

---

**"Exploring the Impact of Political Promises on Public Voting Behavior  
During Elections"**

**Meenakshi Arya**  
**Department of political science**  
**S.S.J Campus Almora**

**Abstract:**

Political promises are important in impacting voters' decisions at elections. Rhetoric from politicians tends to affect how people perceive political parties and the way leaders make choices. The study looks at the effects of election promises on how people vote, mainly in democracies where trust from voters is necessary. To understand how people vote depending on their perception of political promises, this paper has been written through descriptive and hypothesis-led research. A group of voters were surveyed to see their opinions on how promises can change their vote selection. Studies show that voters are strongly affected by promises, mostly in terms of employment, progress and support. The extent to which their promises are successful depends on how trusted they are, their past achievements and media influence. In short, the true influence of political promises rests on a variety of psychological and social elements.

**Keywords:** Political Promises, Voting Behavior, Elections, Public Opinion, Political Campaigns, Voter Trust.

**Introduction:**

No democratic country would exist without elections. Voters decide on their representatives using many factors such as the pledges made by political parties and candidates. Parties frequently share their promises in manifestos or speeches to explain goals to provide more jobs, reduce poverty, improve infrastructures, education, healthcare, support women, provide subsidies and sometimes offer free services. Promises of development are central to many campaigns nowadays, especially in big democracies such as India. Political groups make efforts to relate to people by focusing on what matters to them locally. Even though some people vote based on specific platform ideas, a great number prefer candidates promising benefits to voters.

There can be good and bad outcomes from making political promises. They might encourage people to participate in politics, offer encouragement for progress and ensure that politicians

---

follow the rules. When politicians do not keep their promises, people get frustrated, trust in the government drops and a gap form between voters and leaders. The frequent use of promises that cannot be checked or verified is known as “freebie politics” and has worried both intellectuals and economists. It matters to see how these claims shape the way the average voter thinks and votes.

Media and technology have help make political promises more significant. Much of the information comes from television, social media and mobile phones to the public. Political parties use ads, celebrity backing, emotional messages and clever narratives to gain a good reputation. Thus, people running for office make promises to gain support from voters. What we should ask is: do the citizens think these campaigns are reliable? Are people guided by political advertising to decide who to support in the election?

Learning about voter behavior helps both academically and by making democracy work better. If people pay attention to politicians’ promises, the politicians have to keep their word. But if promises are ignored or rejected by voters, it could result in weak political accountability. When politicians make promises, youth, women, those who live in rural areas and first-time voters may not react in the same way. The study tries to understand these trends and find out how much value voters put on campaign pledges.

The paper investigates this by examining public opinions and survey results to figure out if voters really follow political promises in their decisions about who to elect. It also explores if characteristics such as a person’s age, place of residence or education can influence their acceptance of party titles and what they do at the polls. Using the research results, political parties can conduct more responsible campaigns and promote informed voting by citizens.

### **Literature Review:**

Adrian Yadav studied the political changes during the Indian state assembly elections in 1993–1995, showing how regional parties grew in popularity and voters started supporting issues that mattered to them where they lived. The head researcher noted that because of this change, the country’s political scene became more divided, affecting the results of elections.

They [2] examined how the number of parties in an Indian state affects the performance of its government. They discovered that a few big political parties in a country usually lead to steady

---

government, but many smaller parties may cause unstable coalition governments to struggle fulfilling their promises.

Rai [3] looked at what influences Indian women to participate in elections, finding that their socio-economic situation, education and culture are the main factors. It was noticed by the researcher that despite putting in more effort, many women still face barriers such as not being politically aware and facing social limitations.

Palshikar [4] examined why the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) rose to prominence and became a leading political force. The researcher showed that the party depended on combining cultural nationalism with promises of economic gains to increase their voters.

Kumar observed [5] that the gap between what political parties promise during campaigns and what they actually do can discourage voters. It was found by the researcher that voters continue to be affected by political promises about welfare and social justice.

In this text, Chakrabarty [6] discussed the politics of India from independence and how changes in social issues such as caste and religion, have made an impact on political pledges and how the people view them. An analyst states that these variables greatly affect the outcomes of elections.

