Socio-Economic Development and Voter Preferences in Türkiye: The 28 May 2023 Presidential Election[1]

Türkiye'de Sosyo-Ekonomik Gelişmişlik ve Seçmen Tercihleri: 28 Mayıs 2023 Cumhurbaşkanlığı Seçimi

Umut Turgut YILDIRIM[2]

Öz

Amaç: Bu çalışma, temel olarak Türkiye'de seçmen tercihlerinin analizine odaklanmıştır. Çalışma 28 Mayıs 2023 Cumhurbaşkanlığı Seçimi özelinde seçmenlerin sosyo-ekonomik gelişmişlik seviyelerinin iktidar ve muhalefet bloklarına yönelik tercihleri üzerindeki etkilerini analiz etmeyi hedeflemektedir.

Tasarım/Yöntem: Bu bağlamda çalışmanın temel sorunsalı, seçmenin sosyo-ekonomik gelişmişlik düzeyinin seçim tercihini iktidar lehine mi yoksa muhalefet lehine mi yönlendirdiğinin tespit edilmesidir. Bu amaç doğrultusunda, Sanayi ve Teknoloji Bakanlığının "İlçelerin Sosyo-Ekonomik Gelişmişlik Sıralaması Araştırması (SEGE-2022)" raporundan elde edilen veriler ile Yüksek Seçim Kurulunun (YSK) 28 Mayıs 2023 Cumhurbaşkanlığı seçimi kesin sonuçları ilçe bazında analiz edilmiştir.

Bulgular: Bulgular, sosyo-ekonomik gelişmişlik düzeyi ile seçmenlerin iktidar-muhalefet tercihleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir ilişkinin varlığına işaret etmektedir.

Sınırlılıklar: Çalışmanın sonuçları, çeşitli faktörler nedeniyle sınırlıdır. 2023 seçimlerine odaklanılması genellenebilirliği kısıtlamakta ve analiz, seçmenlerin demografik profilleri, siyasi tutumları, parti bağlılıkları ve kampanya stratejileri gibi olası karıştırıcı değişkenleri kontrol etmemiştir. Bu nedenle, sosyo-ekonomik gelişmişlik ile seçmen tercihi arasında gözlemlenen ilişki, yalnızca nedensel olmayabilir.

Özgünlük/Değer: 2023 yılındaki Cumhurbaşkanlığı Seçimi, Türkiye'nin siyasi tarihinde keskin bir kutuplaşma ve rekabet ortamında gerçekleşmesiyle önemli bir dönüm noktası teşkil etmiştir. Öyle ki, 2023 Cumhurbaşkanlığı Seçimi, beraberinde seçmen tercihlerinin ve bu tercihleri etkileyen faktörlerin detaylı bir biçimde analiz edilmesini de elzem kılmıştır. Çalışmanın önemi, seçmen tercihlerini etkileyen faktörler arasında sosyo-ekonomik gelişmişliğin rolünü, güncel veriler ışığında ve özgün bir örneklem üzerinden analiz etmesinden kaynaklanmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Seçmen Tercihleri, Sosyo-ekonomik Gelişmişlik, 28 Mayıs 2023 Seçimleri, Türkiye

Abstract

Purpose: This study is primarily focused on analyzing voter preference in Türkiye. Specifically, the study aims to analyze the impact of voters' socio-economic development levels on their preference for the incumbent or opposition blocs, with specific reference to the 28 May 2023 presidential election.

Design/Methodology: The primary question is whether a voter's socio-economic status directs their vote towards the incumbent or the opposition. To address this question, district-level data from the Ministry of Industry and Technology's "District Socio-Economic Development Ranking Study (SEGE-2022)" report were analyzed alongside the Supreme Election Council's (YSK) official results from the May 28, 2023, presidential election. Correlation analysis was utilized to determine the nature of the relationship between the Socio-Economic Development Index (SEDI) and candidate vote shares.

Findings: The findings suggest a statistically significant relationship between socio-economic development and voter preference for the incumbent or opposition

Limitations: The study's conclusions are limited by several factors. Its focus on the 2023 election restricts generalizability, and the analysis did not control for potentially confounding variables (e.g., voter demographics, political attitudes, campaign strategies). Therefore, the observed relationship between socio-economic development and voter preference may not be solely causal.

Originality/Value: The 2023 Turkish Presidential Election marked a critical juncture in Türkiye's political history, characterized by heightened polarization and competitiveness. This context necessitates a detailed examination of voter preferences and the underlying factors influencing those preferences. The significance of this study stems from its analysis of the role of socio-economic development as a factor influencing voter preference, using current data and a unique sample.

Keywords: Voter Preferences, Socio-Economic Development, 28 May 2023 Elections, Türkiye

[2]Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, İnönü Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi, umutturgut.yildirim@inonu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-2676-7157

1. INTRODUCTION

In democratic systems, voter preference plays a central role in determining the actors within the political sphere. Therefore, the analysis of voter preferences and the factors influencing these preferences constitutes a significant area of study within the political science literature. Political scientists, particularly political sociologists, are keenly interested in understanding whom voters choose, why they choose them, and, in other words, what factors influence voting decisions. Studies in this area are utilized across a wide spectrum of applications, from profiling the political culture, political behavior, and political attitudes within a country, to understanding the dynamics that determine the institutions of incumbent and opposition. These applications also include assessing the effectiveness of election campaigns and examining the legitimacy of the regime. In this context, Downs (1957), Lipset (1960), Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet (1968), Campbell et al. (1960), Lewis-Beck and Stegmaier (2000), Fiorina (1981), Bruce and Sheth (1987), Almond and Verba (1989), and Thomassen (2005) have all produced works that have shaped the literature on voter preferences. These studies generally contend that individuals' voting behavior changes, whether retrospectively or prospectively, and that a multitude of factors, including psychological, socio-economic (family, environment, education, income, religious belief), and ideological factors, influence voter preference.

