

Political Public Opinion Survey before Election: An Empirical Investigation of 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria

Abdullahi Tafida, Ph.D.

Department of Economics, Kaduna State University, Kaduna, Nigeria

ABSTRACT: *In many of the developed nations, before an election takes place, there is what is known as “political public opinion polls”. Data from sequence of political public opinion polls are sponsored by either private organizations or research institutes using different political polling types, such as phones, internet, face book, whatsApps, Twitter and face-to-face. The main objective of this paper is to empirically investigation of the political public opinion survey of 2015 Presidential Election Seekers. Face-to-face descriptive sampling design was adopted in this paper due to its fairly accurate results. Five (5) States and five (5) Local Government Areas in each of the six (6) Geopolitical Zones (North-Central – Benue, Kwara, Nasarawa, Niger and Plateau; North-East – Adamawa, Bauchi, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe; North-West – Kaduna, Kano, Katsina, Sokoto and Zamfara; South-East – Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu, and Imo; South-South – Akwa-Ibom, Bayelsa, Delta, Edo and Rivers; and South-West – Ekiti, Lagos, Ogun, Ondo, and Oyo) of Nigeria were randomly selected. One of the major findings shows that the age profile of 18 to 50 years dominated the face-to-face political opinion polls survey of 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria. This paper concludes that over 90 percent of the respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the state of Nigerian economy, corporate governance and insecurity and recommends that, rotational presidency should be a Nigerian agenda.*

KEYWORDS: Political Public Opinion Survey, Respondents, 2015 Presidential Election Seekers

INTRODUCTION

Some argue that traditional forms of political participation, such as contact with representatives and volunteerism, indicate the voice of the resource rich at the expense of the less privileged political office seekers. Others suggested that political public opinion representation survey appeared to be unbiased because it requires no resource as well as eliminating the selection bias inherent in the fact that participants in politics are self-selected (Verba, Schlozman, and Brady, 1995).

It may appear that political public opinion survey to be more reliable form of representation than traditional forms of political participation, there are a number of limitations and problems inherent in viewing polls as a source of unbiased public input into the policy process. In some cases, political public opinion survey may reflect poor collective public sentiment because some individual hide their sentiments to the social pressure of the survey interview and may choose to abstain from some specific questions rather than give opinions which might paint them in an unfavourable light.

In measuring the difficulties involved in measuring political public opinion survey on sensitive issues, this paper used face-to-face sampling data to show that the political public opinion survey for 2015 Presidential election in Nigeria overstate support for the teaming

masses calling for change. The results of 2015 Presidential election in Nigeria validate the reliability of the method adopted in this paper. Furthermore, the results in this paper suggest that political public opinion survey questions for 2015 Presidential election in Nigeria and more generally, questions on racial attitudes may provide an inaccurate picture of political public opinion survey sentiment on such sensitive issues.

Statement of Problem

Problems associated with political public opinion survey stem either from issues with the methodology that bias the sample or responses that cause the bias. Self-selection bias arises in any situation in which individuals select themselves into a group, causing a biased sample with non-probability sampling (Kinder, 1998). The wording of the questions by the interviewer, the order in which they are asked, and the number and form of alternative answers offered can influence results of political public opinion survey. Coverage bias is another source of error involving the use of samples that are not representative of the population due to the polling methodology are also some of the problems associated with polling surveys. Respondents are blamed for not giving candid answers, this reflects errors on the part of the pollsters, and many of them are statistical in nature. Some respondents do not answer calls from strangers or refuse to answer the poll (Clymer, 1989). Wording of questions was established as another problem. The order in which the questions were asked, and the number and form of alternative answers offered could influence results of political public opinion survey. For instance, the public is more likely to indicate support for a political seeker who is described by the operator as one of the leading candidates; the common technique to control for this bias is to rotate the order in which questions are asked (Berinsky, 1999).

