



SDPI
Sustainable Development Policy Institute

Political Barometer

A study of public opinion - voters' preferences and political parties' popularity across Pakistan

(Phase 2)

Political Barometer

A study of public opinion - voters' preferences and political parties' popularity across Pakistan

(Phase 2)

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
1. Introduction	2
2. Scope and geographical spread	3
3. Research approach and methodology	3
4. Analysis of respondents' voting preferences: the rise and decline of political parties	4
Voting preferences of our respondents for 2008 elections.....	4
Voting preference of our respondents for 2013 elections	5
Responses exhibiting Provincewise voting preference for elections 2008.....	5
Responses exhibiting Province-wise voting preference for elections 2013	6
Responses exhibiting Regional voting preference for elections 2008.....	7
Responses exhibiting Regional voting preference for elections 2013.....	8
Responses exhibiting Urban-Rural voting preference for elections 2008	9
Responses exhibiting Urban-Rural voting preference for elections 2013	9
Responses exhibiting Gender-wise voting preference for elections 2008	10
Responses exhibiting Gender-wise voting preference for elections 2013	10
Responses exhibiting age specific voting preference for elections 2008	11
Responses exhibiting age specific voting preference for elections 2013	11
Responses exhibiting Reasons behind Political Parties popularity in 2008.....	12
Responses exhibiting reasons behind Political Parties popularity in 2013.....	13
Issues facing Pakistan and respondent's perception on which party may resolve those Issues.....	14
Conclusion.....	15
Annex: Acronyms	17
References	18

Preface

The survey and data analysis for political barometer –II concluded one week before the May 2013 general elections in Pakistan. How successful SDPI team has been in capturing people's perceptions and their political preferences would be evident in next 48 hours when people of Pakistan would go for polls to elect their political representatives. However, let me reiterate that a survey with few thousand respondents can never reflect the socio-economic and sociopolitical diversity of a country like Pakistan. The percentage of respondents presented in this report cannot reflect the number of seats in national or any provincial assembly.

The electoral campaign in Pakistan was badly affected by TTP violence particularly in KPK and Karachi. It is hoped that voters of Pakistan would come out to vote for a peaceful Pakistan. Successful elections would be a manifestation of bravery and resilience of citizens.

Towards the end I offer my gratitude to Heinrich Boll Stiftung (HBS) Pakistan in general and Ms Britta Petersen, the Country Director HBS, Pakistan, in particular for supporting the phase two of political barometer.

Dr. Abid Qaiyum Suleri

Executive Director, SDPI

May 9, 2013

Abstract

The report looks at the rise and fall in popularity of political parties across the four provinces of Pakistan. Voters were asked about their political preferences during 2008 elections and then were asked to whom they would vote for in 2013 elections. The analysis takes into account provincial, regional, rural and urban, gender and age specific segregation. Based on the respondents' voting choices in 2013, variations in the popularity of political parties are examined. Finally, the report examines how these variations have affected the political landscape since 2008. A significant change in the country's political landscape clearly emerges from our analysis.

1. Introduction

In Nov 2012, an SDPI team (with the support of HBS) undertook a study of Pakistan's four provinces. Consisting of field surveys, the study was designed to gauge the sociopolitical preferences of people of Pakistan. The survey also investigated the perception of respondents on, which political party in their opinion, can (or cannot) resolve the issues highlighted by them. The study explored the different dimensions and basis of decision-making for voting to a specific political party. It gauged the interactions of different factors and actors for supporting a party. It encompasses a wide range of areas, including culture, media, military, militancy, foreign policy, security policy, role of election commission and so on. The findings of the survey were published by SDPI in Feb 2013, in collaboration with Dawn and Herald (Barometer phase 1). A maximum number of respondents were of the opinion that Pakistan People's Party (PPP) (though perceived as the most corrupt party by the respondents) could solve the problems of foreign policy, economic issues, and militancy. Pakistan Tahreek-e-Insaf (PTI) was perceived as the least corrupt party and was ranked second in terms of a solution provider. It was also observed that there was a decline in number of respondents, who had voted for PPP in 2008 general elections. The loss in PPP support was visibly seen as a gain for PTI. Pakistan Muslim League (Nawaz) had retained its vote bank compared to 2008.

In the run-up to May 2013 general elections, SDPI team conducted another survey during May 2013 to capture any change in voters' perceptions based on political party manifestos, the election campaign, and the role played by media in highlighting the importance and popularity of political parties in the country.

