



PAKISTAN

AT THE POLLS



Political Weather Report Special Issues

1990



PAKISTAN

AT THE POLLS
1990

Gallup
Political Weather Report
Special Issue
1990



**Special Issue on
1990 National Elections**

**P A K I S T A N
AT THE POLLS
1990**

This report is based on the research carried out by Gallup Pakistan with the collaboration of Election Study Group.

Part I and Part III are based on the data provided by the Election Commission of Pakistan. Part II is based on an Exit-Poll Survey conducted by Gallup Pakistan.

**GALLUP PAKISTAN
Rasheed Plaza, Blue Area,
P.O. Box 1055, Islamabad
Phone: 825406**



This report has been prepared under the direction of **Dr. Ijaz S. Gilani** Who holds a Ph. D. in Political Science from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and is Chairman of Gallup Pakistan (Pakistan Institute of Public Opinion). Dr. Gilani *has* conducted *several pioneering* studies on Pakistan's economy and society.



C O N T E N T S

PART I

ELECTION DATA

5 - 36

Introduction

Two Party House
First Past the Post System
Role of Punjab
Vote Banks of PPP and IJI

Election Data Base

Seats and votes scored by various parties: 1990 Comparative Data of Seats and votes: 1988 and 1990 Data by Regions within Provinces: 1988 and 1990 data Turn-out rates: Summary data and seat by seat data

PART II

VOTERS ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOUR

37 - 70

Exit-Poll Data

Determinants of Voter Behaviour

Socio-Economic Determinants: Age, Education
Income, Overseas Remittances
Attitudinal Determinants:
Reason to choose or Reject a Party

Types of Voters: Seven Types

Voting Patterns and the Future of Democracy

Fairness Issue

Voters Agenda

PART III

ELECTION RESULTS

71- 123

National Assembly
Punjab Assembly
Sindh Assembly
NWFP Assembly
Baluchistan Assembly

Appendix Pre-Election Survey Report

124 - 127



PART I
SECTION DATA



ELECTION DATA

TWO PARTY HOUSE

The 1990 elections produced, for the second time in the country's history, a two party outcome. IJI won 105 seats, PDA won 45 seats. Of the remaining 48 seats, nearly 40 were claimed by the COP allies of IJI or independent candidates.

The evolution towards a two party house had started from the 1988 elections, when PPP won 93 seats, IJI won 55 seats and the remaining 50 seats were claimed by smaller parties and the independents. The leanings of smaller parties and independents at that time were, however, more mercurial and not as clearly in favor of one party as in 1990. This was partly caused by IJI's ability to score a majority in the house (105 in 198 directly held parliamentary contests) whereas the PPP had only won a plurality in the previous house (93 seats in 198 directly held contests).

FIRST PAST THE POST SYSTEM

The last two Pakistani elections lend credence to the theory that the FIRST PAST THE POST electoral system tends to evolve a two party system. It induces **Political parties** or factions to rally under two broad alliances, and it educates the **voters** to cast their ballot in a tactical fashion in favor of one of the two alliances. Most voters learn not to waste their vote by casting it in favor of someone outside the two alliances. Those who cast their vote outside the two alliances are often disappointed. The third party/parties fail to get parliamentary seats even when they score high number of votes. For illustration refer to British elections in the table ahead.

With the evolution of democracy, Pakistani voters and political analysts are learning to live with the realities and the anomalies of the FIRST PAST THE POST system. The latest elections are an illustrative case.

The PPP won 37 percent of the vote, and 45 seats in the parliament. The IJI scored almost the same number of votes, 37%, but its seats were more than twice as many as those of PPP (105 compared with 45).

Through better alliances the IJI concentrated its forces at key points, and relinquished many other areas in favor of allied groups. This resulted in loss of total votes but net gained in seats. IJI just about maintained its 1988 Parliamentary position in the three provinces of NWFP, Baluchistan and Sindh (gaining only 3 more seats) through alliances with regional parties. Because it conceded seats, IJI's popular vote in the three provinces dropped below its 1988 level in these three provinces.

In the fourth and the crucial province of Punjab, IJI confronted PPP with a strong contest, on almost every seat. The two parties had scored nearly equal number of votes in this province in the previous election in 1988. Later PPP government seemed to lose a great deal of good-will. But its dismissal from government reversed this trend, and helped PPP to regain popular sympathies.



THE CARE-TAKER PERIOD

PPP's gains during the period of care-taker government were very real. In Punjab it picked almost every voter, as a net effect, who had been disenchanted from PPP during its incumbency. By the election day the PPP scored 39% of the votes in Punjab, and thus resurrected its 1988 position. But, this was not sufficient to bag the same number of seats as in 1988. The **consolidation of non-PPP** vote had, in the meantime, changed political equations.

While the PPP maintained its 1988 share in the popular vote, the IJI moved ahead and picked up another 11 percent of the votes from the third party and independent voters. With an all Punjab average of 50 percent vote for IJI and 39 % for the PPP, IJI bagged most of the parliamentary seats. An 11% edge in the popular vote gave IJI an advantage of 78 parliamentary seats (92 for IJI, 14 for PPP).

ROLE OF PUNJAB

It would be true to say that IJI's success in the 1990 elections is largely explained by its success in the Punjab province.

IJI was behind PPP in Sindh by **21** seats. They had a draw in Baluchistan. In NWFP IJI scored only 3 more seats than PPP. But, a lead of **78** parliamentary seats in Punjab turned the tables in its favour.

Interestingly, IJI's success in Punjab was caused not through a swing of PPP voters in its favour, but through a swing away from third party and *independent* voters. The 11 percent swing from third party and independents to IJI in the Punjab played a DECISIVE ROLE in *determining* the outcome of 1990 elections.

It is instructive to compare the relationship between popular votes and parliamentary seats for a few countries which follow the FIRST PAST THE POST system. Data from India and the UK is produced below.

Table
CASES OF FIRST PAST THE POST SYSTEM
INDIAN ELECTIONS

Year	No. of Seats	Cong./ cong. (I)		CPI		CPI-M		BJS/ BJP		Janta/ Janta Dal		Janta (S) Lok Dal		Other Parties	
		% votes	Seats	% votes	Seats	% votes	Seats	% votes	Seats	% votes	Seats	% votes	Seats	% votes	Seats
1980	542	42.7	(353)	2.6	(11)	6.1	(36)	-	-	19.0	(31)	9.4	(41)	13.8	(48)
1984	542	48.1	(415)	2.7	(6)	5.7	(22)	7.4	(2)	6.7	(10)	5.6	(3)	15.7	(79)
1989	542	40.3	(193)	2.7	(12)	6.5	(32)	11.8	(88)	18.3	(141)	-	-	20.4	(59)

Table
BRITISH ELECTIONS

Year	Conservatives		Labour		Liberal/ Social democratic Alliance	
	% Votes	Seats	% Votes	Seats	% Votes	Seats
1974	37.9	(297)	37.1	(301)	19.3	(14)
1983	42.4	(397)	27.6	(209)	25.4	(23)



'VOTE BANKS' OF PPP AND IJI

PPP 'VOTE BANK'

The PPP, founded in 1968, has maintained an extremely **resilient 'vote bank'**. It polled 38 percent of the votes in 1970 elections, 38 percent in 1988 and 37 percent in 1990.

The first major dent in PPP's vote bank in the last twenty years was caused three days after the 1990 national assembly elections. In the provincial assembly elections, PPP scored only 30 percent of the vote in Punjab, 16% in NWFP, 9% in Baluchistan and 32% in Sindh. Its national average was 28%.

The switching of votes between October 24 (National Assembly Elections) and October 27 (Provincial Assembly elections) is a note-worthy development, which has so far been largely ignored.

The first interpretation of PPP's set-back at the Provincial Assembly elections was: Its voters were disappointed by the National Assembly results, and they simply stayed home on the Provincial election day. The data does not bear out this interpretation.

The Provincial Assembly election data show that the turn-out in the Provincial Assembly elections was 1% higher than in the National Assembly elections. There is every likelihood that certain PPP voters switched loyalties after their party lost the National Assembly elections.

77,75,816 voters voted for PPP and **78,43,294** for IJI on October 24. On October 27 the number of people who voted for IJI were 83, 18,528 and for PPP were 60, 14,781. The third party/independent voters were 54,26,886 on October 24 and 71,84,655 on October 27.

This means that PPP lost 17,61,035 voters or roughly 25% of its failure at the National Assembly elections. This is a serious set-back for the PPP vote bank, and it remains to be seen whether these switch-away voters would return to the party fold by the time of the next election.



