



# Love of Money, and Personal Sense of Power as Predictors of Political Engagement Dimensions Among Undergraduates

Nweke, Kingsley O.

## Abstract

*The study examined the relationship between love of money and personal sense of power as predictors of political engagement dimensions among undergraduates of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. The participants were 1,158 undergraduates who volunteered from three randomly selected faculties. The participants were made up of 541 (46.7%) males and 617 (53.3%) females with an age range of 19 to 30 years, a mean 23.33 years, and a standard deviation 2.82. Data was collected using questionnaires. Results suggested that love of money significantly and positively predicted political engagement dimension (electoral behaviour) among undergraduates. Similarly, personal sense of power significantly and positively predicted political engagement dimensions (electoral behaviour, political voice, attentiveness, and social media). The focus of discussion was on the reasons why love of money and personal sense of power predicted political engagement among the study participants. It was recommended that incumbent government and politicians should deploy incentives like scholarships, free medicals, free text books, and free internet access. These benefits may go a long way for undergraduates to develop interest in politics.*

Received: 5<sup>th</sup> January, 2022  
Revised: 20<sup>th</sup> February, 2022  
Accepted: 25<sup>th</sup> February, 2022

## Author Affiliation

Department of  
Psychology  
Nnamdi Azikiwe  
University, Awka  
[ko.nweke@unizik.edu.ng](mailto:ko.nweke@unizik.edu.ng)

**Keywords:** Political Engagement, Personal Sense of Power, Love of Money

## Introduction

Nigerian politicians have been blamed for the country's underdevelopment, and multiple problems, including insecurity and seeming loss of zeal in political activities by the citizens. Since the restoration of democratic governance in 1999, Nigeria has held six general elections, and every election year, issues of credibility of the electoral process seem to develop more in both quality and quantity, hence the conduct of most of the elections at all levels have been adjudged to be far below international standards. More importantly, there have been widespread allegations of monetary inducement of voters by politicians as motivation to vote on election days which reached pathological levels in the 2018 governorship election in Ekiti and Osun states (<https://punch.com/ekiti-osun-gov-polls-dress-rehearsals-for-2019-electoral-fraud-olusola/>). Yet, the relative numbers of voters have continually declined from 1999 to date (Amanyie, et al. 2015). Since this social and civic activity of political participation is a prime determinant of leadership practices and the eventual socio-economic wellbeing of a people, in a party political system, it becomes worrisome when citizens become apathetic or when a segment of the society deviously alienate others from participation. In this connection, a search for a possible explanation of current political behaviour, i.e. an understanding of factors that influence political engagement, attracts the attention of Social Psychology.

Records from the Independent National Electoral Commission (2015) suggest that most Nigerians are gradually withdrawing from political activities concerning the population of the citizens in election years, the total number of registered voters, and those that turned out for the elections. The 1979 Presidential and National Assembly elections revealed that 20.61% of the population voted. In the 1983 Presidential and National Assembly election, only 18.00% of the population of the citizens voted. In the 1999 election year, only 52.52% of the registered voters participated, while 47.70% avoided the polls. Furthermore, four years later (2003), the same trends of drop-in political activities continued as 69% of registered voters participated, and 30% shunned from the polls. In 2007, only 57.50% of registered voters participated, while 42.50% avoided the polls. The result of the Presidential and National Assembly elections in 2011 showed that among the registered voters, only 53.68% voted, while 46.32% avoided the polls. More recently, in 2015 records showed that 42.76% of citizens cast their votes, while 57.24% avoided the polls (<http://www.inec.org/>). Regrettably, the presidential and national assembly election of 2015 was the year of the worst political decline in the history of Nigeria from 1999 to the present time. Against this background, it is evident that the trend of political engagement in the country is moving toward political apathy. This suggests that there is an extant need to examine the nature and mechanisms involved in political engagement among Nigerians. Before the study, a focus group was conducted by listing some factors that may predict political engagement such as religion, educational levels, locality, poverty, and personal sense of power, political interest, political efficacy, and love of money. Students were asked to rate three factors that may predict political engagement. The result of the pilot survey revealed that Love of money was 90%, and Personal sense of power was 70%, Poverty 20%, Political interest 20%, Educational level 10%, and Locality 10%. The two highest scores were selected from the outcome of the pilot survey. Therefore, love of money and personal sense of power were the predictors of political engagement chosen by the students. Furthermore, the political engagement scale comprises four main domains; Electoral behaviour (EB), Attentiveness (AT), Political voice (PV), and Social Media Engagement (SME). Political engagement means the implementation of public policy directly or by influencing the selection of individuals who make the policy (Verba, et al. 1995).

Zani and Barrett (2012), defined political engagement as having an interest in, paying attention to, having knowledge of, or having an opinion about either political or civil matters. However, political engagement encompasses the act of voting or asking someone to vote for a particular candidate, joining in signing petitions

and protests, discussing politics with family and friends, and using social media platforms to address political issues. Then, it becomes absolutely clear that political participation is a component of political engagement. Political engagement theorists over four and half decades ago proposed five aspects of political engagement and they include: Voting at polls, Supporting possible pressure groups by being a member of the group, Personally communicating directly with the legislator, Participating in political party activity, and thus acquiring a claim on legislators, and Engaging in habitual dissemination of political opinions through word of mouth communication to other citizens (Woodward & Roper, 1950). Later, Rush and Althoff, (1971) proposed a ten hierarchical political engagement order, from holding political or administrative office to political apathy. The hierarchical order assumes that political engagement and political apathy are in the highest and lowest levels of a continuum. Individuals could be at any level of the continuum (Rush & Althoff, 1971). Furthermore, scholars pointed out some benefits of political engagement: Increase knowledge about politics and overall development, Increased capacity for dealing with political and social problems (Benoit et al. 2004), Increase in the capacity of private citizens to influence public decisions, and participate in democratic decision-making process (Shakaia, 2016; Weiss, 2017). More recently, with the emergence of the social network sites, there appear to be new forms of political engagement as more youths are getting involved in politics which tends to boom traditional political participation (Bode et al. 2014).