This paper presents the main findings of the second phase of the political Barometer and focuses on four important indicators:

- i. Analysis of public voting perception with respect to regions.
- ii. Analysis of public voting perception with respect to locality (urban and rural).

- iii. Analysis of public voting perception with respect to gender (male and female).
- iv. Analysis of public voting perception with respect to age.

Taking the voting preference for 2008 as a benchmark, it was asked;

1. Who did you vote for in 2008?
2. Who will you vote for in 2013?

2. Scope and geographical spread

The survey was carried out by the survey team in randomly selected urban and rural areas of Pakistan's four provinces. Certain areas with security issues were excluded from the scope of this survey. The target population of this study consists of all registered voters, stratified to match the national average for provincial population, gender ratio, urbanization ratio, and age group.

3. Research approach and methodology

The paper draws on a highly selective body of literature offering reflection and debate on political perception (Bierer *et al.*, 2006; Batool *et al.*, 2009; Keefer *et al.*, 2005; Akramov *et al.*, 2007). For the purposes of geographical coverage, the provinces were divided into regions, and these regions were sub-divided into sample "collection districts". From a total of 52 selected districts of the Punjab, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK), Sindh and Balochistan provinces, 5,700¹ registered voters were selected. The sampling for the respondents' information in selected districts was done on the basis of sample size, with 56% from the Punjab, 23% from Sindh, 5% from Balochistan and 16% from KPK. Registered voters in each province were divided into those representing rural and urban populations, and these amounted to 67% and 33% respectively. Equal weightage was accorded, by selecting 50% male and 50% female registered voters from each province, in order to take into account statistical biases in gender selectivity in urban and rural areas. In addition, to capture voter diversity, the provinces of the Punjab and KPK/FATA were divided into three regions. The former consists of Lower, Upper and Central regions, whereas the later comprises Upper, Central and Lower regions.. Similarly, the province of Sindh was divided into two regions, Sindh 1 and Sindh 2. A multi-stage stratified random sampling technique was adopted in order to strategize the respondents' responses, and to ensure that the sample was reliable and representative.

The process of gathering responses from the respondents involved three distinct stages. In the first stage, 52 electoral districts (24 in the Punjab, 12 in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, 13

¹ The sample size was calculated on the basis of 95% level of significance, 5% margin of error, and with a 0.5 baseline indicator effect.

in Sindh, and 3 in Balochistan) were randomly selected on the basis of geographical classification. In the second stage, each electoral district was classified as either an urban or a rural area on the basis of population proportion relative to its size, as defined by the population census of 1998. In the final stage, the rural and urban areas in each selected electoral district were further proportionally divided into male and female². A simple questionnaire was drawn up for the study. The fieldwork was carried out by the experienced local enumerators while team leaders were responsible for ensuring that the information contained in the questionnaire was free from human error. Subsequently, the respondents' information was coded, for which SPSS (statistical software) was used. After the data had been entered by the experienced SDPI staff, it was coalesced and double checked for human or logical errors.

4. Analysis of respondents' voting preferences: the rise and decline of political parties

The analysis of respondents' responses for different political parties is dealt with using the following schema:

- a) Analysis of respondents' preferences for political parties in the 2008 and 2013 elections.
- b) National, provincial, regional, gender and age specific analysis of respondents' preferences to political parties in the 2008 and 2013 elections.
- c) The aforementioned analysis is performed with reference to the following questions: (i) Who did you vote for in the elections of 2008? (ii) Who will you vote for in the elections of May 2013?

Table 1: Voting preferences of our respondents for 2008 elections

<i>Political Landscape</i>	<i>Responses expressed in terms of voting preferences and popularity</i>
PPP	45%
PML-N	29%
PML-Q	8%
JUIF	4%
ANP	3%
JI	2%
MQM	1%
PML-F	1%
APML	0%
MWM	0%
BNP	0%

² The selection of male and female registered voters from each rural and urban area was made on the basis of a simple random sampling technique.

Others	3%
Independent Candidates	4%
Total	100

The above table gives an indication of the national political landscape and the popularity of political parties by presenting the responses of respondents in terms of their voting preferences for 2008. Results presented in the table above show that 45% of respondents voted for PPP in 2008, turning it the most popular party in the country. We also learnt that 29% of the respondents cast their votes for PML-N, and then came PML-Q. Only 1% of the respondents expressed they had voted for MQM, whose vote bank is restricted to Karachi and a few areas in Sindh, then came all other parties.

