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Analysis of the Kerala Assembly Elections, May 2016*

1. Introduction

Kerala was one of the earliest elected Communist governments in the world. Since then, the state has been a ‘political laboratory’ (Gopakumar 2014: 317) and largely an exception to the national political processes. **Left Democratic Front** (LDF – alliance led by the CPI (M)) and **United Democratic Front** (UDF – alliance led by the Congress) governments have been alternatively in power in Kerala since 1982. The 2016 Assembly Election saw the LDF come to power in the same pattern. This study attempts to understand people’s perceptions and their understanding approaching the 2016 assembly elections and how it influenced the voting pattern and behaviour while exercising their right to vote. The study focused on the various alliances, observed continuities and change in the support base of parties during the campaign phase leading to the poll conducted on May 19, 2016.

2. Background of the study

Exit Poll predictions for the Kerala Assembly elections were in largely in line with the history of voting out the incumbent party for four decades. One of the critical components contributing to the anti-incumbency factor against the ruling UDF was that of the UDF faced many corruption cases, ranging from controversial land deals to ministers quitting over allegations of bribery. The CM, Oommen Chandy was accused of having connections with a fake solar energy company; the opposition had urged him many times to resign from CM post taking the moral responsibility of the charges levelled against him and his ministerial colleagues.

A feature of the party system in Kerala is that stable social alliances are present underneath political coalition; there exists a high polarization on caste-religion lines. (Gopakumar 1999) The UDF is dependent on the backing from Christians and Muslims, who form 45% of the population. Christian votes are gained through the Christian party leaders of Congress Party and the factions of *Kerala Congress* party which have a Christian following. Muslims votes are channelised by the *Indian Union Muslim League*. A small percentage of the Nairs (about 14 percent of the
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population) and some Ezhavas (23 per cent) have been supporting the Congress, but the minorities formed their support base (Mathew, 2016). A major section of the Ezhavas and Dalits and a part of the minorities are the sources of support for the CPM. The alleged ‘minority appeasement’ of the UDF was a rallying point for the BJP, which tried to consolidate the Hindu vote by combining the Nair, Ezhava, Brahmin, and the SC votes (Thomas 2016). The BJP is allied with the Bharat Dharma Jana Sena (BDJS), a party formed in late 2015 by the Sree Narayana Dharma Paripalana (SNDP) Yogam, an Ezhava organization.

Performances of various alliances in the Kerala Assembly elections based on Vote percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UDF</th>
<th>LDF</th>
<th>NDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>42.98%</td>
<td>48.63%</td>
<td>4.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>45.89%</td>
<td>44.99%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift</td>
<td>+2.91%</td>
<td>-3.64%</td>
<td>+1.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>43.42%</td>
<td>14.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift</td>
<td>-7.09%</td>
<td>-1.57%</td>
<td>+8.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CEO Kerala

The illustration given above shows the decrease in the vote share of the winning front as well as the rise of the NDA. Changes in the vote share in 2016 indicate that the NDA has eaten into the vote bank of UDF as well that of LDF.

The National Democratic Alliance (NDA - led by BJP) won 1 seat (Nemom, Thiruvananthapuram district) and 15% of the vote share in 2016. It was expected that the BJP - BDJS alliance would shift Ezhava votes from LDF to BJP, but the results did not prove it so conclusively. It looks like the creamy layer of the Ezhavas voted for BJP instead of the UDF, while the rest remained loyal to the LDF. Naturally, upper caste Hindu votes were gained by the BJP at the cost of the UDF. It can be concluded that BJP gains most at the expense of the UDF. For example, the Chengannur constituency of the Alappuzha district saw almost a seven-fold increase in BJP votes - from 6,057 to 42,682. The CPM’s votes were nearly constant at around 52,000. The Congress candidate’s votes fell from 65,156 to 44,897 (CEO Kerala). However, in the overall picture, the BJP has eaten into the LDF votes as well (Devasia, 2016). Its performance has improved.
considerably in as many as 50 constituencies (Sheth and Rajendran, 2016). Figure 1 given above illustrates the rise of the BJP and the combined fall in the vote shares of the LDF and the UDF.

An important feature of Kerala’s political system is the media penetration among people. Kerala’s two leading daily newspapers, *Malayala Manorama* and *Mathrubhoomi*, are among the top 10 dailies in India, followed by Hindi, English, and Tamil dailies. However, Malayalam is the 9th most spoken language in India (Indian Readership Survey, 2014). Kerala is known for its high literacy rate (93.91%, against India’s 74.04% - Census 2011) and a correspondingly higher percentage of newspaper readership. It was reported that social media played a significant role in shaping up the victory in as many as 71 out of the 140 assembly constituencies of Kerala (Deccan Chronicle, May 2016).

