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**ABSTRACT**

The Study is a survey aimed at examining the utilization of social media as a political mobilization tool of electorate during the 2019 presidential election in Nigeria: a study of kabba/Bunu local government area of kogi state. The rationale behind the study was to determine whether the voters choice of candidates was influenced by their social media use. 194 respondents were selected through simple random sampling techniques and the purposive sampling procedure. The result from data analyzed shows that majority of the respondents choice of presidential candidates during the election was influenced by the social media use. Similarly, the respondents were of the opinion that the selected aspirants were popular because of they used the social media in their political campaign. In addition, the respondents affirmed that their voting pattern during the election was influenced by social media usage. The findings further indicates that, political affiliation, integrity and past records were also factors that influenced voters choice of candidates. In view of the findings of this study, it was therefore concluded that social media have redefined the landscape of political mobilization in Nigeria and it should continue to be used in future elections in Nigeria. It also recommended that electorate should also ensure they deemphasized on political affiliation, past records and achievements considerations in voting pattern in future elections: only credible candidates should be voted into power.
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**CHAPTER ONE**

**INTRODUCTION**

**1.1 Background of the Study**

The influence of new media technology in political communication across the globe cannot be overemphasized. In recent times, the social media are playing a dominant role in political mobilization, participation and electioneering campaigns in both developed and developing countries across the continent of the world. It is on record that since President Barrack Obama of the United State of America efficient use of the social media, there has been a growing use of new media technologies in facilitating political communication in contemporary times. Obama’s victory is largely attributed to the massive deployment of social media by his campaign organization which provided inspiration to other world leaders. For instance, President Goodluck Jonathan and other political candidates equally used the social media to execute their political campaign during the 2011 presidential elections. Throughout history, political campaigns have evolved around the advancing technologies that are available to political candidates. As technology develops, politicians are able to deploy them to facilitate the dissemination of their manifestos (Emruli& Baca, 2011 p. 155).

In Nigeria, the 2011 general elections were the first litmus test of the use of social media by political parties, political candidates, and the civil society organizations. The election was historic in the sense that it was the first time ever that new media technologies like Facebook, Blogs, LinkedIn and other social networks facilitated political communication and participation in Nigeria (Dagona, Karick, &Abubakar, 2013, p.2). Thus, these new media technologies have redefined methods of political communication in contemporary times and thereby led to significant shift towards the utilization of these modern tools in the electoral process. This new paradigm shift has challenged previous methods used for political communication where television, radio and newspapers dominated coverage of political campaigns, and thus became the primary source of election-related information. However, today, the social media have become a major avenue where political parties and candidates connect with the electorate to share vital information about their policies, programmes and manifestos. Because of the ease, reach and speed associated with the social media, it has become a tool revolutionizing the field of political communication globally. It is upon this paradigm shift in the communication industry that this study appraised the utilization of social media during the 2019 presidential electioneering campaign.

**1.2 Statement of the Problem**

Nigeria held its general election in 2019 which provided an opportunity for voters to elect the president that would pilot the activities of the state for the next four years. Apart from the conventional media of communication like radio, television and the newspapers available to political candidates and major stakeholders in the electioneering process to communicate their messages to the electorate, the social media were massively deployed for the dissemination of political messages during the elections.

It is an incontrovertible fact that new media technologies have become an integral tool of political communication on a global scale. The medium is gradually becoming a dependable tool in influencing and changing the opinions and behaviour of the public. Recognizing the huge benefits derived from the social media for political communication, Nigerian politicians have embraced and exploited it for political campaigns since the 2011 presidential elections. According to Facebook statistics (2010, p.2) “at least one million, seven hundred and fourteen Nigerians use the social media especially Facebook, with a good number of them being young”. However, there is no comprehensive knowledge of how this “new form of media” can facilitate as well as impact on political communication in Nigeria. This study therefore investigated how social media were utilized for political communication during the 2019 presidential elections.

**1.3 Objectives of the Study**

The aim of the study is to basically evaluate the extent to which social media are redefining the landscape of political communication in Nigeria. In doing this, the 2019 general election will be critically examined to show how social media were used to communicate political messages by the various presidential aspirants. The specific objectives of the study are to:

1. To ascertain the influence of social media on voter’s choice of political candidates during the 2019 presidential election in Nigeria.
2. Find out whether the popularity of the presidential candidates during the 2019 presidential election has any significant relationship with their use of social media.
3. Determine theextent to which social media influence voting pattern of the electorate during the 2019 presidential election.

**1.4 Research Questions**

1. What is the influence of social media on voters’ choice of political candidates during the 2019 presidential election
2. Was the popularity of presidential candidates during the 2019 presidential election influenced by their social media usage?
3. To what extent did social media influence voting pattern of electorate during the 2019 presidential election.

**1.5 Significance of the Study**

Being a relatively new field in the ever-dynamic field of communication in Nigeria, the study will provide additional knowledge on the subject matter. It is hoped that the study in its practical value will educate politicians and political parties on the importance of social media in contemporary political communication, since social media tools are yet to be fully explored for political campaigns in Nigeria. Also, this study will provide insights to the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) and civil society organizations in designing programmes that would promote the use of new media technologies in the political process in Nigeria. Lastly, the findings of this study would serve as a springboard for future research in the field of political communication.

**Definition of Terms**

**Social Media:** The social media is an online tool that allows communication information online and make participation and collaboration possible

**Political Mobilization:** This is the process through which candidates, parties, activists and group induce other groups to participate in politics to win elections and to pass bill and influence politics.

**Electorate:** they are eligible voter ranging from the age of 18 and above who are capable of performing the civic role of voting of candidate into an office.

**Elections:** This is the process of choosing a leader, member of parliament, counsellors, other representatives by popular votes

**Communication:** The concept or state of exchanging information between entities.
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**CHAPTER TWO**

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**2.1 Introduction**

This chapter seeks to explain in details the relationship that exists between social media and political mobilization of electorates. The study uses the Agenda Setting theory as the bedrock for its framework. This chapter also reviews the works of Scholars on similar topics in order to prove the validity of its assumptions.

**2.2 Conceptual Framework**

**An Overview of Social Media use in Election**

According to Sherman (2000) the term “social media” was in 2007 coined by Danah in Boyed of the school of information at the University of California and Nicole B. Ellison of the Department of Telecommunications, information studies and media at Michigan State University. Even though the term is usually regarded by several people to mean the same with similar concepts like new media and social networking sites. However, the two concepts are not actually the same. In order to rightly conceptualize the concept of social media, it is imperative to consider what social networking sites are. Boyd and Ellison (2008, p. 21) opined that “social networking sites are web-based services that allow individuals to construct a public or semi-public profile within a bounded system, articulates a list of other users with whom they share a common connections, and view and traverse their list of v connections and those made by others within the system”. Boyd and Ellison’s definition provides us with an understanding for describing social media. According to them, social media is a medium that allows individuals to share important information with friends. Social media therefore, is a subset of information communication technologies.

