

Sustainable Development Policy Institute Islamabad

Political Barometer

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

(Phase 2)

Contents

Contents

Abstract.....	3
1. Introduction.....	3
2. Scope and geographical spread.....	3
3. Research approach and methodology	4
4. Analysis of respondent’s voting preferences: the rise and decline of political parties	5
Responses exhibiting popularity and voting preferences in Feb 2008.....	5
Responses exhibiting National voting preference and popularity in May 2013.....	6
Responses exhibiting Provincial voting preference and popularity in Feb 2008.....	7
Responses exhibiting Provincial voting preference and popularity in May 2013.....	8
Responses exhibiting Regional voting preference and popularity in Feb 2008.....	9
Responses exhibiting Regional voting preference and popularity in May 2013	10
Responses exhibiting Urban-Rural voting preference and popularity in Feb 2008.....	11
Responses exhibiting Urban-Rural voting preference and popularity in May 2013.....	12
Responses exhibiting Gender wise voting preference and popularity in Feb 2008	13
Responses exhibiting Gender wise voting preference and popularity in May 2013	14
Responses exhibiting age specific voting preference and popularity in Feb 2008.....	15
Responses exhibiting age specific voting preference and popularity in Feb 2008.....	16
Conclusion	17
Annex: Acronyms	18
References.....	19

Abstract

The paper looks at the rise and fall in popularity of political parties across the four provinces of Pakistan. Voter preferences and the popularity of political parties in 2008 and 2013 are compared. The analysis takes into account provincial, regional, rural and urban, gender and age specific preferences. Based on the respondents voting choices in 2013, variations in the popularity of political parties are examined. Finally, the paper 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, assembled by Mohsin Ali¹ and lead by Abid Suleri² and Vaqar Ahmad³, undertook a study of Pakistan's four provinces. The study consisted of field surveys designed to gauge the extent of political participation, in the context of the general elections held in Pakistan on 11th May 2013. The survey also investigated the popularity of the diverse political parties standing in these elections. The surveys resulted in two reports prepared by the field researchers, on the basis of which a further report (Barometer phase 1) was published by the SDPI in Feb 2013, in collaboration with Dawn.

In the first week of May 2013, field research was carried out in the four provinces by the same researchers, investigating the 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 this second phase of the political Barometer. It should be read as a sequel to the first phase of the 2013 political Barometer. This report focuses on four important objectives:

- i. Analysis of public voting perception with respect to regions.
- ii. Comparative 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.

2. Scope and geographical spread

The survey was carried out by the survey team in accessible and prioritized urban and rural areas of Pakistan's four provinces. Certain protected areas which are militarily restricted were excluded from the scope of this survey, as they were inaccessible locales with difficult terrain,

¹ Mohsin Ali works at SDPI.

² Abid Suleri is Executive Director at SDPI.

³ Vaqar Ahmad is Deputy Executive Director at SDPI.

for which financial coverage through enumeration was not possible. The target population of this study consists of all registered voters, classified on the basis of geographical stratification, as per the national average for provincial population, gender ratio, urbanization ratio, and age group and gender.

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). It also draws on a Gallup survey (2013), newspapers, electronic media, a census report of 1998 and PSLM reports of 2010-11. 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 55 prioritized districts, 5,700⁴ registered voters were selected from the four provinces Punjab, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Sindh and Baluchistan. The sampling for the respondents’ information in selected districts was done on the basis of the sample size, with 56% from Punjab, 23% from Sindh, 5% from Baluchistan 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 Punjab and KPK/FATA were divided into 3 regions. The former consists of Lower, Upper and Central regions of Punjab, whereas the later consists of Upper, Central and Lower regions of KPK. 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, 55 electoral districts (24 in Punjab, 12 in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, 13 in Sindh, and 3 in Baluchistan) 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 female⁵. A simple questionnaire was devised for the study. The fieldwork was carried out by experienced local enumerators, while team leaders

⁴ 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.

⁵ 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.

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) provided good support. After the data had been entered by experienced SDPI staff, it was coalesced and double checked for human or logical errors.

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

The analysis of the respondent's responses to 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 respondent's 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?