Over five and half decades ago, it was reported that diverse reasons motivate individuals' engagement in politics: psychological factors, social factors, and political factors (Lane, 1961). Accordingly, psychological factors refer to loneliness, unconscious conflict, tension, and power. Education, occupation, income, social status, sex, age, residence, and religion all refer to social factors. More recently, Miller (2018) found that people who feel threatened participate more in politics than those who are relatively not threatened. Similarly, Hou et al. (2018) argue that predictors of threat among opposition members were sex, age, marital status level of education, and depressive symptoms. Other reasons why people participate include social Identity, self-interest, and values. However, scholars argue that some determinants of people's disengagement from politics include: cynicism, selfishness, and incompetency (Davis, 2006), the illegitimacy of government (Asobi, 2007), vote-buying (Ovwasa, 2013), money politics, poverty (Fagunwa, 2015), inadequate information and deceit ( Adamu & Ocheni, 2016). Works of literature in political engagement show contributions by authors' from Political Science and Public Administration backgrounds. It, therefore, becomes necessary to seek a psychological approach to political engagement dimensions for a more nuanced understanding. The foregoing arguments provide the impetus for a search to unravel the relationships that exist among the variables of, love of money, and personal sense of power as predictors of Political engagement dimensions.

Money had been defined by various scholars as to the bloodline of all organic cultures and as a psychological metaphor that every culture understands (Nnedum, 2009). Various approaches have been made towards understanding money. The three most prominent of these approaches were transactional, liquidity, and scientific construct approaches. The transactional approach defines money as all goods and services. This definition of money was peculiar to the barter system. The liquidity approach defined money as a store of value. This definition advanced the capacity of money as a construct that has value both at present and in the future. The scientific approach is usually referred to as the modern economist approach. The modern economist approach defined money as a measure of goods and services. The three approaches addressed three different capacities about the concept of money. It becomes obvious that the approaches sought their definitions from the potential qualities of money.

Lawler, (1981) found a significant impact of money on people's behaviour, performance, and effectiveness in organizations. Similarly, Tang (2002) reported that there is a significant relationship between money and human behaviour. Perhaps, this means that individuals perceive money from various perspectives and as such are influenced accordingly. Though, the influence of money on individuals may not be the same across persons. Esa & Zahari, (2005) argue that the influence of money on an individual has to do with the personality type of the individual. This submission means that while some individuals may be influenced by money, others may not be as influenced as other individuals. The influence of money may include not only the performance of behaviour, but how much performance is done (effectiveness). Furthermore, performance may go to emphasize the capacity of money to illicit autonomic processes which result in spontaneous responses due to stimulation. One could define money as an object of valued economic materials which may elicit spontaneous responses in individuals when primed. Love of Money (LOM) has been a construct that received numerous attentions among college students, employees in organizations, and health workers (Tang & Chui, 2003). LOM has been defined as one's attitude toward money, or one meaning of money (Tang & Chui, 2003).

According to Du and Tang (2005), the love of money scale is a subset of the money ethics scale (MES). Empirical studies hold that throughout Africa, 16% of voters surveyed in 33 countries during the fifth round of the Afro barometer survey reported being offered money or goods (vote buying) in exchange for their vote during the last elections (Mares & Young, 2016). The rate of vote-buying (a component of love of money) among 33 nations in Africa suggests that the act is a prevalent one in which Nigeria may not be exempted. Yet vote-buying appears to be confirmation of the influence of money on individual behaviour in the domain of political engagement. No wonder Chen and Tang, (2006) posit that a positive attitude towards the love of money relates to vote-buying which is related to abuse, theft, corruption, and deception to secure electoral turnout in favor of political patrons.

Robinson and Verdier, (2013), argue that vote-buying is a particular form of political clientelism, which is a direct exchange at the individual level of rewards and material goods by political patrons in return for electoral support by voters. According to Adamu and Ocheni, (2016) vote-buying connotes the exchange of voting rights with money from candidates in an election. Apart from vote-buying, sometimes incumbent government adopts another component of love of money which is the use of social policy as a part of vote-buying and clientelistic tactics in discretionary government spending (Jones et al., 2012). Usually, poor communities are targets of some government social policies which are ploys to secure turnout (political engagement) in the upcoming election. According to the United Nations- WIDER 2018, such targeted discretionary government spending is referred to as conditional cash transfer (CCT). Conditional cash transfer programs represent one of the most important social policy innovations of the last two decades which secure future political support especially from the impoverished areas of the nation. Such areas are promised development of their locality, health care, school, and other social amenities for their political support during elections. In politics, individuals may show a positive attitude towards the love of money by receiving incentives (training, access to recreation, and special benefits) which are conditional to secure future political engagement in favor of either political patrons or incumbent government. Scholars appear to have different definitions of the personal sense of power.

According to Keltner et al. (2003) power is the ability to influence others, control money, information, decision-making process and shaping internal states. Keltner et al. (2003) hold that individual who has access to money, material resources; power over decision-making premise has power. Earlier definitions emphasized material possession of power, which is social power. Therefore, individuals who have neither money nor material resources nor occupy the social position of authority do not have power. Furthermore, Galinsky et al. (2003)

defined a personal sense of power as a psychological state and perception of one's capacity to influence others. This definition assumes a broad approach to power. It emphasizes the aspect which assumes that each individual with or without money, resource nor within decision-making premises has a personal sense of power. The definition assumes a psychological approach to the concept of power. More recently, Anderson et al. (2012) defined a personal sense of power as not just control over resources but a psychological state of becoming aware of one's capacity to influence other people and change the internal state. The personal sense of power does not only focus on the ability to provide or withhold valued resources or administer punishment. Furthermore, control over valued resources endorses more negative potentials of power. Possession of resources or money does not emphasize awareness of power capacity by the individual and limits such capacity to persons in possession of resources. However, the researcher defines the personal sense of power as an awareness of one's capacity to influence other people's internal state.

