



## FAMILY AS A VOTING DETERMINANT IN 2013 GENERAL ELECTIONS

**Dr. Aziz Ur Rahman**, Assistant Professor, Department of IR and Political Science, Qurtuba University, Peshawar, Pakistan.  
Email: aziz@qurtuba.edu.pk.

**Mian Gul Said**, PhD Research Scholar, Department of IR and Political Science, Qurtuba University, Peshawar, Pakistan.

**Dr. Imtiaz Ahmad**, Assistant Professor, Department of Journalism and Mass Communication, University Of Malakand, Dir Lower, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

**Dr. Muhammad Kashif**, Superintendent D.R (E), University of Karachi, Pakistan

**Masaud Hassan**, Lecturer, Department of Journalism and Mass Communication, University Of Malakand, Dir Lower, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

---

**Abstract-** The main concern of this study is to analyze that how family determine the voting decisions of the voters of district Buner of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa in the 2013 general election. At the time of this field work in early 2018, the general elections of 2018 were not conducted. That is why questions were asked with reference to 2013 elections. The study empirically reveals the inclination of the people while considering family as a determinant of voting behavior. structured questionnaire was personally administered by the researcher to collect the data for the said purpose. A sample size of 385 respondents was selected through multi-stage-sample-method from the voters lists of district Buner. SPSS (Statistical package for social sciences) version 21 has been used for the determination of P-value through Chi-Square test. This study shows that a significant number of respondents have preferred to vote on the basis of family in 2013 general election. It consequently contends that family socialization is the vital determinant of casting vote. Result also highlighted that age is a significant factor, because a considerable number of youth opposed to vote based on family associations. As the age of the voter decreases the impact of family on voting choices likewise decreases. Results of this study show that family and voting behaviour are interrelated. While analysing electoral politics and voting choices, it is pertinent to consider the role of the family of the electorates.

**Keywords:** Family, Voting behavior, Elections, Determinants, Chi-Square test.

### I. INTRODUCTION

The role of election has been recognized worldwide, but in Pakistani context it has special significance. Pakistan was created in the result of a democratic process and the election of 1945-46 has special significance. Similarly the election of 1970, the first general election after independence, contributed in the disintegration of Pakistan. The ruling class of Pakistan opposed liberal democracy. Fragile democracy, military rule, manipulated elections and low political culture did not let the democracy to thrive in this country (Rizvi, 2002) and (Jan, 2010). Electorates choose their representatives in direct or indirect elections to run the administration of the state. So election is an important event of democracy. Democracy and elections are closely linked with one another. Pakistani culture is diverse which require regular election. This will provide an opportunity to all to register their political will and to be on board in state affairs (Hussain, 2018). Voting offers an occasion to the electorates to be more active in the matters of the state. Election is a significant medium of political socialization and makes a bridge between rulers and the common man (Encyclopaedia, 2020). For a viable democracy, free and fair election ought to be conducted regularly (Azhar, 2017). Election plays a crucial role in electing the right man for the right job to represent the electors' will, as the fear of re-election always pinches them. Representatives are, thus, chosen to frame future strategies of the state according to the popular will. Therefore, to shape the future policies of their countries, an election is a controlling power invested in the hands of the people (Berganza, 2000).

Voting behavior is how and why voters decide regarding vote casting ([Hoene,2011](#)). Numerous determinants, for instance, ethnicity, religion, issues, party program, family and stature of party chief impact the democratic decisions of the voters. These elements make electoral behavior of the electorates. This voting decision making process is known as voting behavior ([Elcock, 1976](#)).

For the smooth functioning of a system, socialization of masses is necessary. Through socialization, uniformity in values, behavior and practices are created in the citizens at state level in order to develop the society ([Sapiro, 2004](#)). For this indoctrination of citizens, every state has own method of rules, customs, mindset and way of life which is transferred through different means. These agencies are family, neighbors, peer group, games, educational institutions, political parties, media, religious institutions and security agencies ([Beck, 1977](#)). For this situation [Moghaddam\(2017\)](#) used the term "psycho-nationalist narrative" of the state. According to him state is a major determinant in shaping citizens' life. Family is the first agency in the socialization of a person. This is the family which shapes the future political behavior of a person and play vital role in political change ([Smeltzer&Keddy, 2010](#)). Family makes familiar a child with a particular political party ([Beck, 1977](#)). Family is a platform of political discussion and communication ([Valentino &Sears, 1998](#)) and determines voting preferences ([Akhtar, Awan&Haq, 2010](#)). Family increases political effectiveness ([Lee, 2006](#)) and increase political participation of the children ([Wilder, 1999](#)). Parents transfer political and social awareness and interest in politics to their children ([Jaros, 1973](#)). Family is a significant agency to transfer norms and values and protect the culture and value system of a society. Socialization by parents play active role in shaping voting behavior and political attitude of a voter ([Campbell et al., 1960](#); [Jennings, 1968](#); [Healy &Malhotra, 2013](#); [Niemi& Jennings, 1991](#)).