Responses exhibiting National popularity and voting preferences in Feb 2008

<i>Political Landscape</i>	<i>Responses expressed in terms of voting preferences and popularity</i>
PPP	45%
MQM	1%
JUIF	4%
PML-N	29%
JI	2%
PML-Q	8%
APML	0%
MWM	0%
ANP	3%
BNP	0%
Others	3%
Independent Candidates	4%
PML-F	1%
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. The survey, conducted prior to the general elections held on February 18th 2008, shows that 45% of respondents expressed a preference for PPP. The political preference data also indicates that in 2008, PPP was the most popular party in the country. By examining the political landscape, we learnt that 29% of the respondents cast their political preference in

favor of PML-N. The survey shows the relatively low popularity of PML-Q among the respondents. Only 1% of the respondents expressed the intention to vote for MQM, whose vote bank is restricted to Karachi and to a few areas in Sindh. In terms of extremely low popularity, the political parties JUIF and JI can be grouped together along with MQM, PML-F, ANP and independent candidates.

Responses exhibiting National voting preference and popularity in May 2013

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

The survey above, conducted by SDPI prior to the elections of May 2013, shows that PML-N tops the political landscape, with 33% respondents expressing a preference for this political party. This means that on one hand, there has been a marginal rise in the popularity of PML-N and on the other hand, there has been a sharp decline in the popularity of PPP in 2013. The most anticipated entry into Pakistan's political landscape has been the anticipated rise to power of PTI, with 22% respondents favoring the party. A vast majority of the country's political analysts seem to agree that PTI has in fact upset the political standing of PPP, which now stands 3rd on the political landscape. When we compare this with the popularity of PPP in 2008, the party has in fact lost almost 22% of their voters in 2013. On the other hand, PML-N has succeeded in gaining 4% in terms of their expected votes. PML-Q also seems to have lost up to 6% of its voters, while political support for other popular parties such as JUIF, ANP and MQM has not changed significantly.

Responses exhibiting Provincial voting preference and popularity in Feb 2008

Political Landscape	Province				Responses expressed in terms of voting preferences and popularity
	Punjab	Sindh	KPK	Baluchistan	
PPP	37%	77%	29%	38%	45%
MQM	0%	4%	0%	1%	1%
JUIF	0%	2%	20%	9%	4%
PML-N	45%	8%	10%	11%	29%
JI	1%	1%	5%	15%	2%
PML-Q	11%	4%	2%	8%	8%
APML	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
MWM	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
ANP	1%	0%	15%	2%	3%
BNP	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%
Others	2%	0%	4%	6%	3%
Independent Candidate	3%	0%	15%	4%	4%
PML-F	0%	4%	0%	0%	1%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The above table presents the provincial political landscape, and the responses of respondents in terms of voting preferences and political parties popularity. A glance at voting preference in the 2008 election shows the popularity of PPP in the province of Sindh. Our survey aptly demonstrates this popularity, as 77% of the respondents in the province expressed a preference for PPP. In terms of voter preference, PPP also secured 29% of the votes in the province of KPK, and 38% of the votes in the province of Baluchistan. By securing an aggregate of 45%, PPP emerged as the most popular provincial party in the 2008 elections. On the other hand, in line with the voting choice of the respondents, the 45% voter preference for PML-N demonstrates its strong political base in the province of Punjab. In the provincial context, PML-N emerged as the 2nd most popular party, securing 29% of the aggregated votes. As the survey reveals, other parties such as PML-Q and ANP had some political representation in the provinces of Punjab and KPK. ANP secured 15% of voter preference in the province of KPK, and only 2% in the province of Baluchistan. Provincial results indicate a higher political representation of JUIF in the provinces of KPK (20%) and Baluchistan (9%). These results suggest that no political party in the province has enough support to secure a clear majority, and hence could not govern on its own.

Responses exhibiting Provincial voting preference and popularity in May 2013

Political landscape	Province				Responses expressed in terms of voting preferences and popularity
	Punjab	Sindh	KPK	Baluchistan	
PPP	9.9%	40.2%	15.2%	2.5%	17.4%
MQM	0.7%	5.7%	0.2%	0.4%	1.8%
JUIF	0.1%	4.3%	17.6%	6.4%	4.2%
PML-N	49.0%	13.1%	9.5%	27.8%	33.4%
JI	1.8%	1.1%	17.0%	17.4%	4.8%
PTI	27.7%	10.2%	24.6%	9.6%	22.2%
PML-Q	1.9%	0.1%	1.2%	1.1%	1.3%
APML	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%
MWM	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%		0.4%
ANP	0.1%	0.2%	5.8%	1.4%	1.1%
BNP	0.1%	0.2%		28.1%	1.5%
Others	3.8%	5.5%	2.6%	2.1%	4.0%
PML-	0.0%	15.2%		0.4%	3.6%
Independent Candidate	4.2%	3.9%	6.0%	2.5%	4.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In contrast with voter preferences and the provincial popularity of PPP in 2008, our recent survey reveals a sharp decline in the popularity of PPP. Surprisingly, PPP was not even able to maintain its historical stronghold in the province of Sindh. There was a sharp decline in voter choice for the party, falling from 77% in 2008 to 40% in 2013. According to our survey, carried out in May 2013, PML-N emerged as the victorious party, not only in the province of Punjab but also in the provinces of Baluchistan and Sindh, where there was an increase in voter preference for the party. On the other hand, the data from the province of Punjab shows a noticeable change in the provincial political landscape since 2008. By securing almost 28% of the vote in 2013, PTI emerged as the 2nd most popular party in Punjab. Having previously been non-existent on the political landscape, our survey results of 2013 demonstrates that PTI secured almost 25% of the votes in the province of KPK. In terms of popularity and voter choice, the PTI aggregate of the provincial vote (22%) in the elections of 2013 were higher than those of well-established political parties such as PPP (17%), JUIF (4.2%) and ANP (1.1%). Seen from a different perspective, the popularity of PTI (for diverse reasons, such as the youth factor) had a negative impact on voters' preference for other political parties in KPK, such as JUIF and ANP.