Corroborating Boyd and Ellison’s definition, Chijioke (2013) asserted that “social media are simply internet based interactive platforms through which people can create and exchange information in a participatory manner on a real-time basis.” He went further to note that they are online democratic and participatory communication channels that allow inhibited exchange of information and documents among users. According to Arthur (2011), social media are internet-based tools and services that allow users to engage with each other, generate content, distribute and search for information online. It is the interactive or collaborative nature of the medium that makes them “social”.

In a nutshell, this study defined social media as online tools that allow communication of information online and make participation and collaboration possible. Specifically, social media here is used to refer to Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Blogs, MySpace, Friendster, Linkedin and many others. The advent of the internet which brought about the development of different forms of social media platforms is increasing supporting democratic participation and free flow of information between individuals in emerging democracies. Citizens are not merely consuming information content, but are privileged to become content producers, thereby encouraging participatory democracy which is the hallmark of democracy.

**2.3 Roles of Social Media in Citizen’s Mobilization and Participation in Election**

Most people who use social media tools access them mainly through computers and mobile devices such as phones and tablet PCs. Analyst suggest that majority of phone purchases in the coming years will be more for using online networks rather than making phone calls (Baekdal, 2008, p. 16). Politicians in Nigeria are joining the online community to communicate with their audiences because they believe they are a key demographic who shape and influence perception. Thus, phone communication is now tending toward one-to-many sharing rather than the usual one-one conversation. Nevertheless, there is comprehensive knowledge of the activities as well as h0ow this form of media impacts on citizen’s mobilization and participation in Nigeria electoral process.

Social media technologies take on different forms includi9ng magazines, internet forums, weblogs, social blogs, podcasts, pictures and video. Considering that social media come in diverse forms, Kaplan and Haeaenlein (2010, p.5) tried to classify social media into six distinct categories:

1. Collaborative project (for example Wikipedia)
2. Blogs and microblogs (for example Twitter)
3. Content communities (for example YouTube)\
4. Social networking sites (for example Facebook)\
5. Virtual games worlds (for example World of Warcraft)
6. Virtual social world (for example Second Life)

Out of these categories of social media tools, three categories (blogs and microblogs, content communities, and social networking sites) are the ones that are most relevant to the application of social media in the electoral process. In the process of political communication, there has been strong intermediation between the traditional media and the three categories of social media mentioned above. Traditional media channels, particularly television and newspapers, try to expand their reach by using social media platforms for news broadcasts. In Nigeria for example, many newspapers like Guardian, Vanguard, Daily Trust and ThisDay as well as television stations like Channels, have Facebook and Twitter accounts.

A common trend among traditional media houses especially the television station is to have i-reporters. I-reporters are individuals without professional experience of journalism but who can utilize their dexterity in the use of social media tools to broadcast messages about events taking place around them through the traditional media. I-reporters share pictures and videos of events with the public throu8gh television. In this way, the traditional media rely on users of social media for news, information and leads, the same that the social media utilize news and information emanating from newspapers, radio and television channels. Through the ties of camaraderic, neighborliness and family, and social leaders are able to communicate their messages and to encourage people in civic and political action. The network nature of the internet combined with the opportunity for collaboration has made the internet an important tool for political mobilization. Political and interest group has also shifted onto the internet. There has been a rise in global political activitsm, with internet-based mass demonstrations against corporate globalization. The social media tools made available by the internet enables users to produce, interact and share content online. Online social networks are described as websites that are ideal for encouraging interpersonal interaction, broadening social ties and providing valuable information about how to become civically and politically involved.

Specifically, social media have shaped political communication in four major ways. Firstly, it has deepened segmentation of the audience triggered by the rise of network television channels and specialized magazines and websites. Segmentation of audience is a product of two main elements of the social media: diversification of coverage and selective exposure that is, finding information that aligns with the predispositions of individuals (Stroud, 2008, p. 93). Social media makes it possible for its users to read and discuss specific issues and then connect with other individuals who share their beliefs. This has the possibility of influencing voters that are fixated on specific issues and who may not be able to relate with the wider issues that are part of a general election. The existence of different media and brands of information platform can slit political communication into different segment- all addressing the same issues from different perspectives.

The second way social media has shaped political communication is by weakening the gate keeping capacity of the traditional media. Before the emergence of social media, the traditional media played a key role in deciding what is sufficiently important to be aired to the public. This gate keeper role of the traditional media enables it to set the agenda of the public discourse. In the 1970s, McCombs et al (1997) asserted that the mass social force attention tom certain issues. They build up public images of political figures. They are constantly presenting objects suggesting what individuals in the mass should think about, know about and have feelings about. They argue that number of mass media news producers dominates the market, and therefore, audiences only get information about what the media decides is important enough to be covered. By presenting politicians with a platform to speak directly with their constituents and potential voters without the traditional media intermediary, the social media has curtailed the agenda setting role of the traditional media (Gillin 2008, p. 54).

Related to the weakening of the gatekeeper role of the traditional media is a third effect of social media on political communication. The practice of breaking news through the social media rather than press release4s in the traditional media has gained currency in recent times. Press secretaries are increasingly losing their control as gatekeepers and individuals now have more liberty to frame and prime issues they consider important. In all, the use of social media limits the control of traditional press secretaries over the outflow of information, and also decreases the dependence on traditional media for up-to-date content. Although, the lack of control over the content of social media maybe positive in the sense that it allows for greater freedom of information, there are also the dark sides of this phenomena. The social media has been misused in many ways including using social media platform to spread false information, abusing political opponents and inciting violence. This, therefore, highlights the needs for a reflection on how to balance individual freedom and responsibility in the use of social media. Social media outlet have a responsibility to develop and implement social networking guidelines for their users.

Fourthly, social media have emerged as the new influencer in social, economic and political settings. Research has shown that the increasing use of social media for political communication has led to declining newspaper readership and television viewership in many countries (Eva et al 2009). Under this circumstance the social media may likely continue to dominate political communication and to serve as a tool for gathering and disseminating political messages.