3. Proposed study

Based on preliminary research from secondary sources, a few hypotheses were listed as follows for the proposed study:

1) There exists a high rate of political awareness among people
2) Caste/religion remained to be significant factors in the mobilization of votes in 2016
3) The UDF lost primarily because of corruption
4) The LDF won because its vote base was largely undisturbed
5) The NDA has gained a secure footing in Kerala’s politics

3.1 Objectives

The study aims to understand the various sociological dimensions that provide a framework for the electoral processes in Kerala. As the study background explains, factors like caste and community have been important in deciding the political preferences of voters. Hence, it is necessary to understand the nature and scale of caste/community influence among the people in the current context to arrive at holistic conclusions.

The study also attempts to understand the media penetration among the survey participants. Given the high rate of media penetration in the state, it becomes necessary to analyze the influence of media to understand the people’s perceptions towards the elections and the major parties.

The study aims to find out the people’s perceptions regarding the various fronts that participated in the elections, namely the UDF, LDF and NDA, and the reasons for the UDF’s loss,
LDF’s victory, and the NDA’s performance in the elections. It also intends to realise people’s expectations from the victorious front, the LDF.

3.2 Research Methodology

The research methodology used for the survey was quantitative. A questionnaire was prepared to understand the respondents’ interest in politics, their exposure to the media, their community’s influence on their voting behaviour, and their opinions on the incumbent’s loss and the various alliances that participated in the election. The Likert-type scale was used to understand the respondents’ inclinations towards the LDF and the UDF; opinions of the NDA were measured using the preference ranking method and by asking the respondents to choose from opposing statements. The chi-square test of association was used to find out the relationship between some variables. Surveys were taken from 100 respondents in the public spaces of Ernakulam. The sampling was done in simple random methods at the major transit points in Kochi city so that the respondents belonging to different parts of Kerala could be interviewed.

4. Findings and Inferences

Participants in the survey - people from 53 Assembly constituencies in 12 districts (except Kasargod and Kozhikode) participated in the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of respondents</th>
<th>Less than or equal to 25</th>
<th>Between 26 and 45</th>
<th>Between 46 and 65</th>
<th>Above 65</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Age of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious composition of respondents</th>
<th>Hindus</th>
<th>Christians</th>
<th>Muslims</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6 (no mention of background)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CPPR Field survey
4.1 Interest in elections

The respondents’ interest in the election campaign

**Figure 2: Respondents' interest in elections**

![Graph showing respondents' interest in elections]

*Source: CPPR Field survey*

The above graph shows that Kerala is politically charged, and the participation and the interest in politics are very high. This finding could be checked with the poll percentage in the elections (77.35%).

71% of our respondents were men, and 29% were women. This imbalance in gender is because, during the survey, women were hesitant to respond and claimed that their opinions were the same as their husband’s. In some cases, the husbands themselves claimed their wives did not know anything about politics. Even unaccompanied women largely refused to participate in the survey. When seen through the gender lens, the rate of interest (scale of 1 to 3) between men and women varied, as shown in the figure below.

**Figure 3: Respondents' interest based on gender**

![Bar chart showing respondents' interest based on gender]

*Source: CPPR Field survey*
The media exposure of the respondents was measured by asking them if they followed campaign-related articles, advertisements, etc. in the Newspapers, TV, Radio and the internet. The study shows that 77% read the election-related items in the newspapers every day, and an equal percentage of persons watched election-related matter on the TV every day. 65% read the newspapers as well as watched TV every day. 51% browsed the internet for election-related issues daily, and 16% listened to the radio every day.

**Figure 4: Media access of respondents**

Access to newspapers, TV, and radio did not differ significantly between males and females. At the same time, males had significantly more access to the internet, which could be derived from the chi-square test results given below.

1) Null hypothesis - no significant association between gender and newspaper access.  
   Pearson $\chi^2(3) = 2.5099$ P value $= 0.473$.  
   Null hypothesis accepted.

2) Null hypothesis - no significant association between gender and TV access.  
   Pearson $\chi^2(3) = 0.5192$ P value $= 0.915$.  
   Null hypothesis accepted.

3) Null hypothesis - no significant association between gender and radio access.  
   Pearson $\chi^2(3) = 5.8447$ P value $= 0.119$.  
   Null hypothesis accepted.