**Responses exhibiting Regional voting preference and popularity in Feb
2008**

Political landscape	Region									Responses expressed in terms of voting preferences and popularity
	Lower Punjab	Central Punjab	Upper Punjab	Sindh1	Sindh 2	Lower KPK	Upper KPK/FATA	Central KPK	Baluchistan	
PPP	40%	39%	20%	81%	47%	35%	9%	33%	38%	45%
MQM	0%	1%		1%	26%	1%			1%	1%
JUIF				2%	3%	31%	5%	11%	9%	4%
PML-N	39%	46%	65%	7%	14%	8%	4%	18%	11%	29%
JI	0%	1%	2%	0%	4%	5%		7%	15%	2%
PML-Q	13%	10%	8%	3%	4%	2%		3%	8%	8%
APML		0%	0%				1%		0%	0%
MWM	0%	0%			1%					0%
ANP	2%	0%	1%	0%	1%	14%	4%	22%	2%	3%
BNP				0%		0%			6%	0%
Others	1%	2%	2%	2%	0	3%	0	6%	6%	3%
Independent Candidate	5%	1%	2%	0%		1%	77%		4%	4%
PML-F				4%						1%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The above table presents the regional political landscape, and the responses of respondents expressed in terms of voting preferences and the popularity of political parties. The above results show strong political support for PML-N in the regions of Punjab. PPP trails behind, with 40% of voters indicating a preference for the party in the region of lower Punjab, and 20% in the region of upper Punjab. PPP has a political stronghold in the regions of Sindh, with PML-N a long way behind in terms of popularity and party preference. It is interesting to note the political preference for PPP in the province of KPK, which stands at 35% in Lower KPK and 33% in Central KPK. As regards other political parties, JUIF is the second most popular party in the Central and Lower KPK regions. Likewise, ANP trails behind JUIF, with 14% and 22% of voters expressing a preference for the party in the Central and Lower KPK regions. This means that the regional political landscape is dominated by three major political parties: PPP, PML-N and ANP.

***Responses exhibiting Regional voting preference and popularity in May
2013***

Political landscape	Region									Responses expressed in terms of voting preferences and popularity
	Lower Punjab	Central Punjab	Upper Punjab	Sindh1	Sindh 2	Lower KP	Upper KP/ Fata	Central KP	Baluchistan	
PPP	15%	6%	7%	48%	12%	14%	11%	20%	2%	18%
MQM	0%	1%	1%	1%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
JUIF	0%	0%	1%	5%	1%	25%	7%	7%	6%	4%
PML-N	51%	47%	50%	13%	14%	5%	7%	21%	28%	33%
JI	2%	1%	4%	0%	4%	18%	16%	17%	17%	5%
PTI	19%	36%	29%	6%	41%	25%	25%	25%	10%	23%
PML-Q	2%	2%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%
APML	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
MWM	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%		0%
ANP	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	6%	3%	6%	1%	1%
BNP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	28%	1%
Others	3%	5%	5%	5%	10%	4%	1%	1%	2%	4%
PML-F	0%	0%	0%	18%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%
Independent Candidate	7%	2%	1%	2%	4%	2%	30%	0%	2%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The above regional based political landscape shows that voter preference for PPP has declined drastically in the regions of Lower, Central and Upper Punjab. This means that PPP has not been able to maintain its 2008 levels of political support in the regions of Punjab. A notable observation concerns the decline in PPP popularity in the regions of Sindh: (In Sindh 1, PPP popularity decreased from 81% in 2008 to 48% in 2013, and in Sindh 2 PPP popularity fell from 47% in 2008 to 12% in 2013). In contrast, PML-N has increased its political representation in Lower Punjab: (from 39% in 2008 to 51% in 2013). The popularity of MQM has diminished in the region of Sindh 2: (from 26% in 2008 to 10% in 2013). The entry of PTI onto the regional political landscape is noticeable, not just in the regions of Punjab, but in the 25% of voter support the party secured in the regions of Lower, Upper and Central KPK. Thus, the 2013 regional political landscape shows a shift in voters' choice for political parties such as PPP, PML-N and MQM.