An election is usually brought about when, in order to fill a position, collectively and voluntarily put a consent for the choice of a candidate through voting. Through, the candidate with the highest vote gets elected. Election are primarily mechanism for selecting certain governmental leaders, as well as removing leaders from office, and preventing others from gaining office through democratic means. In some countries, brings about stability and instability. At most abstract level, elections are mechanisms capable of translating the popular will into institutionally defined roles. At a concrete level elections are about the choice of individuals. The word election derives from a Latin word ‘eligere’, meaning to pick out, to choose. Election constitutes the major process for instituting governments and for holding public officials accountable for their actions and keeping them responsive to the peoples needs and interests in democracies(Suberu,2016;Wayne 2017).

From the foregoing, it can be argued that one of the fundamental mainstays of good democratic governance is free and fair election. Elections allows citizens to exercise their civic and constitutional rights to elect or appoint their representatives could be endowed with executive or legislative powers by the electorates. Qualified citizens in a democratic society possess legal rights to vote for politicians and the political party their choice through free, fair and credible election based on their coherently articulated policies. The political significance of any candidate in a democratic setting is measured through quality of expression of citizens that is devoid free, fair and credible elections (Alemika 2011). In such society, every vote must count. Since 1960, when Nigeria joined the comity of independent states, the conduct of elections held so far have been generally marred and characterized with violence and electoral flaws based on several factors.

Mobilization could be seen as the process by which candidates, parties, activists and group induce other people to participate in politics to win elections, to pass bill and to influence policies (Strandbeg 2006). Political organizations may contact people and provide specific opportunity for political action. In most instances, mobilization is a key prerequisite before any participation can occur. Political mobilization can further be defined as the way in which citizens organize people to put pressure on the political representatives. Thus, it could be any sort of movement which in the end result in a change of policy, for example, when a Newspaper writes about malfunctioning within a government, a lot of people read it, and it gets picked up by the politicians who will start working with it, and in the end are able to change the government’s composition. It could be actions such as signing a petition to bring about change in public policy issues.

Marc H (2010) asserts that mobilization is an important precondition for the most forums of political participation and engagement. Potential participants have to be informed and recuited before they can participate. In fact, mobilization and recruitment processes are essential preconditions before citizens can become engaged in any form of civic or electioneering action. In recent years, these mobilization processes have been transformed rapidly from direct to an indirect process. Instead of relying on the face-face contacts or print media, mobilization agents increasingly have adopted new electronic media and the internet to reach out to potential participants. Katerina (2010) distinguishes between direct and indirect types of mobilization.

Direct mobilization includes direct canvassing on the street, television campaigning, direct mails and phone calls. Indirect mobilization takes place through social networks which individual are subscribed to. Indirect mobilization occurs when political leaders contact citizens through social networks and social media of friends, neighbors and colleagues. Social networks are the facilitators of political mobilization which is the focus of this study.

Also, Arthur (2012, p. 57) assets that social media have great potential for political participation. Accessible social media platforms offer ordinary citizens the opportunity to interact more directly and actively with their political system. Social media tools also possess the potential to allow diaspora communities to get involved in social political processes. People engaged in social for various reasons which includes to air their view and express (in some cases) anger and dissatisfaction. The level of reciprocal communication between representatives of political parties and social media users is a matter of debate despite the contestations, various political entities variably utilize these platforms to interact with, and push information to citizens. It should be noted that this interactivity is the hall mark of social media. Interactivity involves users engagement with information and with other users. These online tools allows people to communicate, collaborate and openly share information, thereby, bringing to the power and agency of citizens to make political contributions. Social media also possess the potential to facilitates citizen’s engagement with institutions (Arthur 2012, p. 57). While it is difficult to quantify the direct impact of the campaign, these examples of users engagement with social media to contribute to political conversation underline the quintessential role of these communicative tools in facilitating citizen’s political involvement.

Be that as it may, to address the flaws that marred previous elections in Nigeria, various organizations, institutions and individuals set up social media platforms that enables citizens to oversee the electoral process and report electoral malpractices to authorities through their mobile phones, computers and other electronic devices. Through social media platforms, an overwhelming number of videos, photos, tweets and comments were shared. In the words of Omokiri (2011, p. 21)

The wide spread use of these real- time media severely limitedelectoral malpractices because we found that people were aware that they were on camera and this made them operate on their best behavior.

Two major issues underline the tremendous use of social media during the 2019 presidential elections. Firstly, it reflects a global trend towards’’ internet elections’’ or e- electioneering’’.(Macnamara,2008, p. 35). Around the word, rapidly expanding access to the internet, increased availability of internet ready smart phone and other communication devices, as well as the evolution of web-based new media, personal websites, social networking sites, blogs ,E-newsletters, have redefined methods of political communication, leading to a significant shift towards the use of social media in the electoral process. Previously, network televisions and news papers dominated the coverage of electioneering and were the primary sites of election related information. But today the social media has become major election information sharing platform globally. Because of it ease of use, speed and reach, social media is revolutionizing the efficiency of election administration and reporting.

The second issue that underscores the use of social media in Nigeria 2019 general election is the tendency of the Nigerian civic society and the electorates to take up social media as a tool for improving the efficiency of election observation.

The use of social media in politics has continued to grow in many parts of Africa in recant times. The 2019 general election witnessed a massive use of mobile phone, facebook, twitter etc, both at the federal, state and local governments level. Social media due to their participatory , interactive and cost- effective nature have no doubt become veritable instrument for carrying out electioneering campaigns and other activities.

**2.4 Theoretical Framework**

Agenda setting provided the frame for this study. Agenda setting theory according to Zhu and Blood (2003, p.111), ‘’ is the process whereby the news media lead the public in assigning relative importance to various public issues’’. This is because the action of the media towards influencing people’s perceptions of what is important, acceptable or desirable. Attention is drawn to certain aspect of reality and away from others, thus influencing people in terms of what they think.

This Agenda setting function of news casting can be achieved deliberately or accidentally by the size of headlines, order of appearance, choice of words and length of coverage and this is possible because of the active audience which are conceived as selective in their programming choices and interpretation, motivated by the different demands and resistant to direct media influence; in contrast to the concept of mass audience which may perceived as passive and easily swayed. The concept represents a new way of thinking about audiences and their relationship to media communication.

Agenda Setting does not ascribe to the media the power to determine what people actually think but it does ascribe to them the power to determine what people are thinking about. They set agenda for political campaigns. Daniel (2003, p.121) argues that

The mass media force attention to certain issues and they build-up public images of political figures,they are constantly presenting objects that suggesting thatindividuals in the ass should think about,know about and have feelings about.

The rationale behind adopting the Agenda setting media theory in this study is because it explains the role or function of media in determining public agenda before, during and after elections. It further, describes the influence of the media in molding and shaping the opinion of the public towards some topical issues of which election is paramount. In fact, the main trust of Agenda setting theory is that the mass media set agenda on the burning issues in the society for public discourse.