Political Socialization is the transmission of political culture, mentalities and qualities to the new comers, which people recognize in a particular society ([Almond and Verba, 1963](#)). The youngsters get same political party and ability as their family have. These families are to a great extent successful in transferring the political party, political standards and voting choices to the coming generations ([Banks and Roker, 1994](#)). [Almond and Coleman \(1960\)](#) believed that culture, customs, qualities and perspectives are not sent through genes. These are necessities and social commitments on a person who is a member of society. These necessities and commitments are satisfied through learning to perform their responsibility in a society ([Conover, 1991](#)). [Hahn \(1998\)](#) named this as political learning process which incorporates not just the dynamic ways and strategies but the inactive ways too. People know about the recognized perspectives, qualities and behavior in formal and informal manners. They receive and create values which assist them to adjust in a particular political situation. This process of learning begins in very early childhood and they adjust themselves to political design of the community, which enable them to understand the politics and government ([Dawson and Prewit, 1968](#)). The transfer of these political values is not in every case direct. Family may communicate values in a more informal mean. For instance, [Jaros \(1973\)](#) contended that the method of arriving at decisions inside the family and dealings with the external world hugely affect the kids' political mentalities. [Longton \(1969\)](#) argued that family provides the main experience of using power to the youngsters. Elder of the family has huge reverence in Pashtoon family. The granddad or the elders enjoy huge regard and authority in all family matters, which the youth straightforwardly notice. Youth receive ideas of political power, judiciousness, consistent contentions and understanding, obligation and rights and wrongs in the family.

The current study also aims to know the role of family as a voting determinant in the electorates of district Buner, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The study found a significant association between family and voting in district Buner. This work contends that electorates look to the family as a significant determinant of voting behavior. However, the youth were the least impressed to vote on the basis of family directions. The overall study argue that family is still relevant in electoral decision-making.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

[Hoene \(2011\)](#) analyzes different variables having significant role in molding political behavior of Asian Americans. These factors are gender, income, state where voter is born and the period passed in the United States which fundamentally impacts voting decisions and interest in governmental issues. Level of schooling

is the best factor in voting behavior which forms the basis of the study. The conventional view that party familiarity develops at an early age, under the supervision of family and is generally unaffected by other political factors has been challenged by proof that grown-up partisanship is indeed very receptive to other political factors, for example, manifesto, retrospective evaluations, and voting in early elections ([Franklin,1984](#)).The paper of ([Raymond, 2011](#)) argues that the religious secular cleavage remained or has become a critical indicator of moderate vote decision.[Aden \(2015\)](#) examines impact of political leaders on voting behavior. The study was undertaken in the North Eastern Kenya. This investigation contends that leader style, previous role and ability to convey message impact voting decisions. [Berland Kaul,\(2013\)](#) shed light on urban voting behavior in India, and investigates that why voters votes for the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP). This study argue that ethnic interests and retrospective programmatic interests are significant factors in this regard.

[Rose and Unwin \(1969\)](#),[Converse \(1974\)](#), [Rose \(1974\)](#), [Lijphart \(1979\)](#), and [Powell \(1982\)](#) have stated that religion is assuming huge role in deciding political behavior of an individual. [Brooks, Clem and Jeff Manza \(1997\)](#) dissected the connection between religion and vote casting in presidential election in America. In the study of [Fox, Sandie Wightman and James T. Richardson \(2001\)](#), findings show that religious connection was a superior indicator of legislative voting on abortion reform in comparison to other factors. [Lijphart, A. \(1979\)](#) investigated the general impact of the three conceivably most significant factors on voting behavior-social class, religion, and language—an examination of Belgium, Canada, South Africa, and Switzerland gives a "pivotal investigation". Among the three variable of party choice, religion arises as the victor, language as a solid second place, and class as third.

[Kanwal, \(2016\)](#) argue that family bond is more persuasive in voting behavior. The electors didn't give a lot of significance to religious affairs of the competitor. [Khan, F. K., &Musarrat, R. \(2014\)](#) in their work clarify the relationship of voting behavior with schooling, inner changes in a party and bradarism. The examination inferred that caste system is more grounded than political loyalty with respect to as inspiration for voting behavior is concerned. [Muhammad Shakeel Ahmad \(2010\)](#) in his PhD. thesis contend that family popularity of the contender, helping individuals in a troublesome circumstance and biradari are impacting vote decision. For citizens national and provincial issues are less critical than issues of the territory. Party affiliation was a basic determinant in voting choices.[Ahmed, M. \(2012\)](#) argue that biradarism (casteism, tribalism) is the fundamental part of voting behavior. It has profound effect on political affiliation of the voters of Punjab.