Research Question

Some of the research questions this paper considers include: Is the political public opinion survey of 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria a source of electing a political office seekers? Are the patterns of social attitudes and perception of the electorate to political office seeker, especially the 2015 Presidential election in Nigeria real? Are the current perception indices for various political, social and economic issues in Nigeria the best? And are the report based on analysis and inferences of the findings of the survey sometimes the best solutions?

Objective of the Paper

The main objective of the paper is to empirically investigate the 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria and the specific objectives are:

1. To assess the political disposition of the political public opinion survey of 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria.
2. To identify patterns of social attitudes and perceptions of the electorate to political office seekers, especially the 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria.
3. To assess the current perception indices for various political, social and economic issues in Nigeria.
4. To provide a report based on the analysis and inferences of the findings of the political public opinion survey of 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria.

Hypotheses of the Paper

This paper hypothesized that:

1. H_0 : Political disposition of the political public opinion survey of 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria are not better sources for political office seekers.
2. H_0 : Patterns of social attitudes and perceptions of the electorate to political office seekers, especially the 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria are not true reflection of opinion survey.
3. H_0 : The current perception indices for various political, social and economic issues in Nigeria do not give good assessment of the opinion survey.
4. H_0 : Analysis and inferences of the findings of the political public opinion survey of 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria sometimes do not provide better results of opinion survey.

Significance of the Paper

The significance of this paper is based on the findings, which are expected to diversify our political thinking, provide corporate governance and provide formidable security consciousness in an emerging democracy. The study is also expected to be useful to professionals to assist in creating awareness to the Nigerian political office seekers engaging in politics as career choices, with a view to reducing political violence. The study findings are expected to assist researchers, students and academics so that they can put in their best in understanding the importance of political public opinion survey in Nigeria.

The study findings are expected to explore new ideas and strategies that would bridge the gap and advise policy makers, not to only rely on the output of the political public opinion survey, but to practically collaborate with others to support the electorates as an alternative for positive electorate change in Nigeria. Further findings are expected to expose the relevance of economic diversification, corporate governance and insecurity in an emerging democracy in Nigeria.

Scope of the Paper

The scope of this paper covers four (4) States and five (5) Local Government Areas (LGAs) in each of the six (6) geopolitical zones namely: Benue (Katsina-Ala, Makurdi, Oturkpo, Tarka and Vandeikya LGAs); Kwara (Ilorin East, Irepodun, Kaiama, Offa and Pategi LGAs); Nasarawa (Akwanga, Karu, Keffi, Lafia and Nasarawa-Eggon LGAs); Plateau (Barikin Ladi, Bokkos, Jos North, Langtang South and Shendam Wase LGAs); Adamawa (Mayo-Belwa, Michika, Mubi South, Numan and Yola North LGAs); Bauchi (Bauchi, Darazo, Jama'are, Katagum and Tafawa-Balewa LGAs)); Gombe (Billiri, Kaltungo, Gombe, Nafada/Bajoga and Shomgom LGAs); Taraba (Bali, Jalingo, Sardauna, Wukari and Zing LGAs); Yobe (Damaturu, Fika, Geidam, Machina and Nguru Potiskum LGAs); Kaduna (Birnin Gwari, Kaduna North, Kaduna South, Zangon-Kataf and Zaria LGAs); Kano (Doguwa, Fagge, Gaya, Kano Municipal and Madobi LGAs); Katsina (Daura, Funtua, Jibia, Katsina and Malumfashi LGAs); Sokoto (IIIela, Shagari, Sokoto North, Tambuwal and Yabo LGAs); Zamfara (Bakura, Gummi, Gusau, Shinkafi and Talata Mafara LGAs); Abia (Aba North, Isiala-Ngwa North, Umuahia South, Ohafi and Ugwunagbo LGAs); Anambra (Anambra East, Awka, Idemili, Nnewi South and Onitsha North LGAs); Ebonyi (Afikpo South, Ohaozara,