According to Folarin (2003, p. 68) the elements involved in agenda setting includes

1. The quality or frequency of reporting
2. Prominence given to the reports through headlines, display, pictures and layout in newspapers, magazines, films and graphics or tuning on radio and television.
3. The degree of conflict generated in the reports; and
4. Cumulative media specific effect overtime.

The media, most especially the social media through the above elements can color events by using them in a particular way or refusing to use them at all.

**2.5 Emperical Review**

A number of studies have been conducted by scholars on the growing influence of social media during political campaigns. For instance, a study by Kushin and Yamamoto(2010) attempted to determine the whether social media usage actually impact on political self- efficacy and involvement of electorates during the 2008 US presidential election. Their findings show that there was drastic rise in the use of social media by political candidates as well as electorates. According to them 27% of young people reported obtaining political information from the social media. Corroborating their findings, Owen , Soule, Nairne, Chalif, House and Davidson,(2011) remarked that the 2008 US election marked a breakthrough year for political use of new media and social networks specifically. They further opined that social networking websites played an especially innovative and important role in the protracted primary race between Barrack Obama and Hillary Clinton. Obama subsequent victory at the main election was largely attributed to his massive use of social media during the electioneering campaigns.

Similarly, Warrens(2009) investigated the use of social networking sitefacebook in 2008 presidential election in America. The study was specifically design to analyze whether facebookmight be a practical campaign tool to target young voters, particularly college students. A survey research method was adopted for the study to collect data from 212 students at the university of Central Missouri to determine if facebook was a viable campaign tool. The study concludes that college students that participated in the political activities on facebook felt more motivated ti vote in 2008 presidential election and the students who had facebook account had better identity with candidates due to their presence and the information they received on facebook.

McLaughlin and Osborne(1997,p.10) cited in Alaki, Titus, Akpan and Tarnongo ((2013) revealed that nearly three-quarter(73%) of American internet users, or 54% of all voters went online in 2010 for news or information about midterms elections or communicate with others about campaign and the information voters are getting online appear to have sway. In addition, one third of the respondents said the information they saw online made them to vote for or against a particular candidate. This underscored the role of social media in the US presidential election.

In another related study, Larson and Moe (2011) conducted a study on Twitter use during the 2015 Sweden election and found that twitter also serves as a channel for disseminating political information and not for political dialogue with the electorates. Larson and Moe study revealed that Swedish political elites sees Twitter as a medium to communicate political contents to the people and not necessarily as a tool to electorates in political conversations. On the contrary, Williams and Gulati (2009) research on the extent of Facebook use by congressional candidates during election campaigns, discovered that the number of Facebook supporters can be considered as valid indicator of electoral success.

In the context of Dutch election Utz (2009) valid indicator of electoral shows that social networking sites provided an opportunity for politicians to reach individuals interested in politics. Their view of candidates profile further strengthened their exciting attitudes. Also, Pew Research Centre (2014) examines the use of new media techniques in Lowa and Hampshire. The aim of the study was to determine whether or not the websites of political candidates were being utilized by potential voters. They found that 30% of likely voters in Lowa and 29% in New Hampshire said they visited candidates’ websites. Roughly the same percentage has view political candidates videos online as well. Meanwhile, quite few of respondents have joined a social networking page such as Facebook or Myspace.

The 2019 general election provided political aspirants another avenue to use the social media tool to connect with voters and constituents. For instance, it was reported that the aspirants of the major rulings parties has 700,000 followers on their Facebook pages. Corroborating further also Okoro and Nwafor (2013) conducted a study on the ‘’Lapses and the Lessons’’ of social and political participation in Nigeria during the 2011 general election. The objective of the study was to observe the lapses in the use of social media during elections, and the lessons learnt from social media in the course of the election . The findings of their study revealed that 93% of the respondents attested to the fact that they used social media for political participation during the election. Respondents also said they use different social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, Youtube. The study also identified some lapses in the cause of the use of the social media in electioneering process.

Moreover, civic society groups and activists were not left in the 2019 political process. Groups as ’’ATIKULATE campaign group’’ of the People Democratic party, and NEXT LEVEL campaign organization of the All Progressive Peoples party, among others were formed in order to create awareness and mobilize the masses for the election. Since these groups were mostly dominated by young people and sometimes civilized adults , they heavily employed the use of social media to initiate and put up a youth presidential debate and share intelligence to push forward the campaign for credible elections on social media platforms. In doing this, the mainstream media struck a working relationship with social media platforms that enhance both citizen’s mobilization and professional journalist practices.

Journalists from various media organizations in the country engaged with citizens on Facbook and other social media platforms and citizen’s contributions informed the journalist questions during interview with political institutions such as INEC. For instance, there was a convergence of different media of communications like the print media and television and social networking sites to monitor, cover and report election proceedings for polling stations. In regard to this, the likes of channels TV, AIT,TVC and; NTA among others features regular live coverage through their websites, I phone, I pad and other devices. During the elections, the organizations established a four- person social media team, with one each handling the websites,Twitter, Facebook and the fourth feeding information from newsroom to the other three number of the team.

**Summary**

In summary, the social media as a tool that allow communication of information online and make participation and collaboration possible. Hence, citizens are not merely consuming information content, but are privileged to become content producers, thereby encouraging participatory democracy which is the hall mark of democracy.

The advent of the internet according to research conducted by scholars on the growing influence of social media during political campaigns has brought about the development of different forms of social media platforms and is increasingly supporting democratic participation and free flow of information between individual in emerging democracies.
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**CHAPTER THREE**

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

**3.0 Introduction**

This chapter will treat the method adopted for the study. In order to accomplish the task successfully, the following areas will be covered. These are: Research Design, Population of Study, Sampling Procedure, Sample size, Research Instruments, Validity of Instruments, Method of data collection and Method Of Data Analysis.

**3.1 Research Design**

Research design is the frame work or plan of a study, which can be used for collecting data and analyzing data. William (2012), says research design is the procedure of developing or preparing particular study. Base on the above notion and research problem, the research design adopted for this study will be survey method.

The survey design will be the most appropriate method that will be employed to find out if social media is the rationale behind the political mobilization of electorates during the 2019 presidential election. Ndiyo (2011) stated that survey is interested in the accurate assessment of characteristics of a whole population. In other words, survey research hardly studies the whole, but they normally study samples drawn from population of interest. From this sample, the researcher generalize the result to defined population of study.