Table 2: Voting preference of our respondents for 2013 elections

<i>Political Landscape</i>	<i>Responses expressed in terms of voting preferences and popularity</i>
PML-N	33.4%
PTI	22.2%
PPP	17.4%
JI	4.8%
JUIF	4.2%
PML-F	3.6%
MQM	1.8%
BNP	1.5%
PML-Q	1.3%
ANP	1.1%
MWM	.4%
APML	.2%
Others	4.0%
Independent Candidates	4.3%
Total	100.0 (99.9, rounded to 1000)

As per our respondents' opinion sought one week before the polls of May 2013 (Table 2), PML-N seem to top the political landscape with 33% respondents expressing a preference for it, PPP would be a major loser while PTI would emerge as a third force with 22% respondents favoring this party. Compared with the voter's preference for 2008, PPP has in fact lost almost 22% of their voters in 2013 and this seemed to be a direct gain of PTI. On the other hand, PML-N would gain 4% more votes and emerge as majority party in parliament. PML-Q would be another loser, losing 6% of its voters while political support for other popular parties such as JUIF, and MQM will not be changed significantly.

Table 3: Responses exhibiting Province wise voting preference for elections 2008

Political Landscape	Province (Responses expressed in terms of voting preferences and popularity)			
	Punjab	Sindh	KPK	Balochistan
PPP	37%	77%	29%	38%

³ The number of votes and seats are not uniform in each province hence the average of four provinces does not represent the popularity of any party at national level.

MQM	0%	4%	0%	1%
JUIF	0%	2%	20%	9%
PML-N	45%	8%	10%	11%
JI	1%	1%	5%	15%
PML-Q	11%	4%	2%	8%
APML	0%	0%	0%	0%
MWM	0%	0%	0%	0%
ANP	1%	0%	15%	2%
BNP	0%	0%	0%	6%
Others	2%	0%	4%	6%
Independent Candidate	3%	0%	15%	4%
PML-F	0%	4%	0%	0%
	100%	100%	100%	100%

The above table presents province-wise respondents' voting preferences and political parties' popularity. Majority of our respondents from Sindh, Balochistan and KPK voted for PPP in 2008, whereas majority of the respondents from the Punjab voted for PML-N. Other two popular parties among our respondents in the Punjab were PPP and PML-Q. PML-N and MQM were the second and third popular parties in Sindh respectively; JUI-F and ANP were the second and third popular parties in KPK; whereas JI and PML-N were the other popular parties in Balochistan.

Table 4: Responses exhibiting Province4-wise voting preference for elections 2013

Political landscape	Province			
	Punjab	Sindh	KPK	Balochistan
PPP	9.9%	40.2%	15.2%	2.5%
MQM	0.7%	5.7%	0.2%	0.4%
JUIF	0.1%	4.3%	17.6%	6.4%
PML-N	49.0%	13.1%	9.5%	27.8%
JI	1.8%	1.1%	17.0%	17.4%
PTI	27.7%	10.2%	24.6%	9.6%
PML-Q	1.9%	0.1%	1.2%	1.1%
APML	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.4%
MWM	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%	
ANP	0.1%	0.2%	5.8%	1.4%
BNP	0.1%	0.2%		28.1%
Others	3.8%	5.5%	2.6%	2.1%
PML-F	0.0%	15.2%		0.4%
Independent Candidate	4.2%	3.9%	6.0%	2.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In contrast to voter preferences and the provincial popularity of PPP in 2008, our survey reveals a steep decline in the popularity of PPP. We foresee that although PPP would emerge as the majority party in Sindh, it would lose its monopoly on Sindh (37% of our respondents from Sindh, who voted for PPP in 2008, are not going to vote for it in 2013).

⁴ The number of votes and seats are not uniform in each province hence the average of four provinces does not represent the popularity of any party at national level.

PML-N seems to capitalize its stronghold in the Punjab and has also improved its position in Balochistan and Sindh (where there is an increase in voter preference for the party among our respondents). On the other hand, PTI is emerging as a major political force in the country. Majority of our respondents from KPK would vote for PTI in 2013 where it would damage ANP and JUI-F. PTI is also emerging as the 2nd most popular party in the Punjab, and would claim a reasonable share (from PPP) in Sindh as well.