ELECTION DATA BASE

**Seats and Votes Scored by
Various Parties in the**

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS: 1990

All Pakistan Figures and Provincial Break-down



PARTY POSITION
NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS 1990

Party *	Votes	% of Polled Votes	No. of Seats
IJI	7843294	37.27	105
PDA	7775816	36.95	45
INDEP	2162525	10.28	13**
MQM	1181891	5.62	15
JUI(F)	608181	2.89	6
ANP	355076	1.69	6
JUP(N)	310488	1.48	3
PAT	233966	1.11	-
JWP	127930	0.61	2
PNP	126817	0.60	2
PKMAP	72619	0.34	1
SNF	52118	0.25	-
PDP	51217	0.24	-
BNM	50635	0.24	-
SNA	31053	0.14	-
PPI	18595	0.09	-
AT(PG)	14310	0.07	-
QIP	12825	0.06	-
PML(Q)	6894	-	-

-----Continued -----



Party *	Votes	% of Polled Votes	No. of Seats
PSP	2158	-	-
SQI	2114	-	-
JAS	1991	-	-
PPI(S)	1029	-	-
PPI(MH)	808	-	-
HF	672	-	-
PMKP	643	-	-
NDP	191	-	-
SNA-HG	140	-	-
===Total===	21045996		198***

* For complete names of parties, please see Glossary.

** The results of all 8 seats from Federally Administered Tribal Area are not included in this report.

*** Elections was not held on one seat as per scheduled.



**PROVINCE WISE PARTY POSITION
NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS 1990**

P U N J A B

Party	Votes	% of Polled Votes	No. of Seats
IJI	6888024	49.41	92
PDA	5386682	38.63	14
INDEP	1115741	8.00	6
JUP(N)	245988	1.76	3
PAT	215145	1.54	-
PDP	51152	0.36	-
JUI(F)	24423	0.17	-
PML(Q)	6894	0.05	-
PSP	2158	0.01	-
SQI	2114	0.01	-
JAS	1991	0.01	-
PPI(S)	1029	-	-
Provincial Total	13941341		115

The result of Federal Capital Islamabad is included in Punjab



**PROVINCE WISE PARTY POSITION
NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS 1990**

S I N D H

Party	Votes	% of Polled Votes	No. of Seats
PDA	1823940	41.81	24
MQM	1181891	27.09	15
INDEP	699868	16.04	4
111	385009	8.82	3
JUP(N)	55325	1.27	-
SNF	52118	1.20	-
PNP	35949	0.82	-
JUI(F)	31479	0.72	-
SNA	31053	0.71	-
ANP	28812	0.66	-
PPI	18595	0.42	-
AT(PG)	14310	0.33	-
PAT	2778	0.06	-
PPI(MH)	808	-	-
SNA-HG	140	-	-
Provincial Total	4362075		46

**PROVINCE WISE PARTY POSITION
 NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS 1990**

N W F P

Party	Votes	% of Polled Votes	No. of Seats
IJI	487690	23.74	8
PDA	462410	22.51	5
JUI(F)	422633	20.57	4
INDEP	338140	16.46	3
ANP	308177	15.00	6
PAT	15005	0.73	-
QIP	12825	0.62	-
PKMAP	3152	0.15	-
JUP(N)	2278	0.11	-
HF	672	-	-
PMKP	643	-	-
NDP	191	-	-
PDP	65	-	-
Provincial Total	2053881		26



**PROVINCE WISE PARTY POSITION
NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS 1990**

B A L U C H I S T A N

Party	Votes	% of Polled Votes	No. of Seats
JUI(F)	129646	18.82	2
JWP	127930	18.60	2
PDA	102784	15.00	2
PNP	90868	13.20	2
IJI	82571	12.00	2
PKMAP	69467	10.08	1
BNM	50635	7.35	-
ANP	18087	2.63	-
INDEP	8776	1.30	-
JUP(N)	6897	1.00	-
PAT	1038	0.15	-
Provincial Total	688699		11



**Comparative Data of Seats and Votes
1988 and 1990 Elections**

National and Provincial Assembly Elections



Party Share of Votes

National Assembly Elections

Party *	1988		1990		1993	
	% of Polled Votes	No. of Seats	% of Polled Votes	No. of Seats	% of Polled Votes	No. of Seats
IJI / ML (N)	31.01	55	37.27	105	-	-
PDA/PPP	38.50	93	36.95	45	-	-
INDEP	13.12	18	10.28	13	-	-
MQM	5.37	13	5.62	15	-	-
JUI(F)	1.86	7	2.89	6	-	-
ANP	2.10	2	1.69	6	-	-
JUP(N)/PAj	4.28	3	1.48	3	-	-
JWP/BNA	0.36	2	0.61	2	-	-
P N P	0.53	-	0.60	2	-	-
PKMAP/PMAI	0.24	-	0.34	1	-	-
PDP	0.41	1	0.24	-	-	-
NPP(K)	0.81	2	-	-	-	-
JUI(D)	0.22	1	-	-	-	-
===Total ===		197		198		

NOTE: 8 FATA seats are not included in this tally. In 1988 on 2 seats election was not held as per scheduled. In 1990 on 1 seat election was not held on Oct.24.

* For complete names of parties, please see Glossary.

PARTY SHARE OF VOTES

P U N J A B

	PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS				NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS			
	1988		1990		1988		1990	
	% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats
PPP/PDA	34.17	(93)	29.42	(10)	39.80	(53)	38.63	(14)
IJI	34.98	(108)	54.60	(208)	37.90	(45)	49.41	(92)
PAI/JUP(N)	4.86	(2)	0.78	(0)	5.72	(3)	1.76	(3)
Independents & Others	25.99	(37)	15.2	(16)	16.58	(14)	10.20	(6)
Total	-	(240)	-	(234)**		(115)*	-	(115)*

* Election was not held on one seat as per scheduled.

** Election results are not available for remaining 6 seats.

PARTY SHARE OF VOTES

S I N D H

	PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS				NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS			
	1988		1990		1988		1990	
	% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats
PPP/PDA	45.23	(67)	31.24	(47)	46.54	(31)	41.81	(24)
IJI	7.12	(1)	7.55	(6)	12.80	(0)	8.82	(3)
MQM	*	()	34.62	(28)	25.50	(13)	27.09	(15)
Independents & Others	47.65	(32)	26.59	(18)	15.15	(2)	22.28	(4)
Total	-	(100)	-	(99)**	-	(46)	-	(46)

* Provincial Assembly data of 1988 for MQM is not available separately.

** Election result of 1 seat is not available.

PARTY SHARE OF VOTES

N W F P

	PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS				NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS			
	1988		1990		1988		1990	
	% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats
PPP/PDA	19.87	(19)	15.82	(6)	22.54	(8)	22.51	5
IJI	25.78	(30)	26.29	(34)	27.28	(8)	23.74	8
JUI(F)	7.84	(2)	10.05	(2)	8.85	(3)	20.57	4
ANR	5.41	(14)	14.82	(22)	18.4	(2)	15	6
Independents & Others	41.10	(15)	32.02	(16)	22.93	(4)	18.18	3
Total	-	(80)	-	(80)	-	(25)*	-	(26)

* Election was not held on one seat in November 1988.



PARTY SHARE OF VOTES

B A L U C H I S T A N

	PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS				NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS			
	1988		1990		1988		1990	
	% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats
PPP/PDA	10.19	(3)	9.36	(2)	7.19	(1)	15.00	(2)
IJI	23.19	(9)	9.16	(7)	21.01	(2)	12.00	(2)
JUI(F)	13.23	(10)	14.56	(5)	17.22	(4)	18.82	(2)
ANP	3.30	(0)	3.71	(0)	2.80	(0)	2.63	(0)
JWP/BNA	10.91	(6)	16.60	(8)	11.97	(2)	18.60	(2)
PKMAP/PMAI	3.74	(1)	7.55	(3)	7.46	(0)	10.08	(1)
Other Parties	10.30	(3)	20.33	(8)	14.33	(0)	21.57	(2)
Independents	25.14	(7)	18.73	(4)	18.02	(2)	1.30	(0)
Total	-	(39)*	-	(37)**	-	(11)	-	(11)

"Other Parties" Description :

PNP	-	(2)	11.92	(6)	10.65	(0)	13.20	(2)
BNM	-	-	7.46	(2)	-	-	7.35	(0)
WP	-	(1)	-	-	-	-	-	-

* On one seat Election was not held in November 1988.