**3.2 Popuation of the Study**

The population for this study is kabba/Bunu local government area of kogi state. The total population of Kabba as at 2006 census was 145,446 but has increased with the growth rate of 2.5% to 363,615 as at 2019 from which three (3) out the nine (9) political wards in the area will be focused on for the cause of this study, these three wards are: Asuta ward, Otu-Egunbe ward and Ayewa ward. The study considers only eligible voters most especially those who fall within the age bracket of 18 to 50 years who are active social media users.

**3.3 Sampling Procedure**

It has always been a difficult task to cover a very large population in a single research of study. For this study, there is need to carryout population of sample. To this effect, the research will adopt the probability and non-probability sampling procedure.

In the probability sampling the research will utilized simple random techniques which according to Asemah (2012, p. 172) “it is the process of selecting a sample in such a way that all individual in the defined population have an equal and independent chance of been selected for the sample”.

For the non-probability sampling a purposive sampling procedure will be employed since purposive sampling in the view of Tejumaiye (2003, P. 69) is deliberately chosen it attempts to represent a specific portion of the population and not all sundry. This means the researcher chooses at his or her own discetion any portion to represent the entire population.

In view of the fact that Kabba is a large town, it will be an enormous task to study the entire population therefore; the researcher used purposive sampling to select the following areas: Asuta Ward, Otu-Egunbe ward and Ayewa Ward. Purposive sampling according to Asemah, Gujbawu, Ekhareafo and Okpanachi (2012 p. 187) is where a researcher uses his judgment to choose his respondent and select those that best meet the purpose of his study. The researcher administered the question to the respondents and ensure it accuracy and efficiency has they are administered.

**3.4 Sample Size**

The sample size for this work will be calculated using Taro Yamani’s formulae which is expressed below

n=

Where n= sample size

N = population

e = error limit/ degree of error

Then N = 363,615 (total population)

e = 0.07 (degree of error)

=

= x 0.049

=

=

= 204.967

~ 204

Sample size for this study is 204 which also mean that the total number of questionnaires that will be administered in the three wards. 68 questionnaires will be administered in each of the wards.

**3.5 Research Instrument**

In getting data for this study, questionnaire will be designed to gather information for the study. A questionnaire according to Asemah (2012, p.115) is a list of question designed to elicit information from respondents by filling answers in space provided for the purpose. The question will seek to obtain information from respondents on the topic. The question will be divided into two parts. Part one comprises of demographic data and the part two comprises of the subject matter.

**3.6 Validity of Instrument**

Validity according to Asemah (2012, p. 207) is the accuracy of truthfulness of a measurement. The research supervisor approves the research instruments before they are utilized. Thus, validating the research tools used in the collection of the data for the study. Response gotten from the randomly interviewed persons representing the three wards ascertain the relevance and the ability of the respondents to understand the questions and ensuring also that the answers provided correspond as emphasized by the supervisor, the researcher then reframed the questions before embarking on the actual survey.

**3.7 Reliabity of Instrunment**

To ensure that this research work measures what it seeks to measure, the researcher submitted her measuring instrunments to the supervisor for study and approval. The questionniare was tested on few member of the selected sample before finally administering the questionniare to them. This was done to ensure that respondents understands the questions in the questionniare for the purpose of providing correct and relevant responds to them.

**3.8 Method of Data Collecttion**

This study will adopt the use of questionnaire for data collection. The questionnaire contains 10 questions that will cover demographic data of such respondents such as sex, age, level of educational qualification; occupation. The questions were structured to bring out some relevant information relating to the research questions.

**3.9 Method of Data Analysis**

In analyzing the data collected from the field work, this study will adopt a univariated method of data analysis. The univariated method involves analysis of one variable at a time in a tabular form. Simple percentage table will be effectively use in this study

**CHAPTER FOUR**

**DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS**

This chapter focuses on data presentation, analysis and discussion of findings.

**4.1 Data Presentation**

This chapter presents and analyses data collected from the field survey through the use of questionnaire. Two hundred and three (203) copies of questionnaire were distributed to respondents, out of which 194 were retrieved. It was on these retrieved copies that analysis were made.

**Table 4.1.1: Sex Distribution Of Respondents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | **FREQUENCY** | **PERCENTAGE** |
| Male | 92 | 47 |
| Female | 102 | 53 |
| **TOTAL** | **194** | **100** |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019.**

**Analysis:** The table above shows the distribution of respondents according to sex. It indicates that 92 respondents representing 47% were male while 102 respondents representing 53% were female. Therefore, there are more female respondents than male in the questionnaire administered.

**TABLE 4.1.2: The age of respondents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | **FREQUENCY** | **PERCENTAGE** |
| 18-35 | 102 | 53 |
| 35-40 | 62 | 32 |
| 41-45 | 20 | 10 |
| 46-50 | 10 | 5 |
| **TOTAL** | **194** | **100** |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019**

**Analysis:** The table above shows the age distribution of respondents. It shows that the respondents between the ages 18-35 are 102 representing 53%, those between the ages 35-40 are 62 representing 32%, those between 41-45 are 20 representing 10% and those between 46-50 are 10 representing 5% of the respondents.

**TABLE 4.1.3: Distribution of Respondents by Educational Qualification**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | **FREQUENCY** | **PERCENTAGE** |
| B.Sc | 92 | 47 |
| HND | 44 | 23 |
| ND | 28 | 14 |
| NCE | 20 | 10 |
| School Cert | 10 | 6 |
| **TOTAL** | **194** | **100** |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019.**

Analysis: From the educational qualification distribution table above, 92 respondents representing 47% are B.Sc holders, 44 respondents representing 23% are HND holders, 28 respondents representing 14% are ND holders, 20 respondents representing 10% are NCE holders, while 10 respondents representing 6% are School Cert Holders.

**TABLE 4.1.4: Are you aware of the social media?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | **FREQUENCY** | **PERCENTAGE** |
| **Yes** | **194** | **100** |
| **No** | **0** | **0** |
| **TOTAL** | **194** | **100** |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019**

**Analysis:** From the table above, 194 respondents representing 100% are aware of social media while 0 respondents are not aware of social media. Hence, all the respondents indicate that they are aware of social media.

**TABLE 4.1.5: Through which social media platform do you receive information?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | **FREQUENCY** | **PERCENTAGE** |
| **Facebook** | **50** | **26** |
| **Twitter** | **30** | **15** |
| **Google** | **80** | **41** |
| **MySpace** | **10** | **6** |
| **Others** | **24** | **12** |
| **TOTAL** | **194** | **100** |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019**

**Analysis:** From the table above, 50 respondents representing 26% make use Facebook in accessing information, 30 respondents representing 15% make use of Twitter in accessing information, 80 respondents representing 41% make use of Google in accessing information, 10 respondents representing 6% make use of MySpace in accessing information, while 24 respondents representing 12% make use of other social media platforms in accessing information. Therefore, it means more people make use of Google to access information.

