace. This can be done in addition to rigorous civic education programs to wane down the influence of ethnic politics and encourage leadership by merit.

5.5. Further Research

The findings of this study have highlighted several issues that are recommended for further research in this field. Further interrogating these issues might offer more effective and inclusive frameworks for understanding the factors that influence voter behavior and the pursuit of political participation.
i. To make the study more inclusive, there is need to expand the dynamic and conduct a state-wide investigation to examine the extent to which these preferences are mirrored in different counties.

ii. As an effort to build on existing literature, it is suggested that the research questions of a wider nature be incorporated to investigate the sociological and psychological influences of voter behavior, to incorporate the findings from different study disciplines and improve output quality.

iii. Given that this study was centered on voter behavior and electoral action, there is need to conduct the study in the next five years to investigate the patterns of trend changes or determine whether ideals and preferences have remained constant. This adds to the repertoire on electoral studies and voter behavior, encouraging vigilant monitoring of global elections and their outcomes as well as the demonstrated preferences shared by the people.

iv. Government administrations should conduct such studies to identify the strongest needs of the people and create action frameworks to deal with the issues, ensuring good governance and adequate servitude to the people.
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Appendix 1: Respondent Questionnaire

This questionnaire has been prepared as a data collection tool for a Thesis research paper for the topic ‘An Interrogation of the Factors Influencing Voter Behavior: Case Study of Kenya 2017 General Elections’ by Wendy Ajierh, a Master’s student at USIU-Africa. This questionnaire seeks to understand voter behavior and is thus restricted to only registered voters. The questionnaire looks at the impact of individual centered issues and arising situational factors on voter behavior.

This questionnaire tool is divided into three (3) sections, the first covering basic identification groupings, the second part covering questions on the individual-centered issues and the last asking questions relating to the arising situational stimulus.

This research is for educational research purposes only and your identity is protected through ensured anonymity with your responses being treated with utmost discretion.

Section A

This section serves to give a basic understanding of the respondent and classify you into groups according to the characteristics derived from the responses given. Please tick against the relevant option.

1. What age group do you belong to?
   - 18-24
   - 25-30
   - 31-40
   - Above 40

2. Gender
   - Male
   - Female

3. Highest Education Qualification
   - High school
   - Technical College
   - Master’s Degree
   - University Degree
   - Doctorate degree

4. Status of Employment
   - Student
   - Unemployed
   - Self-employed
   - Employed
   (b). If you are in any employed category, what is your average monthly income
   - Below Ksh. 10,000
   - Ksh. 10,000-40,000
   - Ksh. 40,000-80,000
   - Ksh. 80,000-120,000
   - Above Ksh. 120,000

5. Which religious group do you ascribe to?
   - Christian
   - Muslim
   - Atheist
   - Other
**Section B**

This group of questions investigates the extent to which individual-centered factors influence voter behavior. On a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 is strongly disagree, 2 is disagree, 3 is neutral, 4 is agree and is strongly agree, indicate your response to the statements below by ticking or marking the space provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>STATEMENT OF PREFERENCE</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neutral</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My education level and exposure affects how I make political decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The political party I support has my guaranteed vote, regardless of performance and development record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am more inclined to vote for candidates of the same gender as me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I am more inclined to vote for a candidate who will protect and grow my economic status and benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My religious beliefs guide me in choosing a candidate to vote for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I support the same candidates that my parents/peers and relatives support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I am guided by performance records and policies of the political candidates I vote for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I am more willing to vote for a candidate seeking re-election than a new aspirant on the same seat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Candidates who have practical goals are more appealing than those who make unfounded promises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I would vote for a candidate who has toured my neighborhood and related with the people on the ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C

This section covers issues and trends that have risen in the past few months on the political scene and how the changes and shifts have influenced how we perceive elections and how we will choose to vote.

On a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 is strongly disagree, 2 is disagree, 3 is neutral, 4 is agree and is strongly agree, indicate your response to the statements below by ticking in the space provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>STATEMENT OF PREFERENCE</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neutral</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The current state of the economy and lack of food resources has changed my mind about who to vote for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If my preferred candidate changed political parties, I would still vote for him/her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The increasing number of independent candidates will bring better leadership than old politicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I will still vote for my preferred candidate even if they have been implicated in corruption scandals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I will still vote for my preferred candidate even if they have been accused of hate speech and inciting violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I will still vote for my preferred candidate even if they do not have the support of the political party leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Candidates who offer bribes in exchange for votes should still be allowed to vie for political positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>If offered a bribe in exchange for my vote, I am inclined to vote for the candidate who offered the money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I would rather vote for the current administration than put faith in a new leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The claims of election fraud and irregularities have changed my mind about voting in the general elections and who I should vote for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix ii: SPSS Data Output