Table 5: Responses exhibiting Regional⁵ voting preference for elections 2008

Political landscape	Region								
	Lower Punjab	Central Punjab	Upper Punjab	Sindh1	Sindh 2	Lower KPK	Upper KPK/FATA	Central KPK	Balochistan
PPP	40%	39%	20%	81%	47%	35%	9%	33%	38%
MQM	0%	1%		1%	26%	1%			1%
JUIF				2%	3%	31%	5%	11%	9%
PML-N	39%	46%	65%	7%	14%	8%	4%	18%	11%
Ji	0%	1%	2%	0%	4%	5%		7%	15%
PML-Q	13%	10%	8%	3%	4%	2%		3%	8%
APML		0%	0%				1%		0%
MWM	0%	0%			1%				
ANP	2%	0%	1%	0%	1%	14%	4%	22%	2%
BNP				0%		0%			6%
Others	1%	2%	2%	2%	0	3%	0	6%	6%
Independent Candidate	5%	1%	2%	0%		1%	77%		4%
PML-F				4%					
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The regional political landscape, in terms of voting preferences and the popularity of political parties for election 2008 as per our respondents, is shown in Table 5. The above results show strong political support for PML-N in the Punjab regions. The only region where PPP could claim to compete with PML-N is the lower Punjab. However, PPP has a political stronghold in the regions of Sindh, followed by MQM in urban Sindh, whereas PML-N was far behind in terms of popularity and party preference in Sindh. Majority of our respondents from lower KPK, Central KPK and Balochistan voted for PPP in 2008. As regards other political parties, JUIF was the second most popular party in the Lower KPK region. ANP was the second popular party in central KPK region. Our respondents manifest the pre 2013 election scenario where PPP, PML-N, MQM, ANP, and JUI-F seemed to be major political powers at national level. PML-N formed the government in the Punjab, whereas PPP formed the government with allies in Sindh, KPK and Balochistan.

⁵ The number of votes and seats are not uniform in each region hence the average of these regions does not represent the popularity of any party at national/provincial level.

Table 6: Responses exhibiting Regional⁶ voting preference for elections 2013

Political landscape	Region								
	Lower Punjab	Central Punjab	Upper Punjab	Sindh 1	Sindh 2	Lower KP	Upper KP/Fata	Central KP	Balochistan
PPP	15%	6%	7%	48%	12%	14%	11%	20%	2%
MQM	0%	1%	1%	1%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%
JUIF	0%	0%	1%	5%	1%	25%	7%	7%	6%
PML-N	51%	47%	50%	13%	14%	5%	7%	21%	28%
JI	2%	1%	4%	0%	4%	18%	16%	17%	17%
PTI	19%	36%	29%	6%	41%	25%	25%	25%	10%
PML-Q	2%	2%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	3%	1%
APML	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
MWM	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
ANP	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	6%	3%	6%	1%
BNP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	28%
Others	3%	5%	5%	5%	10%	4%	1%	1%	2%
PML-F	0%	0%	0%	18%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Independent Candidate	7%	2%	1%	2%	4%	2%	30%	0%	2%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Regional voting preferences of our respondents for election 2013 are presented in Table 6. Except for upper KPK and FATA, where PPP gained 2%, its popularity has declined drastically in all regions, especially in all regions of the Punjab and Balochistan. PPP has also lost its support among our respondents in both regions of Sindh for election 2013. However, by virtue of its majority in Sindh 1 (Sindh except Karachi and Hyderabad) it would be able to form provincial government in Sindh. PTI is visibly claiming its share from MQM among our respondents in Sindh 2 (Karachi and urban Hyderabad). If elections 2013 are not disturbed by violence, then PTI can emerge as second largest power in Sindh. PML-N would strengthen its popularity in all three regions of the Punjab, including lower Punjab where PPP was slightly ahead of it as per our respondents' voting behavior for 2008 elections. PTI emerged as a majority party in all regions of KPK. On the basis of our respondents' preference, one may foresee PTI forming the provincial government in KPK. PPP is the major loser in Balochistan, where PML-N and BNP seem to emerge as major political parties.

⁶ The number of votes and seats are not uniform in each region hence the average of these regions does not represent the popularity of any party at national/provincial level.