[Ishtiaq Ahmad and Muhammad Ishaq \(2018\)](#) dissected the significance of party manifesto in campaign strategy of 2013 election. Lahore which is one of the educated metropolitan regions in Pakistan, 52% of the respondents didn't know even the meaning of manifesto. As opposed to manifesto, reprimanding adversaries is a lot of viable device in political race. [Farmanullah \(2014\)](#) in his paper argue that voting on the basis of religion is an important determinant of voting behavior in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. In any case, it isn't as significant as the casting vote on the basis of issues and clientelism. [Hassan Shah \(2019\)](#) is of the view that religion is a significant component in voting decisions in the Pakhtun society. Religion is assuming a vital job in making socio-political perspectives of the individuals. Religious parties used the slogans of execution of Islamic system and that religious groups are the protectors of Islam. These slogans attracted a great number of electors in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

A few researchers contend against the party identification and the related norms to it, in the youngsters ([Jenning and Niemi, 1974](#)). They consider the similarity of the youngsters' political perspectives to their guardians is subjected to the climate and the social setting. Environment and the social setting determine whether a kid should proceed with his family political standards and values or to leave them ([Connell, 1972](#)). [Plutzer \(2002\)](#) establishes in his work that a few guardians straightforwardly and expressly encourage their youngsters to take an interest in political matters. They urge them to participate in political conversations and discussions with their companions.

The study of ([Nadeem, R. U., & Bashir, H. E. 2020](#)) argues that (31.7%) of total respondents agreed up to somewhat extent they discussed politics with parents. The analysis showed that maximum (21.8%) of total respondents reported that at little level they discussed political issues with their family members. Furthermore, it was evident that most of the respondents reported that they discussed politics with friends (31.7%) andfamily (33.7%). Majority (38.7%) expressed they discussed little on politics with their relatives.

[Mehmood, W., and Rauf, A. \(2018\)](#) approves the contention that family assumes exceptionally huge role in political training of young individuals. Political and social ideas alongside religious thoughts found in members of Jamat-i-Islami Pakistan are subsequently sent to youngsters more through guardians in the family than educational institutions, companions or media.

In the analysis of certain researchers, behavior of the guardians impacts the activities of the kids since they (youngsters) consider elders role models in their political and social matters. Youngsters get and receive the way of life of elders in their own life and they begin to start their political and social responsibilities from an extremely youthful stage ([Hess and Torney, 1967](#)). In the evaluation of [Chan and Elder \(2001\)](#), elders through their responsibility and relationship in the political and social activities, mingle their children and effect their political views. Subsequently, they are encouraged to take interest in different political and local area associations in an un-tolled way. [Rauf and Shah \(2015\)](#) in their investigation found that family has a significant part in shaping the democratic conduct of individuals. In addition, they grouped family in different orders. Each type has its own impacts on the electoral behavior of individuals. In another paper [Shah et al \(2015\)](#) recommended that family is the principal part in the social network of an individual.

Some of the researchers argue that the level of interest of the children in politics is just about as basic as the parents and other socializing offices ([Tedin, 1974](#)). In those families where the political conversations and discussions are more, adolescents' interest develops by and large. This interest in political conversations inside a family empowers them for political interest and characteristics adaptation ([Prewitt, 1965](#)). [Niemi et al. \(1978\)](#) in their work on the resemblance of guardians and youngsters political conduct found a strong closeness in viewpoints of students with their parents. Interestingly with that, the likeness between the guardians and their non-understudy kids was not all that strong and basic. They relate their revelations to the financial status of the families and contended that guardians have a more grounded sway over their children in families with high financial status. In [Plutzer's \(2002\)](#) evaluation, the high monetary status families offer more endeavors, resources and time in moving their characteristics and lifestyle to their adolescents. That is the reason their endeavors of mingling their children are more effective than those with a reasonably low financial status inside a community.

#### **Research Questions**

1. To what extent a person should cast vote on the basis of family connections?
2. To what extent you voted a candidate on the basis of your family connections in 2013 elections?

### **III. METHODOLOGY**

Quantitative research method has been used to move toward the problem. Information has been gathered through a questionnaire from the electorates of district Buner of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. Voter lists of Election Commission of Pakistan were utilized to choose respondents. SPSS version 21 has been used for the determination of P-value through Chi-Square test.

#### **Research Population**

Population of the examination is the enrolled male citizens of Buner. Exclusion of female citizens as respondents was because of their seldom interest in voting and other political activities. Apart from this, social and religious constraints make it difficult for a male researcher to get to female respondents. As shown by Election Commission of Pakistan, the enrolled voters of focused region were 360019, out of which male electors were 195215 ([Election Commission of Pakistan, 2013](#)).