However, in the context of the present study, a personal sense of power is an individual's perception of his ability to influence other people and change his internal state. Studies found that a personal sense of power has a significant positive relationship with human behaviour (Anderson et al., 2012). Earlier studies showed that the effects of the personal sense of power were evident in an organizational setting among employees, consumer behavior, personality traits, and increased source of personal powers (Bugental & Lewis, 1999). The positive implications of the personal sense of power have been found in reduced stress levels among those with a high personal sense of power, decreased anxiety compared to relative individuals with a lower personal sense of power (Sapolsky, 2012). Negative consequences of the personal sense of power have been linked to depression and schizophrenia (Ross & Sastry, 1999). More recent observations reveal that the absence of the personal sense of power has negative implications on effects mood and cognition (Smith & Hofmann, 2016). Similarly, if the personal sense of power was found to influence behaviors positively in organizational settings, the researcher expects a personal sense of power to influence undergraduates' political behaviour. Finally, the present study explored the relationship between Love of money, and personal sense of power as predictors of political engagement among undergraduates in Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

In the present statement of the problem, earlier studies examined factors that are related to political engagement, (Ibrahim et al., 2015; Mbah et al., 2019), targeted programs and voting behavior (Ana, 2013), vote-buying, and election performance (Chuyi-Lu & Chung-Ping, 2016), anti-poverty program and election result (Filipovich et al., 2018), Similarly, others examined power relation and political behavior (Shehata, 2017), personality and political participation (Weinschent, 2017), while most of them focused on systemic problems of the body handling the elections in Nigeria (Onuoha & Ojo, 2018; Kalu & Gberevbie, 2018), others focused on unethical behaviours of politicians who are vying for political positions (Akude, 2007; Obiefuna-Oguejiofor, 2018). Most of these studies adopted the descriptive and qualitative design in exploring the factors they were interested in (Obiefuna-Oguejiofor, 2018; Kalu & Gberevbie, 2018). However, only a few to the best of the researcher's knowledge have adopted predictive design to explore the psychological factors (internal that could be implicated in political engagement). The present study examined the psychological factors (such as love of money, prosocial behaviour, and personal sense of power) to see if they predict political engagement, electoral behaviour, attentiveness, political voice, and social media engagement self-report psychological tests, and inferential statistics.

### **Theoretical Framework**

The theory of planned behavior was considered as the most appropriate theoretical model to be adopted for the present study. The theory of planned behavior provides the best explanation of the association between love of

money and personal sense of power on political engagement dimensions (electoral behaviour, political voice, attentiveness and social media) in the study.

### **Love of Money and Political Engagement**

Ana (2013) reported a study that on targeted programs (a component of love of money) and increased pro-incumbent voting (political engagement) by persuading beneficiaries to cast ballots against their first partisan choice. The result showed that (love of money) led to a substantive increase in political engagement. In a related study Jenny and Wantchekon (2014) reported a study on the relationship between electoral handouts (a positive component of love of money) and voting behavior (political engagement). The empirical result showed that love of money does not affect either political engagement. This finding was not supported by an earlier study by (Ana, 2013). Leight et al., (2016) reported a study on voter behavior (political engagement) under and payment for votes (factor in the love of money) in the laboratory. Data for the study was drawn from 86 subjects at Harvard Decision Science Laboratory and the Busara experimental laboratory in Nairobi, Kenya. Results revealed that love of money enhanced political engagement. The finding is consistent with an earlier study by Ana (2013) but different from Jenny and Wantchekon (2014). Smith et al. (2016) reported a study on group incentives (a component of love of money) and rational voting (political engagement). The result showed that contingent allocation of incentives (love of money) increased political engagement. This finding is consistent with earlier works (Ana, 2013; Leight, et al 2016). Chuyi-Lu and Chung-Ping (2016) reported a study on vote-buying (a component of love of money) and victory of election (political engagement) among Taiwanese. Data for the study was drawn from a panel of 23 counties of Taiwan between 1998 and 2008. Result revealed that love of money increases political. This finding is confirmed in the works of (Ana, 2013; Leight, et al 2016; Smith, et al., 2016). In a related study, Filipovich et al., (2018) reported a study on the electoral effects of Mexico's Progres-Prospera (a program on anti-poverty policy design). Data were drawn from three presidential elections within a period of profound political transitions. Results revealed monetary incentives influenced political engagement. This work was confirmed in the works of (Ana, 2013; Leight et al., 2016; Smith, et al., 2016; Chuyi-Lu & Chung-Ping, 2016).

### **Personal Sense of Power and Political Engagement**

Solhang (2006) reported a study on knowledge and self-efficacy (a component of the personal sense of power) as predictors of political participation (a component of political engagement). 1,730 students aged between 16 and 19 years served as participants. The result showed that a personal sense of power is a stronger predictor of motivation and three aspects of political engagement than knowledge. Leimgruber (2011) reported a study on the direct effect of personal values (a component of the personal sense of power) on voting behavior (a component of political engagement). Data for the study was drawn from Swiss electoral data (Set 2007). The empirical analysis result showed that a personal sense of power had a direct effect on political engagement. This finding is similar to earlier findings (Solhang, 2006; Caprara, et al., 2006). In another related examination, Maurissen (2018) reported a study on political efficacy (a component of the personal sense of power) and interest as mediators of expected political participation among Belgian adolescents. Participants for the study were drawn from the Belgian (Flemish) sample of the ICCS 2016 study. The results indicated that three educational strategies (i.e. classroom discussions, civic learning opportunities, and student participation at school) are positively associated with expected political participation in distinct ways. Also, a substantial part of this relationship is mediated by political interest and political efficacy. This study is consistent with earlier studies in the relationship between personal sense of power and political engagement (Solhang, 2006; Caprara, et al., 2006; Leimgruber, 2011; Hashish & Kamel, 2014; Weinschent, 2017; Ahoya; 2016). More recently, McDonnel (2019) reported a study on municipality size, political efficacy (a component of the personal sense of

power), and political participation: a systematic review. The study examined how extant empirical literature bears on the relationship between size, political efficacy (a component of the personal sense of power), and political participation. Multiple regression analysis results showed that citizens of smaller municipalities feel a greater sense of political efficacy and participate to a greater degree in local politics.