In Turkish political life, elections have also been the focus of numerous studies aiming to explain changes in voter preference and shifts in power between the incumbent and the opposition. Analysis of voter preference, a consistently relevant topic in studies focused on Turkish political life, has been investigated from various perspectives, alongside subjects such as political participation, voter preferences, political culture, political attitudes, and the factors influencing voters (Abadan, 1965; Akgün, 2000; Akgün, 2001; Aydın & Özbek, 2004; Beren, 2013; Canöz, 2010; Gülmen, 1979; Kalaycıoğlu, 1994; Özbudun & Tachau, 1975; Turan, 1986). However, the dynamic and evolving nature of voter preferences makes their analysis a field of study that requires constant updating. Indeed, changing political landscapes and electoral systems, socio-economic transformations within the social structure, and shifts in political actors render existing analyses of voter preference increasingly inadequate for understanding and explaining current political life. Yet, understanding voter preferences is one of the key ways to access the fundamental parameters of a country's political life. The results of the 2023 Presidential Election have once again demonstrated the importance of analyzing voter preferences in Türkiye to comprehend the country's political landscape. In other words, these elections clearly illustrated how critical an in-depth examination of voter preference is for understanding and interpreting the country's political future. Before the election, there were significant discussions about whether the Justice and Development Party (AK Party), which had governed the country for over 20 years, and President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan would be re-elected, with many polling companies predicting that the incumbent would not secure another term. The media also extensively covered the prospect of opposition candidate Kemal Kılıçdaroğlu winning the presidency, and Erdoğan transitioning to the opposition (Euronews, 13.05.2023; Independent Türkçe, 15.05.2023; Medyascope, 11.05.2023). When the elections concluded on May 14, 2023, there was no winner; therefore, according to election law, the election was repeated on May 28, 2023, and Erdoğan was re-elected as president, receiving 52.18% of the valid votes. As Öztürk (2023) also notes in his study, the election results demonstrated that the predictions of polling companies were insufficient to explain voter preferences. Furthermore, it can be argued that studies intending to explain voter preferences have also fallen short in fully accounting for the volatility of the current political climate and the fluctuations in voter preference. The results, especially those seen in recent elections, reveal the existence of more complex dynamics influencing voter preferences, beyond these traditional approaches.

This study primarily examines the preferences of Turkish voters, specifically in the context of the 2023 Presidential Election. It aims to investigate the impact of voters' socio-economic development levels on their preferences for the incumbent and opposition candidates in the 28 May 2023 presidential election. In this context, the central research question is to determine whether the socio-economic development level of voters in Türkiye directs their electoral preference towards the incumbent or the opposition. Answering this question will contribute to a better understanding of voter

preference in Türkiye and reveal the socio-economic foundations of the dynamics between the incumbent and the opposition. The significance of this study stems from its analysis of the role of socio-economic development as a factor influencing voter preference, using current data and a unique sample. Although numerous studies in the literature examine the impact of socio-economic variables on voter preference, a study that correlates the results of the 28 May 2023 Presidential Election with socio-economic development data at the district level is unprecedented. In this respect, the study aims to contribute to the existing gap in the literature and offer a new perspective on the relationship between political preferences and socio-economic structure in Türkiye.

The scope of the study is limited to the Presidential Election held on 28 May 2023, and voter preferences for the candidates who competed in this election. The analyses will be conducted using two main datasets that serve as data sources. The first of these is the SEGE-2022 report, published by the Ministry of Industry and Technology in 2022, which includes the socio-economic development levels of 973 districts. The second dataset is a compilation, by the researcher, of the official results of the 28 May 2023 Presidential Election from the Supreme Election Council (YSK), organized at the district level. These two datasets will be merged using statistical analysis techniques, and the relationship between the districts' socio-economic development indices and the votes cast for the incumbent and opposition candidates will be examined.

In this context, first, the concepts of voter preference and socio-economic development will be addressed within a theoretical framework, and the relevant literature will be examined in detail. Subsequently, using the SEGE-2022 report and the results of the 28 May 2023 Presidential Election obtained from the YSK, the relationship between socio-economic development level and the votes cast for the incumbent and opposition candidates will be analyzed at the district level. Finally, the findings will be evaluated in light of the existing literature, and conclusions will be drawn about the relationship between voter preference and socio-economic development, specifically in the context of the aforementioned election. A better understanding of the socio-economic foundations of voter preferences has the potential to assist political parties and candidates in developing their strategies and reaching voter bases more effectively. Therefore, this study will also shed light on future studies on democracy, voter preference, and political participation in Türkiye.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In its political sense, voter refers to individuals with the right to vote; voting signifies the indication of the desired candidate or the expression of a positive/negative opinion towards the candidate; and election denotes the process of determining representatives (Collin, 2004). In this sense, voter preference can be defined as a concept expressing individuals' attitudes and preference towards political parties, candidates, or policies. Analyses of voter preference, therefore, play a critical role in understanding and predicting the political outcomes of elections in democratic systems. Indeed, elections are the fundamental mechanism by which politicians come to office in democratic systems. In other words, in democratic countries, both incumbent and opposition actors are appointed by voters. However, the basis on which voters make their choices—in other words, whom they vote for, why, and for what reason—remains a subject of debate.

Socio-economic development, in a general sense, is a multidimensional concept that refers to the level of progress a society has achieved in both social and economic terms. This concept is not limited to narrow measures such as economic growth or per capita income; it also encompasses other elements of human life, including education, health, quality of life, infrastructure, technological progress, equitable income distribution, and social welfare (United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], 2020). In the literature, socio-economic development level is generally assessed using measurement tools such as human development indices (e.g., the United Nations Human Development Index - HDI) or multidimensional poverty indices (Alkire & Santos, 2014). For example, Amartya Sen's (1999) Capability Approach considers socio-economic development through the freedoms individuals possess and their capacities to shape their lives. This approach associates socio-economic development not only with material well-being but also with the social and economic opportunities necessary for individuals to realize their potential. Similarly, Douglass North's (1991) institutional economics approach also emphasizes the role of institutional structures (e.g., the legal system,

property rights, governance mechanisms, etc.) that influence socio-economic development. Socio-economic development is also examined in the context of regional and global inequalities. For instance, Immanuel Wallerstein's (1974) world-systems theory attempts to explain how development is distributed on a global scale, taking into account the economic and social inequalities between core, semi-periphery, and periphery countries. In this context, it can be accepted that socio-economic development is a complex process shaped by structural dynamics at both the national and international levels. Therefore, it should be stated that socio-economic development is a multidimensional concept encompassing the interaction between economic growth, social welfare, institutional structures, and individual freedoms (Stiglitz et al., 2009).

Efforts to understand voter preferences have already generated a significant body of literature. Studies focusing on the questions of why and on what basis voters cast their ballots have provided a specific theoretical framework for the topic. Considering these studies, it is evident that sociological (Columbia School), socio-psychological (Michigan School), and economic (rational choice school) approaches stand out in the analysis of voter preference (Akgün, 2000). The sociological approach posits that fundamental social divisions within society influence voter preference. The socio-psychological approach, in contrast, concentrates on the individual rather than society, arguing that party affiliation, acquired during the process of political socialization influenced by family and environment, determines voters' preferences (Ezikoğlu, 2024). For example, Raphael Ventura's (2001) study, which emphasizes the direct determining role of parents on voter preference, can be considered in this vein. The economic approach, on the other hand, emphasizes that voters intend to make the most beneficial choice for themselves by conducting a cost-benefit analysis. Accordingly, voters evaluate the economic performance of the incumbent based on its impact on their own economic situation and vote accordingly (Heywood, 2007).