#### **Sample and Sampling Technique**

The research population of district Buner is more than 100,000 and according to Krejcie and Morgan the complete sample size becomes 385 ([Krijcie, 1970](#)). Consequently to get a representative sample size, 385 voters were picked. This determination was made randomly based on multi-stage sample technique which is as under:

**Stage 1:** There were 27 union councils in district buner ([Pakistan Bureau of Statistics, n.d.](#)). In the first stage out of 27, 07 UCs were picked randomly which were Chinglai, Nawagi, Riga, Bataara, Karapa, Turwarsak and

Per Baba. The decision of these union councils was done randomly, as all the union councils are rural in nature.

**Stage 2:** In the second stage 55 electors were taken from each union council, making the total 385. Respondents were taken from the voter lists of the Election Commission of Pakistan based on random and systematic sampling strategy. Initial one elector was picked randomly, and then every fourth was picked till 55 respondents were done from each union council. A significant number of respondents didn't return their questionnaire. A couple of respondents were reluctant and frightened to share their experience and information in written shape. Many were considering the activity as a pointless and inconsequential. Out of all 385 distributed questionnaires, 306 were filled and returned. A close ended questionnaire was used for this purpose, since it is simple for respondents to reply and less tedious. Closed-ended questionnaire is also more affordable survey technique. The proportion of responses in structured questionnaire is higher than unstructured questionnaire ([Dawson,2002](#)).

#### IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This part consist of results gathered through survey. The data has been analyzed through SPSS. The results contain information got from the picked respondents. Through Chi-Square Test and P-Value, relationship of age, education and profession has been established with voting choices of the electorates of district Buner and the impact of family.

##### Family As Voting Determinant

Family is a vital social institution where socialization of youngsters begins. Social, political, religious and financial lifestyle of a family has profound effects over the whole life of an individual. Family association has significant job in molding political behavior in Pakistan, especially in rural areas. Youth get influenced by their parent's attachment with a party. These citizens generally stay steadfast with the political party of their parents. This shows that family bond is more powerful in voting behavior ([HYPERLINK "file:///E:\Research%20Papers\Family%20as%20a%20voting%20determinant%20for%20Plagarism.doc x" Kanwal, 2016](#)).

The data in hands shows that overall 119 (38.88%) out of 306 respondents opposed to vote on family lines. 80 (26.14%) respondents favored voting on family lines. To analyze the influence of family as a voting determinant a general question, "To what extent a person should cast vote on the basis of family connections?" was asked from the respondents. The responses given to the question were analyzed keeping in view the age, education and profession of the voters.

##### Age Consideration

The group of 31-40 years was in majority to support voting on the basis of family. Views of different age categories are in the following table.

**Table No.01**

Responses to the question," To what extent a person should cast vote on the basis of family connections?"

	Age				Total
	18-30 Years	31-40 Years	41-50Years	Above 50 Years	
To a great extent	20	24	20	16	80
	25.0%	30.0%	25.0%	20.0%	100.0%
To some extent	16	23	16	6	61
	26.2%	37.7%	26.2%	9.8%	100.0%
To a limited extent	19	11	11	5	46

	41.3%	23.9%	23.9%	10.9%	100.0%
Not at all	42	37	20	20	119
	35.3%	31.1%	16.8%	16.8%	100.0%
Total	97	95	67	47	306
	31.7%	31.0%	21.9%	15.4%	100.0%

Chi Square=10.653 P-value=0.300

The above table shows that (35.3%) of the age group 18-30 did not voted on family lines. A large number of the category 31-40 (31.1%) also selected not at all. The result shows that with the decreases in age the family impact also decreases. The voters who supported to vote on family lines were (30.0%) of the group 31 to 40, followed by 18- 30 and 41-50 (25.0%) each and above 50 years (20%). The Chi square test provides inconsequential P-value. The value (0.300) is larger than 0.05, shows that there is insignificant association between age and vote for a party on the basis of family attachments.

### Education Consideration

Education influence voting choices of the voters. The results show that the voters of primary level were in majority in voting on the basis of family.

**Table No.02**

Responses to the question, "To what extent a person should cast vote on the basis of family connections?"

	Education							Total
	Illiterate	Primary	Middle	Matric	Intermediate	Bachelor	Master	
To a great extent	11	21	5	15	12	8	8	80
	13.8%	26.3%	6.3%	18.8%	15.0%	10.0%	10.0%	100.0%
To some extent	7	6	7	11	11	7	12	61
	11.5%	9.8%	11.5%	18.0%	18.0%	11.5%	19.7%	100.0%
To a limited extent	5	3	7	9	10	5	7	46
	10.9%	6.5%	15.2%	19.6%	21.7%	10.9%	15.2%	100.0%
Not at all	21	1	14	19	20	21	23	119
	17.6%	0.8%	11.8%	16.0%	16.8%	17.6%	19.3%	100.0%
Total	44	31	33	54	53	41	50	306
	14.4%	10.1%	10.8%	17.6%	17.3%	13.4%	16.3%	100.0%

Chi Square=42.306 P-value=0.001

In terms of education (19.3%) of Master degree holders were of the view that a person should not cast vote on family basis. The next were (17.6%) of Bachelor degree holders to oppose voting on these lines. Those who were in favor of vote casting as directed by family, majority were Primary level (26.3%), (18.8%) of Matriculate, Intermediate (15.0%) and (13.8%) illiterate. The Chi-square test shows important p-value. The value (0.001) is smaller than 0.05, which indicates a vital relation between education of a person and voting decision as directed by family.