** Election results are not available for remaining 3 seats.



Data by Regions Within Provinces

1988 and 1990 Data

National Assembly Elections

PARTY SHARE OF VOTES
REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF
P U N J A B

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS

NA Seats ->		Barani		Nehri		Colony		Southern	
		(35 - 46) (80 - 84)		(57 - 65) (71 - 79) (85 - 131)		(47 - 56) (66 - 70) (132 - 140)		(141 - 150)	
		% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats
IJI	1990	51.86	(15)	50.35	(55)	45.48	(15)	48.05	(7)
	1988	38.24	(9)	40.8	(25)	30.66	(5)	36.21	(6)
PDA	1990	41.14	(2)	39.80	(5)	33.88	(5)	37.73	(2)
PPP	1988	38.40	(6)	44.44	(36)	31.21	(8)	34.20	(3)
INDEP	1990	4.0	(0)	6.26	(3)	13.25	(2)	13.81	(1)
	1988	14.14	(2)	9.23	(2)	21.22	(6)	20.78	(1)
All Others	1990	3.0	(0)	3.59	(1)	7.39	(2)	0.41	(0)
	1988	9.22	(0)	5.53	(1)	16.91	(5)	8.81	(0)

PARTY SHARE OF VOTES
REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF
S I N D H

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS

NA Seats ->		RURAL		URBAN	
		(152 - 167) (170 - 183)		(151 , 168 , 169) (184 - 196)	
		% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats
IJI	1990	9.11	(3)	8.40	(0)
	1988	14.71	(0)	10.21	(0)
PDA	1990	57.56	(22)	18.32	(2)
PPP	1988	67.61	(28)	17.90	(3)
MQM	1990	1.79	(1)	64.85	(14)
	1988	2.97	(0)	56.07	(13)
INDEP	1990	25.64	(4)	1.73	(0)
	1988	11.05	(2)	5.74	(0)
All Others	1990	5.9	(0)	6.7	(0)
	1988	3.66	(0)	10.08	(0)

PARTY SHARE OF VOTES
REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF
N W F P

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS

		Peshawar Valley		Hazara		Malakand		Southern	
NA Seats ->		(1 - 8)		(11 - 17)		(21 - 26)		(9 - 10)	
		(18 - 20)							
		% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats
IJI	1990	5.15	(1)	41.53	(4)	35.99	(2)	24.16	(1)
	19881	18.82	(0)	30.53	(4)	32.77	(2)	32.51	(2)
PDA	1990	25.43	(0)	8.22	(0)	30.67	(3)	24.20	(2)
PPP	1988	33.99	(5)	12.84	(0)	34.05	(3)	4.56	(0)
ANP	1990	41.16	(6)	-	-	1.66	(0)	-	-
	1988	38.47	(2)	0.85	(0)	17.38	(0)	6.07	(0)
JUI(F)	1990	23.84	(1)	9.02	(2)	14.73	(0)	33.11	(1)
	19881	3.68	(1)	1.61	(0)	6.93	(0)	26.64	(2)
INDEP	1990	4.06	(0)	39.15	(1)	16.56	(1)	13.63	(1)
	1988	4.53	(0)	41.83	(3)	8.47	(0)	16.65	(0)
ALL Others	1990	0.36	(0)	2.08	(0)	0.39	(0)	4.9	(0)
	1988	0.51	(0)	12.35	(0)	0.40	(0)	13.57	(1)

PARTY SHARE OF VOTES
REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF
B A L U C H I S T A N

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS

NA Seats ->		Quetta		Pashtun		Balochi/ Brahvi	
		(197)		(198 - 200)		(201 - 207)	
		% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats
IJI	1990	1.34	(0)	14.11	(1)	14.07	(1)
	1988	19.20	(0)	17.26	(0)	23.12	(2)
PDA	1990	33.50	(1)	8.09	(0)	12.54	(1)
PPP	1988	10.70	(0)	9.51	(1)	5.12	(0)
JWPP	1990	9.50	(0)	6.14	(0)	26.11	(2)
BNA	1988	11.20	(0)	-	-	17.05	(2)
JUI(F)	1990	30.14	(0)	35.43	(1)	9.80	(1)
	1988	20.52	(1)	34.46	(2)	9.22	(1)
PKMAP	1990	14.35	(0)	29.14	(1)	1.21	(0)
PMAI	1988	11.33	(0)	17.60	(0)	2.13	(0)
PNP	1990	-	-	1.08	(0)	21.73	(2)
	1988	10.31	(0)	0.76	(0)	14.73	(0)

-continued-

NA Seats ->		Quetta		Pashtun		Balochi/ Brahvi	
		(197)		(198 – 200)		(201 - 207)	
		% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats	% of Votes	No. of Seats
BNM	1990	3.88	(0)	-	-	110.28	(0)
	1988	-	-	-	-	-	-
INDEP	1990	2.5	(0)	1.03	(0)	1.03	(0)
	1988	1.90	(0)	9.31	(0)	26.76	(2)
ALL Others	1990	4.79	(0)	4.98	(0)	2.23	(0)
	1988	14..84	(0)	11.10	(0)	1.87	(0)



TURN OUT RATES

Summary Data and Seat by Seat Data

TURN-OUT RATES: SUMMARY DATA

	PROVINCIAL		NATIONAL	
	ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS		ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS	
	1988	1990	1988	1990
ALL PAKISTAN	42.69%	45.73%	42.40%	44.58%
PUNJAB	45.33%	46.87%	46.49%	48.67%
SIND	41.90%	51.01%	42.38%	42.80%
NWFP	36.70%	37.97%	33.16%	34.40%
BALUCHISTAN	28.78%	29.42%	24.94%	26.20%

**COMPARATIVE DATA ON
 TURN OUT RATES**

Country	Means Turnout (%)
Australia	95
Netherlands	95/84
Austria	94
Italy	93
Belgium	93
New-Zealand	90
West Germany	87
Sweden	85
Israel	82
Norway	81
France	79
Finland	79
United Kingdom	77
Canada	76
Ireland	75
Japan	73
Switzerland	65
India	59
USA	59

TRUN OUT RATES: SEAT BY SEAT DATA
NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS 1988 & 1990

SEAT NO.	SEAT NAME	TURN-OUT RATIO	
		1990	1988
NA001	PESHAWAR-I	41.45	52.68
NA002	PESHAWAR-II	40.65	42.76
NA003	PESHAWAR-CUM-NOWSHEREA	37.46	36.34
NA004	NOWSHEREA	41.03	38.16
NA005	CHARSADDA	36.02	61.95
NA006	MARDAN-I	37.92	58.92
NA007	MARDAN-II	34.40	28.91
NA008	SWABI	37.81	35.02
NA009	KOHAT	27.55	36.66
NA010	KARAK	33.75	50.71
NA011	ABBOTTABAD-I	40.09	40.32
NA012	ABBOTTABAD-II	34.51	39.25
NA013	ABBOTTABAD-III	42.20	61.98
NA014	MANSEHRA-I	38.37	43.24
NA015	MANSEHRA-II	26.09	36.62
NA016	MANSEHRA-III	43.91	39.24
NA017	KOHISTAN	16.88	31.65
NA018	D.I.KHAN	41.36	41.62
NA019	BANNU-I	29.21	33.88
NA020	BANNU-II	34.72	49.82
NA021	SWAT-I	33.81	0.00
NA022	SWAT-II	27.27	24.59
NA023	SWAT-III	31.71	30.60
NA024	CHITRAL	53.41	56.22
NA025	DIR	21.90	47.28
NA026	MALAKAND-CUM-DIR	34.88	44.51
NA027	TRIBAL AREA-I(MOHMAND AGENCY)	0.00	46.15
NA028	TRIBAL AREA-II(KURRAM AGENCY)	85.85	50.20
NA029	TRIBAL AREA-III(ORAKZAI AGENCY)	52.76	45.55
NA030	TRIBAL AREA-IV(N.W.AGENCY)	68.89	44.62
NA031	TRIBAL AREA-V (S.W.AGENCY)	83.55	67.74
NA032	TRIBAL AREA-VI(BAJAUR AGENCY)	44.30	27.35
NA033	TRIBAL AREA-VII(KHYBER AGENCY)	72.42	36.14
NA034	TRIBAL AREA-VIII (F.R.)	0.00	45.42
NA035	FEDERAL CAPITAL	56.16	37.67
NA036	RAWALPINDI-I	51.55	34.90
NA037	RAWALPINDI-II	53.47	43.98
NA038	RAWALPINDI-III	49.33	53.60
NA039	RAWALPINDI-IV	53.35	41.76
NA040	RAWALPINDI-V	62.59	48.84