Abakaliki, Ezza and Ivo LGAs)); Enugu (Enugu South, Oji-River, Nsukka, Nkanu East and Udenu LGAs); Imo (Ahiazu-Mbaise, Oguta, Okigwe, Orlu and Owerri North LGAs); Akwa-Ibom (Essien Udim, Etim Ekpo, Onna, Oruk and Urue-Offong/Oruko LGAs); Bayelsa (Brass, Kolokuma/Opokuma, Sagbama, Southern Ijaw and Yenegoa LGAs); Delta (Aniocha, Burutu, Ughelli North, Ethiope East Sapele and Warri Central LGAs); Edo (Esan Central, Egor, Etsako, Oredo Ovia South-West and Uhumwonde LGAs); Rivers (Ahoada West, Ikwerre, Ogba/Egbema/Ndoni, Okrika and Port-Harcourt LGAs); Ekiti (Ado, Irepodum, Oye, Ikole and Gbonyin LGAs); Lagos (Ibeju/Lekki, Ikeja, Lagos Mainland, Oshodi-Isolo and Shomolu Surulere LGAs); Ogun (Abeokuta North, Ijebu North East, Obafemi-Owode, Ogun Waterside and Shagamu LGAs); Ondo (Akoko North East, Akure South, Ilaje, Ondo East and Owo LGAs); Oyo (Akinyele, Ibadan Central, Ogbomosho, Ogo Oluwa Oyo West LGAs) and FCT (Abaji, Bwari, Gwagwalada, Kwali and Municipal Area Council). The rationale for selecting the States rests on their long history as the seats, centres of political power and activity, cosmopolitan mixture and their relative high level of literacy in the zones. In addition, the maximum number of States this paper can randomly select are five, that is, from the South-East.

Five States (5) from the six (6) Geopolitical Zones were randomly selected, given a total number of 30 States. Five (5) LGAs from the 30 States were also randomly selected, giving a total number of 150 LGAs. Furthermore, fifty (50) questionnaires were distributed in each of the 150 LGAs, giving a total number of 7,500 questionnaires. Out of the 7,500 questionnaires distributed, 7,000 (93.33 percent) were returned and only 500 (6.67 percent) were not returned.

Six independent resource organizations participated in the 2015 Presidential political public opinion survey in the six Geopolitical Zones namely:

- i. Youth Vanguard Forum (YVF) – North Central Geopolitical Zone;
- ii. Good Governance Media Forum (GGMF) – North East Geopolitical Zone;
- iii. Better Democracy for All (BDA – North West Geopolitical Zone;
- iv. Empowerment for Justice (EFJ) – South East Geopolitical Zone;
- v. Movement for Economic Survival (MES) - South-South Geopolitical Zone;
- vi. Movement for Zero Corruption Tolerance (MZCT) – South West Geopolitical Zone.

Limitations of the Paper

The limitations encountered in this paper were: lack of exposure to the opinion survey by some respondents, who thought that the survey was sponsored by a political party in Nigeria. The political public opinion survey is time consuming as well as natural resistance by the layman in giving answers to the questions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Political Public Opinion Survey, according to conventional theories, have ascertained that the results of the responses is a product of individuals' attempt to expose fixed preference on a given policy issue. Zaller (1992) and Feldman (1989) argued that individuals do not typically possess true attitudes on issues of partially independent political public opinion survey as also

assumed by the conventional theorists. The race of the interviewer as part of the social nature could affect the survey response. Ignoring a social factor, could also omit a key factor from consideration. The interview on the other hand, is a conversation at random, which is a form of social interaction between two individuals: the interviewer and the respondent (Converse and Schuman, 1974).