### Profession Consideration

Professions of the voters influence voting decision. The data in hands show that labor were in majority to support voting as directed by family.

**Table No.03**

Responses to the question, "To what extent a person should cast vote on the basis of family connections?"

	Profession						Total
	Servants	Farmers	Businessmen	Labour	Unemployed	Student	
To a great extent	7	17	14	20	12	10	80
	8.8%	21.3%	17.5%	25.0%	15.0%	12.5%	100.0%
To some extent	13	7	11	17	3	10	61
	21.3%	11.5%	18.0%	27.9%	4.9%	16.4%	100.0%
To a limited extent	11	8	10	8	3	6	46
	23.9%	17.4%	21.7%	17.4%	6.5%	13.0%	100.0%
Not at all	26	20	26	9	12	26	119
	21.8%	16.8%	21.8%	7.6%	10.1%	21.8%	100.0%
Total	57	52	61	54	30	52	306
	18.6%	17.0%	19.9%	17.6%	9.8%	17.0%	100.0%

Chi square=28.535 P value=0.018

Labor class was in majority (25.0%) followed by farmers (21.3%) and businessmen (17.5%), supported that a person should vote as directed by family. Those who opposed the idea of voting on family lines, majority were students (21.8%) followed by farmers (16.8%) and unemployed (10.1%). The Chi square test shows vital p-value (0.018) which is smaller than 0.05. This value indicates an important association between profession of a person and his views regarding voting on family lines.

**Family As Voting Determinant in 2013 Election**

The second question was specific to 2013 election. The purpose of this question was to analyze that how many voters were impressed by family in the mentioned election. The gathered information shows that 146 (47.71%) out of 306 declined to vote as directed by family. 74 (24.18%) voters responded voting as directed by family. The responses given to the question were analyzed keeping in view the age, education and profession of the voters.

**Age Consideration**

Different age categories expressed their views regarding family role in the election. Details are in the accompanying table.

**Table No.04**

Responses to the question, "To what extent you voted a candidate on the basis of your family connections in 2013 elections?"

	Age				Total
	18-30 Years	31-40 Years	41-50Years	Above 50 Years	
To a great extent	23	26	12	13	74

	31.1%	35.1%	16.2%	17.6%	100.0%
To some extent	10	20	15	6	51
	19.6%	39.2%	29.4%	11.8%	100.0%
To a limited extent	17	13	5	0	35
	48.6%	37.1%	14.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Not at all	47	36	35	28	146
	32.2%	24.7%	24.0%	19.2%	100.0%
Total	97	95	67	47	306
	31.7%	31.0%	21.9%	15.4%	100.0%

Chi square=20.394 p-value=0.016

The group of 31-40 years was in larger part (35.1%) to decide based on family in 2013 elections. The age group of 18-30 years (32.2%) firmly dismissed the plan to decide on family lines. They were trailed by the group 31-40 (24.7%), 41-50 (24.0%) and more than 50 years (19.2%) rejected to vote under the influence of parents. It shows that as the age decline the impact of family on voting decisions likewise decline. The Chi-square test gives critical p-value. The value (0.016) is smaller than 0.05, which shows that there exists an important connection between age of a citizen and his choice to decide based on family during elections.

### Education Consideration

As for as education is concerned, Illiterate were in dominant part who decided to vote based on family in 2013 election.

	Education							Total
	Illiterate	Primary	Middle	Matric	Intermediate	Bachelor	Master	
To a great extent	15	5	7	13	10	11	13	74
	20.3%	6.8%	9.5%	17.6%	13.5%	14.9%	17.6%	100.0%
To some extent	4	4	7	12	9	6	9	51
	7.8%	7.8%	13.7%	23.5%	17.6%	11.8%	17.6%	100.0%
To a limited extent	2	3	2	8	9	4	7	35
	5.7%	8.6%	5.7%	22.9%	25.7%	11.4%	20.0%	100.0%
Not at all	23	19	17	21	25	20	21	146
	15.8%	13.0%	11.6%	14.4%	17.1%	13.7%	14.4%	100.0%

**Table No.05**



Total	44	31	33	54	53	41	50	306
	14.4%	10.1%	10.8%	17.6%	17.3%	13.4%	16.3%	100.0%

Responses to the question, "To what extent you voted a candidate on the basis of your family connections in 2013 elections?"