SEAT NO.	SEAT NAME	TURN-OUT RATIO	
		1990	1988
NA041	ATTOCK-I	50.19	38.27
NA042	ATTOCK-II	55.41	42.50
NA043	CHAKWAL-I	55.20	43.31
NA044	CHAKWAL-II	56.74	55.47
NA045	JHELUM-I	58.20	41.15
NA046	JHELUM-II	51.82	41.93
NA047	SARGODHA-I	45.72	50.27
NA048	SARGODHA-II	45.85	41.50
NA049	SARGODHA-III	49.74	51.92
NA050	SARGODHA-IV	50.99	54.67
NA051	SARGODHA-CUM-KHUSHAB	48.37	60.37
NA052	KHUSHAB	51.26	47.67
NA053	MIANWALI-I	43.17	49.25
NA054	MIANWALI-II	49.56	39.19
NA055	BHAKKAR-I	51.84	43.35
NA056	BHAKKAR-II	70.65	46.47
NA057	FAISALABAD-I	54.55	46.85
NA058	FAISALABAD-II	42.55	54.66
NA059	FAISALABAD-III	42.77	53.43
NA060	FAISALABAD-IV	49.56	26.55
NA061	FAISALABAD-V	54.66	55.12
NA962	FAISALABAD-VI	50.19	0.00
NA063	FAISALABAD-VII	54.49	48.71
NA064	FAISALABAD-VIII	55.14	47.30
AN065	FAISALABAD-IX	54.35	52.74
NA066	JHANG-I	45.37	36.13
NA067	JHANG-II	47.11	57.81
NA068	JHANG-III	47.82	39.87
NA069	JHANG-IV	49.11	50.73
NA070	JHANG-V	50.30	54.81
NA071	TOBA TEK SINGH-I	52.00	53.07
NA072	TOBA TEK SINGH-II	55.17	55.37
NA073	TOBA TEK SINGH-III	54.46	46.79
NA074	GUJJANWALA-I	55.23	51.89
NA075	GUJJANWALA-II	46.08	52.89
NA076	GUJJANWALA-III	50.80	49.41
NA077	GUJJANWALA-IV	51.72	53.14
NA078	GUJJANWALA-V	54.03	50.57
NA079	GUJJANWALA-VI	52.92	34.33
NA080	GUJRAT-I	53.81	49.48
NA081	GUJRAT-II	57.03	51.84
NA082	GUJRAT-III	52.55	49.02
NA083	GUJRAT-IV	45.64	40.12
NA084	GUJRAT-V	37.78	37.97
NA085	SIALKOT-I	50.99	56.14

SEAT NO.	SEAT NAME	TURN-OUT RATIO	
		1990	1988
NA086	SIALKOT-II	55.06	47.14
NA087	SIALKOT-III	55.90	41.57
NA088	SIALKOT-IV	57.83	45.40
NA089	SIALKOT-V	50.07	31.81
NA090	SIALKOT-VI	47.89	49.32
NA091	SIALKOT-VII	0.00	32.84
NA092	LAHORE-I	47.23	47.20
NA093	LAHORE-II	46.63	58.43
NA094	LAHORE-III	52.10	51.69
NA095	LAHORE-IV	48.21	56.25
NA096	LAHORE-V	48.27	50.83
NA097	LAHORE-VI	43.08	48.00
NA098	LAHORE-VII	42.75	47.76
NA099	LAHORE-VIII	48.44	43.21
NA100	LAHORE-IX	54.13	42.75
NA101	SHEIKHUPURA-I	46.72	58.88
NA102	SHEIKHUPURA-II	45.78	37.96
NA103	SHEIKHUPURA-III	47.30	39.30
NA104	SHEIKHUPURA-IV	42.69	55.61
NA105	SHEIKHUPURA-V	39.86	50.27
NA106	KASUR-I	44.61	59.64
NA107	KASUR-II	49.21	46.93
NA108	KASUR-III	48.93	56.24
NA109	KASUR-IV	45.60	52.17
NA110	OKARA-I	51.17	54.65
NA111	OKARA-II	45.21	47.48
NA112	OKARA-III	46.48	49.81
NA113	OKARA-IV	50.85	52.10
NA114	MULTAN-I	47.49	56.73
NA115	MULTAN-II	40.35	40.88
NA116	MULTAN-III	39.81	51.13
NA117	MULTAN-IV	50.48	48.04
NA118	MULTAN-V	46.73	33.05
NA119	MULTAN-VI	47.54	51.65
NA120	MULTAN-CUM-KHANEWAL	51.61	50.48
NA121	KHANEWAL-I	45.85	52.34
NA122	KHANEWAL-II	46.63	50.50
NA123	KHANEWAL-III	53.13	48.26
NA124	SAHIWAL-I	46.49	52..1
NA125	SAHIWAL-II	47.21	49.95
NA126	SAHIWAL-III	51.71	45.68
AN127	SAHIWAL-IV	41.58	48.20
NA128	PAKPATTAN	40.27	55.47
NA129	VEHARI-I	53.98	50.37
NA130	VEHARI-II	48.45	53.11

SEAT NO.	SEAT NAME	TURN-OUT RATIO	
		1990	1988
NA131	VEHARI-III	50.69	54.00
NA132	D.G. KHAN	40.86	50.15
NA133	D.G.KHAN-CUM-RAJANPUR	41.89	65.94
NA134	RAJANPUR	41.14	45.62
NA135	MUZAFFARGARH-I	49.45	27.89
NA136	MUZAFFARGARH-II	50.71	52.63
NA137	MUZAFFARGARH-III	45.90	59.62
NA138	MUZAFFARGARH-IV	46.19	75.31
NA139	LAYYAH-I	49.90	44.23
NA140	LAYYAH-II	48.64	35.39
NA141	BAHAWALPUR-I	39.05	58.38
NA142	BAHAWALPUR-II	47.20	46.37
NA143	BAHAWALPUR-III	51.32	38.48
NA144	BAHAWALNAGAR-I	48.57	33.85
NA145	BAHAWALNAGAR-II	52.98	48.55
NA146	BAHAWALNAGAR-III	53.53	44.60
NA147	RAHIMYAR KHAN-I	41.89	48.51
NA148	RAHIMYAR KHAN-II	43.94	41.07
NA149	RAHIMYAR KHAN-III	44.65	44.80
NA150	RAHIMYAR KHAN-IV	47.36	37.33
NA151	SUKKUR-I	45.70	56.10
NA152	SUKKUR-II	47.47	63.03
NA153	SUKKUR-III	40.76	64.14
NA154	SHIKARPUR-I	40.77	62.39
NA155	SHIKARPUR-II	38.28	78.97
NA156	JACOBABAD-I	37.69	85.96
NA157	JACOBABAD-II	42.21	53.11
NA158	N.FEROZE-I	49.48	69.23
NA159	N.FEROZE-II	43.48	58.21
NA160	NAWABSHAH-I	39.86	42.08
NA161	NAWABSHAH-II	36.20	77.77
NA162	KHAIRPUR-I	45.64	71.05
NA163	KHAIRPUR-II	41.89	73.33
NA164	LARKANA-I	39.56	92.21
NA165	LARKANA-II	38.12	76.80
NA166	LARKANA-III	43.35	96.71
NA167	HYDERABAD-I	39.74	75.45
NA168	HYDERABAD-II	52.64	73.17
NA169	HYDERABAD-III	59.25	68.60
NA170	HYDERABAD-IV	38.60	72.28
NA171	HYDERABAD-V	44.28	72.72
NA172	BADIN-I	34.47	68.35
NA173	BADIN-II	30.27	70.27
NA174	THARPARKAR-I	41.97	41.33
NA175	THARPARKAR-II	35.71	49.66

SEAT NO.	SEAT NAME	TURN-OUT RATIO	
		1990	1988
NA176	THARPARKAR-III	48.96	49.88
NA177	DADU-I	35.65	83.75
NA178	DADU-II	40.28	83.43
NA179	DADU-III	41.90	74.89
NA180	SANGHAR-I	45.26	62.73
NA181	SANGHAR-II	48.03	46.63
NA182	THATTA-I	32.50	82.13
NA183	THATTA-II	35.17	74.11
NA184	KARACHI (WEST)-I	36.85	27.96
NA185	KARACHI(WEST)-II	41.65	67.63
NA186	KARACHI (CENTRAL)-I	46.32	70.59
NA187	KARACHI (CENTRAL)-II	51.74	81.07
NA188	KARACHI (CENTRAL)-III	48.33	81.55
NA189	KARACHI (SOUTH)-I	36.14	68.83
NA190	KARACHI (SOUTH)-II	43.63	40.83
NA191	KARACHI(SOUTH)-III	40.71	42.87
NA192	KARACHI (EAST)-I	42.98	63.22
NA193	KARACHI(EAST)-II	42.81	62.24
NA194	KARACHI (EAST)-III	38.69	65.85
NA195	KARACHI (EAST)-IV	44.06	53.48
NA196	KARACHI (EAST)-V	57.28	60.06
NA197	QUETTA-CUM-CHAGAI	35.01	20.52
NA198	PISHIN	24.28	38.14
NA199	LORALAI	32.49	26.37
NA200	ZHOB-CUM-QILLA SAIFULLAH	16.37	45.34
NA201	KACHHI	29.01	49.59
NA202	SIBI,KOHLU,DERA BUGTI,ZIARAT	38.48	47.98
NA203	JAFFERABAD-CUM-TAMBOO	21.36	70.40
NA204	KALAT-CUM-KHARAN	21.26	38.36
NA205	KHUZDAR	26.28	35.82
NA206	LASBELA-CUM-GWADAR	38.84	32.11
NA207	TURBAT-CUM-PANJGUR	30.87	36.40



PART II

VOTERS

ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOUR

Findings from the Exit-Poll Data conducted with approximately 4500 voters covering all provinces and regions of the country. The Survey was conducted outside the polling stations on October 24, 1990.