Table 7: Responses exhibiting Urban-Rural voting preference for elections 2008

Political landscape	Urban / Rural	
	Urban	Rural
PPP	44%	46%
MQM	3%	0%
JUIF	3%	4%
PML-N	28%	30%
JI	3%	1%
PML-Q	8%	8%
APML		0%
MWM	0%	0%
ANP	4%	3%
BNP	0%	0%
Others	4%	2%
Independent Candidate	2%	5%
PML-F	1%	1%
	100%	100%

It is assumed that there is a considerable divergence in the socio-economic dynamics of rural and urban areas of Pakistan. An analysis of voting preferences, which takes locality into account was, therefore, warranted. The voting preferences of our respondents for election 2008, segregated on rural/urban basis are presented in Table 7. It appears that there was an almost symmetrical preference for PPP in urban and rural areas (44% and 46% correspondingly). There was a similar preference in the case of PML-N (28% and 30% respectively) and PML-Q. Political representation and voters' choice for other political parties in urban and rural areas, such as ANP, did not differ significantly from the analysis presented above. However, there was one notable difference, wherein MQM and JI seemed to be politically significant only in the urban locality. This means that in the case of MQM and JI, the argument concerning the effect of urban-rural dynamics on voter preference has some bearing.

Table 8: Responses exhibiting Urban-Rural voting preference for elections 2013

Political landscape	Urban / Rural	
	Urban	Rural
PPP	14.4%	19.1%
MQM	3.4%	0.9%
JUIF	2.9%	4.8%
PML-N	30.7%	34.9%
JI	4.9%	4.7%
PTI	26.4%	19.9%
PML-Q	1.1%	1.4%
APML	0.1%	0.2%
MWM	0.6%	0.2%
ANP	0.8%	1.2%
BNP	1.3%	1.6%
Others	4.5%	3.6%

PML-F	4.6%	3.0%
Independent Candidate	4.0%	4.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Political preferences of our urban and rural respondents for election 2013 are presented in Table 8. PML-N emerged as the most popular party among both our rural and urban respondents. A sharp decline in popularity of PPP is observed in rural areas from 46% in 2008 to 19% in 2013, and from 44% to 14% in urban areas. Moreover, PPP has also lost the symmetrical representation in urban and rural areas, which it held in 2008, a change that can be attributed to social and economic dynamics. PTI seems to be the most popular party among urban voters. 27% of PTI voters among our respondents live in urban areas against 20% in rural areas. MQM and PML-F also gather greater voter preference in urban areas. What emerges clearly from the 2013 survey is loss of PPP votes in rural areas due to PTI and PML-N.

Table 9: Responses exhibiting Gender-wise voting preference for elections 2008

Political landscape	Gender	
	Male	Female
PPP	44%	47%
MQM	1%	1%
JUIF	4%	5%
PML-N	28%	30%
JI	3%	1%
PML-Q	10%	6%
APML	0%	0%
MWM	0%	
ANP	3%	4%
BNP	0%	1%
Others	2%	1%
Independent Candidate	5%	4%
PML-F	1%	1%
	100%	100%

Gendered analysis of our respondents reveals that PPP was the most popular party among women voters in 2008 with a 47% female and a 44% male voting preference. PML-N was the second most popular party among women with 30% of them voting for PML-N. On the other hand, PML-Q attracted more male voters than the female ones with 10% men and 6% women claiming that they voted for PML-Q in elections 2008.

Table 10: Responses exhibiting Gender-wise voting preference for elections 2013

Political landscape	Gender	
	Male	Female
PPP	16.8%	18.0%
MQM	1.4%	2.1%
JUIF	4.0%	4.3%
PML-N	33.9%	32.9%
JI	5.7%	3.9%
PTI	22.9%	21.5%

PML-Q	1.3%	1.3%
APML	0.2%	0.1%
MWM	0.1%	0.6%
Political landscape	Male	Female
ANP	1.1%	1.0%
BNP	1.0%	1.9%
Others	3.2%	4.7%
PML-F	3.6%	3.6%
Independent Candidate	4.8%	3.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

There were more women respondents than men, who intend to vote for PPP and MQM in elections 2013. PML-N, PTI and JI are more favoured by men than women. However, the first two choices of women voters were PML-N and PTI.