Chi square=14.712 p-value=0.682

As shown in the table those having Intermediate level were in greater part (17.1%) who contradicted to

	Profession						Total
	Servants	Farmers	Businessmen	Labour	Unemployed	Student	
To a great extent	13	16	13	9	10	13	74

decide based on family, (13.5%) of this category decided based on family to a great extent. This category was trailed by illiterates, (15.8%) didn't make choice on family premise, however (20.3%) of the uneducated decided based on family associations in 2013 election. (14.4%) Master level educated, declined to decide on family premise, while (17.6%) of this group decided on family lines. The Chi-square test gives inconsequential p-value. The p value (0.682) is greater than 0.05, which shows that there is no relationship between schooling of an elector and decision in favor of a competitor under family influence.

### Profession Consideration

As far as profession is concerned, it was discovered that the class of farmers was in majority to decide based on family associations.

#### Table No.06

Responses to the question, "To what extent you voted a candidate on the basis of your family connections in 2013 elections?"

	17.6%	21.6%	17.6%	12.2%	13.5%	17.6%	100.0%
To some extent	12	13	10	9	3	4	51
	23.5%	25.5%	19.6%	17.6%	5.9%	7.8%	100.0%
To a limited extent	3	3	11	6	5	7	35
	8.6%	8.6%	31.4%	17.1%	14.3%	20.0%	100.0%
Not at all	29	20	27	30	12	28	146
	19.9%	13.7%	18.5%	20.5%	8.2%	19.2%	100.0%
Total	57	52	61	54	30	52	306
	18.6%	17.0%	19.9%	17.6%	9.8%	17.0%	100.0%

Chi square=18.914 p-value=0.218

A dominant part (20.5%) of working class declined to decide on family lines, (12.2%) of this class unequivocally decided on these lines. This was trailed by government servants (19.9%), who dismissed to decide on family lines and (17.6%) of this class decided on family associations. (19.2%) of the students totally rejected to vote on this base, while (17.6%) of this category voted under the influence of their family. The Chi-square test gives inconsequential p-value (0.218), which is more than 0.05. This shows that there is no relationship between profession of an elector and decision in favor of a candidate based on family bond in 2013 elections.

## V. CONCLUSION

Voting behavior doesn't rely upon any sole political factor rather each vote choice is a composite of a few factors that clarifies how and why an individual votes the way that a person chooses. The aggregate impact of all political factors drives the citizens to set their political inclinations and settle on voting decisions. What role family plays in influencing voting behavior, when the citizens were asked that how much an individual should make choice based on family associations, 119 (38.88%) out of 306 respondents contradicted to decide on family lines. 80 (26.14%) respondents supported that an individual should decide under the influence of family. Afterward, electors were asked that to what extent you voted under the influence of family in 2013 election? 74 (24.18%) totally decided on family lines, while 146 (47.71%) declined to decide on family bases. In terms of age, the research work shows that with decline in age, the impact of family also diminishes. Those having the age between 18 to 30 years, (32.2%) of the group unequivocally dismissed the plan to cast a vote under the influence of family. Among various education levels, Intermediate qualified were in larger part (17.1%) and in different professions, labors were in majority (20.5%) to cast a ballot under the influence of family. Among the electorates, who voted under the influence of family, majority in age class were 31-40 years (35.1%). In different education levels, illiterate were in majority (20.3%) and among different professions, farmers were in majority (21.6%), who voted under the influence of their family.

The current study focused on male citizens of district Buner. The exclusion of female as respondents was that they took rare interest in voting and other political exercises. Aside from this, social and religious constraints make it hard for a male researcher to get to female respondents. Thus, the investigation recommends that future researchers should focus on female electorates and their voting decisions. Likewise, studies must be conducted in other parts of the country, as voting behavior isn't static, and changes with the passage of time and situations. Political awareness, exposure to media, industrialization, urbanization, education, religious contemplations and other significant local, national and worldwide issues change the voting behavior. It is a dynamic process of absorbing new social patterns constantly. It makes electoral studies progressive and innovative for future exploration.