October 24, 1990



DETERMINANTS OF VOTING BEHAVIOUR



SOCIO-ECONOMIC DETERMINANTS

ROLE OF AGE

Findings from the Exit-poll data show that IJI is ahead of PDA among voters of age 30 and above. But it is behind PDA among the under thirty.

Comparison with the 1988 election study shows that IJI gained additional votes from the over thirty group of voters, but could not cut into PPP's strength among the younger voters. The PPP is still ahead of IJI among the younger voters by 8 percent; in 1988 it was ahead by 9 percent.

Among the older voters, however, the IJI was able to reverse the 1988 results: PPP's edge of 3 percent in 1988 among the over 30 voters was changed into an edge of 6 percent in favour of IJI.

Table

Age Group	Percent who Voted for			
	1990		1988	
	IJI	PDA	IJI	PPP
21 - 30	28	36	29	38
30 and above	37	31	34	37

Source: Gallup Exit Poll Surveys



ROLE OF LITERACY

The Gallup exit-poll data show that PDA was ahead of IJI among the illiterate voters. But IJI more than made up the difference among the literate voters.

This finding identifies one of the most crucial features of the 1990 elections: **Dismally low turn-out among the illiterate population.**

The illiterate population voted substantially less than its share among the registered voters. Since the illiterate population had a tilt in favour of PPP, their abstention from polling hurt the PPP's in its competition with IJI. Gallup exit-poll data show that in 1990 elections the share of illiterates among voters declined in comparison to where it stood in 1988. However, even in 1988 the illiterate population was disproportionately low in the turn-out.

The root-cause of PDA's failure in 1990 elections lies in its inability to mobilize the party's strongest vote bank, that is, the illiterate majority of the country.

Apparently, this aspect of PDA's weakness in the 1990 elections has been forgotten in the heat generated by the passionate argument about 'influencing the elections through rigging'.

IJI can, however, take some comfort from the fact that PDA's edge among the illiterates over IJI was not as sharp in 1990 as it was two years ago.

PDA was still ahead of IJI by 5 percent among the illiterates; but two years ago the gap was 16 percent. Among the literates the IJI jumped ahead of PPP by 2 percent; previously the two were exactly even.

Table

	Percent who Voted for			
	1990		1988	
	IJI	PDA	IJI	PPP
Education-wise				
Illiterate	29	34	28	44
Literate	35	33	34	34

Source: Gallup Exit Poll Surveys



ROLE OF FOREIGN REMITTANCES

The Gallup exit poll confirmed the general impression among political observers and analysts that overseas income through remittances had worked to the advantage of IJI. IJI had an edge of 10 percent over PDA among recipients of overseas remittances.

Table

ROLE OF FOREIGN REMITTANCES

Questions: who did you vote for to the National Assembly elections?

	Percent of respondents who Voted for		
	IJI	PDA	Others
Remittance Receiving Household			
Personal recipient	41	31	28
Family recipient	39	30	31

Source: Gallup Exit Poll Survey, October 24, 1990



ATTITUDNAL DETERMINANTS

ATTITUDES AMONG PDA VOTERS

Why did they decide to choose PPP and reject IJI?

CAUSE FOR CHOICE

More than one quarter of those who voted for PPP made their choice in its favour because they believed it was the 'party of the poor'.

This is an image which the PDA's predecessor PPP projected at birth, and has apparently sustained it among a good portion of its supporters ever since. **Another 16 percent** voted for PPP because they believed that it had been the victim of injustice. Perhaps they referred to the premature dissolution of PPP government by the President. But, they were also echoing the general theme of PPP being a party of the 'poor and the oppressed'.

CAUSE FOR REJECTION

PPP's accusation that IJI had compromised on national integrity by associating with regionalist groups in Sindh, NWFP and Baluchistan did not echo with its voters. **Only 5 percent** of PPP voters said they rejected IJI because it was '**un-patriotic**'. Another PPP theme, accusing IJI of being a disunited **alliance of disparate political elements**, was relatively more successful: **16 percent** of PPP voters described it as their reason to reject IJI.

For the PPP voters the strongest charge against IJI was its leadership: **20 percent** said they rejected IJI because its **leadership was unfair and ruthless**. Another **9 percent** of PPP voters rejected IJI because its leadership was corrupt **and unprincipled**.



Table

Campaign Themes

POSITIVE THEMES WHICH APPEALED TO THE PPP VOTERS

Question: [Ask from only those who voted for PPP. (Arrow election symbol)]

The PDA put forward many arguments in its favour. Which of those arguments moved you the most to vote for the PDA?

(Give only one answer.)

Percent among respondents who answered this question

	Pro- poor	Under dog	Good Leadership	Good Performance	Pro-democracy	others
All Pakistan	26	14	12	9	3	35
Language-wise						
Urdu	36	4	8	8	12	32
Punjabi	34	4	12	8	5	38
Sindhi	20	31	11	13	0	26
Pashto	24	14	19	5	10	29
Balochi	10	40	10	0	5	35
Income-wise						
Poor	31	5	15	12	4	32
Lower Middle	22	16	10	8	3	41
Middle	32	16	11	9	2	30
Upper Middle & above	18	18	13	7	6	37

Source: Gallup Exit Poll Survey, October 24, 1990



Table

Campaign Themes

**NEGATIVE THEMES WHICH CAUSED
PPP VOTERS TO REJECT IJI**

Question: [Ask form only those who voted for Peoples' Party. (Arrow election symbol)]

IJI is the principal opponent of the PPP. What did you most dislike about the IJI which led you not to vote for IJI?

(Give only one answer.)

Percent among respondents who answered this question

	Unfair/ ruthless	Dis- United Alliance	Corrupt/ Un-Principled	Poor Performance	Un- Patriotic	Others
All Pakistan	20	16	9	8	5	42
Language-wise						
Urdu	25	13	4	17	4	37
Punjabi	22	13	13	10	5	37
Sindhi	20	18	5	3	1	53
Pashto	6	28	11	11	0	44
Balochi	22	11	0	11	17	39
Income-wise						
Poor	17	24	10	6	8	35
Lower Middle	22	13	6	9	7	43
Middle	26	12	9	6	3	44
Upper Middle & above	14	18	12	10	4	42

Source: Gallup Exit Poll Survey, October 24, 1990



ATTITUDE AMONG IJI VOTERS

Why did they decide to chose IJI and reject PPP?

CAUSE FOR CHOICE

IJI appealed to its voters through establishing its credentials as an Islamic and Pakistani nationalist party. The exit-poll data show that **one half** of IJI voters said they had chosen IJI because of its **Islamic stance**. Another 13% voted for *IJI* because of its **'patriotic' stance**. Only 12 percent of *IJI* voters mentioned problems such as poverty, unemployment and injustice as themes on which they voted for IJI.

The exit-poll data indicate that IJI's leadership was successful in establishing ISLAMIC ETHOS and PAKISTANI NATIONALISM as the two major election issues in the minds of their voters. Having established an agenda of its own choice, the *IJI* leadership proceeded to distinguish itself as superior to PPP, at least in relative terms, on those issues. Besides *IJI* convinced its voters that PPP's Islamic and Pakistani credentials were doubtful?

CAUSE FOR REJECTION

More than half of *IJI* voters said they rejected PPP because they were suspicious of its Islamic and Pakistani credentials. They viewed PPP as **weak on Islamic ethos (29%)** or **weak on Pakistani patriotism (24%)** some IJI voters specifically mentioned PPP's weak stand on Kashmir, India, Afghanistan, nuclear issue and relations with the US. But, a much larger number summed up their impressions under the general term 'unpatriotic'.

Corruption and incompetence of PPP government was described as another reason, by IJI voters, to reject PPP. **Corruption** was mentioned by **12%** and **incompetence** or poor performance by **11%** of IJI voters.



Table

Campaign Themes

NEGATIVE THEMES WHICH CAUSED IJI VOTERS TO REJECT PPP

Question: [Ask from only those who voted for IJI. (Bicycle election symbol)]

PPP is the principal opponent of the IJI. What did you most dislike about the PPP which led you not to vote for PPP? (Give only one answer.)