Responses exhibiting Urban-Rural voting preference and popularity in Feb 2008

Political landscape	Urban / Rural		Responses expressed in terms of voting preferences and popularity
	Urban	Rural	
PPP	44%	46%	45%
MQM	3%	0%	1%
JUIF	3%	4%	4%
PML-N	28%	30%	29%
JI	3%	1%	2%
PML-Q	8%	8%	8%
APML		0%	0%
MWM	0%	0%	0%
ANP	4%	3%	3%
BNP	0%	0%	0%
Others	4%	2%	3%
Independent Candidate	2%	5%	4%
PML-F	1%	1%	1%
	100%	100%	100%

The above table presents the urban-rural political landscape, and the responses of respondents expressed in terms of voting preferences and political parties popularity. It is assumed that there is considerable divergence in the socio-economic dynamics of rural and urban areas of Pakistan. An analysis of voting preferences which takes locality into account is therefore warranted. Our 2008 survey demonstrated that voters expressed significant political preference for PPP, and that there was an almost symmetrical representation of PPP in urban and rural areas (44% and 46% correspondingly). There was a similar urban-rural vote disparity or party preference in the case of PML-N (28% and 30% respectively). By securing an overall 45% political preference, PPP is far ahead of PML-N and other political parties. With an overall 8% political preference, and symmetrical support in urban-rural areas, PML-Q is in third position. Political representation and voters' choice for other political parties in urban and rural areas, such as ANP and JI, did not differ significantly from the analysis presented above. However, there was one notable difference, in that MQM seemed to be politically significant only in the urban locality. This means that in the case of MQM, the argument concerning the effect of urban-rural dynamics on voter preference has some bearing. However, with the exception of MQM, and contrary to the assumption of urban-rural socio-economics and its effect on political preferences, our 2008 survey suggests that this argument is not relevant.

***Responses exhibiting Urban-Rural voting preference and popularity in
May 2013***

Political landscape	Urban / Rural		Responses expressed in terms of voting preferences and popularity
	Urban	Rural	
PPP	14.4%	19.1%	17.4%
MQM	3.4%	0.9%	1.8%
JUIF	2.9%	4.8%	4.2%
PML-N	30.7%	34.9%	33.4%
JI	4.9%	4.7%	4.8%
PTI	26.4%	19.9%	22.2%
PML-Q	1.1%	1.4%	1.3%
APML	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%
MWM	0.6%	0.2%	0.4%
ANP	0.8%	1.2%	1.1%
BNP	1.3%	1.6%	1.5%
Others	4.5%	3.6%	4.0%
PML-F	4.6%	3.0%	3.6%
Independent Candidate	4.0%	4.5%	4.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

According to the 2013 survey, PML-N has a greater degree of political representation, as compared to PPP and other political parties. PML political representation in urban areas has also increased as compared with 2008, rising to 35% against 31% in rural areas. Concerning PPP, a sharp decline in popularity is observed in rural areas, from 46% in 2008 to 19% in 2013, and from 44% to 14% in urban areas. Moreover, PPP have also lost the symmetrical representation in urban and rural areas which they held in 2008, a change which can be attributed to social and economic dynamics. PTI seems to be the most popular party among urban voters, as was suggested in the above analysis concerning the political significance of PTI. 27% of PTI voters 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 that there has been a change in the urban-rural political landscape, and in the symmetrical representation among political parties such as PPP and JUIF.

Responses exhibiting Gender wise voting preference and popularity in Feb 2008

Political landscape	Gender		Responses expressed in terms of voting preferences and popularity
	Male	Female	
PPP	44%	47%	45%
MQM	1%	1%	1%
JUIF	4%	5%	4%
PML-N	28%	30%	29%
JI	3%	1%	2%
PML-Q	10%	6%	8%
APML	0%	0%	0%
MWM	0%		0%
ANP	3%	4%	3%
BNP	0%	1%	0%
Others	2%	1%	3%
Independent Candidate	5%	4%	4%
PML-F	1%	1%	1%
	100%	100%	100%

The above table presents the political landscape and gender specific responses of respondents, expressed in terms of voting preferences and political parties popularity. Gender analysis reveals that PPP was the most popular party among female voters in 2008, with a 47% female and a 44% male voting preference. PML-N is the second most popular party, with a 29% aggregate of voter choice. Concerning PML-Q, the party had 10% male and 6% female preference. PML-Q was the third most popular party among respondents in aggregate terms, according to the survey carried out in Feb 2008.