The relationship between voter preference and socio-economic development level is also a frequently examined topic in the political science and sociology literature. The effects of voters' socio-economic development levels on their voting behaviors have been debated for many years within the context of the approaches mentioned above. The sociological approach maintains that socio-economic characteristics of voters, such as education, income, and occupation, have a decisive influence on their voting behaviors. The pioneering studies of the Columbia School emphasize the impact of sociological factors on voter preferences. For instance, in their study The People's Choice, Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet (1968) showed that voters' preferences are significantly influenced by their social contexts and group affiliations. Likewise, Saenger (1945) discovered that both religion and socioeconomic status play important roles in shaping voter preferences. Weakliem (2000) also found that individuals with higher education levels were more likely to support liberal parties. Alderman et al. (2009) analyzed a range of demographic factors that impact voting behavior in U.S. cities. The study revealed that race, income, geographic location, marital status, and population size are important in determining a voter's ideological stance. For instance, they observed that areas with lower income and education levels tended to favor liberal candidates more frequently.

The research conducted by the Michigan School also highlighted the role of socio-economic factors in explaining voter preferences. In their book, The American Voter, Campbell et al. (1960) explored how social class and other socio-economic traits impact the development of party loyalty and political views. These investigations indicated that voting behavior is shaped more by social and economic contexts than by rational decision-making. The social identity theory further suggests that voters' political inclinations are influenced by elements pertaining to the social groups and identities they identify with, underscoring the psychological factors affecting voter choices (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). This theory posits that identities related to ethnicity, religion, or class can significantly affect individuals' attitudes towards political parties and candidates.

A significant contributor to the economic perspective, Anthony Downs, in his book An Economic Theory of Democracy (1957), investigates how voter preferences align with rational choice theory. Downs (1957) suggests that voters, operating as rational individuals aiming to enhance their self-interest, decide on their voting patterns based on the personal advantages offered by candidates. Accordingly, voters' preferences are shaped primarily by economic interests and benefits. Inglehart's (1977; 1997) studies also draw attention to the relationship between voter preference and socio-

economic development level. Inglehart argues that increasing socio-economic development leads voters to place greater emphasis on post-materialist values such as freedom, democracy, and the environment, rather than material concerns. In other words, in his book The Silent Revolution, Inglehart (1977) posits that in advanced industrial societies, as material well-being increases, voters' priorities shift, and post-materialist values gain importance. In Modernization and Postmodernization (1997), Inglehart further develops this thesis, arguing that cultural change and the evolution of values have a significant impact on political behavior, and suggesting that voters with higher levels of socio-economic development may be more likely to support parties that advocate for post-materialist values.

Studies focusing on Türkiye after the transition to a multi-party system have also focused on the impact of socio-economic development level on voter preferences, revealing different dimensions of this relationship. A research study by Özbudun and Tachau (1975) classified the provinces in Türkiye based on their economic development levels and determined that these levels significantly influenced voters' political party choices. The findings reveal that varying political party preferences emerged in regions with higher economic development. This suggests that economic factors must be considered when assessing voter preferences. Kalaycıoğlu (1994), in his research titled Elections and Party Preferences in Turkey: Changes and Continuities in the 1990s, examined the shifts in voter preferences in Türkiye during the 1990s. The results showed that factors such as urbanization, education, and income levels influenced voter preferences in distinct ways. Specifically, it was identified that voters residing in urban areas with higher education levels were more inclined to support parties advocating for liberal and economic reforms, while those living in rural regions were more likely to back parties that emphasized traditional values.

Tayyar (2012) further demonstrated that urbanization, education, and income influenced voting behavior for different political parties in elections held between 2002 and 2011, arguing that the likelihood of voting for the incumbent increased in regions with higher urbanization rates. Esmer (2002) discovered in his research on voting preferences in Türkiye that the rate of urbanization was a crucial factor. Özler (2000) revealed that the political party preferences of those residing in gecekondus (informal settlements) evolved over time. For example, it was observed that in the 1960s, right-wing parties garnered support from this demographic, while in the 1970s, the center-left Republican People's Party (CHP) attracted their backing. Akarca and Tansel (2007) investigated how various socio-economic factors—such as growth rates, average education levels, urbanization rates, net migration rates, and female employment outside of agriculture—could predict voting shares in the 1995 general elections. Their research concluded that these economic and social factors had a significant impact on party preferences among voters at the provincial level. This supports the idea that socio-economic indicators are vital in influencing the political choices of voters.

Çarkoğlu and Toprak's (2000) research, titled Religion, Society and Politics in Turkey, indicated that declining economic conditions diminished the electoral support for the ruling party. The study highlighted that voters, particularly those residing in rural regions and valuing religious beliefs more highly, tended to favor conservative parties. Akgün (2000), analyzing the outcomes of 14 general and local elections from 1954 to 1994 (excluding the years 1961 and 1983), observed that inflation adversely affected the vote percentages for the incumbent party. This study revealed that voters' political inclinations are influenced not solely by economic factors but also by ideological beliefs and party loyalties. Specifically, it was shown that party loyalties held a major sway over voting behavior. It was further noted that economic elements (such as unemployment, inflation, and income distribution) significantly impacted voters' choices. Sezgin's (2007) research, which assessed the influence of the economy on Turkish voters' preferences between 1998 and 2003, similarly found that voters responded more rapidly to negative economic changes than to positive ones, thus emphasizing a tendency towards punishment according to the reward/punishment hypothesis. Sezgin illustrated that economic indicators like unemployment, inflation, and income distribution considerably shaped voter preferences. Notably, it was found that during times of deteriorating economic circumstances, voters displayed a reactive stance toward the ruling party and gravitated towards opposition parties. Sezgin (2007) supported this claim by stating that citizens' trust in the coalition government consisting of the Democratic Left Party, Motherland Party, and Nationalist Movement Party was between 25-35% until the crisis in 2001, but fell to 10% after the crisis. Çinko

(2006) also emphasizes that voter preferences are significantly influenced by economic factors, but that social, cultural, ideological, and psychological factors should also be taken account. The study found out that in periods of economic problems, economic dynamics play a more critical role in determining voter preference.

In his analysis titled Economic Evaluations vs. Ideology: Diagnosing the Sources of Electoral Change in Turkey 2002–2011, Çarkoğlu (2012) utilized national surveys from 2002, 2007, and 2011 to investigate how economic assessments influence voter behavior. The findings indicated that during times of economic decline, voters tended to react negatively towards the ruling party and shifted their support to opposition parties. Moreover, Çarkoğlu (2012) emphasized that ideological aspects also significantly influenced voter preferences. In a recent study, Çağlar Ezikoğlu (2024) explores the economic voting patterns of Turkish voters and asserts that after the 2008 general elections, the impact of economic factors on voter choices diminished. Instead, it highlights that ideological beliefs and the role of leadership became more prominent. Ezikoğlu's (2024) research argues that during the elections of the 1980s and 1990s, the economy was a key determinant of voter choice, but this influence has lessened since the 2000s. Adem and Tokgöz (2022) found that macroeconomic factors like inflation, unemployment, and growth rates had a meaningful impact on voter preferences in Türkiye, although employment rates and consumer confidence did not significantly influence election outcomes from 1983 to 2018. These results imply that voters are more responsive to certain macroeconomic indicators, and that economic voting behavior is influenced by particular variables.