	Percent among respondents who answered this question					
	Un-Islamic	Un-Patriotic	Poor Performance	Corrupt	Un-fair/Ruthless	Others
All Pakistan	29	24	12	11	10	13
Language-wise						
Urdu	25	33	9	11	8	13
Punjabi	32	22	12	11	10	13
Sindhi	0	0	33	67	0	0
Pashto	35	16	19	3	10	16
Income-wise						
Poor	19	29	17	13	10	13
Lower Middle	34	23	11	9	10	12
Middle	32	19	13	9	13	14
Upper Middle & above	31	24	10	14	10	12

Source: Gallup Exit Poll Survey, October 24, 1990



TYPE OF VOTERS

The Seven Types



SEVEN TYPES OF VOTERS

Analysis of Gallup exit-poll data suggests that voters can be classified into seven major types. **The Party Loyals, The Value seeking Voters, The Patron Seeking Voters, The Legislation-minded, The Development Searchers, The Biradari Bound, and the Skeptic Voters.**

A preliminary analysis of the data suggests that one quarter of the voters like to be seen as **Party Loyals**. The most important reason in their choice was the nomination of their candidate by the party. They chose this reason from seven different reasons provided to them on a circular card.

Sixteen percent of voters would like to be seen as **value-seeking/ Morality-Seeking** voters. They describe legislator's religiosity, honesty and integrity as the principal motive behind their choice.

Another 16 percent of voters are the **Patron-seeking** types. The legislator's ability to help them with the police, courts and other officials stands out as his major attribute.

Fourteen percent of voters are **Legislation-Minded**. They chose their legislator because of his competence in the comprehension of national affairs.

Nine percent of voters would pass as **Development Searchers**. They mentioned their legislator's ability to execute development projects, such as, bringing roads and electricity to their community as the critical reason behind their choice.

Eight percent admitted to be **Biradari-bound**. They said they followed their Biradari's verdict in choosing the legislator.

Only 4 percent placed themselves in the category of **Skeptic Voters**, that is those who chose a certain legislator because he was in their view, at least better than his competitor.



Table
Motivations To Vote
MOST LIKED ATTRIBUTE IN THE CANDIDATE

Question: Would you tell us the most important reason which led you to vote for the candidate for whom you have just voted? I will read out to you seven different reasons (show round card). Please think for a moment and tell us which was the most important reason was for you?

	Percent of respondents								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
All Pakistan	25	17	16	13	9	7	4	3	6
Voting-wise									
IJI Voters	23	22	16	12	10	7	5	0	5
PDA Voters	32	9	16	13	10	8	3	3	6
Other Voters	20	20	15	15	6	8	4	3	9
Income-wise									
Poor	17	21	22	11	8	10	2	1	8
Lower Middle	25	16	17	13	8	8	3	3	7
Middle	28	15	13	16	10	7	5	1	6
Upper Middle & above	31	16	12	16	9	5	6	2	3
Rural/ Urban-wise									
Rural	20	17	18	14	10	8	3	2	8
Urban	28	17	14	13	8	7	5	3	5
Education-wise									
Illiterate/Primary	20	16	19	10	9	10	2	3	10
Middle/Matric	23	20	16	15	9	6	4	2	4
Above Matric	36	14	9	16	7	6	6	2	3

Legend:

1 = Party Candidate

2 = Religious and clean

3 = Helpful in personal needs

4 = Competent in national affairs

5 = Helpful in Community development
roads, electricity, etc.

6 = Biradri/clan's choice

7 = Better than his competitor

8 = Others

9 = No Opinion

Source: Gallup Exit Poll Survey, October 24, 1990



PERSONAL LOYALTY TO THE CANDIDATE

One issue often raised in political discourse about Pakistani politics is: To what extent are the voters' loyalties bound to the individual legislator rather than the party in whose name he contested the elections? The Gallup exit-poll has some answers.

One quarter of the voters in 1990 said they held loyalty to individual legislator as superior to loyalty to his party. They said they would vote for him, even if he were to crossover to the competing political party.

The espoused views of those who held personal loyalty to the candidate superior to his party were borne out by their voting behaviour. They formed a majority among those who switched loyalties across IJI and PPP between 1988 and 1990 elections. Personal and biradri/class loyalties appeared to be the underlying motivation for their extra-party loyalties.



Table

PERSONAL LOYALTY TO THE CANDIDATE

Question: (State the name mentioned in the previous question and ask) If (Name) was not a nominee of this party and instead was nominated by the opposing party, would you still vote for him?

	Percent of respondents		
	Same Candidate	Not the Same	No Opinion
All Pakistan	26	62	12
Voting-wise			
IJI Voters	25	66	9
PDA Voters	21	70	9
Other Voters	31	51	18
Rural/Urban-wise			
Rural	29	55	16
Urban	23	67	10
Language-wise			
Urdu	20	73	7
Punjabi	26	63	11
Sindhi	8	71	21
Pashto	33	54	13
Balochi	21	56	23
Education-wise			
Illiterate	29	51	20
Literate	24	66	9
Political Participation-wise			
Very active	24	70	6
Active	25	64	12
Inactive	27	56	17

Source: Gallup Exit Poll Survey, October 24, 1990



VOTING PATTERNS AND THE FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY IN PAKISTAN



SENSE OF EFFICACY AMONG VOTERS

A large majority (73%) of the voters in Pakistan's 1990 elections believed their vote would make a difference in steering the course of national affairs. In other words they believed in the efficacy of voting. The Political science literature describes such attitudes as a positive sign for democratic development.

The sense of efficacy varies, although only slightly, from group to group. The educated voters have a slightly higher sense of efficacy compared to their illiterate counterparts. Voters' sense of efficacy had a direct relationship with their active participation in the election campaign. Those who regarded themselves as active in the campaign had a considerably higher sense of efficacy compared to those who did not take active part in the election campaign.



Table

VOTERS' SENSE OF EFFICACY

Question: You have just voted for the National Assembly election. In your view, will your vote make any contribution in improving national affairs?

	Percent of respondents		
	Affective	Ineffective	No Opinion
All Pakistan	73	10	17
Voting-wise			
IJI Voters	77	10	13
PDA Voters	72	9	19
Other Voters	69	12	19
Education-wise			
Illiterate	66	11	23
Literate	78	10	13
Above Matric	77	9	14
Political Participation-wise			
Active	80	8	13
Somewhat Active	73	11	16
No Active	67	11	22
Campaign Participation-wise			
Participated in Rallies	76	10	14
Hoisted Flags	75	9	15
Canvassed	78	9	13
Campaign Organiser	79	9	12
Campaign Speaker	79	11	10
Campaign Non-Participation-wise			
Not Participated in Rallies	66	11	23
Not Hoisted Flags	70	11	19
Not Canvassed	68	11	21
Non Campaign Organiser	70	11	19
Non Campaign Speaker	72	10	18

Source: Gallup Exit Poll Survey, October 24, 1990



Views on personal sense of efficacy through elections are consistent with the prevalent altitude that a government formed through elections can solve the nation's problems. Democratically elected governments are NOT viewed, as the exit-poll data show, with skepticism in Pakistan. There is apparently a store of good-will for the process of democracy in Pakistan.

A majority of 66 percent said that regularly held elections will improve Pakistan's conditions. Only 7 percent disputed such optimism.

	Percent of respondents			
	Positive	Negative	No Impact	No Opinion
All Pakistan	66	7	12	15
Voting-wise				
IJI Voters	71	6	11	12
PDA Voters	62	8	14	16
Other Voters	66	7	10	17
Education-wise				
Illiterate	59	7	11	24
Middle/Matric	70	6	14	10
Above Matric	75	9	10	6
Political Participation-wise				
Active	73	6	13	8
Somewhat Active	70	8	10	12
Not at all	59	7	13	22
Campaign Participation-wise				
Participated in Rallies	69	7	12	12
Hoisted Flags	69	7	11	12
Canvassed	73	6	12	9
Campaign Organiser	72	6	12	9
Campaign Speaker	74	8	11	7

Source: Gallup Exit Poll Survey, October 24, 1990

Table

PROFILE OF VOTERS OF IJI AND PDA

	Composition of IJI Voters %	Composition of PDA Voters %
Age Composition		
21-3- Years	31	40
31-40 Years	33	30
41-50 Years	19	16
51-60 Years	11	9
Over 60 Years	4	4
Education Composition		
Illiterate	22	26
Primary	16	20
Middle	16	14
Matric	22	19
Intermediate	13	10
Graduation	11	11
Income Group Composition		
Rs. 1 - 500	3	3
Rs. 501 - 1000	16	16
Rs. 1001-2000	32	33
RS. 2001-2000	23	23
Above Rs.3000	22	20



	Composition of IJI Voters %	Composition of PDA Voters %
--	--	--

Language Group Composition

Urdu	14	9
Punjabi/Saraiki	75	60
Pushto/ Hindko	5	9
Sindhi	1	14
Balochi/Others	4	8

Note: When the total of a segment does not add up to 100, the difference is explained by No Response.