**Responses exhibiting Gender wise voting preference and popularity in May
2013**

Political landscape	Gender		Responses expressed in terms of voting preferences and popularity
	Male	Female	
PPP	16.8%	18.0%	17.4%
MQM	1.4%	2.1%	1.8%
JUIF	4.0%	4.3%	4.2%
PML-N	33.9%	32.9%	33.4%
JI	5.7%	3.9%	4.8%
PTI	22.9%	21.5%	22.2%
PML-Q	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%
APML	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%
MWM	0.1%	0.6%	0.4%
ANP	1.1%	1.0%	1.1%
BNP	1.0%	1.9%	1.5%
Others	3.2%	4.7%	4.0%
PML-F	3.6%	3.6%	3.6%
Independent Candidate	4.8%	3.9%	4.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

As compared to 2008, the 2013 survey reveals insignificant differences between male and female voting preferences for parties such as MQM, JUIF and ANP. However, one notable difference is the loss of PPP popularity, reflected in the aggregate change in male and female preferences for the party (from 45% in 2008 to 17% in 2013). According to the 2013 survey, PML-N has risen to first place in terms of popularity and urban and rural voters' choice. As already noted, PTI seems to be the second most popular party across the 2013 political landscape, as the 22% aggregate male and female voters' choice for the party suggests. However, the vote bank for PML-N and PTI seems to be equally divided among male and female voters. Concerning PML-Q, it seems that the party has lost its popularity, with its aggregate male and female total falling from 8% in 2008 to 1% in 2013. In the case of PPP and MQM, there are some gaps in gender-based preferences, with 18% of females but only 16.8% of men favoring PPP. Similarly, 2.1% of females and 1.4% of males favor MQM. Among the religious parties, there is greater male support for JI (5.7% male and 3.9% female). The most popular party among females is PML-N, followed by PTI.

Responses exhibiting age specific voting preference and popularity in Feb 2008

Political landscape	Age of Respondents				Responses expressed in terms of voting preferences and popularity
	18-35 years	36-50 years	51-70 years	Above 70 years	
PPP	45%	44%	47%	49%	45%
MQM	2%	1%	1%	0%	1%
JUIF	5%	4%	2%	3%	4%
PML-N	28%	30%	30%	35%	29%
JI	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%
PML-Q	7%	8%	8%	9%	8%
APML	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
MWM	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
ANP	3%	3%	3%	1%	3%
BNP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Others	3%	3%	2%	0%	3%
Independent Candidate	4%	4%	5%	1%	4%
PML-F	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

**Responses exhibiting age specific voting preference and popularity in Feb
2008**

Political landscape	Age of Respondents				Responses expressed in terms of voting preferences and popularity
	18-35 years	36-50 years	51-70 years	Above 70 years	
PPP	16%	19%	21%	19%	18%
MQM	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%
JUIF	4%	4%	4%	2%	4%
PML-N	30%	36%	40%	40%	33%
JI	5%	6%	4%	1%	5%
PTI	28%	18%	16%	21%	23%
PML-Q	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%
APML	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
MWM	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
ANP	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%
BNP	2%	2%	1%	0%	1%
Others	4%	4%	4%	8%	4%
PML-F	4%	4%	3%	1%	4%
Independent Candidate	4%	4%	5%	6%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

What emerges from the above age specific political landscape is that support for PPP and PML-N is strongest among voters aged 36 or over, and, in particular, from those aged 50 or over. In contrast, support for PTI is strongest among voters aged 18-35. The political support for JUIF is balanced across voters aged 18-70. Moreover, MQM and ANP seem to have no political support among respondents aged 51-70 and above.

Conclusion

In the 2008 elections, 45.1% of our respondents voted for PPP, 29.2% for PML-N, 7.7% for PML-Q, 3.1% for ANP, 4% for JUI-F, 2.1% for JI, and 1.2% for MQM. Support for PPP was reduced to 27% in May 2013. Only 18% of the respondents in the 2008 survey 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 the most stable, having gained 0.6% in popularity as indicated in our 2013 survey.

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 Quami 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 Peoples Party
PSLM	Pakistan Social And Living Standards Measurement
PTI	Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaf
SDPI	Sustainable Development Policy Institute
SPSS	Statistical Product and Service Solutions

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]