Erdem Aytaç (2020) investigated economic voting behavior in recent elections, emphasizing the role of partisanship in shaping economic assessments. The research revealed that voters' economic perceptions and choices are closely linked to their political affiliations, indicating that partisanship can impact economic voting behavior. In a study by Deniz et al. (2021), the distribution of votes for the AK Party in parliamentary elections post-2002 was analyzed, highlighting that socio-economic elements like inflation, unemployment, and per capita GDP growth played a significant role in shaping voter inclinations toward the AK Party. Furthermore, they noted that these factors had a stronger effect in provinces where the AK Party held considerable support, as opposed to eastern areas predominantly populated by Kurds. This scenario illustrates that the influence of socio-economic variables can differ based on regional and demographic contexts, emphasizing the importance of considering ideological influences.

Gündem (2023) analyzed how beliefs, economic conditions, and spatial regimes affected voting behavior in Türkiye from 2007 to 2018, discovering that socio-economic elements, particularly local unemployment and religious conservatism, had a notable impact on voter preferences. Gündem (2023) also states that Center-Periphery dynamics affected AK Party voting behavior more than national economic conditions. This finding suggests that regional differences and socio-cultural factors should also be considered when analyzing voter preferences. Baslevent and Kirmanoğlu (2016) show that socio-demographic characteristics, including education and urbanization, significantly affect voter preferences in Türkiye, especially concerning the incumbent AK Party. Both international and Türkiye-specific scientific literature provide strong and consistent findings that socio-economic variables influence voter preferences. Although the manifestations and intensity of this influence vary, the determining role of socio-economic factors on voter preference cannot be denied.

3. METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS

This study fundamentally utilizes two datasets. The first is the SEGE-2022 report, prepared by the Ministry of Industry and Technology in 2022. This report generated SEDI scores for 973 districts. The SEDI was produced from data on 56 variables grouped into eight dimensions: demography, employment and social security, education, health, finance, competitiveness, innovation, and quality of life. Examples of these variables include urbanization rate, social assistance rate per capita, university graduate rate, number of doctors per capita, number of bank branches per capita, value of agricultural products per capita, number of patent applications per capita, and passport ownership rate. According to the SEDI, districts were classified into six levels, ranging from 1 to 6. Detailed information is provided in the table below.

Table 1: Distribution of Districts by SEDI Development Level

Development Level	Index Value (IV)	Number of Districts
1	IV ≥ 1,632	67
2	1,632 > IV ≥ 0,396	173
3	0,396 > IV ≥ -0,173	175
4	-0,173 > IV ≥ -0,493	215
5	-0,493 > IV ≥ -0,824	222
6	-0,824 > IV	121

Source: (Turkish Ministry of Industry and Technology, 2022: 33)

As the second dataset, this study utilizes voter preferences from the second round of the Presidential Election held on May 28, 2023, as these represent the final results. The data were obtained from the Supreme Election Council's database, and only the official results of votes cast within Türkiye were considered. Accordingly, the total number of valid votes cast domestically was 51,418,556, and the voter turnout rate was 85.72%.

The approach adopted in this study, taking into account the existing literature, aligns with the arguments put forth by the economic approach. According to Downs (1957), when voting for either the incumbent or the opposition, voters make their decisions based on an expectation principle, evaluating the current economic situation in the case of the incumbent and the potential future economic situation in the case of the opposition. Accordingly, it is argued that the positive/negative performance of the incumbent regarding the level of socio-economic development influences voters when making their choice. In other words, voters may make choices based on their socio-economic development levels. Based on this, the study's main hypothesis is derived: voters will either desire the continuation or change of the existing order depending on their positive/negative assessment of their socio-economic development level. In this study, the continuation of the existing order is defined as support for the incumbent, while change is defined as support for the opposition. The relationship between socio-economic indicators and voter preferences, on the other hand, can generally be understood as the former determining the latter. It is also accepted that voters cast their votes after making an analysis, involving many variables, of whether the incumbent's policies have had a positive or negative impact on the level of socio-economic development (Telatar, 1998). Therefore, a perspective that combines all three approaches attempting to explain voter preference can be placed at the foundation of this study's analytical approach. Considering that a voter's socio-economic development level is closely related both to their social divisions and status, and to their social environment and current economic situation, this approach can be considered beneficial. In this context, it is expected that voters with low levels of socio-economic development will vote for the opposition, while those with high levels will vote for the incumbent; accordingly, the study's main hypothesis is as follows:

H1: The socio-economic development level of districts in Türkiye significantly influences voter preference.

H1a: Voters, depending on their socio-economic development level, exhibit rewarding or punishing preference in their preferences for the incumbent /opposition candidate. This hypothesis posits that voters with high socio-economic development will increasingly prefer the incumbent candidate, while those with low socio-economic development will increasingly prefer the opposition candidate.

H1b: The preference for the opposition candidate increases among voters in districts with low socio-economic development levels. This hypothesis is based on the assumption that voters in districts with low socio-economic development will turn to the opposition with an expectation of change.

In this study, which examines the relationship between the socio-economic development level of districts and voter preferences in the second round of the Presidential Election on May 28, 2023, voter preference, as the dependent variable, is defined as a dichotomous (dummy) variable that takes the value of '1' in districts where President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan (the incumbent candidate) won, and '0' in districts where Kemal Kılıçdaroğlu (the opposition candidate) won.

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & Incumbent \\ 0 & Opposition \end{pmatrix}$$

The socio-economic development level of the districts, as the independent variable, was measured using the index values from the SEGE-2022 report. Because the SEDI is a composite indicator encompassing numerous socio-economic variables (demography, employment, education, health, competitiveness, finance, accessibility, quality of life, etc.), no additional control variables were used in the analysis. It was determined that the SEGE-2022 index scores for the districts did not conform to a normal distribution (see Table 2, Jarque-Bera test results); therefore, the assumptions of parametric tests (such as Pearson correlation, t-test, linear regression) were not met. Consequently, non-parametric analysis methods were chosen to examine the relationship between the variables. In this context, Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (Spearman's rho) was calculated to determine the direction and strength of the relationship between the SEDI values and voter preferences. Spearman's correlation is a non-parametric test that measures the ordinal relationship between variables and does not require the assumption of a normal distribution

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for the Index

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6	Country Level
Mean	2.644	0.897	0.053	-0.343	-0.645	-1.029	-4.11e-06
Median	2.334	0.844	0.037	-0.352	-0.630	-1.013	-0.290
Maximum	6.959 (Şişli)	1.581 (Yunusemre)	0.379 (Bergama)	-0.178 (Espiye)	-0.500 (İkizdere)	-0.831 (Göle)	6.959 (Şişli)
Minimum	1.632 (Narlıdere)	0.396 (Toroslar)	-0.173 (Kurşunlu)	-0.493 (Güdül)	-0.824 (Silvan)	-1.447 (Harran)	-1.447 (Harran)
Standard Deviation	1.154	0.336	0.161	0.097	0.095	0.145	0.999
Skewness	2.102	0.450	0.418	0.130	-0.259	-0.457	2.175
Kurtosis	7.534	2.153	2.075	1.708	1.865	2.313	10.799
Jarque-Bera	106.744 (0.00)[a]	11.004 (0.00)[a]	11.328 (0.00)[a]	15.560 (0.00)[a]	14.403 (0.00)[a]	6.595 (0.03)[b]	3233.68 (0.00)[a]

p<0.01 a, p<0.05 b

In the SEDI, the highest standard deviation is found in Level 1, and the lowest standard deviation is in Level 5. Levels 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 are positively skewed with respect to the districts of whole country, while other levels are negatively skewed. Level 1 and the entire country have a leptokurtic distribution of tails (high peak), whereas the others have a platykurtic distribution (low peak). According to the Jarque-Bera test, none of the levels, nor the country as a whole, follow a normal distribution.