FAIRNESS ISSUES



FAIRNESS AND PARTIALITY IN ELECTIONS

The fairness of the care-taker government and the local administration was seen as questionable by a sizable section of the population. But, only a small number of voters questioned the propriety of the balloting process or the staff which conducted elections.

Thirty percent of the sample believed that the care-taker government acted partially in the election process. Fifteen' percent disputed the fairness of the local administration. But, only 5 percent regarded the polling staff which supervised the balloting operation to have acted in a partisan manner.

The attitudes of PDA voters on the issue of fairness of elections are extremely revealing. They are careful in making a distinction between unfairness at three different levels. 58 percent of PDA voters regarded the care-taker government as partial. 29 percent of them viewed the local administration to have acted as partially against them. But, only 9 percent disputed the propriety of the election process on the polling day.



Table

**ELECTIONS
EVALUATED AS PARTIAL**

(The wording of the relevant question may be seen in the Table on the following page.)

	Percent of respondents		
	Care-taker Government	Local Administration	Polling Staff
All Pakistan	30	15	5
Voting-wise			
IJI Voters	11	5	2
PDA Voters	58	29	9
Other Voters	21	12	4

Table

**ELECTIONS
EVALUATED AS FAIR**

(The wording of the relevant question may be seen in the Table on the following page.)

	Percent of respondents		
	Care-taker Government	Local Administration	Polling Staff
All Pakistan	55	70	83
Voting-wise			
IJI Voters	77	83	90
PDA Voters	26	53	75
Other Voters	61	74	82

Source: Gallup Exit Poll Survey, October 24, 1990



**FAIRNESS AND PARTIALITY ISSUE:
CARE-TAKER GOVERNMENT**

Question: some people believe that the current caretaker government is acting partially. Others believe that it is acting fairly. What is your view?

	Percent of respondents		
	Fair	Partial	No Opinion
All Pakistan	55	30	15
Voting-wise			
IJI Voters	77	11	11
PDA Voters	26	58	16
Other Voters	61	21	19

Table

**FAIRNESS AND PARTIALITY ISSUE:
LOCAL ADMINISTRATION**

Question: In your view, is the local administration acting fairly or being partial in favour of a particular election candidate in your constituency?

	Percent of respondents		
	Fair	Partial	No Opinion
All Pakistan	70	15	15
Voting-wise			
IJI Voters	83	5	12
PDA Voters	53	29	18
Other Voters	74	12	14

Source: Gallup Exit Poll Survey, October 24, 1990



Table

**FAIRNESS AND PARTIALITY ISSUE:
POLLING STAFF**

Question: In your view, is the polling staff at your polling station acting fairly or partially in favor of a particular candidate at this?

	Percent of respondents		
	Fair	Partial	No Opinion
All Pakistan	83	5	12
Voting-wise			
IJI Voters	90	2	8
PDA Voters	75	9	16
Other Voters	82	4	14

Source: Gallup Exit Poll Survey, October 24, 1990



VOTERS' AGENDA



VOTERS' AGENDA FOR THE NEW GOVERNMENT

"What should be the new government's first step?" And, "What in your view is the most important problem faced by the nation today?"

These two questions were posed to a cross-section of some four thousand five hundred voters all over the country on the election eve. Voters of different ages, educational and income background offered a number of interesting ideas with the hope that the new Prime Minister will stand up and listen to them.

Unemployment ranks as the number one problem among voters. Almost **one of every three voters** who stepped out of the polling stations described that as their foremost concern for the country. This is consistent with a study which Gallup conducted last year with ten thousand recent college and university graduates. The Study had found that more than thirty percent of them were unemployed even a year after graduation.

Inflation and poverty emerged as the second most important concern of voters. **Seventeen percent** identified that the nation's foremost problem.

Law and order problems came next, identified by **12 percent** as the nation's most important problem.

Ten percent drew attention to **external threats** especially from India.

Social ills such as parochialism, selfishness, corruption and disunity were articulated as the nation's foremost problems by 6 percent. Another 2 percent drew attention towards illiteracy and lack of education in the population.

What should then be the new government's first step?

The voters' responses took a slightly different, though not completely unexpected turn. Nearly one quarter of them, or 24 percent, said the new government should begin by the introduction of **Islamic measures** in the country. The next step suggested by voters was: **Restore law and order**. This was mentioned by 14 percent. That was followed by the suggestion: **Remove unemployment**. This was mentioned by 11 percent. An equal number (10%) listed their priority to be: **Remove Poverty**. Other priority items in voter's advice to the new government included: Focus on removing citizen's



day-to-day problems with the administration and initiate administrative reforms (9 %), ensure the nation's domestic and external security (7%).

There are certain significant differences of perception from province to province about the nation's problems. The residents of Sindh Province, in both rural and urban areas, are considerably more concerned about law and order, compared to the rest of the country. Similarly the concerns in Balochistan have their own sensitivities deserving special attention, rather than being left to the mercy of broad national policies.

Priorities on the agenda for the new government also vary from province to province. Islamization is a very prominent theme in Punjab and NWFP, but it is superseded by the overriding need to restore law and order in the Sindh province. Again, Baluchistan voters articulate their priorities in a fashion that distinguishes them from their fellow citizens in the more populous parts of the country.



Table

MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM

Question: In your view, what is the most important problem faced by the country at this time?

	Percent of respondents					
	Unemployment	Inflation	Law & Order	National Security	All Others	No Opinion
All Pakistan	30	17	12	11	24	6
Voting-wise						
IJI Voters	30	19	9	11	26	5
PDA Voters	30	17	15	11	20	7
Other Voters	28	16	12	11	27	6
Province-wise						
Punjab Rural	33	21	8	9	23	6
Punjab Urban	29	21	7	12	27	4
Sindh Rural	27	5	36	6	15	11
Sindh Urban	29	8	28	7	23	5
NWFP Rural	34	11	5	18	24	8
NWFP Urban	36	17	8	12	23	4
Baluchistan Rural	6	14	9	11	23	37
Baluchistan Urban	8	18	13	32	14	15
Income-wise						
Poor	32	22	10	9	21	6
Lower Middle	31	17	11	11	23	7
Middle	28	15	16	10	26	5
Upper Middle & Above	27	16	11	14	27	5

Source: Gallup Exit Poll Survey, October 24, 1990

Table

VOTERS' AGENDA FOR THE NEW GOVERNMENT

Question: Whichever government is formed after the elections, what in your view should be its first priority? (Give only one answer)

	Percent of respondents					
	Islamiza- tion	Law and Order	Anti Poverty/ inflation steps	Remove Unemplo- yment	All Others	No Opinion
All Pakistan	24	13	13	11	33	6
Voting-wise						
IJI Voters	27	11	13	10	34	5
PDA Voters	23	15	12	11	32	7
Other Voters	20	14	13	11	34	8
Province-wise						
Punjab Rural	29	11	11	10	33	6
Punjab Urban	28	9	16	11	33	3
Sindh Rural	9	30	6	14	30	11
Sindh Urban	9	32	10	12	33	4
NWFP Rural	25	6	11	16	33	9
NWFP Urban	31	8	12	10	37	0
Baluchistan Rural	4	4	8	2	30	52
Baluchistan Urban	8	11	25	5	29	22
Income-wise						
Poor	28	13	12	9	31	7
Lower Middle	24	15	11	10	33	7
Middle	21	15	14	14	30	6
Upper Middle & Above	21	12	14	10	37	6

Source: Gallup Exit Poll Survey, October 24, 1990



Exit Poll 1990 Questionnaire

- Q 1) In your opinion, what task should the new government take right after its election?
(Suggest ONE task only)

- Q 2) In your opinion, what is the biggest problem facing Pakistan at the moment?

- Q 3) Which Newspaper do you usually read?
- Newspaper Name: _____
 - Whichever I can get
- Q 4) How many days a week do you listen to radio?
- No of days (Per week) _____
 - Rarely
 - Do not listen to radio
- Q 5) How many days a week do you watch television?
- No of days (Per week) _____
 - Rarely
 - Do not watch television
- Q 6) Some people take active part in elections campaigning, e.g., by attending a rally or supporting a candidate, while others show no interest in such activities. What is your position?
- Take active part in politics
 - Participate to some extent
 - Do not participate in politics at all
- Q 7) Which of the following option would you say you had a chance to do in recent elections campaigning?
- Had a chance to gather votes/do some convincing in favor of a candidate
 - Had a chance to participate in a rally/ listen to a speech
 - Had a chance to hoist the flag of some party on my house/ shop or vehicle
 - Had a chance to help organize a rally
 - Had a chance to deliver a speech in a rally
- Q 8) If you are given an option, which ONE of the following candidates would you choose to be the next prime minister?
- Benazir Bhutto
 - Nawaz Sharif
 - Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi
 - Muhammad Kahn Junejo
 - Other: _____



f. DK/NA

Q 9) Who did you just vote for in national assembly elections today?