Environment of the political public opinion survey, according to researchers could have significant effects on the nature of the opinions of electorates (Singer, Von Thurn and Miller, 1995; Hyman, 1954). Psychologists (Sudman, Bradburn, and Schwarz, 1996; Wilson and Hodges, 1992; Tourangeau and Rasinki, 1988) have proposed a number of models to separate opinion formation from expression with a view to integrating cognitive and social dimensions. Different terminology were used to describe the various tasks in the question-answering process, such as phones, face book, face-to-face, twitter, internet, whatsApps, but they all offer a more complete view of the political public opinion survey. The most important is that these models recognize that the translation of an individual's private summary judgment into a survey response is accomplished by means of a social interaction between the survey respondent and the interviewer. The opinion constructed by the interviewer may not necessarily be the same as the opinion expressed by the respondent.

Respondents may decide to skip the questions constructed by the interviewer because they are uncertain how the interviewers may feel about the political office seekers, policy or issues. Respondents may decide to hide their political leanings to the survey interviewer for reasons best known to them (Krosnick and Milburn, 1990; Noelle-Neuman, 1994; Schuman and Presser, 1981).

Responses of political public opinion survey may not necessarily be accepted at the long-run, due to some bias aggregate measures and the social context of the survey itself. But one important dimension that scholars adopted when passing the validity of aggregate signals sent by the public through opinion polls is the hard versus easy issue dimension identified by Carmines and Stimson (1980). Hard issues, such as abolishing of private schools and hospitals as change agenda approach may not necessarily be accepted by the government, while easy issues, such as removal of school fees in the public's eye. One best area that is collectively good for the respondents is the question of racial equality, which seems to touch almost everybody, such as all citizens must attend the same government schools or hospitals (Schuman et.al., 1997).

METHODOLOGY

Face-to-face sampling was adopted for the political public opinion survey for the 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria because it assumes to give a fairly accurate outcome. This method adopted in this paper gives room to be selective of respondents and the opportunity for further explanation of sample questions to the respondents as well as allowing this paper to measure the disposition and sincerity of the respondents.

Survey Study Design

A face-to-face descriptive survey sampling design was adopted in this paper, and used a population census approach to collect data from the targeted respondents for the 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria at the time of this study. A total of 7,500 respondents were

targeted for the opinion public survey during the 2015 Presidential Election in the bracket of 18 to 50 years. This age group or demographic factor suggests the critical importance this age group could play in the political equation in Nigeria. This paper accessed the responses of the respondents based on the questionnaires returned as indicated in Table 1.

Data Collection and Assessment

The Simple Substitution Theory of Survey Response of Zaller and Stanley (1992) presented in this paper was used to collect data on the face-to-face survey. The simple theory was used to develop a fairly accurate outcome for political public opinion survey for electorates on political office seekers as indicated in Tables 1-28 and the data were coded and analyzed with the aid of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 10.

Discussion of Tool Analysis

Zaller and Stanley (1992) defined the following stages and purposes of political public opinion survey in terms of the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents, such as: gender (sex), age, educational levels, and occupational levels, political and economic background.

Sample Size and Sample Technique

Random selection took place in this study on a political public opinion survey of the 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria. Thirty (30) States and one hundred and fifty (150) Local Government Areas (LGAs) of the 30 States were randomly selected. Also fifty (50) questionnaires were distributed in the 150 LGAs of the 30 States as well as 7,000 questionnaires were returned and 500 questionnaires not returned.

DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Discussion of Research Findings

The findings in this paper reveal the followings:

Table 1 reveals that, of the 7,500 questionnaires distributed in 30 States and 150 LGAs on the 2015 Presidential Election, 7,000 questionnaires were returned giving a percentage of 93.33 and the remaining 6.67 percent were not returned.

Table 1: Respondents Rates on the 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria

Type	Questionnaires Distributed	Questionnaires Returned	Balance	No. Responded (%)	No. Not Responded (%)
Total	7,500	7,000	500	93.33	6.67

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 2 reveals the respondents views on the 2015 Presidential Election if Buhari were a Candidate. The results show that 14 percent of the respondents (980 respondents) indicated their opinions on Atiku, 35 percent (2,450 respondents) on Buhari, 10 percent (700

respondents) on Bukola Saraki, 6 percent (420 respondents) on David Mark, 16 percent (1,120 respondents) on Jonathan and 19 percent (1,330 respondents) on Kwankwaso.

