Voting Determinants and its Volatility in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa's Electoral Politics (2002-2013)

[1]Dr. Taseer Ullah* [2]Dr. Habib Ullah and [3]Dr. Safi Ullah Khan Marwat

1. Lecturer, Government Post-Graduate College Kohat, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan
2. Associate Professor, Government Post-Graduate College Kohat, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan
3. Assistant Professor, Department of History & Pakistan Studies, International Islamic University, Islamabad, Pakistan

| ***Corresponding Author:** | taseerktk@gmail.com |

ABSTRACT

The electoral history of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) during 2002- 2013 reveals inconsistency in voting behaviours. An overwhelming majority voted for Muttahidda Majlis-i-Amal (MMA) in the general elections of 2002, followed by the victory of progressive political parties i.e. Pakistan People's Party Parliamentarians (PPPP) and Awami National Party (ANP) in the succeeding elections of 2008. This volatile trend continued in the 2013 general elections, where Pakistan Tehreek-i-Insaf (PTI), Jamaat-i-Islami (JI), and Awami Jamhuri Ittihad (AJI) formed a coalition government of progressive and religio-political parties. The changing behaviour of voters in KP during the stated period has made it difficult to predict the relative impacts of the voting determinants on the electoral results. This research aims to investigate the impacts of voting determinants on voting behaviour in KP. It also unfolds the factors that leads to shifting priorities of the voters in each of the three general elections in KP. Using a systematic random sampling method, a sample size of 664 respondents is questioned. A number of characteristics, including area, gender, age, literacy, profession, and monthly income-based stratifications, are taken into consideration while analyzing the quantitative data.

| **KEYWORDS** | Electoral politics, General Elections, KP Provincial Assembly, Voter behaviour, Voting Factors |

Introduction

Public's participation in politics via electoral process is the most commonly practiced way throughout the democratic world. In advanced democracies electoral process is generally smooth with steady voting behaviour because society is largely levelled with maximum political consciousness (Yaseen, et. al., 2021). Whereas, voters' behaviour in developing countries is volatile and typically determined by some social, economic and political factors (Blais & et al., 2001). In Pakistan, the role of these factors determining the voting behaviour is not uniform throughout the country. It varies from region to region depending on which factor is deeply rooted in specific region than the others. The organisation and structure of political parties also matter in this regard. Political parties in Pakistan are mostly controlled by what is called hereditary elites. Except JI, none of the political parties has intra party democratic system. Mainstream political parties are run by specific families such as: PPP by Bhutto family, Pakistan Muslim League-Nawaz (PML-N) by Sharif family, PTI by Imran Khan's charisma, and Jamiat Ulema-i-Islam-Fazal (JUI-F) by Mufti Mehmud family (Fareed, et al., 2019; Azhar, et al, 2019).

The electoral politics in Punjab and Sindh province is characterised by feudal structure whereby landlords provide land to tenants in return for their allegiance and labour. The local politicians have regularly taken advantage of these landlords during election times (Amna, 2017). Moreover, a large number of prominent figures in Punjab and Sindh politics are actually hereditary *Pirs* (religious saints) in their home regions, and they receive political backing from their adherents. The *Pirs* and land lords' equation, thus control maximum vote bank in these two provinces (Parveen & Dasti, 2014).

Electoral politics in Balochistan has been characterised by the *Sardari* system (Chieftainship). However, the nationalist political leaders and their workers are now gradually losing their vote bank amidst the repressive policies of state's agencies in the province (Raisani, 2018).

The KP electoral politics demonstrates a novel feature of electoral alliances, coalitions, and change of seats, among other things, during elections (ECP, 2016). Moreover, the local politicians of KP have frequently taken advantage of voters' adherence to their *baradari*, usually headed by influential elders (Key, 1966). *Pakhtuns* keep their word to their elders, who usually choose their fate in elections. However, unlike the *pirs* and landlords of Panjab and Sind, *Pakhtun* leaders of KP do not show permanent allegiance to any particular candidate or political party (Hassan & Taieb, 2021).