Table 3: Correlations

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6	Country Level
				Voter Preferences			
Index	-0.170 (0.168)	-0.064 (0.400)	-0.221 (0.00)[a]	-0.097 (0.152)	0.138 (0.038)[b]	0.156 (0.085)[c]	-0.249 (0.00)[a]

p<0.01 a, p<0.05 b, p<0.1 c

In this study, the relationship between the districts' socio-economic development levels (SEGE-2022) and voter preferences in the second round of the May 28, 2023 Presidential Election was examined using Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (see Table 3). The findings of the study indicate that socio-economic development played a significant role among the factors shaping voter preferences in the second round of the May 28, 2023 Presidential Election in Türkiye. However, it confirms this effect is not homogeneus and linear, instead, this role differed according to the development level of the districts. In districts with high and medium-low development levels (Levels 1, 2, and 4), no statistically significant relationship was found between the SEDI and voter preference (p > 0.05). This suggests that above a certain threshold, the determinative effect of socio-economic development on voter preference diminishes, and voter preference may be shaped by other factors such as ideology, party affiliation, leader image, and demographic characteristics.

In districts with a medium-low level of development (Level 3), a negative and weak, but statistically significant, correlation was found between the SEDI and voter preference (r = -0.221, p < 0.01). This finding indicates that voters in these districts tended to favor the opposition candidate, which may be related to dissatisfaction with current economic conditions and incumbent policies.

In districts with low levels of development (Levels 5 and 6), a positive and weak, but statistically significant, correlation was observed between the SEDI and voter preference (r = 0.138, p < 0.05 for Level 5; r = 0.156, p < 0.1 for Level 6). This indicates that voters in these districts voted in favor of the incumbent, which can also be interpreted as voters attributing relative improvements in socio-economic development to the incumbent's policies and tending to reward the incumbent. Additionally, this demographic of voters might rely more heavily on elements like social aid, availability of public services, and governmental assistance, which could contribute to their support for the ruling party due to the significant value they place on these services.

When the entire country is considered, a negative and weak, but statistically significant, correlation was found between the SEDI and voter preference (r = -0.249, p < 0.01). This general trend can be interpreted as indicating that voters with higher socio-economic development levels across Türkiye tended to prefer the opposition. In other words, it can be stated that the 2023 elections indicate the presence of widespread dissatisfaction with the socio-economic level across Türkiye, and that this situation created a voter movement in favor of the opposition parties.

The study's findings offer an opportunity to evaluate the validity and interrelationships of different theoretical approaches to explaining voter preference, specifically within the Turkish context. The findings suggest that no single theoretical approach is sufficient to fully explain voter preference, and that a combined assessment of multiple theoretical approaches is necessary. The assumption underlying the economic voting approach (Downs, 1957), which posits that voters act as rational actors seeking to maximize their own economic interests by voting for the party most aligned with those interests, is broadly consistent with the study's findings. However, a narrow interpretation of this theory—"voters satisfied with the current economic situation support the incumbent, while those dissatisfied support the opposition"—is insufficient to explain, on its own, the positive relationship observed in districts with low levels of socio-economic development (Levels 5 and 6). Although voters in these districts may, at first glance, appear to be acting irrationally by favoring the incumbent party despite relatively worse economic conditions, this preference can be explained when the economic voting theory is considered from a broader perspective. Voters with low levels of development, even if not in an absolutely good economic situation, may perceive a relative improvement compared to the past, attribute this improvement to the policies of the incumbent, and tend to reward the incumbent. Furthermore, the fact that this group of voters may have experienced partial economic improvement thanks to social assistance, public services, and other government support, and the high marginal utility of these types of support, may increase dependence on the incumbent party. Voters' rational choices are not limited to the current economic situation but may also include future expectations, economic stability, and social and cultural factors. Therefore, voters at low levels of development may be considering their long-term interests, believing in the incumbent party's promises to maintain economic stability and provide better conditions in the future. For these reasons, the findings in Level 5 and 6 districts do not completely contradict economic voting theory; on the contrary, they demonstrate that voter rationality is multidimensional and that different priorities may apply to different socio-economic groups. Indeed, the negative relationship observed in districts with a medium-low level of development (Level 3) indicates that economic voting theory alone cannot fully explain the situation, as voters may tend to punish the incumbent when their expectations are not met.

The absence of a significant relationship between the SEDI and voter preference in districts with development levels 1, 2, and 4 suggests that socio-economic factors may lose their primacy in determining preferences in these districts. Furthermore, this can also be interpreted as voters potentially adopting a pragmatic approach, leaning towards either incumbent or opposition parties. At this point, the sociological approach (Columbia School) (Lazarsfeld, Berelson, & Gaudet, 1968; Berelson, Lazarsfeld, & McPhee, 1954) and the socio-psychological approach (Michigan School) (Campbell et al., 1960) come into play. The lack of a significant relationship in developed districts

suggests that, in addition to economic factors, sociological and socio-psychological factors are also important. Ezikoğlu's (2024) study is relevant in this regard, because political polarization and identity politics in Türkiye may lead voters to vote according to their ideological and identity-based affiliations, which may overshadow the effect of socio-economic development or lead to different reactions at different levels of development. Therefore, the significant role of other factors, such as the leader factor, in voter preferences should not be overlooked. The personality traits, leadership styles, discourses, and public images of President Erdoğan and opposition candidate Kılıçdaroğlu may have influenced voters' preferences independently of, or in interaction with, economic and social factors.

On the other hand, Inglehart (1977) argues from a post-materialist perspective that as socio-economic development increases, voters begin to value post-materialist values more than material concerns. Accordingly, it could be argued that voters in developed districts have become less sensitive to economic factors and, therefore, independent of their socio-economic development level. However, more empirical evidence is needed to definitively assess the validity of this theory in the specific context of Türkiye. Consequently, because the dataset used in this study does not include direct measures of social divisions and party affiliation, it was not possible to fully test the validity of these theories. Nevertheless, the possibility that voters in developed districts become insensitive to socio-economic development and vote in accordance with their social identities, values, and party affiliations should not be ignored.