Table 2: Respondents Views if Buhari were a 2015 Presidential Candidate in Nigeria

Presidential Hopeful	Number of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Atiku	980	14.0
Buhari	2,450	35.0
Bukola Saraki	700	10.0
David Mark	420	6.0
Jonathan	1,120	16.0
Kwankwaso	1,330	19.0
Total	7,000	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 3 reveals the responses on the Presidential Candidate hopeful if Buhari were not a Presidential Candidate. The results show that 15 percent (1,050 respondents) indicated their opinions on Atiku, 12 percent (840 respondents) on Bukola Saraki, 6 percent (420 respondents) on David Mark, 15 percent (1,050 respondents) on Jonathan, 24 percent (1,680 respondents) on Kwankwaso and 28 percent (1,960 respondents) on Tambuwal.

Table 3 – Respondents Views if Buhari were not a 2015 Presidential Candidate

Presidential Hopeful	Number of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Atiku	1,050	15.0
Bukola Saraki	840	12.0
David Mark	420	6.0
Jonathan	1,050	15.0
Kwankwaso	1,680	24.0
Tambuwal	1,960	28.0
Total	7,000	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 4 reveals the responses on the Presidential Candidate hopeful if Jonathan were not a Presidential Candidate. The results show that 17 percent (1,190 respondents) indicated their opinions on Atiku, 12 percent (840 respondents) on Bukola Saraki, 4 percent (280 respondents) on David Mark, 24 percent (1,680 respondents) on Kwankwaso, 10 percent (700 respondents) on Sule Lamido and 33 percent (2,310 respondents) on Tambuwal.

Table 4 – Respondents Views if Jonathan were not a 2015 Presidential Candidate

Presidential Hopeful	Number of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Atiku	1,190	17.0
Bukola Saraki	840	12.0
David Mark	280	4.0
Kwankwaso	1,680	24.0
Sule Lamido	700	10.0
Tambuwal	2,310	33.0
Total	7,000	100.00

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 5 reveals the responses on the Presidential Candidate hopeful if Atiku were not a Presidential Candidate. The results show that 15 percent (1,050 respondents) indicated their opinions on Amaechi, 13 percent (910 respondents) on Bukola Saraki, 4 percent (280) on David Mark, 24.5 percent (1,715 respondents) on Kwankwaso, 10 percent (700 respondents) on Sule Lamido and 33.5 percent (2,345 respondents) on Tambuwal.

Table 5 – Respondents Views if Atiku were not a 2015 Presidential Candidate

Presidential Hopeful	Number of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Amaechi	1,050	15.0
Bukola Saraki	910	13.0
David Mark	280	4.0
Kwankwaso	1,715	24.5
Sule Lamido	700	10.0
Tambuwal	2,345	33.5
Total	7,000	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 6 reveals the responses on the Presidential Candidate hopeful if David Mark were not a Presidential Candidate. The results show that 16 percent (1,150 respondents) indicated their opinions on Amaechi, 15 percent (1,050 respondents) on Bukola Saraki, 2 percent (140 respondents) on Fayose, 24.5 percent (1,735 respondents) on Kwankwaso, 8 percent (560 respondents) on Sule Lamido and 33.5 percent (2,365 respondents) on Tambuwal.

Table 6 – Respondents Views if David Mark were not a 2015 Presidential Candidate

Presidential Hopeful	Number of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Amaechi	1,150	16.0
Bukola Saraki	1,050	15.0
Fayose	140	2.0
Kwankwaso	1,735	25.0
Sule Lamido	560	8.0
Tambuwal	2,365	34.0
Total	7,000	100.