The overall comparative analysis of voting behaviour in Pakistan reveals that there is a minimal amount of free and fluctuating votes in Punjab and Sindh provinces with maximum amount of stable votes due to the prevalent social, political, and economic factors. As a result, the electoral records of Punjab and Sindh demonstrate that the PPP and PML-N largely achieved success in succession in their respective provinces. In contrast to the other provinces, KP has a very unusual situation where there are more free and erratic votes than constant vote-bank. Owing to this fluctuating vote KP's electoral politics during the above stated period has been dynamic and volatiles, as evidenced by its electoral history (Mahar & Malik, 2021). Moreover, the electorate in KP largely altered its voting habits in every general election as a result of their dissatisfaction with earlier voting patterns based on legitimate grounds, such as the party or candidate's disregard for the election manifesto, their failure to fulfil their campaign promises, their disregard for the electorate, or their failure to win a majority or seat (Ullah & Khan, 2022). Thirdly, the survey's results show that KP's fundamental issues—such as its "lack of developments," "law and order" situation, and "economic" and "political" discriminations at the federal level—were what caused fluctuation in electoral politics in the province during the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013 (Badshah et al., 2018).

KP's General Elections of 2002

On the eve of general elections of 2002, political environment in Pakistan in general and KP in particular was not normal. The US-led war against terror in Afghanistan and the president Musharaf's U-turn on Pakistan's pro-Taliban policy had caused great resentment among the KP electorates. Following the August 2002 passage of the Legal Framework Order, political parties began preparing election manifestos and running campaigns. Their electoral manifestos outlined the future government's strategy for resolving many concerns and difficulties that Pakistani citizens, and those in KP in particular, confronted. MMA, an alliance of six ultraconservative religious groups, was formed by the religio-political parties in reaction to the Afghan crisis. Enforcing *Sharia* (Islamic Rule) throughout the country was the central narrative of the MMA election manifesto and campaign, which resonated with the *Pakhtun* community in KP.

In 2002 general elections, MMA won 48 out of the 99 elected seats altogether and formed provincial government in KP (K. A. Khan, 2011). It also became an opposition party at the centre (Khan, 2014). The religious parties had a very poor standing in the nation's electoral history, although, they managed to create coalition governments in Balochistan and KP in 1970s. The MMA victory in KP during 2002 general elections was largely due to the *Pakhtuns*' 'anti-American sentiments during the ongoing US-led war on terrorism in the region (Khan, 2014).

KP's General Elections of 2008

Voters' faith in MMA had significantly decreased by the end of 2007 as a result of the internal rift among the alliance's partners and its poor performance over the previous five

years *(The Express Tribune,* 2012). In addition, the stronger alliance known as the "Alliance for the Restoration of Democracy (ARD)" posed a serious threat to MMA. Before and during the general elections of 2008, the law and order situation in KP in general and Peshawar in particular had deteriorated to the unprecedented level. Benazir Bhutto, the PPP chairperson, lost her life in a terrorist attack during her election rally at Liaqat Bagh, Rawalpindi (Bhatia, 2008). ANP leaders faced an extremely difficult situation as a result of a combination of terrorist actions and suicide attacks throughout the election campaign. A number of its key leaders and workers lost their lives as a result of suicide attacks. The Pakistani government designated eight (8) of KP's 24 districts as high-risk areas (Abbas, 2008). Terrorists targeted political parties, politicians, political workers, and other political entities. Surprisingly, Tehreek-eTaliban Pakistan stated that their goal was to sabotage the 2008 elections.

Approximately 3423426 voters used their adult right to vote for KP assembly in the general election of 2008. Despite that terror, ANP secured 48 out of 99 provincial assembly seats and formed coalition government with PPPP in KP. Both these parties also formed government at the centre. (Crisis Group Asia, 2011). The ANP leaders' main narrative for electoral campaign was to get rid of Talibinization and to restore peace and security to the region which worked well. During the general elections of 2008 in KP, a radical shift was witnessed in voting behaviour as overwhelming majority preferred secular parties over conservative religious parties.

KP's General Elections of 2013

The previous coalition government of ANP and PPPP accomplished a great deal in the field of education, agriculture, provincial autonomy, however, it disappointed KP voters because they could not address the major issues such as militancy, poverty, unemployment, energy crisis etc. (Shafqat and Khosa, 2014). The emerging popularity of Imran Khan and his political party, PTI, was viewed by many *Pakhtun* voters of KP as the only panacea to their problems. The increase in voters turn out i.e. from 44% in the general elections of 2008 to 55% in 2013 demonstrates that PTI was able to mobilize a larger group of people—women, youth, elders, minorities, etc.— who were usually not interested in electoral politics of KP.