The study's primary finding is that voter preferences in Türkiye's May 28, 2023, Presidential Election were related to the SEDI, but this effect was neither linear nor homogeneous. This general finding largely aligns with the results of other studies in the literature, while also offering some unique contributions. For example, the studies of Akarca and Tansel (2007), Doğan and Tokgöz (2022), and Kozal et al. (2023) similarly emphasize that voter preference in Türkiye is influenced by socio-economic factors, but that this influence is not simple or unidirectional. Moreover, the finding of Akarca and Tansel (2007), Akgün (2000), and Sezgin (2007) that poor economic performance leads voters to vote for opposition parties is generally consistent with this study's finding of a negative correlation between the SEDI and voter preference across the country as a whole. In particular, the finding by Çarkoğlu and Toprak (2000) that deteriorating economic conditions erode the vote shares of incumbent parties offers an important perspective for understanding voter preference in contemporary Türkiye, despite the intervening time. Indeed, the negative correlation identified across the country in this study also points to a voter mobilization against the incumbent. In this context, both studies, despite being conducted in different periods and with different methodologies, confirm the determining role of economic conditions on voter preference and the potential risks they pose for incumbent parties. However, this finding does not hold for districts in Levels 5 and 6. But Çarkoğlu and Toprak also highlight the tendency of voters in rural areas to favor conservative parties. This study, by finding a positive relationship between the SEDI and voter preference in districts with low levels of socio-economic development (Levels 5 and 6), reveals that voters tend to favor the incumbent candidate with conservative leanings. When these two findings are considered together, it can be concluded that rural areas and socio-economically disadvantaged districts are home to a voter profile that favors conservative values and incumbent parties, and that this relationship has remained relatively consistent over time. However, further in-depth examination is needed regarding the change in this relationship over time, its continuity in different periods, and its interaction with other socio-political factors.

While the findings of this study suggest statistically significant relationships between district-level socio-economic development and voter preference, it is important to note that these are correlational findings and do not establish direct causality. Given that voter preference is a complex phenomenon influenced by a multitude of interacting factors, a simplistic cause-and-effect interpretation would be misleading. A nuanced assessment of the results, therefore, necessitates consideration of Türkiye's geographical diversity, cultural variations, and unique political context, as well as the specific characteristics of individual districts. More thorough, district-level studies would lead to a deeper insight into these results and enable the formulation of different interpretations.

The lack of a statistically significant relationship between SEDI and voter preferences in developed districts at levels 1 and 2 calls for a more thorough investigation, considering the distinct

socio-economic and demographic attributes of these regions. These districts are usually characterized by elevated income, advanced infrastructure, and easy access to education and healthcare services. This environment may lead to a scenario where economic concerns play a lesser role in shaping voter preferences, as fundamental needs are typically met. Therefore, it could be argued that non-economic factors—such as ideological beliefs, social identity, cultural values, leadership, and party loyalty—have a stronger impact on voters in these regions. This finding aligns with Inglehart's (1977) post-materialism theory, which suggests that as material conditions improve, individuals start to prioritize post-materialist values more. Additionally, the lower need for social support in these districts indicates a diminished reliance on government assistance, potentially reducing any inherent inclination towards the incumbent. The positive net migration rate observed in most of these districts implies a diversification of the voter base, thereby adding complexity to electoral behavior. The geographical concentration of these districts in the Marmara, Aegean, Central Anatolia, and Mediterranean regions also underscores the importance of considering regional variations in voter preference.

The negative relationship observed between the SEDI and voter preference in level 3 districts can be more comprehensively understood by taking into account the socio-economic structure and voter profile of these areas. Although these districts are more evenly distributed across the country, a concentration is notable in the Black Sea region. Comprising 12.7% of the total population, voters in these districts are likely to possess similar concerns and expectations, given the comparable mean values for variables such as education, housing, health, quality of life, and finance. However, the disproportionately low share of manufacturing and service sector businesses within these districts suggests that voters may have been more significantly impacted by the economic situation, potentially fostering a desire for change and a shift in support towards opposition.

The absence of a statistically significant correlation in level 4 districts suggests that socio-economic development may not be a decisive factor in voters' decision-making processes. These districts are more widely dispersed across Türkiye, exhibiting less pronounced regional concentrations. This may indicate that local dynamics and district-specific factors exert a stronger influence on voter preference. Furthermore, the smaller population size and net out-migration observed in these districts have likely altered the demographic structure and socio-economic expectations of the electorate. In particular, the out-migration of young and educated individuals may have led to a voter profile characterized by an older, less educated, and more economically vulnerable population. This, in turn, could result in social assistance, pensions, and agricultural subsidies playing a more significant role in shaping voter preference, potentially leading to choices in favor of the incumbent. Conversely, the relatively low economic indicators (e.g., share of manufacturing and service sector businesses, commercial sales, debit/credit card usage) in these districts suggest that meeting basic needs and economic security are not entirely inconsequential for voters and, to some extent, continue to shape preferences.

Level 5 districts, while demonstrating a more widespread distribution across Türkiye, are concentrated in the Central Anatolia and Black Sea regions. These districts are characterized by low population levels and consistent out-migration. Economically, they exhibit considerable weakness in the manufacturing and service sectors, with undeveloped tourism and organized industrial zones (OIZs). These characteristics suggest that voters in 5th-tier districts may be more likely to attribute even limited economic improvements to the incumbent party and may exhibit greater dependence on social assistance, public services, and government support. The ongoing out-migration, especially of young and educated individuals, may result in a voter profile that is older, less educated, and more economically precarious, potentially amplifying the influence of conservative values and established political preferences. Consequently, this could have predisposed voters against change. Level 6 districts, representing the most socio-economically disadvantaged group, are concentrated in the Eastern Anatolia and Southeastern Anatolia regions. Characterized by very low populations and near-universal out-migration, these districts exhibit minimal economic activity and a very high fertility rate. This context suggests that voters endure challenging conditions, possess a heightened dependence on government assistance, and demonstrate significant social, cultural, and demographic differences from other regions. The support for the incumbent party among voters in these districts cannot be attributed

to economic factors alone; a multidimensional assessment, incorporating regional, ethnic, cultural, and religious considerations, is necessary.

4. CONCLUSION

Democratic systems empower citizens to shape the composition of the governing body. In other words, in parliamentary democracies, elections are the means by which governments come to power or are removed. When the time comes to vote, voters convey to the political system, through elections, either their desire for the continuation of the current administration, that is, the preservation of the established order, or their demands for change. Regardless of the direction of preference, past experiences or future expectations, and, as mentioned above, many factors influence the choices made. In Türkiye, which has practiced democracy since 1945, voters have been the sole actor determining the incumbent and opposition, except for certain intervals, up to the present day. This study analyzed the relationship between Turkish voters' preferences for the incumbent or opposition and their socio-economic development level, specifically in the context of the May 28, 2023, Presidential Election.