## Hypotheses

1. Love of Money will significantly predict political engagement dimensions among undergraduates.
2. The personal sense of power will significantly predict political engagement dimensions among undergraduates.

## Method

### Participants

One thousand one hundred and fifty-eight (1,158) undergraduates who volunteered from three randomly selected faculties from Nnamdi Azikiwe University participated in the study. The three faculties that participated were randomly selected from the whole faculties in the Awka campus of Nnamdi Azikiwe universities using simple random sampling (deep pick). These randomly selected faculties were as follows Faculty of Arts, Management Sciences, and Education. The ages of the participants ranged from 19 to 30 years with a mean age of 23.33 years and a standard deviation of 2.82. Five hundred and forty-one (46.7%) of the participants were males and 617 (53.3%) were females.

### Instruments

Three instruments were used for the study: Political engagement scale (Nweke, 2019), Love of money scale (Tang & Chiu, 2013), and Personal sense of power scale (Anderson et al., 2012).

The political engagement scale was developed by Nweke (2019) in the course of this study. The PES has a total of 26 items that assess the levels of an individual's engagement in political activities. The PES has four main domains, Electoral behavior (EB), Attentiveness (AT), Political Voice (PV), and Social Media engagement (SM). Similarly, the internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha) for the 26 items is .78. However, the Cronbach's alphas for the different subscales are .76, .69, .65, and .70. The sub-factors of instruments also correlated significantly whereby the correlation between Electoral behavior and Political Voice ( $r = .35^{**}$ ); Electoral Behavior and Social media ( $r = .42$ ), Electoral behavior and Attentiveness ( $r = .49^{**}$ ), Political Voice and Social media ( $r = .52$ ), Political Voice and Attentiveness ( $r = .41$ ) & Attentiveness and Social media ( $r = .40$ ).

The Love of Money Scale (LOMS) was developed by Tang & Chiu (2003). This is a 9-item 3-factor scale used to assess the attitude people have about money. The LOM is a five-point Likert format ranging from 1 strongly agree, to 5 strongly disagree. The LOMS has three components an affective component (items 1, 2, & 3), behavioral component (items 4, 5, & 6), and Cognitive component (items 7, 8, & 9). Items on LOMS are positively scored. Sample items on the LOMS scale include: for cognitive domain, "I want to be rich", affective domain, "it would be nice to be rich" and "I am motivated to work hard for money" and achievement components. Tang (2005) reported a Cronbach alpha of 0.70 for the scale. The following psychometric properties were obtained for the Nigerian sample. A total Cronbach alpha of .75 was found. Also, it has convergent validity .35 with achievement factor of love of money and divergent validity of -.25 with evil factor love of money.

Personal Sense of Power Scale (PSPS) was developed by Anderson et al., (2012). The PSPS consists of 8 items that measure how individuals perceived power. The Items are on a seven-point Likert response format ranging from "1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. Items 2, 4, 6, and 7 were reversed during scoring, while other items are positively scored. Items on the personal sense of power scale include: "I can get people to listen to me" "my wishes do not carry much weight" and "I can get people to do what I want". Anderson, et al., (2012) reported internal consistency of Cronbach alpha between .76 and .91, while convergent validity on conscientiousness and extraversion were .59, .48 respectively and divergent validity was neuroticism -.46. Earlier, Galinsky and Dubois (2011) found that the general self-efficacy scale by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995) positively predicted the personal sense of power scale. Convergent validity of ( $r = .52, p < .01$ ) was obtained when the Personal sense of Power Scale was correlated with the general self-efficacy scale. Also, the internal consistency (Cronbach,s alpha) of .80 was obtained for the PSPS in the present study.

### **Procedure**

The instruments for the research require each participant to sign a consent form before completing them. Three schools were randomly selected from the Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, using simple random sampling. From each selected faculty, one department was randomly selected. According to Mensah (2013), the minimum required number of participants for each department where the standard deviation is not known is 386. Therefore, incidental random sampling was used to administer to any available student seated in a class, five minutes before their lecture until the required minimum number was obtained. Four research assistants were employed to assist the researcher in administering the questionnaires to the participants. It took about 25 minutes to complete the questionnaires for each student and the data were collected within two months. On completion, the questionnaires were collected immediately. A total of 1210 questionnaires were administered. However, 1158 were properly filled, collated, and were used for data analysis.

### **Design and Statistics**

The present investigation adopted a predictive design. A predictive design is usually adopted in non-experimental studies that do not necessarily require causal effects. Statistics employed for the study were Pearson  $r$  product-moment correlation and Multiple Regression analyses enter method. Data generated were managed using Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22.0.

### **Result**

This section deals with the results of data analysis. The order of result presentation are as follows: Table 1: Zero-order correlation coefficient, and Table 2: Standardized Beta Coefficient result for effects of Love of money, and Personal Sense of Power on Political Engagement, Electoral behaviour, Attentiveness, Political voice, and Social media.