**TABLE 4.1.6: How often do you use the social media?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | **FRQUENCY** | **PERCENTAGE** |
| Frequently | 154 | 79 |
| Not frequently | 40 | 21 |
| **TOTAL** | **194** | **100** |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019**

Analysis: From the table above, the data indicates that 154 respondents representing 79% use social media frequently, while 40 respondents representing 21% are not frequent users of social media. Hence, there are more frequent users of social media.

**TABLE 4.1.7: Do you use social media platforms for communication purposes?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | **FREQUENCY** | **PERCENTAGE** |
| Yes | 100 | 51 |
| No | 34 | 18 |
| Partially | 60 | 31 |
| **TOTAL** | **194** | **100** |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019**

**Analysis:** From the table above, 100 respondents representing 51% use social media platforms for communication purposes, 34 respondents representing 18% do not use social media platforms for communication purposes, while 60 respondents representing 31% use social media partially for communication purposes. A larger percentage of the respondents use social media platforms for communication purposes.

**TABLE 4.1.8: Through which of these social media platforms did you hear about the last general election?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | **FREQUENCY** | **PERCENTAGE** |
| Facebook | 90 | 46 |
| Twiitter | 28 | 14 |
| WhatsApp | 12 | 7 |
| Youtube | 20 | 10 |
| Others | 44 | 23 |
| **TOTAL** | **194** | **100** |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019.**

Analysis: The table above indicates that 90 respondents representing 46% heard about the last general election on Facebook, 28 respondents representing 14% heard about the last general election on Twitter, 12 respondents representing 7% heard about the last general election on WhatsApp, 20 respondents representing 10% heard about the last election on YouTube, while 44 respondents representing 23% heard about the last general election from other sources.

**TABLE 4.1.9: Were you an eligible voter duringthe 2019 Presidential election?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | **FREQUENCY** | **PERCENTAGE** |
| Yes | 130 | 67 |
| No | 64 | 33 |
| **TOTAL** | **194** | **100** |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019**

Analysis: From the table above, 130 respondents representing 67% were eligible voters in the last general election, while 64 respondents were not eligible voters in the last election.

**TABLE 4.1.10: Do you use social media to access political information?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | **FREQUENCY** | **PERCENTAGE** |
| Yes | 100 | 52 |
| No | 60 | 31 |
| Partially | 34 | 17 |
| **TOTAL** | **194** | **100** |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019**

Analysis: From the table above, 100 respondents representing 52% use social media to access political information, 60 respondents representing 31% do not use social media to access political information while 34 respondents representing 17% partially use the social media for accessing political information.

**TABLE 4.1.11: How often do you use the social media to get political information during the election?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | **FREQUENCY** | **PERCENTAGE** |
| Often | 80 | 41 |
| Very often | 60 | 31 |
| Rarely | 54 | 28 |
| **TOTAL** | **194** | **100** |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019**

**Analysis:** From the table above, 80 respondents representing 41% often use the social media to get political information during the election, 60 respondents representing 31% use the social media to get political information very often, while 54 respondents representing 28% rarely use the social media to get political information during the election?

**TABLE 4.1.12: Does the use of social media influence your voting pattern?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | **FREQUENCY** | **PERCENTAGE** |
| Yes | 130 | 67 |
| No | 45 | 23 |
| Partially | 19 | 10 |
| **TOTAL** | **194** | **100** |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019**

**Analysis:** From the table above, 130 respondents representing 67% are of the opinion that social media influences their voting pattern, 45 respondents representing 23% do not think that the use of social media influences their voting pattern and 19 respondents representing 10% are of the opinion that social media partially influences their voting pattern.

**TABLE 4.1.13: Does the use of social media influence your choice of candidate?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | **FREQUENCY** | **PERCENTAGE** |
| Yes | 145 | 75 |
| No | 30 | 15 |
| Partially | 19 | 10 |
| **TOTAL** | **194** | **100** |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019**

**Analysis:** From the table above, 145 respondents representing 75% are of the opinion that the use of social media influences their choice of candidates, 30 respondents representing 15% do not feel that social media influences their choice of candidates, while 19 respondents representing 10% are of the opinion that social media partially influences their choice of candidates.

**TABLE 4.1.14: To what extent were you influenced by social media in voting your choice of candidate during the 2019 election**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | **FREQUENCY** | **PERCENTAGE** |
| Great extent | 85 | 44 |
| Some extent | 60 | 30 |
| No extent | 49 | 26 |
| **TOTAL** | **194** | **100** |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019**

**Analysis:** From the table above, 85 respondents representing 44% were influenced to a great extent by the social media in voting the candidate of their choice, 60 respondents representing 30% were only to some extent influenced by social media in voting the candidate of their choice while 49 respondents representing 26% were not influenced by social media in voting the candidate of their choice.

**TABLE 4.1.15: Do you think the aspirants were popular because they utilized the social media?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | **FREQUENCY** | **PERCENTAGE** |
| Yes | 164 | 84 |
| Partially | 20 | 10 |
| No | 10 | 6 |
| **TOTAL** | **194** | **100** |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019**

**Analysis:** From the table above, 164 respondents representing 84% think that the aspirants were popular because they utilize the social media, 20 respondents representing 10% think that the aspirants were only partially due to the social media, while 10 respondents representing 6% think that aspirants were not popular due to the social media they utilized.

**Table 4.1.16: Do you think the social media played any role in political mobilization during the election?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | **FREQUENCY** | **PERCENTAGE** |
| Yes | 85 | 43 |
| Partially | 65 | 33 |
| No | 45 | 24 |
| **TOTAL** | **194** | **100** |

**source: field survey 2019**

**Analysis:** from the table above, 85 respondents representing 43% attest to the fact that the social media played a role in the political mobilization while 65 respondents representing 33% are partially of the option of the social playing a role in the political mobilization during the election and 45 of the respondents representing 24% said the social does not play any role in the poltical mobilization during the 2019 presidential election.

**Table 4.1.17: Do you have a personal profile on any social media?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | **FREQUENCY** | **PERCENTAGE** |
| Yes | 194 | 100 |
| No | 0 | 0 |
| **TOTAL** | **194** | **100** |

**source: field survey 2019**

**Analysis:** From the table above 194 respondents has a personal profile on the social media.

**Table 4.1.18: What factor influence your decision to Vote for the Presidential candidate of your choice**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **VARIABLES** | **FREQUENCY** | **PERCENTAGE** |
| Integrity | 60 | 31 |
| Political affiliation | 100 | 52 |
| Past records | 34 | 17 |
| **TOTAL** | **194** | **100** |

**source: field survey 2019**

**Analysis:** from the table above 60 respondents representing 31% says integrity influenced their decision to vote for the candidate of their choice, while 100 respondents representing 52% affirmed that they voted for the candidate of their choice for political affiliation and the remaining 34 respondents representing 17% says they voted the candidate of their choice because of their past records.