## REFERENCES

1. ADEN, H. I. (2015). Effect of Political Leadership on Voting Behavior in North Eastern Kenya. *Master thesis, The Management University of Africa*. Retrieved from <http://repository.mua.ac.ke/447>
2. AHMAD, M. S. (2010). Electoral Politics in NWFP. 1988-1999. *Doctoral dissertation*, National Institute of Pakistan Studies *QUAID-I-AZAM UNIVERSITY ISLAMABAD, Islamabad, 2010*. Retrieved from <http://pr.hec.gov.pk/jspui/bitstream/123456789/1232/2/1159S.pdf>
3. Ahmed, I., & Ishaq, M. (2018). Manifestoes Importance in Election Campaign in 2013.
4. Ahmed, M. (2012). Voting behaviour in rural and urban areas of Punjab. *Journal of Political Studies*, 45-56. Retrieved from <http://pu.edu.pk/images/journal/pols/Currentissuepdf/voting%20behaviour.pdf>
5. Akhtar, M. J., Awan, M. & Haq, S. S. (2010). Elections of Pakistan and response of social scientists: a study of theoretical understandings. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 30(2), pp.453-466.
6. Almond, G. & Coleman, J. (1960). *The politics of the developing areas*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
7. Almond, G. & Verba, S. (1963). *The civic culture: political attitudes and democracy in five nations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
8. Azhar, A. G. (2017). The Key to Triumphant Practices of Technology in Elections: It's Time to Reboot Electoral Process in Pakistan.
9. Banks, M. H., & Roker, D. (1994). The political socialization of youth: exploring the influence of schoolexperience. *Journal of Adolescence*, 17(1), pp. 3-15.
10. Beck, A. P. (1977). The role of agents in political socialization. In: Renshon, A. S. ed., *Handbook of Political Socialization Theory and Research*, New York: The Free Press. pp.115-142.
11. Berganza, J. C. (2000). Politicians, voters and electoral processes: an overview. *Investigaciones económicas*, 24(3), 501-543. Retrieved from <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/173/17324301.pdf>
12. BerlandKaul, A. (2013). Ethnic Politics and Urban Voting Behavior in India: Explaining Variation in Electoral Support for the BharatiyaJanata Party, 1999-2009. Retrieved from [https://drum.lib.umd.edu/bitstream/handle/1903/14124/BerlandKaul\\_umd\\_011\\_E\\_14235](https://drum.lib.umd.edu/bitstream/handle/1903/14124/BerlandKaul_umd_011_E_14235)
13. Brooks, Clem and Jeff Manza. (1997). The religious factor in U.S. Presidential election 1960-1992. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(1), 38-81
14. Campbell, A., Converse, P., Miller, W., Stokes, D. (1960). *The American Voter*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
15. Chan, C. G. & Elder, G. H. (2001). Family influences on the social participation of youth: the effects of parental social involvement and farming. *Rural Sociology*, 66(1). pp. 22-42.
16. Connell, R. W. (1972). Political socialization in the American family: the evidence re-examined. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36 (Fall, 1972), pp. 323-333.
17. Conover, J. P. (1991). Political socialization: where's the politics? In: W. Crotty, ed., *Political Science: Looking to the Future*, Vol. III, Political Behavior. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, pp. 125-152.
18. Converse, P. E. (1974). Some Priority Variables in Comparative Electoral Research." pp. 727-45 in *Electoral Behavior: A Comparative Handbook*, edited by Richard Rose. New York: Free Press.
19. Dawson, R. & Prewitt, K. (1968). *Political socialization: an analytical study*. Boston: Little Brown and Company.
20. Dawson, Dr. C. (2002). *Practical Research Methods, A User-friendly Guide to Mastering Research Techniques and Projects*. Oxford: United Kingdom.
21. Elcock, Howard (1976). *Political Behaviour*. London: Methuen & Co Ltd. pp. 217-218, 231,
22. Election Commission of Pakistan. (2013). *Election Report Vol:11*. pp.21,439. Retrieved from [www.ecp.gov.pk/frmGenericPage.aspx?PageID=3053](http://www.ecp.gov.pk/frmGenericPage.aspx?PageID=3053)
23. Encyclopedia Britannica Online. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/election-political-science> on 24 December 2020.
24. Farmanullah. (2014). VOTING BEHAVIOUR IN PAKISTAN:(A Case Study of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa in 2008 General Elections). *Pakistan Study Centre University of Peshawar*. Retrieved from <http://pr.hec.gov.pk/jspui/bitstream/123456789/2507/1/3060S.pdf>