**Table 1: Zero-order Correlation Matrix**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Political Engagement	1							
2. Love of money	.06*	1						
3. The personal sense of power	-.03	.36**	.38**	1				
4. Electoral behaviour	.90**	.06*	.09*	-.06	1			
5. Attentiveness	.83**	.02	.12*	.01	.77**	1		
6. Political voice	.85**	-.14*	-.12*	.19**	.77**	.61**	1	
7. Social media	.84**	.18**	.28**	.08**	.56**	.59**	.57**	1

\*\*Correlation is significant at the .001 level (2- tailed)\*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

Table 1 shows the zero-order correlation coefficient of the studied variables. There was a significant positive correlation between love of money and political engagement ( $r = .06, p < .05$ ), while the correlation between personal sense of power and political engagement was also significant at ( $r = -.03, p < .01$ ). The correlation between love of money and personal sense of power was significant at ( $r = .36, p < .01$ ). The correlation between Electoral behaviour and Love of money was at ( $r = .06, p < .01$ ), and the correlation between Electoral behaviour and Personal sense of power was ( $r = -.6, p < .05$ ). The correlation between Attentiveness and love of money was ( $r = .01, p < .05$ ), and the correlation between Attentiveness and Personal sense of power was ( $r = .01$ ). The correlation between Political voice and love of money was ( $r = -.14, p < .01$ ), and the correlation between political voice and Personal sense of power was ( $r = -.19, p < .01$ ). The correlation between Social media and love of money was ( $r = .18, p < .01$ ), and the correlation between Social media and Personal sense of power was ( $r = .09, p < .01$ ).

**Table 2: Standardized Beta Coefficient Results for Independent Effects of Love of Money, and Personal Sense of Power on Political Engagement.**

Predictor Variables	Adjusted $R^2$	df1(df2)	F	B	Std Error
MODEL 1(PES)	.03	3(1154)	13.49**		
A. Love of Money				.09**	.10
B. The personal sense of Power				.13**	.08
MODEL 2 (EB)	.02	3(1154)	10.21**		
A. Love of Money				.10*	.03
B. The personal sense of power				.14**	.03
MODEL 3 (AT)	.01	3(1154)	6.22**		
A. Love of Money				.02	.02
B. The personal sense of power				.05	.02
MODEL 4 (PV)	.04	3(1154)	17.55**		
A. Love of money				-.09	.02
B. Personal sense of power				.12*	.02
MODEL 5 (SM)	.11	3(1154)	47.31**		
A. Love of money				-.19	.04
B. Personal sense of power				.10*	.03

\*\* $P < .01$ , \*  $P < .05$ , Adjusted  $R^2$ , PES= Political Engagement Scale, EB=Electoral Behaviour, AT=Attentiveness, PV= Political Voice, SM= Social Media Engagement.

The five Models were analyzed independently using the multiple regression Enter method. Thereafter the following outcomes were obtained. Model 1 (Hypothesis one) in Table 2 showed that when Enter method was applied to Political engagement for the three independent predictors (love of money, prosocial behaviour, and personal sense of power), the adjusted ( $R^2 = .03$ ). This means that the multiple models contributed 3% in understanding political engagement. The ANOVA summary ( $F$  ratio) shows that the adjusted  $R^2$  value was significant at  $F(3, 1154) = 13.49, P < .01$ . Specifically, the unstandardized beta values for each of the predictor factors were for Love of money ( $\beta = .09^*, P < .05$ ). Personal sense of power ( $\beta = .13, P < .01$ ). The results of hypotheses 2 and 3 can be seen in modules 2, 3, 4, and 5 (see Table 2).

Model 2 tested the predictive strength of the love of money and personal sense of power on Electoral behaviour. The overall module contributed to 2% of Electoral Behavior (Adjusted  $R^2 = .02$ ). The  $F$ -ratio was also significant  $F(3, 1154) = 10.21, p < .001$ . The unstandardized beta coefficient of each predictor variable is love of money ( $\beta = .10 < .01$ ), and personal sense of power revealed ( $\beta = .14 < .01$ ).

Model 3 tested the predictive strength of the love of money and personal sense of power in the Attentiveness domain. The overall module contributed to 1% of Attentiveness (Adjusted  $R^2 = .01$ ). The  $F$ -ratio was also significant  $F(3, 1154) = 6.23, p < .01$ . The standard beta coefficient of each predictor variable is love of money ( $\beta = .02 > .05$ ), and personal sense of power revealed ( $\beta = .05 > .05$ ).

Model 4 tested the predictive strength of the love of money and personal sense of power in Political voice domain. The overall module contributed to 4% of Political voice (Adjusted  $R^2 = .04$ ). The  $F$ -ratio was also significant  $F(3, 1154) = 17.55, p < .000$ . The standard beta coefficient of each predictor variable is love of money ( $\beta = .09 > .05$ ), and personal sense of power revealed ( $\beta = .12 > .05$ ).

Model 5 tested the predictive strength of the love of money and personal sense of power in Social media domain. The overall module contributed to 11% of Social media (Adjusted  $R^2 = .11$ ). The ( $F$ -ratio) was also significant  $F(3, 1154) = 47.31, p < .000$ . The standard beta coefficient of each predictor variable is love of money ( $\beta = .19 < .01$ ), and personal sense of power revealed ( $\beta = .10 < .05$ ).

### **Limitations of the Study**

The sample size of the present study was 1,158 participants. This sample is only a small portion of the entire population of undergraduates in Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. Literature on the relationship between the independent variables and dependent variables was not locally available. Also, works of literature linking the independent variables to some domains of political engagement were not available such as electoral behaviour, attentiveness, political voice, and social media engagement. As a result, the study focused more on global political engagement. As is common with self-reports, there is the possibility of bias in the response of participants.

### **Discussion**

The study examined Love of Money, and Personal Sense of Power as predictors of Political Engagement, electoral behaviour, attentiveness, political voice, and social media engagement. The finding of an association between the love of money and political engagement was consistent with earlier studies (Leight, et al., 2016; Cruzei et al., 2018; Canare et al., 2018; Baezi et al., 2018); Filipovich et al., 2018). Earlier studies as examined in a review of related literature revealed that love of money manifested in different forms such as vote-selling, vote-buying, acceptance of incentives (money, gift), and conditional cash transfers). In each of these forms in which love of money manifested, it was evident that the goal for such manipulation by the political patrons or incumbent government was to increase political engagement of the targeted groups through inducement by money or material rewards. The targets of this form of the transaction were usually the impoverished members of the society. The transaction between the political patrons and the electorates was referred to as political clients (Verdier, 2013). According to Baez et al., (2018) undergraduates who have a positive attitude towards the love of money may sell their vote to get money and engage in politics but, lose focus of their political interests. This position is also sustained by Leight, et al., (2018) who argues that in cost-benefits analysis, politicians adopt vote-buying because it is more effective than an information campaign in generating electoral support and greater political engagement. Therefore, love of money may account for the current level of political engagement among undergraduates in Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. Perhaps, this explains the reason why most students volunteer to campaign for politicians to the detriment of their studies. It was found that love of money did predict Electoral behavior and global political engagement, but failed to predict attentiveness, social media engagement, and political voice.