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 7 reveals the responses on the Presidential Candidate hopeful if Bukola Saraki were not a Presidential Candidate. The results show that 19 percent (1,360 respondents) indicated their opinions on Amaechi, 2.0 percent (140 respondents) on Fayose, 28 percent (1,945 respondents) on Kwankwaso, 3.0 percent (210 respondents) on Liyel Imoke, 11 percent (770 respondents) on Sule Lamido and 37 percent (2,575 respondents) on Tambuwal.

Table 7 – Respondents Views if Bukola Saraki were not a 2015 Presidential Candidate

Presidential Hopeful	Number of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Amaechi	1,360	19.0
Fayose	140	2.0
Kwankwaso	1,945	28.0
Liyel Imoke	210	3.0
Sule Lamido	770	11.0
Tambuwal	2,575	37.0
Total	7,000	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 8 reveals the ranking positions responses and better 2015 Presidential Candidate hopeful if Amaechi, Atiku, Buhari, Bukola Saraki, David Mark, Liyel Imoke, Fayose, Jonathan, Kwankwoso, Sule Lamido and Tambuwal were Presidential Candidates. The results show that Buhari (21 percent, 1,470 respondents), Tambuwal (16 percent, 1,120 respondents), Kwankwoso (14 percent, 980 respondents), Amaechi (11 percent, 770 respondents), Atiku (9 percent, 630 respondents), Bukola Saraki (9 percent, 630 respondents), Jonathan (8 percent, 560 respondents), David Mark (4 percent, 280 respondents), Fayose (3 percent, 210 respondents), Sule Lamido (3 percent, 210 respondents) and Liyel Imoke (2 percent, 140 respondents) respectively

Table 8– Ranking Positions of Respondents if All 2015 Presidential Candidates were to Contest

Presidential Hopeful	Number of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Buhari	1,470	21.0
Tambuwal	1,120	16.0
Kwankwaso	980	14.0
Amaechi	770	11.0
Atiku	630	9.0
Bukola Saraki	630	9.0
Jonathan	560	8.0
David Mark	280	4.0
Fayose	210	3.0
Sule Lamido	210	3.0
Liyel Imoke	140	2.0
Total	7,000	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 9 reveals the responses for top 6 most likely 2015 Presidential Candidates as; Bihar (21 percent, 1,470 respondents), Tambuwal (16 percent, 1,120 respondents), Kwankwoso (14 percent, 980 respondents), Amaechi (11 percent, 770 respondents), Atiku (10 percent, 700 respondents), Bukola Saraki (10 percent, 700) respondents respectively

Table 9 – Ranking Positions of Respondents on All 2015 Presidential Candidates

Presidential Hopeful	Number of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Buhari	1,470	21.0
Tambuwal	1,120	16.0
Kwankwaso	980	14.0
Amaechi	770	11.0
Atiku	700	10.0
Bukola Saraki	700	10.0
Total	5,740	82.0

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 10 reveals the responses for age profile of 2015 Presidential Candidates as; Less than 18 years (1.0 percent, 70 respondents), 18-20 years (30 percent, 2,100 respondents), 21-30 years (32 percent, 2,240 respondents), 31-40 years (25 percent, 1,750 respondents), 41-50 years (10 percent, 700 respondents), more than 50 years (2 percent, 140 respondents).

Table 10 – Respondents Views on Age Profile of 2015 Presidential Candidates

Age Range (Years)	Number of Respondents	Percentage (%)
< (Less than) 18	70	1.0
18-20	2,100	30.0
21-30	2,240	32.0
31-40	1,750	25.0
41-50	700	10.0
>(More than) 50	140	2.0
Total	7,000	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 11 reveals the responses for educational profile of 2015 Presidential Candidates as; 5 percent or 350 respondents with no education, 20 percent or 1,400 respondents with primary certificates, 21 percent or 1,470 respondents with secondary qualification, 30 percent or 2,100 respondents with higher school qualification, 14 percent or 980 respondents that are graduates, 10 percent or 700 respondents with postgraduate qualifications indicated their political public opinion survey respectively.