4) Null hypothesis - no significant association between gender and internet access.  
   Pearson $\chi^2(3) = 21.7132$ P value $= 0.000$.  
   Null hypothesis rejected.
The rate of interest in elections, as well as participation in election analysis, differed among males and females, despite equal access to TV, radio, and newspapers, almost equally high literacy rates among men and women. Hence, our hypothesis on the high level of political awareness stands true among people to a greater extent in favour of male voters.

4.2 Factors influenced vote

The factors deciding the respondents’ votes are given below

82% of the interviewees claimed in the inquiry that they were influenced by none on whom to vote for in elections. Only 18% felt that their community/religious leader favoured a particular political party. According to their opinion, 29.41% of the leaders supported the UDF, 58.8% supported the LDF, and 11.7% supported the NDA. Out of the 18% (those who admitted that their community leadership had strong vibes favouring a front/party), 52.9% people voted for the same party as their community leader wanted, 35.2% people voted for the same party but not because of the leader and 5.8% voted for another party (Figure 6). Out of the 11 Ezhavas that participated in the survey, only 18.18% (2 out of 11) felt that their community leader supported...
the NDA. In spite of open support to BJP by the Ezhava community leader Vellapally Natesan, most respondents have refused to recognize it. It can be concluded that many people have not considered community leaders as guides in an election. However, among the minimal number of respondents whose leaders have supported a party, around half of them have voted for the same party vouched by their leader.

**Figure 6: Respondents who claimed their community leaders supported a party**

![Chart showing voting behaviour based on leader's support](source: CPPR Field survey)

Among the respondents, only sixteen of them were recent beneficiaries of a state government scheme, twelve of them were satisfied, and three of them were somewhat satisfied. Most of the recipients reported an improvement in their household condition. Out of them, seven each had voted for the LDF and the UDF. The respondents’ vote seem independent from the welfare benefits received.

86 of the interviewees had voted in the elections; out of the 14 who did not vote; one was not interested, three names were not on the voter list, eight were travelling, one did not know the reason and one said he hated politics.

On a question related to the time at which one has decided to vote for a particular party/candidate - 57% stated that they had decided before the campaign, 17 % during the campaign, and 6% just before voting, 20% did not know.

**Figure 7: Time period when respondent decided candidate/party to vote for**

![Chart showing time of decision to vote](source: CPPR Field survey)
One can relate the media penetration among respondents and their awareness on the various political developments as key factors here. Since most of the respondents followed the news regularly, they seem to have made up their minds not based on the campaign, but on a party’s public image. According to our survey, people with more interest in elections and politics had made up their mind much in advance which party to vote for. A higher rating on a scale of 1-3 (1 - decided before the campaign, 2 - during the campaign, 3 - just before voting) means a late decision, and hence citizens with a lesser interest in elections seem to have made up their minds much later than those who were interested.

![Figure 8: Respondents’ decision to vote based on their interest](chart)

**Source**: CPPR Field survey

### 4.3 Respondents’ opinion of UDF and LDF

The respondents seemed to have an overall positive outlook of the LDF. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1- fully disagree and 5- fully agree), the average rating for the possibility of factions in CPI (M) affecting governance was 2.85. Respondents also agreed with the statements that LDF has a pragmatic approach towards the prohibition policy (3.15), the LDF is a secular front (3.29) and that the LDF is more sombre about the protection of natural resources (3.28). The UDF government was believed to be corrupt; the ratings for this statement were the most extreme (3.39). However, the respondents did not think that the UDF was minority centric, albeit with a small margin (2.86). They also believed that the UDF was pro-development than the LDF (3.17). Community wise, both Hindus and Christians were slightly in favour of the statement that the UDF was minority centric in equal measure (around 3.04). Muslims disagreed with the statement, averaging the rate of 2.42. Figure 9.1 and 9.2 will illustrate our argument.
An average of the LDF and UDF’s statements show that there was a greater ranking given to UDF’s corruption (3.39) compared to LDF’s secular credentials (3.29), its apparent importance accorded to natural resources (3.28) and its approach towards prohibition (3.15). Hence, it can be concluded that people voted more against the UDF than for the LDF.