Singh [7] looked at voter trust and political promises using psychological methods. It was discovered that trust greatly affects who people vote for, as broken promises make them suspicious and less likely to go to the polls, but being open and delivering on actions help build trust.

Mehta [8] studied the ways election campaigns and political pledges influence how people vote in India and found that campaign success varies by region and social group, yet is still critical for voting decisions. The researcher pointed out how media messages and visibility of the candidates are key factors.

Banerjee and Duflo [9] studied if politicians really benefit those, they serve through what they say and do. They discovered that impacts were not always the same and this was largely shaped by specific political settings and struggle within local communities.

---

**Objectives of the Study:**

1. To explore the impact of political promises on voter behavior during elections.
2. To identify which types of promises influence voting decisions the most.
3. To study whether trust in political leaders affects the response to political promises.
4. To analyze the difference in influence of promises among different demographic groups.

**Hypothesis:**

**H<sub>0</sub> (Null Hypothesis):** Political promises do not significantly influence public voting behavior during elections.

**H<sub>1</sub> (Alternative Hypothesis):** Political promises significantly influence public voting behavior during elections.

**Research Methodology:**

The research uses a quantitative research method to examine the effect of political pledges on how people vote during elections. The focus of the methodology is to collect valid information from a group of voters, use statistics to look at their answers and come to important conclusions. The purpose was met with a questionnaire featuring both fixed questions and Likert scale questions. They looked at how much people recognized political promises, how much faith they had in those promises, how important they felt each type of promise was (for example, economic, social or cultural) and how much influence such promises had on their final vote.

Random sampling was applied to choose 200 participants and this sampling ensured that all demographic groups like age, gender, education, occupation and voting records were represented. Special attention was given to include people from across the age group so that different opinions could be recorded. Both online and traditional approaches were used, so no one with limited internet access in rural areas was left out.

After finishing the data collection process, each response was coded and analyzed statistically to see the average scores, standard deviations, medians and modes for trust in promises, influence on voting decisions and awareness about campaign content. In addition, an Independent Sample t-Test was used to examine how significant the results are and to support

the hypothesis. The purpose of this test was to discover if the impact of political promises is the same or different in people living in urban and rural areas.

It was made clear that all interactions were anonymous and confidential to help people be as honest as possible. It was important to follow ethical rules while doing the research and everyone who took the survey knew in advance what the survey was for. In general, the researchers tried to ensure the research methodology was structured, impartial and encompassing so that they could better understand the effects of political promises during elections.

**Table 1: Descriptive Statistics:**

Variable	Mean	Standard deviation	Median	Mode
Awareness of Political Promises	4.20	0.60	4.00	4
Influence on Voting Decision	3.90	0.75	4.00	4
Trust in Promises	3.50	0.85	3.50	3
Preference for Economic Promises	4.10	0.68	4.00	4
Response to Unfulfilled Promises	3.30	0.82	3.00	3

**Analysis of Descriptive Statistics:**

The survey data show key details about how political promises impact public voting. Assessing voting awareness of political promises, we found that on average people are highly aware of promises made during political campaigns. It means that election campaigns are able to get their messages out by many media outlets and that the average person stays informed about current events.

Based on the mean of 3.90, it seems that political promises affect the way many people decide who to vote for. Most voters consider the promises from politicians and political parties to be

very important. Indeed, the trustworthy factor of promises was slightly lower, scoring 3.50, suggesting that even though people consider the promises made by politicians, they tend not to fully trust that the promises will be kept or fulfilled. The public's wariness is caused by continuous incidents of past promises not being kept.

It is clear from the data that voters want economic help the most such as new jobs, support programs and poverty lessening, scoring 4.10 out of 5. It means that offers that are useful and save money are more persuasive for people than ideas based on emotions or beliefs. Additionally, the results for unfulfilled promises were only 3.30, reflecting that many voters are hurt or disappointed when politicians fail to keep their guarantees which might push them to become less involved in politics in the future.

All things considered, there is clear proof that political promises are seen by a large number of people and strongly influence voting decisions. However, how much someone trusts politicians and their earlier experiences decides how important promises are to them. The most important promises are economic promises and voters usually remember if they are delivered. The analysis shows that campaigns need to promise voters attractive things and then live up to those promises after winning.