Table 11 – Respondents Views on Educational Profile of 2015 Presidential Candidates

School Attended	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
None	350	5.0
Primary	1,400	20.0
Secondary	1,470	21.0
Higher School	2,100	30.0
Graduate	980	14.0
Postgraduate	700	10.0
Total	7,000	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Table 12 reveals the responses for occupational distribution profile of 2015 Presidential Candidates as; 30 percent or 2,164 respondents as civil servants dominated the survey, 22

percent or 1,513 respondents as crop farmers, 15 percent or 1,037 respondents as traders, 14 percent or 980 respondents as mixed farmers, 6 percent or 442 respondents as others, 6 percent or 406 respondents as craftsmen, 5 percent or 328 respondents as artisans and 2 percent or 130 respondents as food processors indicated their political public opinion survey respectively.

Table 12: Respondents Views on Occupational Profile of 2015 Presidential Candidates

Occupation	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Crop Farming	1,513	22.0
Mixed Farming	980	14.0
Trading	1,037	15.0
Food Processing	130	2.0
Civil Servant	2,164	30.0
Craft	406	6.0
Artisan	328	5.0
Others	442	6.0
Total	7,000	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Table 13 reveals the responses for gender/sex profile of 2015 Presidential Candidates as; 60 percent or 4,200 respondents as females dominated the survey, 33 percent or 2,300 respondents as males indicated their political public opinion survey while 7 percent or 500 respondents made no response.

Table 13: Respondents Views on Gender/Sex Profile of 2015 Presidential Candidates

Gender/Sex	Number of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Male	2,300	33.0
Female	4,200	60.0
No Response	500	7.0
Total	7,000	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 14 reveals the responses on the state of the Nigerian economy and security situation as; 26 percent or 1,800 respondent were not satisfied, 38 percent or 2,702 respondents were mostly dissatisfied, 30 percent or 2,100 respondents were very dissatisfied, 3 percent or 200 respondents were satisfied, 1.5 percent or 104 respondents were mostly satisfied, 1 percent or 60 respondents were very satisfied about the Nigerian economy, current dividend of democracy, present reform agenda and present security situation, while 0.5 percent or 34 respondents never responded.

Table 14: Respondents Views on the Present State of the Nigerian Economy, Dividends of Democracy, Reform agenda and Security Situation

Option	Number of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Not Satisfied	1,800	26.0
Most Dissatisfied	2,702	38.0
Very Dissatisfied	2,100	30.0
Satisfied	200	3.0
Most Satisfied	104	1.5
Very Satisfied	60	1.0
No Response	34	0.5
Total	7,000	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 15 reveals the responses on the rotational presidency in Nigerian as; 19 percent or 1,300 respondent did not agree, 48 percent or 3,400 respondents strongly disagreed, 19 percent or 1,340 respondents somewhat disagreed, 5 percent or 340 respondents agreed, 3 percent or 240 respondents strongly agreed, 3 percent or 200 respondents somewhat agreed, indicated their views on rotational presidency, 3 percent or 180 respondents never responded.

Table 15: Respondents Views on the Rotational Presidency as the Best for Nigeria

Option	Number of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Not Agree	1,300	19.0
Strongly Disagree	3,400	48.0
Somewhat Disagree	1,340	19.0
Agree	340	5.0
Strongly Agree	240	3.0
Somewhat Agree	200	3.0
No Response	180	3.0
Total	7,000	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2015

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

On the demographic profile of the respondents, a total of 7,500 electorates from 30 States and 150 Local Government Areas (LGAs) were randomly selected for the 2015 Presidential Election. The age profile showed a significant number of respondents in the age bracket of 18-50 years or 97 percent as indicated in Table 10 of this paper.

Tables 11 and 12 highlighted 97 percent of the state electorates plus the civil servant (30 percent) plus farmers (36 percent) plus the male and female electorates (97 percent) plus primary and secondary school certificate holders (41 percent) plus higher, graduates and postgraduate school certificate holders (54 percent) constituted greater percentage of the state electorates, which may not be enough to represent the entire survey result findings, but what matters is that some sections of the Nigerian electorates was sampled and that the findings of the results were their opinions.