- a. Name of the Candidate: _____
- b. Election Symbol: _____

Q 10) What party does the candidate you voted for, belongs to?

- a. Party Name: _____

Q 11) Suppose the candidate you voted for belonged to a different party. Would you still vote for him?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. DK/NA

Q 12) What would you say the biggest reason was to vote for the candidate you have voted for? Pick three most important reasons (1 being the most important, 2 as the second most important and 3 being third most important reason)

- a. Helps people (public service of getting across official red tape)
- b. Regional developmental work (utility services, roads etc.)
- c. Aptitude to tackle national issues
- d. He is honest, pious and close to religion
- e. Belongs to my preferred party
- f. Has given a verdict in favor of our Biradri/clan
- g. A better choice than other candidates at the very least
- h. Other: _____
- i. DK/NA

Q 13) Did you cast your vote in 1977 elections?

- a. Yes
- b. No

Q 14) Who did you vote for in 1977 elections?

- a. PPP
- b. IJI (Islami Jamhoori Itehad)
- c. MQM
- d. Jamiat Ulama-e-Islam (Fazal-ur-Rehman group)
- e. ANP
- f. Balochistan National Alliance
- g. Pakistan national alliance
- h. Independent candidate
- i. Other: _____
- j. DK/NA

(If the interviewee has given vote to a different party than the last time then ask)

Q 15) You have changed your opinion as compared to 1977 elections. What is the reason for the change? (Mention one most pertinent reason)



(Incase the interviewee voted for PDA/PPP (Arrow) then ask question

Q 16) (a) PPP gave plenty of arguments in its favor. Which **ONE** of those arguments/reasons convinced you to vote for it?

(b).The biggest opposition party to PPP is IJI (Islami Jamhoori Itehad). What aspect of the opposition party do you dislike the most that kept you from voting for it?

Only For IJI (Islami Jamhoori Itehad) - Bicycle Voters

Q 17) (a) IJI gave plenty of arguments in its favor. Which **ONE** of those arguments/reasons convinced you to vote for it?

Q 18) (b).The biggest opposition party to IJI is PPP. What aspect of the opposition party do you dislike the most that kept you from voting for it?

Q 19) Some people hold the view that current government is biased regarding elections while other think it's impartial. What is your opinion?

- a. Biased
- b. Impartial
- c. DK/NA

Q 20) Do you think the regional administration is handling the elections impartially in your constituency or is it favoring one of candidates unfairly?

- a. Handling the elections impartially
- b. Favoring a candidate unfairly
- c. DK/NA

Q 21) Do you think election committee handling the elections in your constituency impartially or is it favoring one of candidates unfairly?

- a. Handling the elections impartially
- b. Favoring a candidate unfairly
- c. DK/NA

Q 22) Do you believe your vote will make a difference in improving present condition of the country?

- a. It would make a difference
- b. No, it wont
- c. DK/NA

Q 23) In your opinion, If elections are held on regular basis, would the condition of the country improve, worsen or stay the same?

- a. Improve
- b. Worsen
- c. No Change
- d. DK/NA



PART III
ELECTION RESULTS
1990



Appendix: Pre-Election Survey Report.

**At Polls 1990
Number 1**

PAKISTAN AT THE POLLS

Number 1

**GALLUP
Political Weather Report
October 15, 1990**

GALLUP PAKISTAN
RASHEED PLAZA, BLUE AREA, ISLAMABAD
Phone: 825406



A Gallup Poll conducted on October 5, nearly three weeks prior to the forthcoming elections in Pakistan, shows that until that date IJI was ahead of the People's Party/People's Democratic Alliance, by nearly 10 percent. The Poll which was conducted in all the four provinces, rural as well as urban areas, indicated that nearly 40 percent of the voters intended to vote for the IJI as opposed to 30 percent for the PPP. Ten percent intended to vote for other parties while the remaining 20 percent had still not made up their mind. The Sample for the Survey was selected through a two stage area probability sampling technique in accordance with internationally recognized norms for such surveys.

The Gallup Poll of October 5 showed interesting regional differences in the likely voting pattern. The PPP enjoyed a strong hold over the voters in the rural Sindh where sixty-seven percent of the voters intended to vote for the People's Party as against nineteen percent for the IJI, fourteen percent were undecided. PPP's sway over the Sindh is peaking voters was even higher, seventy-seven percent of whom intended to vote for the PPP. The Poll showed that electoral support for the Sindhi nationalist parties was meagre.

The urban Sindh presented a different picture. Here the division of voting pattern was as follows: MQM: 34 percent; PPP: 26 percent; IJI: 14 percent, with 27 percent undecided. In Karachi and Hyderabad, the intended voting pattern on October 5 was: MQM 35 percent; People's Party 20 percent; IJI 15 percent; Undecided: 30 percent. However, among the Urdu-speaking population of these two cities, MQM support was 56 percent as against 10 percent for IJI and 32 percent undecided.

The Poll showed that the voting picture in Balochistan was tricky. 75 percent of those polled in the Survey said that they had not made up their mind. Among those who had firmed up their views, the People's Party seemed to be doing well in the urban areas. But, the statistical picture was too hazy to be of any predictive value.

In the urban areas of the North West Frontier province (which comprise 15 percent of the entire province) PPP, IJI, ANP and JUI(F) were neck-and-neck in a highly split composition of voting strength. According to the latest Poll, PPP, singly, claims more vote than any other party in urban NWFP. However, in constituency where IJI and ANP are cooperating, PPP would not match their combined strength.

In rural N.W.F.P., the People's Party made a poor showing in the latest opinion poll. Voters were mainly divided between IJI, JUI (F), and ANP in that order.

Voters in the province of Punjab, which has 115 seats, or more than 50 percent of the National Assembly, the IJI appeared to have a substantial edge over the People's Party until October 5, the date on which the survey was conducted. While nearly 30 percent intended to vote for the PPP, those intending to vote for the IJI were in the vicinity of fifty percent. Interestingly, IJI's edge over PPP was accounted for more by its success in the rural than in the urban Punjab. In the urban areas the contest was closer, although the IJI was still ahead of PPP.



It should be recalled that in the early 1970s, People's Party emerged as a formidable force in Pakistani politics due to its hold over the rural masses of Punjab. Twenty years later, People's Party is still a major contender in Punjab's politics, but it has lost its erstwhile poignancy.

Past elections have, however, shown that the voter in the Punjab province has a volatile character. His sympathies do sometimes sway within a short period of time. There is evidence from the polling data, that in 1988 People's Party was behind IJI only a week prior to the elections; but it then made up the difference in a last minute sprint and scored equal votes to those of IJI on the election date. Would People's Party be able to make a similar ascent in the 1990 elections between October 5 and the polling day of October 24, is still a moot question.

It is self-evident that PPP's performance in Punjab will notably affect the outcome of 1990 elections. There are three possibilities. **First**, if by some unusual turn of events, PPP in the Punjab was to perform substantially better than it did in 1988, it would have a strong chance of returning to power at the Centre. **Second**, if the PPP simply maintains the voting strength it polled in 1988 in Punjab, it would be unlikely to form a government at the Centre, but would prevent IJI from forming a comfortable coalition with its COP allies at the Centre. **Third**, if the PPP slides by nearly ten percent in its voting strength in the Punjab, it will encounter a serious set-back at the Centre. Even then PPP will be a respectable parliamentary opposition, but would not be a major threat to the IJI.

Voter turn-out is another imponderable in the 1990 elections in Pakistan. In the general elections two years ago, the turn-out was only 41 percent.

Polling data show that low turn-out had hurt the IJI slightly more than PPP during the last elections. 7 percent of those intending to vote for IJI in the 1990 elections said they had not polled their vote in the previous elections, PPP supporters have a slightly better track record: 5 percent among them did not poll their vote in the 1988 elections. The different turn-out ratios among the supporters of the two contending parties can play a crucial role in determining the final outcome of the forthcoming elections. IJI's current lead over the PPP in opinion polls is partly attributable to the sympathies of those who have a poor turn-out history. Should the IJI supporters repeat their past behaviour, IJI's edge in the pre-election *opinion* poll may not be translated into superior position at the ballot box.