The electoral domain of political engagement is the aspect of political engagement in which an undergraduate vote, encourages others to do the same for a political patron or incumbent who may have advanced positive motivation in terms of cash and or other material resources. It appears that electoral behavior is more predisposed to actions that bring result in retaining or changing government which is the control of resources and sit of power. Therefore, undergraduates know that when they work with the politician the reward comes immediately, so they key in. One could also understand the reason these undergraduates widen the scope of electoral behavior to some unethical dimensions such as falsifying voters results, destruction of polling booths, snatching of polling booths, and sometimes vandalism of electoral building. Perhaps this explains the reason why many undergraduates do not engage in political activities. Since undergraduates who engage in unethical behaviours were rewarded by politicians and incumbent government other undergraduates who may not fit into this type of political practice could decide to avoid political activities. More also, this could lead to the perception that politics was a dirty game which has been a general notion since ancient times. These undergraduates that engage in unethical political practices, also seem to be aggressive, since the only language the politicians and incumbent government wish to hear was the result. Consequently, undergraduates were not concerned with attentiveness, social media engagement, or political voice, since cost-benefit analysis results reveal that it pays more to get undergraduates who need money to work for politicians. Perhaps, this approach is because the action is more potent through electoral activities that have to deal with electorates and voting processes than other political outlets. Of course, neither political patron nor the incumbent government would be interested to spend money on any other aspect of political engagement other than where the resources promise to reward them handsomely. This means that to the average politician, election and political activities seem to be business. No wonder, politicians go to any length to borrow or raise funds for politics.

The domain of social media was not predicted despite that in contemporary times, undergraduates seem to have been so addicted to mobile phones that they cannot live their lives without a mobile phone and the internet. Today, among undergraduates, it is about mobile phones and data subscriptions. As a result, most undergraduates have come to embrace the use of a mobile phone. Accordingly, the uses of the mobile phone and the internet have included political engagement. Rainnie et al. (2012) found that over 66% of social media users have employed the platforms to post their thoughts about political issues. This application may be because social media is convenient, easy to reach wider participants within a very short time. According, to Rainie et al. (2012), the proportion of youth that uses social media is higher than other groups put together. Therefore, it makes sense to say that the undergraduates are formidable forces to reckon with in the aspect of political engagement.

One could wonder the motivation behind the use of social media as an instrument to address political issues in which undergraduates had keyed in. After all, money and gifts serve as an inducement in predicting electoral behavior. The reason may be because social media has come with some satisfaction and is also an instrument for political discussion, which provides the user with a sense of belonging to an online social group in which the theory of social identity applies (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). In as much as humans crave social interaction, social media engagement seems to be another type of family where undergraduates belong and events are addressed simultaneously as they arise through Facebook, email, Twitter, Personal Blogs, and chat groups. Love of money did not predict Attentiveness and Political Voice. Perhaps one of the reasons why Love of money did not predict Attentiveness and Political Voice may be found in the works of Tang (2006) who reported that individuals that have high love of money may manifest type-A personality traits. Accordingly, type-A personality traits demonstrate impatience, selfishness, aggressive tendencies, profit-oriented, and non-prosocial traits. If these traits manifest in an individual it may be hard or extremely difficult for the individual to engage

---

in non-profit social issues such as having an interest in news about politics or discussing politics with authorities in a manner that suggest collective welfare.

The empirical report on the love of money, political engagement, and electoral behavior domain may be explained in the theory of planned behavior (TPB) by Ajzen (1991). According to the TPB, attitude/personality traits, subjective norm and perceived behavioral control are three factors upon which organized behavior may be predicted. According to the topic under consideration, the dependent variables are Political engagement, Electoral behavior, Attentiveness, Political voice, and Social media. In line with TPB, all dependent variables are considered to be planned behavior which is a hybrid of the theory of reasoned action. Furthermore, determinants of planned behavior in the context of the present study are the independent variables; love of money, prosocial behavior, and personal sense of power. However, according to Ajzen (1991), the independent variables may not have a direct prediction of the dependent variables. Therefore to predict the dependent variables, the independent variables would have to pass through the attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control. Therefore, since the purpose of the present study is to examine actual behavior, the researcher assumes that inclusion of intention may not be necessary. The thought of carrying out behavior is regarded as behavioral intention. As a result, love of money may serve as feelings or thought towards incentives, vote-buying or selling, and acceptance of conditional cash transfers which undergraduates manifest when primed with money. Individuals who have developed political engagement and electoral behavior intentions may likely have developed a positive attitude towards the love of money. If such a level of positive attitude develops in an undergraduate, is high such a person may have overcome pressure from the environment (subjective norm). Subjective norm is pressure from the environment which aims at a specific behavioral expectation of an individual.