Table 14 reveals that the present state of the Nigerian economy, dividends of democracy, reform agenda and security situation constituted 94 percent of the respondents' expressed dissatisfaction with the issues.

Rotational Presidency as indicated in Table 15 shows that 86 percent of the respondents indicated disagreement with the rotational presidency.

Seven thousand (7,000) respondents in the population of over 180 million Nigerians may not give an accurate national outlook, but what matters is the implication of economic statistical inferences as highlighted in Tables 2-9, where a good number of respondents showed their preference of the 6 top 2015 Presidential office seekers as; Buhari, Tambuwal, Kwankwaso, Amaechi, Atiku and Bukola Saraki, with Buhari as the best 2015 Presidential Candidate for Nigeria, where 5,740 or 82 percent of the respondents expressed preferences for the 6 top presidential seekers as indicated in Table 9..

The implication of the 2015 Presidential political public opinion survey drawn from the economic statistical analysis in this paper suggests that, developing countries would learn more from the developed ones in the areas of politics equations such as corporate governance.

Results of Hypotheses

From the drawn hypotheses:

1. H₁: Political disposition of the political public opinion survey of 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria are better sources for political office seekers.
2. H₁: Patterns of social attitudes and perceptions of the electorate to political office seekers, especially the 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria are true reflection of opinion survey.
3. H₁: The current perception indices for various political, social and economic issues in Nigeria do give good assessment of the opinion survey.
4. H₀: Analysis and inferences of the findings of the political public opinion survey of 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria sometimes do provide better results of opinion survey.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

Based on the findings and analysis of the results this paper concludes that the age profile of 18 to 50 years dominated the face-to-face political opinion polls survey of 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria. Over 90 percent of the respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the state of Nigerian economy, corporate governance and insecurity as well as rotational presidency is not the best option for Nigeria.

Recommendation

This paper recommends that rotational presidency is not the best option for Nigeria as politics is a game of number.

REFERENCES

- Berinsky, A. J. (1999). *Public Opinion Polling and Political Representation in America*. Ph.D. diss. The University of Michigan.
- Carmines, E. G. and Stimson, J. A. (1980). The Two Faces of Issue Voting. *American Political Science Review* 79:78-91.
- Clymer, A. (1989). *Election Day Shows What the Opinion Polls Can't Do*. New York Times, November 12, pp. A1.
- Converse, J. and Schuman, H. (1974). *Conversations at Random: Survey Research as Interviewers See It*. New York : John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Feldman, S. (1989). Measuring Issue Preferences: The Problem of Response Instability. *Political analysis* 1:25-60.
- Hyman, H. H. (1954). *Interviewing in Social Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kinder, D. R. (1998). Opinion and Action in the Realm of Politics. In *Handbook of Social Psychology*, Fourth Edition, ed. Daniel Gilbert, Susan Fiske, and Gardner Lindzey. Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Krosnick, J. and Milburn, M. (1990). Psychological Determinants of Political Opinionation. *Social Cognition* 8:49-72.
- Noelle-Neuman, E. (1984). *The Spiral of Silence: Public Opinion-Our Social Skin*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schuman, H. and Presser, S. (1981). *Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys*: New York: Academic Press.
- Schuman, H., Steeh, C., Bobo, L., and Krysan, M. (1997). *Racial Attitude in America: Trends and Interpretations, Revised Edition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Singer, E., Von Thurn, D. R. and Miller, E. R. (1995). *Confidentiality Assurance and Response: A Quantitative Review of the Experimental Literature*. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 59-66-77.
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., and H. E. Brady (1995). *Voice of Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Zaller, J. (1992). *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Zaller, J. and Stanley, F. (1992). A Simple Theory of the Survey Responses. *American Journal of Political Science* 36:579-616.