Table 11: Responses exhibiting age specific voting preference for elections 2008

Political landscape	Age of Respondents			
	18-35 years	36-50 years	51-70 years	Above 70 years
PPP	45%	44%	47%	49%
MQM	2%	1%	1%	0%
JUIF	5%	4%	2%	3%
PML-N	28%	30%	30%	35%
JI	2%	2%	2%	1%
PML-Q	7%	8%	8%	9%
APML	0%	0%	0%	1%
MWM	0%	0%	0%	0%
ANP	3%	3%	3%	1%
BNP	0%	0%	0%	0%
Independent Candidate	4%	4%	5%	1%
Political landscape	18-35 years	36-50 years	51-70 years	Above 70 years
Others	3%	3%	2%	0%
PML-F	1%	1%	0%	0%
	100%	100%	100%	100%

The above table presents age specific responses of respondents, expressed in terms of voting preferences and political parties popularity. The above analysis reveals that first choice for our respondents of all age categories (18-35, 36-50, 51-70, 70 & above) was PPP during elections 2008. PML-N appeared as the second most popular party followed by PML-Q in all age categories. The interesting observation is that all three major political parties (PPP, PML-N and PML-Q) had their highest levels of support in the age group consisting of voters who were aged above 70.

Table 12: Responses exhibiting age specific voting preference for elections 2013

Political landscape	Age of Respondents			
	18-35 years	36-50 years	51-70 years	Above 70 years
PPP	16%	19%	21%	19%
MQM	1%	1%	0%	0%

JUIF	4%	4%	4%	2%
PML-N	30%	36%	40%	40%
JI	5%	6%	4%	1%
PTI	28%	18%	16%	21%
PML-Q	1%	1%	2%	1%
APML	0%	0%	0%	1%
MWM	0%	0%	0%	0%
ANP	1%	1%	0%	0%
BNP	2%	2%	1%	0%
Others	4%	4%	4%	8%
PML-F	4%	4%	3%	1%
Independent Candidate	4%	4%	5%	6%
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Majority of our respondents in all age categories intend to vote for PML-N in elections 2013. However, its major supporters are age 50 and above. Majority of PTI's supporters among our respondents were the first time voters or those falling in age bracket of 18-35. PPP has its major voters falling in age bracket of 51-70.

Table 13: Responses exhibiting Reasons behind Political Parties popularity in 20087

Reasons	Who did you vote for in Election 2008												
	PPP	MQM	JUIF	PML-N	JI	PML-Q	APML	MWM	ANP	BNP	Others	Independent Candidate	PML_F
It can solve economic problems	40.7%	1.2%	2.6%	38.0%	2.0%	10.1%	.1%	.0%	3.3%	.4%	.0%	1.5%	.2%
It can provide better roads and other civic amenities	38.5%	.8%	2.1%	40.1%	2.4%	10.2%	.1%	.1%	3.1%	.6%	.1%	1.9%	.0%
It will work to improve schools and hospitals	39.6%	.9%	3.1%	38.0%	2.6%	10.0%	.1%	0.0%	3.6%	.3%	.0%	1.7%	0.0%
It will bring inflation down	39.4%	1.2%	3.1%	37.3%	3.0%	10.1%	.2%	.0%	3.9%	.4%	.0%	1.4%	0.0%
It will improve foreign relation	36.6%	1.2%	2.1%	40.5%	3.0%	10.5%	.2%	.0%	3.4%	.3%	.0%	1.8%	.4%
It will create employment opportunities	41.3%	1.3%	3.0%	35.4%	2.6%	9.9%	.2%	.0%	3.5%	.5%	.1%	1.5%	.7%
It will reduce corruption	37.0%	1.1%	2.6%	40.3%	2.5%	9.9%	.1%	.1%	3.7%	.6%	.0%	1.8%	.1%
It will solve energy crisis	40.6%	1.2%	2.6%	38.0%	1.7%	10.2%	.1%	.1%	3.3%	.5%	.0%	1.6%	.0%
It will empower minorities	36.4%	1.1%	2.5%	41.8%	2.3%	10.6%	.1%	.1%	3.0%	.5%	.1%	1.5%	0.0%
It will empower women	37.3%	1.3%	2.7%	39.4%	2.3%	10.9%	.1%	.1%	3.7%	.4%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%

⁷ Multiple responses, hence are more than 100%

The respondents were presented with few challenges facing Pakistan and asked whether their decision to vote for a particular political party in elections 2008 was based on that party's ability to solve those issues, it appeared that most respondents had favoured PPP due to its economic agenda. Majority of our respondents had preferred PPP over PML-N for its perceived ability to create employment opportunities, solve economic and energy problems, control inflation, and improve schools and hospitals. Similarly, most respondents favoured PML-N over PPP perceiving it would empower women and minorities, reduce corruption, improve foreign relations, and improve roads and other civic amenities.