It is noteworthy that 64% of the respondents were neutral over the years. Only 16% were traditional LDF supporters, 11% supported the UDF, 4% supported the NDA. The rest were not unconditional supporters; they merely voted on the basis of their judgement, based on the image and delivery of the parties.
4.4 Respondents’ opinion of NDA

According to the respondents, the main reason behind NDA gaining 15% vote share was that people were fed up with the LDF UDF system. The Modi factor was the second most important reason. However, for voters of the NDA, the Modi factor was only the 4th important factor out of the 5 options given. Some people went beyond the options given and stated that O Rajagopal won sympathy votes and that caste and religion were the important factors in NDA gaining votes. LDF voters listed the Modi factor as the least possible reason why the NDA could have gained 15% votes. Figures 10.1 to 10.4 show a party-wise split on why someone could have voted for the NDA, as well as the average opinion of all the respondents. Here, a higher rating means lesser importance as the scale used was 1 being most important and 5 being least important.

Figure 10.1: People’s perception on why someone could have voted for NDA

Figure 10.2: LDF voters’ perception on why someone could have voted for the NDA
**Analysis of the Kerala Assembly Elections, May 2016**

**Figure 10.3: UDF voters' perception on why someone could have voted for the NDA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Popular perceptions</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindu community is ignored by parties</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are fed up with UDF LDF system</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre and state should have the same govt</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference between UDF and LDF governance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modi factor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 10.4: NDA voters' perception on why someone could have voted for the NDA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Popular perceptions</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindu community is ignored by parties</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are fed up with UDF LDF system</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre and state should have the same govt</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference between UDF and LDF governance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modi factor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: CPPR Field survey*

Total respondents’ views about the BJP-BDJS alliance are shown in fig. 11.1 to 11.4.

**Figure 11.1**

- **BJP BDJS alliance**
  - Would not last long: 16%
  - Would last for a long time: 69%
  - Don't know: 15%

**Figure 11.2**

- **BJP BDJS alliance**
  - Benefitted the BJP more: 25%
  - Benefitted the NDJS more: 62%
  - Don't know: 13%
4.5 UDF’s loss and LDF’s manifesto

Responses to the main reason for the UDF’s loss are shown in figure 12. As seen, corruption seems to be the overriding reason behind the UDF’s loss.

We selected some promises from the LDF manifesto and asked people about the importance and the urgency of the promises, which included employment, health and education, social security, liquor policy, transport, anti-corruption, and agriculture. Employment generation received the highest expectation; according to reports, the unemployment rate in Kerala tops the country at 7.4, in contrast to the national average of 2.3% (The Hindu, 2016). The second preference was given to anti-corruption measures. The UDF’s last two years in the office was marked by corruption accusations, which has led the respondents to give importance to the anti-corruption promises of the LDF. Liquor policy received the least importance. A significant outcome of the
survey was the lack of importance given to the UDF’s liquor ban as well as the LDF’s stance on abstinence and awareness.

![Figure 13: Respondents' ranking on the importance of LDF promises](image)

**Source:** CPPR Field survey

### 5. Conclusions

From the survey, it could be concluded that the voters in Kerala are conscious and aware of the various developments on the political front that confirms with the clichéd ‘the argumentative Keralite’ submission in the social discourses and narratives of Kerala. The literacy level in Kerala is very high which has been literally synonymous to the access to the newspapers, television, internet etc. to get to know about the politics and politicians. The survey shows that the voters cannot be easily bought over by the politicians and community/religious leaders and with the blitzkrieg campaign trails.

The fanfare and hoopla around BJP-BDJS alliance has not resulted in the desired numbers (victorious seats); according to the political scientists. This is vetted by the survey also. Even though NDA has gained 10% votes this time compared to the last assembly elections, it is going to be a bog challenge for them to sustain the momentum if one goes by the survey results. The lack of trust and confidence of the voters in BDJS need to be examined; many believe that it is a short term bet which is sync with the public perception on the party formation (BDJS) as a temporary one. The survey also concludes that there is not much difference between UDF and
LDF though the replacement is based on the odds against the incumbent government. The political nature of Kerala is such that the corruption, green policies, employment etc. are treated on priority basis when it comes to the evaluation of the anti-incumbency trends which are yet again proved in the last Assembly Elections.

Kerala is bestowed with unique coalition opportunities of the past. The study shows that the trends will continue. Even though there is resentment against both the front, entry of a new front into the Kerala scene could not be based on old equations that control both the existing fronts. The caste and communities play a major role in the public life but not at the same level on the election front. A malayalee voter cannot be easily won over as he has a rich and profound understanding on the political developments around him. The study shows voters are not easily amendable for a new front unless they are very much convinced for the political reasons and not for the religious reasons.

6. Limitations of the Study

One limitation is that the survey is done among 100 respondents only in the public spaces of Ernakulam though the respondents include people from different parts of Kerala. The survey, however, is not done by travelling to different parts of the state.