25. Fox, J (2001). Religion: An oft-overlooked element of international studies. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227743308\\_Religion\\_as\\_an\\_Overlooked\\_Element\\_of\\_International\\_Relations](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227743308_Religion_as_an_Overlooked_Element_of_International_Relations)
26. Fox, Sandie Wightman and James T. Richardson. (2001). Religion and voting on abortion reform: A follow-up study. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 14(2), 159-164.
27. Franklin, C. H. (August 1984). Issue Preferences, Socialization, and the Evolution of Party Identification. *American Journal of Political Science*, 28(3), 459.
28. Hahn, C. (1998). *Becoming political: comparative perspectives on citizenship education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
29. Healy, A., & Malhotra, N. (2013). Childhood Socialization and Political Attitudes: Evidence from a Natural Experiment. *The Journal of Politics*, 75(4), 1023- 1037.
30. Hess, R. D. & Torney, J. V. (1967). *The development of political attitudes in children*. Chicago: Aldine.
31. Hoene, E. (2011). Asian Americans and politics: Voting behavior and political involvement. *Senior thesis, Bemidji State University*. Retrieved from <https://www.bemidji.state.edu/academics/departments/political-science/wp-content/uploads/sites/40/2015/05/>
32. Hussain, Dr Ejaz, (2018). Elections 2018 in Pakistan: A Critical Assessment [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326942464\\_Elections\\_2018\\_in\\_Pakistan\\_A\\_Critical\\_Assessment](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326942464_Elections_2018_in_Pakistan_A_Critical_Assessment)
33. Jan, F. (2010). Pakistan: A struggling nation-state. *Democracy and Security*, 6(3), 237-255.
34. Jaros, D. (1973). *Socialization to politics. basic concepts in political science*. Nairobi: Nelson.
35. Jennings, M. K, and Niemi, R. G. (1968). The Transmission of Political Values from Parent to Child. *American Political Science Review*, 62(1), 169-84.
36. Jennings, M. K., & Niemi, R. (1974). *The political character of adolescence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
37. Kanwal, L. S. (2016). Voting Behavior of Educated Youth in Pakistan: A Study of Multan City. *Journal of the Research Society of Pakistan*, 53(2), p.94,95,96. Retrieved from [http://pu.edu.pk/images/journal/history/PDF-FILES/6-Paper\\_53\\_2\\_16.pdf](http://pu.edu.pk/images/journal/history/PDF-FILES/6-Paper_53_2_16.pdf)
38. Khan, F. K., & Musarrat, R. (2014). Electoral Politics in Pakistan (Elections 2013): A Case Study of District Muzaffargarh. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 4(4), 79-99.
39. Khan, Imdad Ali. (1986). *Voting Behaviour in Rural NWFP: A Study of People's Participation in Election*. Peshawar: Pakistan Academy for Rural Development.
40. Krijcie, R. &. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and psychological measurement* (Vol. 30). pp.607-610.
41. Langton, K. P. (1969). *Political socialization*. New York: Oxford University Press.
42. Lee, K. (2006). Effects of internet use on college students' political efficacy. *Cyber Psychology & Behavior*, 9(4), pp. 415-422.
43. Lijphart, A. (1979). "Religious vs. Linguistic vs. Class Voting: The "Crucial Experiment" of Comparing Belgium, Canada, South Africa, and Switzerland," *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 73, No. 2, 442-458.
44. Mehmood, W., & Rauf, A. (2018). Family, politics and socialization: A case study of Jamaat-i-Islami in Dir (KP), Pakistan. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(1), 138-148.
45. Nadeem, R. U., & Bashir, H. E. (2020). Dynamics of Political Discussion of Voters in 2013.
46. Niemi, R. G., & Jennings, M. K. (1991). Issues and Inheritance in the Formation of Party Identification, *American Journal of Political Science*, 35, 970-88.
47. Niemi, R. G., Ross, D. R., & Alexander, J. (1978). The similarity of political values of parents and college-age youths. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 42(4), pp. 503-520
48. Pakistan Bureau of Statistics. (n.d.). *district-glace-buner*. Retrieved March, 2018, from <http://www.pbs.gov.pk/content/district-glace-buner>
49. Plutzer, E. (2002). Becoming a habitual voter: inertia, resources, and growth in young adulthood. *American Political Science Review*, 96(1), pp. 41-56.

50. Powell, G. B. (1982). *Contemporary Democracies: Participation, Stability and Violence*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
51. Prewitt, K. (1965). Political socialization and leadership selection. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 361, pp. 96-111.
52. Raymond, C. (2011). "The Continued Salience of Religious Voting in the United States, Germany, and Great Britain," *Electoral Studies* 30, 125-135.
53. Rauf, A. & Shah, H. (2015). Determinants of turnout in elections: a case study of 2008 general elections in district Charsadda. *Frontier Women University Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(Summer 2015), pp.111-117.
54. Rizvi H.A. (2002) „Democracy in Pakistan“ Lokniti (Programme of Comparative Democracy), Centre, for the Study of Developing Societies, Delhi retrieved from <http://www.democracy-asia.org/qa/pakistan/Hasan%20Askari.pdf>
55. Rose, R. & Unwin, D. (1969). Social Cohesion, Political Parties, and Strains in Regimes, *Comparative Political Studies*, 2, 7-67.
56. Rose, R. (1974). *The Problem of Party Government*. London: MacMillan.
57. Sapiro, V. (2004). Not your parents' political socialization: introduction for a new generation. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7(2004), pp.1-23.
58. Shah, H. (2019). *Voting Behaviour in Pakistan: An Analysis of Partisan and Floating Voters in General Elections 2013 in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Peshawar, Peshawar).
59. Smeltzer, S. & Keddy, D. (2010). Won't you be my (political) friend? the changing face (book) of socio-political contestation in Malaysia. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 30(3), pp. 421-440
60. Tedin, K. L. (1974). The influence of parents on the political attitudes of adolescents. *American Political Science Review*, 68(4), pp. 1579-1592
61. Valentino, N. A. & Sears, D. O. (1998). Event-driven political communication and the pre-adult socialization of partisanship. *Political Behavior*, 20(2), pp.127-154.
62. Wilder, A. (1999). *The Pakistani voters, electoral politics and voting behavior in the Punjab*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.