Table 14: Responses exhibiting reasons behind Political Parties popularity in 2013

Reasons	Who will you vote for on May 11, 2013													
	PPP	MQM	JUIF	PML-N	JI	PTI	PML-Q	APML	MWM	ANP	BNP	Others	PML (F)	Independent Candidate
It can solve economic problems	12.3%	1.0%	1.8%	41.5%	3.3%	28.0%	1.7%	.3%	.5%	.8%	1.8%	3.5%	1.9%	1.7%
It can provide better roads and other civic amenities	11.6%	.8%	1.8%	42.7%	3.6%	29.1%	1.9%	.2%	.5%	.6%	1.8%	3.3%	.5%	1.7%
It will work to improve schools and hospitals	9.8%	.9%	2.3%	42.6%	4.2%	29.0%	1.9%	.2%	.4%	.8%	1.9%	3.1%	1.0%	1.8%
It will bring inflation down	10.8%	.9%	2.6%	41.1%	4.8%	28.3%	1.8%	.2%	.4%	.9%	2.3%	3.6%	.9%	1.5%
It will improve foreign relation	8.5%	.8%	1.6%	43.7%	4.7%	30.0%	2.0%	.2%	.5%	.8%	2.2%	3.0%	.7%	1.3%
It will create employment opportunities	13.1%	.9%	2.5%	38.0%	4.4%	27.9%	1.8%	.2%	.5%	.8%	2.3%	3.3%	2.8%	1.5%
It will reduce corruption	9.1%	.7%	2.1%	41.8%	4.2%	30.8%	2.1%	.2%	.5%	.9%	2.0%	2.9%	.6%	2.1%
It will solve energy crisis	11.4%	1.0%	2.1%	40.7%	3.6%	29.9%	1.7%	.2%	.5%	.9%	1.7%	3.3%	1.4%	1.5%
It will empower minorities	7.8%	.7%	2.0%	44.0%	3.9%	30.7%	2.0%	.2%	.5%	.6%	2.2%	3.2%	.2%	2.0%
It will empower women	8.8%	.9%	1.8%	43.2%	3.7%	30.5%	2.0%	.2%	.6%	.8%	1.8%	3.5%	.3%	1.9%

The same challenges were again presented to the respondents and they were asked to share whether their decision to vote for a particular political party in elections 2013 would be based

on party's ability to solve those issues. Majority of the respondents trusted in PML-N for the solutions of those challenges, followed by PTI. The perception about PML-N delivering on these issues had improved, whereas the respondents seemed dissatisfied from PPP. It emerged that respondents wanted to try PTI instead of PPP for solution of their issues (Table 15).

Table 15: Issues facing Pakistan and respondent's perception on which party may resolve those Issues

Reasons	PPP-2008	PPP-2013	Loss	PML-N-2008	PML-N-2013	Gain	PTI-2008	PTI-2013
It can solve economic problems	40.70%	12.30%	28.40%	38.00%	41.50%	3.50%		28.00%
It can provide better civic amenities	38.50%	11.60%	26.90%	40.10%	42.70%	2.60%		29.10%
It will work to improve schools and hospitals	39.60%	9.80%	29.80%	38.00%	42.60%	4.60%		29.00%
It will bring inflation down	39.40%	10.80%	28.60%	37.30%	41.10%	3.80%		28.30%
It will improve foreign relation	36.60%	8.50%	28.10%	40.50%	43.70%	3.20%		30.00%
It will create employment opportunities	41.30%	13.10%	28.20%	35.40%	38.00%	2.60%		27.90%
It will reduce corruption	37.00%	9.10%	27.90%	40.30%	41.80%	1.50%		30.80%
It will solve energy crisis	40.60%	11.40%	29.20%	38.00%	40.70%	2.70%		29.90%
It will empower minorities	36.40%	7.80%	28.60%	41.80%	44.00%	2.20%		30.70%
It will empower women	37.30%	8.80%	28.50%	39.40%	43.20%	3.80%		30.50%

Conclusion

In the 2008 elections, 45% of our respondents voted for PPP, 29% for PML-N, 8% for PML-Q, 3% for ANP, 4% for JUI-F, 2% for JI, and 1% for MQM.