The second limitation of the study is that there is a gender bias in the sample, with 71% of respondents as men, and 29% were women. The gender bias, however, is due to the hesitance of women in responding to the questions.
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8. Annexure I

Post Election Survey

Age -
Gender -
Community/ Religion -
Annual Income -
Constituency -
Address (with landmark) -

The data collected from the survey will only be used for research purpose and will not be put in public domain. The identity of the respondents will not be disclosed to anybody.

Q1. How interested were you in the campaign for the Kerala assembly elections of 2016?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not interested</th>
<th>Some interest</th>
<th>Very Interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2. What were the media that you had access to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspapers</th>
<th>Less than once a week</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Twice - thrice a week</th>
<th>Everyday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>Less than once a week</td>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>Twice - thrice a Week</td>
<td>Everyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Less than once a week</td>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>Twice - thrice a week</td>
<td>Everyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet / social media</td>
<td>Less than once a week</td>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>Twice - thrice a week</td>
<td>Everyday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3. What/who mattered the most in deciding your support? - Party / local candidate / CM candidate / present central government / past state government / don’t know
Q4. Whose opinion mattered the most in deciding your vote? - Local leader / spouse / family member / neighbour / colleague / caste or community member / media / I voted on my own / can’t say

Q5. Did your community leader support a party? - Yes / No / maybe (If no, go to Q11)

Q5a. If yes, which party did they support? - UDF / LDF / NDA / Independent / Other

Q5b. Did you vote for the same party? - Yes, because of the leader / yes, but not because of the leader / No, I did not

Q6. As compared to five years ago, has the economic condition in your household improved? - Much worse / worse / same / better / much better / no opinion

Q7. Have you recently been the beneficiary of a state govt. scheme? - Yes / No (If no, go to Q10)

Q7a. Are you satisfied with the scheme? - No / somewhat / Yes / don’t know

Q8. Did you vote in the recent Assembly elections? - Yes / No (If no, go to Q11)

Q8a. If yes, whom did you vote for? - LDF / UDF / NDA / Independent / Other / NOTA

Q8b. When did you decide to vote for this party? - Before the campaign / during the campaign / just before voting / can’t say

Q8c. If not, why didn’t you vote? - Not interested / name not on the voter list / travelling / not a resident of Kerala / other ____________

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Fully agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9. Please consider the following statements about the UDF and LDF and select the most appropriate option that influenced your voting behaviour:

a. The UDF government was corrupt -

b. The UDF was minority centric -

c. UDF is pro-development (infrastructure projects) than LDF -

d. Factions in CPI (M) may hamper their governance -

e. The LDF has a pragmatic approach towards the prohibition policy -

f. LDF is a secular front-

g. LDF is more serious about the protection of environment and natural resources -

Q10. Did you support any party before the campaigns? - **LDF supporter / UDF supporter / NDA supporter / other supporter / neutral**

Q11. Consider the following statements related to the NDA campaign. Which of these statements do you strongly believe in? Rate them preferentially on a scale of 1 (most important) to 5 (least important).

a. Majority Hindu community is ignored by parties.

b. People are fed up with two fronts (UDF & LDF) system in Kerala.

c. Centre and State should have same governments.

d. There is not much difference between UDF and LDF in governance.

e. The *Modi factor* and faith in PM in delivering the promises.
Q12. Please select one of the options (‘a’ or ‘b’) in the following four opposing statements:

The BJP-BDJS alliance-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. is an alliance of convenience with short term goals</th>
<th>b. will be a long term alliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. benefitted the BJP more</td>
<td>b. benefitted the BDJS more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. is against the interests of upper caste voters</td>
<td>b. will consolidate Hindu votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. BDJS has its own strengths</td>
<td>b. BDJS was helped by BJP’s resources (man and money)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q13. According to you, what was the most important factor in the UDF’s loss? - Corruption / minority centric appointments / liquor prohibition policy / LDF’s liquor abstinence policy

Q14. The following are some important promises made in the LDF manifesto. Please rate the urgency and importance of the following on a scale of 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest).

a. Employment - 25 lakh jobs in 5 years, jobs for NRI returnees
b. Health & education - Upgrading 1000 government schools; spending 5% of the state GSDP for health
c. Social security - a Hunger-free state with assured one meal, welfare pensions, and an increase in minimum daily wage
d. Liquor policy - Awareness programs for liquor abstinence, de-addiction centres
e. Transport - High-speed corridor in railways; 4-line National Highways and reconstruction of other roads.
f. Anti corruption - Transparency in governance - social audits of government offices
g. Agriculture - income assurance, govt department for traditional agro-based industries
h. Other - (please mention)