However, the subjective norm may equally be seen as an undergraduate's perception of what is right or wrong. Perhaps, if an undergraduate has a positive attitude towards the love of money for instance and the individual has much need which may require money to be solved, even if part of the pressure from the environment is what other people expect the undergraduate to do was not to actualize the behavior, the undergraduate would take a decision contrary to subjective norm and move on to the next level (perceived behavioral control) to goal actualization. Perceived behavioral control is the level at which undergraduates' level of confidence or lack of it concerning the dependent variables under consideration. According to Ajzen (1991), a behavior may be manifested only when such behavior is within an individual's control. Perhaps, considering a behavior under one's control may entail looking at one's available resources, considering one's level of self-confidence, considering the consequences of one's actions. If these considerations come up positive, the individual may begin to make plans toward engagement with the behaviour (s) under consideration (political engagement and electoral behavior). Such plans may include moving towards the politicians for mobilization, voting, persuading someone to vote for a party or candidate, and taking instructions from political patrons. The collusion between undergraduates and political patrons as well as the incumbent government ensures that remunerations and conditional cash transfers are made possible which then generates increased political engagement behaviors. Furthermore, the researcher assumes that within the theory of planned behavior, some reasons why Attentiveness, social media engagement, and Political Voice were not predicted by the love of money may be because the participants did not perceive a positive attitude towards other dependent variables. Therefore, the participants were unable to overcome subjective norms and as a result, were not in control of the behavior.

Association between the personal sense of power and political engagement was confirmed in the present study on global political engagement and all of its domains except attentiveness. Similarly, earlier findings reported a

positive association between personal sense of power and political engagement (Caprara, et al., 2006; Solhang, 2006; Leimgruber, 2011; Gahnsky & Dnbrons. 2011; Quintelier, 2012; Anderson et al. 2012; Condon & Holleque, 2013; Vecchione, 2014; Hela & Hamza 2015; Weinschert, 2017). The result of the present study showed that undergraduates in Nnamdi Azikiwe University are aware of the capacity they have to influence change through political engagement, electoral behavior, political voice, and social media. Capacity to effect change means that one knows that when he or she engages in political activities that under such participation they could change the resulting outcome of political activities of a place. Perhaps the outcome of this study explains the level of political engagement of undergraduates in Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria. Studies consistently emphasized the need for someone to believe in himself or herself (a component of PSP) as the basis for successful accomplishments in political tasks. If an undergraduate does not have a personal sense of power such a person may not see the need to engage in politics. This is because the presence of personal sense power enables one to become aware of his or her ability to initiate and sustain action towards a goal-directed behavior (political engagement and its domains). Perhaps, one could say that motivation to engage in politics in line with a personal sense of power is intrinsic because it is dependent on the individual. The personal sense of power also refers to self-will, political efficacies which are trait-like and vary from one person to another person. However, a trait like the concept of PSP varies from person to person. As a result, while some undergraduates engage easily in politics others appear not to be interested. To this end, levels of a personal sense of power exist among individuals. The relationship between personal sense of power and political engagement and its domains may find an explanation in the theory of planned behavior.

According to the theory of planned behavior, by Ajzen (1991), a personal sense of power is a personality trait. Personality traits vary from one individual to another. In line with the TPB, attitude, and personality traits are affected by subjective norms. Perhaps, if an undergraduate's trait is high it implies that the undergraduates tend to overcome subjective norms. Subjective norm is an expectation of how or what one should do by significant others. It also refers to pressures that come from the environment on what one trait will be. However, since subjective norm has to do with the undergraduate evaluation of both personal and environmental factors, the undergraduate may damn the environmental definition to choose what he or she feels his sense of power should be. When this happens, the undergraduate assumes a higher sense of power. Undergraduates with a high sense of power may overcome what or how significant others expected of him/her is. As the undergraduate overcomes what significant others expect him/her to do or behave, this leads to perceived behavioral control. Perceived behavioral control assesses the degree of the personal sense of power undergraduate has to overcome challenges that stand in the way to achieving political engagement. Such assessment of personal sense of power includes self-will, self-determination, self-belief, and political self-efficacy. Positive assessment of PSP leads to a higher level of political engagement. A higher level of a personal sense of power is more predictive of political engagement than political engagement intentions. This is because once an undergraduate has a positive assessment of PSP, he /she begins to make plans on the execution of political engagement behaviors. Such plans may include mapping strategies on how to make the political engagement a success. Execution plans include; speaking to people about one's political intentions, display of political materials, voting during an election, campaigning for or against the political party of the incumbent government, joining in peaceful demonstrations, and using social media to address political issues.

## **Conclusion**

The present study investigated love of money and personal sense of power as predictors of political engagement among undergraduates in Nnamdi Azikiwe University. The findings suggest that some undergraduates may engage in political activities because they have love of money. The love for money may come in form of,

conditional cash transfer, targeted program, and vote-buying. As result of these forms of gratifications recipients were forced to vote sometimes against their wish, while those who feel it may be wrong to receive gratifications may either avoid voting or vote according to their conscience. Finally, undergraduates who are aware of their sense of power seem to be courageous, fearless, and strong in the face of challenges. These groups of students that believe in their personal ability to effect changes in politics may be convinced to vote even in the absence of incentive.

### **Acknowledgement**

This study was sponsored by TETFund ( Institutional Based Research Grant)  
7<sup>th</sup> December, 2021.