**4.2 Discussion of Findings**

The data collected from the field work on the"Social media and political mobilization of electorate during the 2019 presidential election: a study of Kabba/Bunu local government area of Kogi state" would be discussed thus: the questionnaire analyzed contained 18 questionsand 194 out of the 203 questionnaire distributed was found usable therefore responses to answers from the research questions were discussed below.

**Research Question 1:** what is the influence of social media on voter's choice of political candidates during the 2019 election?

The data contained in table 13 and 14 answered the above question. Table 4.1.13 shows that out of 194 respondents,145 representing 75% attest to the fact that the use of social media influenced their choice of political candidates while 30 representing 15% says the social media does not influence their choice of political candidates while the remaining 19 representing 10% says the use of social media partially influence their choice of political candidates.

Table 4.1.14 shows that out of 194 respondents,85 representing 44% of the respondents agreed they were greatly influenced by the social media in voting the candidate of their choice during the election,60 representing 30% agreed they were influenced to some extent and the remaining 49representing 26% says they were not in any extent influenced by the social media in voting for the candidate of their choice during the election.

This indicates that the majority of the respondents were influenced by social media usage in the choice of their political candidates and to a great extent they were influenced by the social media in voting the candidates of their choice via social media usage.

**Research Question 2:** was the popularity of the presidential candidates during the 2019 presidential election influenced by their social media usage?

The date contained in table 4.1.10,4.1.11 and 4.1.15 provides the answer to the question.Table 10 shows that 100 respondents representing 52% of uses the social media to access political information,60 respondents representing 31% does not while the remaining 34 respondents representing 17% partially use the social media to access political information. Therefore, a large percentage of the respondents access political information using the social media.

Table 4.1.11 shows the data of how frequent the social media was use to get political information during the election with 80 respondents representing 41% agreed they use the social media often,while 60 respondents representing 31% agreed they very constant(very often) with the use of social media in getting political information during the election while 54 representing 28% of the respondents rarely use the social media to get political information during the election.

Table 4.1.15 shows wether political aspirants were popular because they utilized the social media.84% of the respondents says aspirants were popular because of their social media usage,while 10% says they were partially popular because of their social media usage and 6% disagree with the fact of their popularity being based on the social media. This implies that, 84% of the respondents agreed to fact that political aspirants were popular because they utilized the social media with facebook and Google as the major tool as indicated in table 4.1.5 and table4.1.8.

**Research Question 3:** to what extent does the socail media influence voting pattern of the electorates during the 2019 presidential election?

As shown in table 4.1. 6,154 of the respondents representing 79% uses the social media more often.Therefore,table 4.1.12 indicates that 130respondents representing 67% are of the opinion that the social media influences their voting pattern,45respondents representing 23% does not think the use of social media influences their voting pattern and the remaining 19 representing 10% are of the opinion that social media partially influence their voting pattern. This means that,the social media to a great extent influences the voting pattern of the electorates during the 2019 presidential election.

From the findings therefore,it was discovered that: 53% of the respondents were female,the age distribution also shows that majority of the respondents are within the age bracket of 18-35 year of age. The educational qualification of the respondents B.sc which shows that the respondents are well educated and they are aware of the social media with a personal profile on the platform of their choice with facebook and google as the major tools of communication and with the frequent use of the social media,they recieve political information and access information duely using the same platform.67% of the repodents claimed they were eligible voter during the period, but the social media greatly influenced their choice of candidates and their voting pattern during the election.

**CHAPTER FIVE**

**5.1 Implications of Findings**

The findings of this study attest to the fact that majority of people who use social media to get political information are predominantly youths. The implication of this is that, more youths are now being mobilized to participate in the political process through the social media where their opinions and voices can be heard.

Voter’s choice of political candidates during electioneering campaigns was to a greater extent influenced by politician’s use of social media. However, respondents also affirmed that other factors such as political experience of a candidate, integrity, past records, achievements, and political affiliation (political party) were among the factors that influenced their voting pattern. The implication of this import is that apart from the social media, other intervening variables plays a greater role in the voting patterns of electorate during the elections. This reveals that voting pattern in Nigeria is influence by these factors.

Based on the findings of the study, Facebook ranked highest among the several social media platforms available to the electorate for political engagement during election campaigns. This, therefore, suggests that, for Nigerian politicians to remain relevant in contemporary politics, they have to utilize the social media so as to woo their supporters who are mostly young people.

With the emergence of social media, traditional means of political campaigns is gradually changing to modern means of communication. The implication of this is that politicians must acquaint themselves with this new paradigm shift if they must mobilize the youths in future elections.

**5.2 Conclusion**

In view of the findings of this study, it was concluded that social media have redefined the landscape of political communication in Nigeria. This phenomenal change is brought about by development of new media technologies such as the internet and other social media platforms. Political candidates now use these communication platforms to engage with the electorate during political campaign. The electorate on the other hand, finds these tools very effective to connect with their political representatives or candidates as it is the only medium that gives them free and unlimited access to stay connected with happenings in the political sphere.

**5.3 Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this study, the researchers, therefore, made the following recommendations:

1. Nigerian politicians should continue to use the social media to engage the electorate during political campaigns especially the youth who are avid users of the social media.
2. Based on the findings of this study, Facebook is the most utilized social media platform by the presidential candidates. The study therefore recommends that in future elections, other social media platforms likes YouTube, Instagram, and Blogs should by employ by politicians during electioneering campaigns.

Nigerian electorate should ensure that their voting pattern in future elections should not be by influenced by political candidate’s religious affiliations or ethnic considerations but on the credibility of candidates.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Alemika, E.E.O. (2011). Post-Election Violence in Nigeria: Emerging Trend and Lessons. Retrieved from: <http://CleanFoundationblogspot.Com> Accessed on October 15, 2012

Arthur, C. (2012). Encouraging Political Participation in Africa. [<http://www.issafrica.org>](http://www.issafrica.org/) Retrieved August 18, 2013

Baekdal, T. (2008). The Mobile Internet Revolution is Here, [<](http://www.baekdal.com/%20trends/mobile-internet-revolution)*http://www.baekdal.com/ trends/mobil[e-internet-revolution](http://www.baekdal.com/%20trends/mobile-internet-revolution)*[>](http://www.baekdal.com/%20trends/mobile-internet-revolution). Accessed August 10, 2014

Chijioke, O. (2013). Social media. In Okoro, N. (Ed.) *Contemporary readings in media and communication studies.* Enugu: St B

Daniel, A. A. (2003). Agenda Setting For Political Communication: A Nigerian Experience. *UNILAG Communication Review,* 4(1):117-132

Dictionary

Emruli, S., & Baca, M. (2011). Internet and political communication- Macedonian case. *International Journal of Computer Science Issues*. 8 (3), 154-163.