When the study's findings and hypotheses are evaluated, the results of Spearman's rank correlation analysis partially support H1. A negative and weak, but statistically significant, correlation was found between the SEDI and voter preference for the entire country. This indicates that, in general, as socio-economic development increases, the preference for the opposition candidate increases. However, analyses based on the development levels of districts reveal that this relationship is more complex.

In districts with high levels of development, no significant relationship was found between the SEDI and voter preference. This suggests that voter preferences in these districts are determined by factors other than socio-economic development. In districts with medium-low levels of development, a negative and significant relationship was found between the SEDI and voter preference; this means that as socio-economic development increases in these districts, voters tend to favor the opposition candidate, in other words, they punish the incumbent. In districts with low levels of development, a positive and significant relationship was found between the SEDI and voter preference. This can be interpreted as voters in these districts tending to favor the incumbent candidate as socio-economic development increases, that is, they reward the incumbent.

Hypothesis H1a, which posits that voters exhibit rewarding or punishing preference towards the incumbent based on their socio-economic development level, presents differentiated results depending on the districts' level of development. While no significant relationship was found in highly developed districts, voters in medium-low development districts were found to punish the incumbent, whereas those in low-development districts were found to reward the incumbent. Hypothesis H1b was only confirmed for districts with medium-low levels of development. Hypothesis H1b, which posits that as the level of socio-economic development decreases, voters' preference for the opposition candidate will increase, was only confirmed for districts with medium-low levels of development (Level 3). While no significant relationship was found in highly developed districts, the opposite relationship (positive) was observed in districts with low levels of development.

The study's findings indicate that socio-economic development level is one of the significant factors influencing voter preferences in Türkiye, but this influence is complex and multidimensional, rather than a direct and simple causal relationship. While this relationship weakens or becomes statistically insignificant in districts with high levels of development, it becomes more pronounced in districts with medium-low and low levels of development. Furthermore, the direction of this relationship varies depending on the socio-economic development level of the districts. It is understood that voter preference is shaped by the interaction of various factors, such as rational choices, identity, value judgments, and emotional responses, and these factors may have different weights for different socio-economic groups. In this multi-layered interaction, the specific political, economic, and social context of Türkiye is also considered to play a determining role. In particular, it can be assumed that in districts with low levels of socio-economic development, the leader factor and the election campaign were effective in the success of the incumbent candidate. This situation suggests that opposition parties need to review their strategies for expanding their voter base in these districts.

When evaluating the study's findings, some methodological and data-related limitations should be taken into account. First, because the analysis is limited to the results of the second round of the May 28, 2023, Presidential Election, the generalizability of the findings to other election periods or different political contexts should be treated with caution. Second, numerous factors (such as voters' demographic profiles, political attitudes, party affiliation, leader perception, campaign strategies employed) may influence voter preferences, and these factors were not controlled for in the analysis. Therefore, the findings regarding the relationship between socio-economic development and voter preferences exclude the potential effects of these external factors.

Third, the SEDI, used to measure the socio-economic development level of districts, may not, by its nature, reflect all aspects of this complex phenomenon; factors that are outside the scope of the index or are not sufficiently represented may also influence voter preference. Fourth, the study's dataset consists of aggregated data at the district level; this eliminates the possibility of directly examining the effects of individual voters' socio-economic characteristics (income, education level, etc.) on their voting behavior. Finally, this study, by its nature, is a correlational analysis and does not claim to establish a causal relationship between the variables. However, the 2023 Presidential Elections took place during a period in which Türkiye experienced serious economic problems, such as high inflation, high cost of living, and inequalities in income distribution. This negative economic climate may have led to widespread economic dissatisfaction among voters and significantly influenced their preferences. Indeed, the study's findings indicate a negative relationship between the SEDI and voter preference across the entire country, meaning that as socio-economic development increases, support for the opposition candidate increases.

Finally, in order to reach more definitive and generalizable conclusions, future studies should, first and foremost, longitudinally examine the impact of socio-economic development on voter preferences in Türkiye's subsequent presidential elections. Furthermore, a comparative analysis with the results of similar studies in other countries governed by a presidential system (e.g., the United States), and the conduct of studies supported by qualitative data, would contribute to a more in-depth understanding of the issue. Moreover, the statistical relationship found between socio-economic development level and voter preferences should not necessarily be interpreted as a cause-and-effect relationship. These limitations point to important areas of research for future studies.

Considering these limitations, the study's findings offer a valuable starting point for understanding the socio-economic foundations of voter preferences in Türkiye. However, to achieve more comprehensive and causal inferences, further research is needed that controls for more variables, covers different elections and time periods, uses individual-level data, and applies different analytical methods.

Ethics Statement: In this study, no method requiring the permission of the "Ethics Committee" was used.
Etik Beyan: Bu çalışmada "Etik Kurul" izini alınmasını gerektiren bir yöntem kullanılmamıştır

---

REFERENCES

Abadan, N. (1965). Ankara şehir nüfusunun siyasi eğilimlerinden bazı örnekler nisan 1964. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, *20*(02), 495-516. https://doi.org/10.1501/SBFder_0000000559

Akarca, A. T., & Tansel, A. (2007). Social and economic determinants of Turkish voter choice in the 1995 parliamentary election. *The Institute for the Study of Labor No*: 2881.

Akgün, B. (2000). Türkiye'de seçmen davranışı: Partizan tutumlar, ideoloji ve ekonomik faktörlerin oy vermeye etkisi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Meslek Yüksekokulu Dergisi*, *1*(4), 75 – 92.

Akgün, B. (2001). Türkiye'de siyasal güven: Nedenleri ve sonuçları. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, *56*(4), 1-23.

Alderman, J., et al. (2009). The most conservative and liberal cities in the United States. The Bay Area Center for Voting Research. https://dumitruluinae.ro/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/conservatives-vs-liberal-cities-us.pdf

Alkire, S., & Santos, M. E. (2014). Measuring acute poverty in the developing world: Robustness and scope of the multidimensional poverty index. *World Development*, 59, 251-274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.01.026

Almond, G. & Verba, S. (1989). The civic culture: Political attitudes and democracy in five nations. Sage Publications.

Aydın, K., & Özbek, V. (2004). Ailenin seçmen davranışları üzerindeki etkisi. *Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (8), 144-167.

Aytaç, S. E. (2020). Economic voting during the AKP era in Turkey', in Güneş Murat Tezcür (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Turkish Politics* (pp. 319–340), (2022; online edn, Oxford Academic, https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190064891.013.6

Baslevent, C., & Kirmanoğlu, H. (2016). Economic voting in Turkey: Perceptions, expectations, and the party choice. Turkish Studies, 17(1), 130-150.* https://doi.org/10.1080/23760818.2015.1099784

Berelson, B. R., Lazarsfeld, P. F., & McPhee, W. N. (1954). Voting: A study of opinion formation in a presidential campaign. University of Chicago Press.