Support for PPP was reduced to 17% in May 2013. Only 17% of the respondents, who voted for PPP in the 2008 elections, indicated that they would vote for PPP in the 2013 general elections. PML-N gained 4% in popularity among our respondents, with 33% expressing the intention to vote for PML-N in the May 2013 election. PTI, which boycotted the 2008 elections, seems to have created a huge dent in PPP's vote bank. According to the 2013 survey, 22% of our respondents indicated that they would vote for PTI. The gain in support for PTI and PML-N, when compared with the 2008 polls, represents a net loss for PPP. JI appears to be another winner, gaining 3% in political preference votes and emerging as the 4th most popular party among our respondents. PML-Q lost 5.8% popularity among voters and ANP lost 2% in popularity votes as compared to their vote in the 2008 elections. MQM support seems to be the most stable, having gained 0.6% in popularity as indicated in our 2013 survey.

If the preference of our respondents is any guide to election outcome, then it seems that PML-N would form its government both in center as well as in the Punjab. The PPP would be confined to Sindh and form its government in Sindh. KPK would be governed by PTI and one ally either JI or JUI-F. The PML-N and BNP should be able to form government in Balochistan.

This would mean that Federal Government would have tough opposition in the form of PTI, PPP, JI and MQM.

Socio-economic and political factors seem to determine respondents' decision to vote for a particular party. The respondents are disappointed from PPP, mainly because it could not deliver on an economic and energy agenda. Similarly, partly affected by TTP led violence, ANP's poor performance in KPK can be attributed to its inability to develop a coherent road map for the socio-economic uplift of the people of KPK.

Till November 2012, when the political Barometer-I was conducted, the respondents still seemed to have hopes from the then ruling parties that they would deliver on issues facing Pakistan as part of their electoral campaigns. PPP, PML-N and PTI were close in respondents' rating at that time. However, partly due to TTP's violence against ANP, PPP, and MQM, and partly due to the successful efforts of PML-N and PTI to present themselves as reformist parties, PPP and ANP seems to lose to PML-N and PTI.

The analysis of -sociopolitical reasons affirms a clear ascendancy of PML-N and PTI. Both parties in 2013 are viewed by the respondents as reformist parties, adhering to accountability, rule of law, creating employment opportunities and introducing aggressive policies for reviving the economy and regional linkages.

Moreover, religious parties namely JUI and JI have not been able to create an impact on the political landscape. The results also imply that provincial governments would have to positively compete with each other if they are aiming at elections 2018.

One interesting observation during the survey was that a huge number of people were influenced by the media. Opinion regarding the performance of government, corruption, weak foreign policy, bad governance and fragile security were influenced by media, as the respondents referred to media frequently for the validity of their point of view. This reveals the emerging importance of media in governance and political landscape of country.

Annex: Acronyms

Acronyms	Meaning
ANP	Awami National Party
APML	All Pakistan Muslim League
BNP	Balochistan National Party
FATA	Federally Administered Tribal Areas
JI	Jamaat-e-Islami
JUI-F	Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam
KPK	Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
MQM	Muttahida Qaumi Movement
MWM	Majlis Wahdat-e-Muslimeen
PML-F	Pakistan Muslim League – Functional
PML-N	Pakistan Muslim League (N)
PML-Q	Pakistan Muslim League (Q)
PPP	Pakistan People’s Party
PSLM	Pakistan Social And Living Standards Measurement
PTI	Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaf
SDPI	Sustainable Development Policy Institute
SPSS	Statistical Product and Service Solutions
TTP	Tehrik-i- Taliban Pakistan

References

1. Batool, I., Seig, and Gernot., 2009: *Pakistan, Politics and Political Business Cycles*, University of Braunschweig, Economics Department Working Paper Series No, 7.
2. Birer, R., Qureshi, SK., Akramove, K, and Khan, B.H., 2006: *Voice and Votes-Does Political Decentralisation Work for the Poor and for Women? Emperical Evidence from the 2005 Local Government Elections in Pakistan*, The Pakistan Development Review,PP 1345-1360.
3. Kamil, J.T., Akramov, K., Qureshi, S.K., Birner, R, and Khan, B.H., 2007: *Decentralization, Local Government elections and Voter Turnout in Pakistan*, Published by International Food Policy Research Institute 2033 K Street, NW Washington DC 20006-1002 USA.
4. Vishwanat, T., Narayan, and Keefer, P.E., 2005: *Decentralization in Pakistan: Are Local Politicians Likely to be More Accountable?* Available from: <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTINVTCLI/Resources/decentralizationinPakistan.pdf> [Accessed 17 April 2013]