Ethnicity and Multiculturalism (CRONEM), University of Surrey, Guildford, UK, June 29th-30th Lagos State Bureau of Statistics Bulleting (2011).

Eva, A. et al (2009). Political Participation and the Internet, *Information, Communication & Society Journal,12*(6), 860-878.

Facebook Statistics (2010 )

Folarin, B. (1998). *Theories of Mass Communication: An Introductory Text.* Ibadan: StirlingHorden Publishers Nig. Ltd.

Gillin, P. (2008). New Media, New Influencers and Implications for the Public Relations Profession. *Journal of New Communications Research,2*(2).

Kaplan, A. M. (2010). Users of the World, Unite! The Challenges and Opportunities of Social Media. *Business Horizons,* 53(1):59–68.

Katerina, V. (2010). Contextual Determinants of Political Participation in Democratic Countries. Paper presented at conference for Research on Nationalism,

Kushin, M., & Yamamoto, M. (2010). Did social media really matter? college students use of online media and political decision making in the 2008 election. *Mass communication and Society,* 13(5), 608-630.

Larson, K. & Moe, H. (2011). Who tweets? tracking micro blogging use in the 2010 Swedish election campaign. In *ECIS 2011*. Shangai, China.

Macnamara, J. (2008). *E-Electioneering: Use of New Media in the 2007 Australian Federal Election*, Paper Presented at the ANZCA08 Conference, Wellington, New Zealand. <[http://pep.massey.ac.nz/massey/fms/Colleges/College%20of%20Business/Communication%20and%20Journalism/ANZCA%202008/Refereed%20Papers/Macnamara\_ANZCA08.pdf>](http://pep.massey.ac.nz/massey/fms/Colleges/%20College%20of%20Business/Communication%20and%20Journalism/ANZCA%202008/Refereed%20Papers/Macnamara_ANZCA08.pdf) Retrieved July 17, 2014

Marc, H. et al (2010). The Potential of Internet Mobilization: An Experimental Study on the Effect of Internet and Face-to-Face Mobilization Efforts. Philadelphia: Routledge Publishing.

McCombs, M., Shaw, D. L. & Weaver, D. (1997). *Communication and Democracy: Exploring the Intellectual Frontiers of Agenda-Setting Theory.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaun Associates.

Okoro, N. & Kenneth, A. N. (2013). Social media and political participation during the 2011 general elections; The lapses and the lessons. *Global Journal of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences.* 1(3), 29- 46.

Omokri, R. (2011). “How Social Media and the Youth Helped Achieve Credible Elections in Nigeria”, Paper delivered at the Atlantic Council, Washington D.C. on April 19 <http://www.nigeriavillagesquare.com/articles/guestarticles/how-social-media-and-the-youth-helped-achieve-credible-electionsin-nigeria.html> Retrieved May 17, 2014

Sherman, A. (2010). The problem with social media: Online collaboration. Retrieved October 16, 2014 from httpww.gigaom.com/collaboration/the-probe.

Strandberg, K. (2006). *Parties, Candidates and Citizens Online: Studies of Politics on the Internet*. Finland: ÅboAkademi University Press.

Stroud, N. J. (2008). Media Use and Political Predispositions: Revisiting the Concept of Selective Exposure*.Journal of Political Behaviour,30*(3), 341-366.

Tejumaiye, A. (2003). *Mass Communication Research: An Introduction*. Ibadan: Sceptre Prints Limited

Utze, S. (2009). The potential benefits of campaigning via social networks. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*. 14 (2), 221- 243.

Wayne, S. J. (2001). Is This Any Way to Run a Democratic Election? Boston; New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Zhu, J.H., and Blood, D. (1997)*.* Media Agenda Setting Theory Telling the Public What to Think About, In G. Kovacic (Ed.) *Emerging Theories of Human Communication.* Albany NY: Sunny Press.

**APPENDIX**

Department Mass communication

Faculty of Social Sciences

Kogi State University, Anyigba

Dear Respondents,

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

I Bello Oluawtosin Victoria, a 400 level student of the above department and institution, am conducting a research on ‘’Social media and he Political mobilization of electorates during the 2019 presidential election: A Study of Kabba/Bunu Local Government Area of Kogi’’.

You are kindly requested to answer the following questions as explicitly as you can. Your response will be treated confidentially.

Yours faithfully,

Bello Oluwatosin Victoria.

**PART A**

Sex: Female( ) Male( )

Age: 18-35( ) 35-40( ) 41-45( ) 46-50 ( )

Qualification: B.Sc ( ) HND ( ) ND( ) NCE ( ) School Cert( )

**PART B**

1. Are you aware of the social media ?Yes ( ) No ( )
2. Through which the media do you receive information? Facebook( ) Twitter( ) Google( ) Myspace ( ) Others( )
3. How often do you the social media? Frequently( ) Not frequently ( )
4. Do you use the social media tools as a communication platform? Yes ( ) No ( )
5. If your answer to question 4 is yes which of the social media platforms do you use constantly \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
6. Through which of these social media platforms did you haer about the last general election? Facebook( ) twitter( ) whatsapp( ) youtube ( ) others( specify)
7. Were you an eligible voter during the 2019 presidential election? Yes( ) No( )
8. Do you use the social media to access political informations yes( ) No( ) Partially( )
9. How often do you use the social media to get political information during the election? Often( ) very often( ) rarely ( )
10. Does the use of social media influence your voting behavior? Yes( ) No( ) partially( )
11. Does the use of social media influence your choice candidates? Yes( ) NO( ) Partially( )
12. Does your access to social media influence your voting pattern during the election? Yes( ) Partially( ) No( )
13. To what extent were you influenced by social media to vote your choice of candidate during the 2109 election? Great extent( ) some extent( ) no extent( )
14. Which of these factors influenced your decision to during the election? integrity ( ) political affiliation ( ) past records( )
15. Do you think the two aspirants were popular because they utilized social media? Yes( ) No ( ) partially( )
16. Do you the social media played any role in political mobilization of electorate during the election period? Yes( ) no( ) partially( )
17. Do you have a personal profile on any social media platform? Yes( ) No ( )
18. If your answer to question 17 is yes, identify