Beren, F. (2013). Seçmen tercihine etki eden faktörler ve seçim güvenliği: Şanlıurfa ili örneği. *Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi*, 8(1), 191-214.

Bruce, N. & Sheth, J. N. (1987). A theory of political choice behavior. Praeger Publications.

Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., Miller, W. E., & Stokes, D. E. (1960). The American voter. Wiley.

Canöz, K. (2010). Seçmen tercihinde aday imajının rolü: 29 Mart 2009 yerel seçimleri öncesinde Konya seçmeni üzerine bir araştırma. *Selçuk İletişim*, *6*(2), 95-114.

Çarkoğlu, A. & Toprak, B. (2000). *Türkiye'de din, toplum ve siyaset.* TESEV Yayınları.

Çarkoğlu, A. (2012). Economic evaluations vs. ideology: Diagnosing the sources of electoral change in Turkey, 2002–2011. *Electoral Studies*, 31(3), 513-521.

Çinko, L. (2006). Seçmen davranışları ile ekonomik performans arasındaki ilişkilerin teorik temelleri ve Türkiye üzerine genel bir değerlendirme. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, *61*(01), 103-116. https://doi.org/10.1501/SBFder_0000001390

Collin, P. H. (2004). *Dictionary of politics and government*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Deniz, P., Karahasan, B. C., & Pinar, M. (2021). Determinants of regional distribution of AKP votes: Analysis of post-2002 parliamentary elections. Regional Science Policy & Practice, 13(4), 1067-1092. https://doi.org/10.1111/rsp3.12383

Doğan, A., & Tokgöz, E. (2022). Seçmen tercihinde ekonomik gelişmelerin rolü: Ekonomik oy verme teorisi bağlamında Türkiye genel seçimleri üzerine bir inceleme. *Gümüşhane Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Elektronik Dergisi*, *10*(2), 1179-1205. https://doi.org/10.19145/e-gifder.1112826

Downs, A. (1957). *An economic theory of democracy*. Harper & Row Publishers.

Esmer, Y. (2002). At the ballot: Determinants of voting behavior. Lynne Rienner Publishers

Euronews. (13.05.2023). *14 Mayıs Cumhurbaşkanlığı seçimi: Nisan ve mayıs ayında yapılan son anketlerin ortalaması kaç?.* https://tr.euronews.com/2023/05/13/14-mayis-cumhurbaskanligi-secimi-nisan-ve-mayis-ayinda-yapilan-son-anketlerin-ortalamasi-k

Ezikoğlu, Ç. (2024). The collapse of economic voting behaviour in Turkish politics. Intellectual Discourse, *32*(1), 393–410.

Fiorina, M. P. (1981). Retrospective voting in American national elections. Yale University Press.

Gülmen, Y. (1979). *Türkiye'de seçmen davranışında ekonomik ve sosyal faktörlerin rolü*. Güryay Matbaacılık.

Gündem, F. (2023). Beliefs, economics, and spatial regimes in voting behavior: The Turkish case, 2007–2018. Humanities & Social Sciences Communications, 10(1), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01584-3

Heywood, A. (2007). *Siyaset*. (Çev. Bekir Berat Özipek vd.). Adres Yayınları.

IndependetTürkçe. (15.05.2023). *Anket firmalarının seçim sınavı: Pek çoğu tahminde sınıfta kaldı.* https://www.indyturk.com/node/631826/haber/anket-firmalar%C4%B1n%C4%B1n-se%C3%A7im-s%C4%B1nav%C4%B1-pek-%C3%A7o%C4%9Fu-tahminde-s%C4%B1n%C4%B1fta-kald%C4%B1

Inglehart, R. (1977). The silent revolution: Changing values and political styles among Western publics. Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, R. (1997). Modernization and postmodernization: Cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies. Princeton University Press.

Kalaycıoğlu, E. (1994). Elections and party preferences in Turkey: Changes and continuities in the 1990s. *Comparative Political Studies*, *27*(3), 402-424. https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414094027003004

Lazarsfeld P., Berelson, B. & Gaudet, H. (1968). *The people's choice: How the voter makes up his mind in a presidential campaign*. Columbia University Press.

Lewis-Beck, M. S., & Stegmaier, M. (2000). Economic determinants of electoral outcomes. Annual Review of Political Science, 3(1), 183-219.

Lipset, S. M. (1960). *Political man: The social bases of politics*. Doubleday & Company Inc.

North, D. C. (1991). Institutions. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *5*(1), 97-112. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.5.1.97

Özbudun, E.& Tachau, Frank (1975). Social change and electoral behavior in Turkey: Toward a 'critical realignment'?. *International Journal of Middle East Studies,* 6(4), 460-480. : https://www.jstor.org/stable/162753

Özler, S. I. (2000). Politics of gecekondu in Turkey: The political choices of urban squatters in national elections. Turkish Studies, 1(2), 39-58.

Öztürk, Ö. (2023). 14 Mayıs 2023 cumhurbaşkanlığı seçimi ve kamuoyu araştırmaları üzerine. *İstanbul Arel Üniversitesi İletişim Çalışmaları Dergisi*, *12*(24): 335-354.

Saenger G. H. (1945). Social status and political behavior. *American Journal of Sociology*, *51*(2), 103-113.

Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. Oxford University Press.

Sezgin, Ş. (2007). Ekonomik oy verme teorisi: Türkiye örneği (1998-2003). *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, *40*(2), 21-38.

Stiglitz, J. E., Sen, A., & Fitoussi, J.-P. (2009). Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/8131721/8131772/Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi-Commission-report.pdf

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Nelson-Hall.

Telatar, F. (1998). Makroekonomi-siyaset ilişkileri: Politik devresel dalgalanmalar. *Ekonomik Yaklaşım*, *9*(31), 37-60.

Thomassen, J. (2005). The European voter: A comparative study of modern democracies. The Oxford University Press.

Turan, İ. (1986). *Siyasal sistem ve siyasal davranış*. Der Yayınları.

Türkiye Sanayi ve Teknoloji Bakanlığı. (2022). İlçelerin *sosyo-ekonomik gelişmişlik sıralaması araştırması* SEGE-2022. Kalkınma Ajansları Genel Müdürlüğü Yayını. https://www.sanayi.gov.tr/merkez-birimi/b94224510b7b/sege/ilce-sege-raporlari

United Nations Development Programme. (2020). Human development report 2020: The next frontier—human development and the Anthropocene. http://hdr.undp.org/en/2020-report

Ventura, R. (2001). Family political socialization in multiparty systems. *Comparative Political Studies*, *34*(6), 666-691. https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414001034006004

Wallerstein, I. (1974). The modern world-system: Capitalist agriculture and the origins of the European world-economy in the sixteenth century. Academic Press.

Weakliem, D. L. (2000). The effect of education on political opinions: An International study. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 13*(2), 141-168.