### **References**

- Adamu, A, & Ocheni, P. D. (2016). Money politics and Analysis of voting. Behavior in Nigeria: challenges and prospects for free and fair elections. *International Journal of public Administration and management research (IJPAMR)*, 3 (3):
- Amanyeie, N. S., Bariledum, K. & Lucky, N. B. (2015). Electoral violence and political apathy in Nigeria: Issues and challenges. *British Journal of Humanities and social sciences* 13(1): 155-173
- Ana, L. De La O. (2013). Do Conditional Cash transfers affect Electoral behavior. Evidence from Randomized Experiment in Mexico. *American Journal of Political Science*, 57(1):1-14.
- Anderson, C., John, O.P, & Keltner, D. (2012). The Personal Sense of Power. *Journal of Personality*, 80, (2) 313–344.
- Bode, I., Vag, Borah & Shah, T. (2014). Closing the gap. Gender parity in political engagement on social media. *Journal of information communication and society*, 20(4) 587-603
- Bugental, D. B & Lewis, J. C. (1999) The Paradoxical Misuse of Power by Those Who See Themselves as Powerless: how Does It Happen? *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 51 – 64.
- Caprara, G. V., Schwartz, S. H., Capanna, C., Vecchione, M., & Bar-baranelli, C. (2006). Personality and politics: Values, traits, and political choice. *Political Psychology*, 27, 1–28
- Chen, I. T. & Tang .T. L. P. (2006). Attitude towards and propensity of engage in unethical behavior : Measurement invariance across major among university student. *Journal of management and organization review* (23): 423-452
- Davis, A. (2006). Consistency, Understanding and Truth in Educational Research. *Journal of Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain*, 40(4), 487-500.
- Du, L. Z. & Tang, T. L.P. (2005). Measurement invariance across gender and major: the love of money among. University students in people republic of chic. *Journal Business Ethics*, 59, 281 -93
- Esa, E. & Zahari, A. R. (2015). Relationship between personality traits and accounting students perception on ethics and love of money: case of Malaysian Government liked University. *Journal of Asian Business strategy*, 5 (8): 174-182.
- Fagunwa, T.C. (2015). Conference paper by Fagunwa, T.C.-INEC Nigeria <https://www.inecnigeria.org>
- Filipovich, D., Nino-Zarazua, M., & Santillan A. (2018). Campaign Externalities, Programmatic Spending, and volting Preferences in rural Mexico: The Case of ProgresaOportunidades-ProsperaProgramme. The Political economy of social Protection Systems.Wider Working Paper 2018/27.<https://www.researchgatenek/>
- Galinsky, A. D., Gruenfeld, D. H. & Magee, J. C. (2003). From power to action. *Journal of personality psychology*, 85 (3): 453-66

- Hou, W.K., Canetti, D., Ma, T.W., Hall, B. Y., Lan, K.M., Ng, S.M.D., & Hobfoll, S.E. (2018). What Predicts Threat Perceptions Forward people Opposing to the government PA Population Based Study Following the Umbrella Movement, Hong Nong, *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*. 6 (2): 383-400.  
<https://punch.com/ekiti-osun-gov-polls-dress-rehearsals-for-2019-electoral-fraud-olusola/>.
- Jones, Mark P., Meloni, O. & Tommasi, M. ( 2012). Voters as Fiscal Liberals: Incentives and Accountability in Federal Systems. *Economics Politics*, 24(2): 135–156.
- Kalu, T. O. & Gberevbie, D. E. (2018). Election violence and democracy in Nigeria: A study of the 2011 and 2015 general elections in Lagos state. *Kaduna Journal of Humanities*, 2 (1): 60 – 70
- Keltner, D. A., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson C. (2003). Power, Approach and Inhibition: *Psychological Review*, 110: 265 – 284.
- Lane, R.E. (1961). *Political Life: Why People get Involved in Politics*, New York: free press.
- Lawler, E. E. (1981). *Pay and organizational development*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley
- Leimgruber, P. (2011). Values and Votes: The Indirect Effects of Personal Values on Voting Behaviour. <http://www.researchgate.net>
- Mares, I., & Young, T. (2016). Buying expropriating and Stealing Votes. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 19: 267-288.
- Mbah, P. O.; Nwangwu, C. & Ugwu, S. C. (2019). Contentious elections, political exclusion, and challenges of national integration in Nigeria. *Congent Social Sciences*, 5 (1): 1-21
- McDonnell, J. (2019). Municipality, Size, Political Efficacy and Political participation: a systematic review. *Journal Local Government*, 0(0): 1-4.
- Miller, J.M. (2018). Why do people participate in politics? The center for the study of the individual and society, university of Minnesota. [psych.umn.edu/projects/ why-do people-participate-politics](http://psych.umn.edu/projects/why-do-people-participate-politics) .
- Nnedum O.A.U, Chine, B. C; & Ezeokana, J. O. (2005). Money Functionalism Among Ndi Igbo Ethnico - Linguistic Culture, *OGIRISI: A NEW Journal of African Studies*, 2, (1): 87-91.
- Nweke, K.O. (2019). Love of Money, Prosocial Behaviour and Personal Sense of Power as Predictors of Political engagement proposal presentation. Department of Psychology Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, unpublished.
- Onuoha, F. & Ojo, J. (2018). African center for the constructive resolution of disputes. <https://www.accord.org.za>
- Ovwasa, O.L. (2013). Money Politics and Vote Buying in Nigeria. The Bane as Good Governance. *Afro Asian Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(4):3.
- Robinson, J. A. & Verdier, T. (2013). The Political Economy of Clientism. *Journal of Economics*, 115 (2): 260-291.
- Ross, C.E. & Sastry, J. (1999). The sense of personal control: Social-structural causes and emotional consequences. In C. S. Aneshensel and J.C. Phelan (eds). *Handbook of Sociology and social research. Hand book of sociology of mental health* (pp. 369-394). Dordrecht Netherlands: Kluwer Academic publishers.
- Rush, M. & Althoff, R. (1971). *An introduction to political Sociology*. London, Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd
- Sapolsky, R. M. (2012). Importance of a sense of control and physiological benefits of leadership. *Proceedings of the National Academy of sciences of the United States of American*, 109 (44): 17730-17731.
- Shehata, M. (2017). Political Participation and Power Relations in Egypt: The Scope of newspapers and Social Network Sites. *Media and Communication*, 5(2):52-63.
- Smith, P.K. & Hofmann, W. (2016). Power in everyday life. *PNAS Early Education*, 2-6.
- Solhang, T. (2006). Knowledge and self efficacy as predictors of political participation and Civic Attitude. With relevance for educational practice. *Policy futures in educations* 4 (3) 265-278



- 
- Tang, T. L. (2002). The meaning of money: the money ethics endorsement and work-related attitudes in Taiwan, the USA and the UK. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17, 7.
- Verba, S., Lehman, K. & Brady, H. (1995). Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics. *Political Science General*
- Weiss, M. (2017). What is the importance of political participation? <https://www.quora.com>
- Werischent, A. (2017). Cause you've got personality: Political participation and the tendency to join civic groups. *International Sociological Association*, 1-12.