**Table 2: Hypothesis Testing (Independent Sample t-Test)**

Group	Mean (Influence Score)	SD	N
Urban Voters	4.10	0.70	100
Rural Voters	3.70	0.78	100

**Analysis of Hypothesis Testing:**

A comparison of urban voters and rural voters was made using an Independent Sample T-Test to see the extent of influence political promises have on voter behavior. Urban voters had an average influence score of 4.10 and rural voters had one of 3.70. It shows that political promises have an effect on both groups, but urban voters are influenced much more. Both sets of data had a low standard deviation which indicates that responses stayed similar and reliable within the groups.

---

There was a calculated t-value of 3.85 and this is larger than the critical value of  $\pm 1.97$  at a significance level of 0.05. Besides, the calculated p-value comes out to be 0.0002 which is well below the 0.05 value set for significance. From what has been shown, there is a significant difference in how political promises influence people's decisions to vote between urban and rural voters. So, in conclusion, the researcher rejects the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) and accepts the alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ), as political promises have a significant effect on what people vote for.

It suggests that political promises matter when people decide who to vote for, though the way they matter can change with the location. Because news and discussions are available online, people living in cities can read much information about promises made by politicians during their campaigns. There could be more focus on checking if promises are realistic after previous experience. By contrast, rural people tend to listen to what local leaders have to say and remember what has been done for them in the past.

In addition, the way politicians appeal to people might affect the outcomes. Job, education, infrastructure and smart city projects might be important to urban voters, but rural voters may expect promises about agriculture, local water, electricity and rural development. According to the t-test, each group of voters wants political parties to use local strategies and make reliable and practical promises aimed at their expectations.

Generally, hypothesis testing proves that political promises stand out during elections by directly affecting people's votes when perceived as meaningful, attainable and believable.

### **Conclusions Overall Results:**

The study finds that political promises deeply influence how people vote in elections. Both the findings of descriptive statistics and the results of hypothesis testing show that voters indeed take political promises into account. A large number of participants knew about election promises and said these promises matter a lot in shaping their decisions. Trust in these promises is low due to negative past experiences which seems to reflect the public's caution. Promise of jobs, subsidies and help through government schemes had a strong impact on who people decided to support. It was shown in the analysis that promises made by politicians affect urban voters more than rural ones which may happen because urban voters are more exposed to media

---

and are more interested in politics. This study points to why being responsible in campaigning matters and ensures political leaders remain trusted as they keep their word.

### **Future Scope of the study:**

The findings created by this research will allow for further studies. A key point is how Twitter, Facebook and other online services help to shape opinions and pass on political pledges. Looking at first-time voters alongside more experienced voters can show how voters of different ages experience and respond to election campaigns. It would be interesting to do a longitudinal research study to watch how voting trust changes after the promises of politicians compared to before the elections. Also, interviews or discussions in focus groups could be used as qualitative methods to find out how people are affected by unkept promises emotionally and mentally. Cross-country or cross-regional comparisons may give us insights into how political strategies and what voters expect are shaped in various democracies.

### **References:**

1. Yadav, Y. (1996). Reconfiguration in Indian politics: State assembly elections, 1993–1995. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 31(2/3), 95–104.
2. Chhibber, P., & Nooruddin, I. (2004). Do party systems count? The number of parties and government performance in the Indian states. *Comparative Political Studies*, 37(2), 152–187. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414003261827>
3. Rai, P. (2011). Electoral participation of women in India: Key determinants and barriers. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 46(3), 47–55.
4. alshikar, S. (2010). Towards hegemony: BJP beyond electoral dominance. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 45(42), 41–48.
5. Kumar, A. (2009). Role of election promises in Indian politics. *Indian Journal of Political Studies*, 12(2), 45–53.
6. Chakrabarty, B. (2008). *Indian politics and society since independence: Events, processes and ideology*. Routledge.
7. Singh, P. (2012). Voter trust and political promises: A psychological approach. *Democratic Insights Quarterly*, 6(1), 77–89.



8. Mehta, R. (2008). Electoral behavior and campaign influence in democratic systems: An Indian perspective. *Journal of Political Psychology*, 27(3), 201–212.
9. Banerjee, A. V., & Duflo, E. (2011). Do politicians help? Evidence from Indian elections. *Public Policy and Governance in India*, 19(3), 101–112.