PTI's success may be attributed primarily to its thoughtful emphasis on middle-class unique politics but its candidates' unrestrained movement and fearless rallies, particularly in the most dangerous areas of KP, gave it an edge over other competing parties, such as ANP, PPPP, PML-N, or even JUI-F who could not run a free campaign during 2013 elections in KP because of terrorist attacks (Amir, 2012).

Similar to MMA in 2002, Imran Khan was successful in inciting people's anti-American feelings by condemning US drone strikes in former Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) and patron-client relationship between US-Pak foreign policy in order to increase his support. His touting for the accomplishments such as: winning the 1992 world cup, establishment of Shaukat Khanum Memorial Cancer Hospital & Research Centre and Namal Institute also helped him inspiring the *Pakhtun* voters of KP (Yusuf, 2011). Above all, it was the Imran Khan's well calculated policy of propagating the incapacity and corruption of the two coalition partners, the ANP and PPPP which helped his party to form government in KP in the general elections 2013 (Hamdani, 2014).

Literature Review

Andrew R. Wilder, (2005) provides detailed description of Pakistan's politics, economy and society. The author has sketched the *Pakhtun* dominant areas of KP physically and geographically. He has discussed the origin and nature of *'Pakhtunlwali'* and has briefly elaborated it with special reference and context in legitimizing the Status-Quo under general elections of 2002. He has also highlighted the political and constitutional development in KP after the elections of 2002.

Syed Karim Haider, (2010) is an explanatory work regarding the general elections held in 2008. In his work, few chapters are mainly concerned with the elections and electoral politics in KP and help in finding the information about the general elections of 2008 in KP. He has given the results of National Assembly as well as four Provincial Assemblies of Pakistan. He has also discussed manifestoes of major political parties, pre and post elections laws, orders, reports, schedules, symbols and campaigns of general elections of 2008.

Hon Sir Doug Kidd, (2013) explains the electoral reforms from 2002 to 2008, key developments from 2008 to 2012, the 18th Amendment (2010), the Caretaker Government, the Political Parties Order, Local Government and role of the Supreme Court in the political background to the general elections of 2013. He has also elaborated with full detail the electoral framework and election administration, elections campaign and media, voting, counting and results of the general elections of 2013.

Farmanullah, (2014) has discussed various voting behaviours that are commonly responsible determinants in the general elections of KP. He has used different theories of voting determinants and having useful information about the general elections of 2002, 2008 and 2013. This work provides much information about electoral politics during the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013. However, the study is confined to only one constituency of the National Assembly i.e. NA-2 Peshawar – II.

Hypotheses

1. The social factor i.e. religion, *baradari* and ethnicity etc. would be a major factor influencing electoral politics and voting behavior in KP during the general elections 2002,2008 and 2013.

2. Political and economic factors i.e. party manifesto/party loyalty and clientelism would have relatively lesser role in influencing electoral politics and voting behavior in KP during the stated period.

3. The maximum wavering votes in KP would be the major factor behind the volatile nature of voting behavior during the stated period.

Material and Methods

Research instruments used for data collection are mainly survey questionnaires and seven face-to-face in-depth interviews. Out of the total 800 survey questionnaires 664 completely filled questionnaires were returned to the author. For data analysis SPSS method was applied. With SPSS, descriptive analysis was performed, including percentage calculations and variable evaluations. Using the Chi-Square test, a substantial correlation (Pearson value) was investigated. Moreover, the date collected as a result of Seven face to face in-depth interviews was objectively analysed. With respect to the accuracy and repeatability of the same result the above used method of SPSS was found quite valid and reliable.

Theoretical Framework

The research paper, in hand, is grounded in analytical, comparative, and factual methodologies. The research utilised three electoral theories: Sociological, Psycho-Sociological/Party Identification, and Rational Choice/Downs' Axis. The data was obtained through questionnaire responses about the voting patterns in the KP provincial assembly

general elections held in 2002, 2008, and 2013 respectively. The impact of social and environmental factors on voters' decisions has been highlighted by proponents of "sociological theory." However, the "Psycho-Sociological model" placed more emphasis on psychological factors or a voter's subjective opinion. The "rational choice model" proponents emphasised the economic factors that influence voters (Ahmad, 2010). This is an empirical study that primarily uses analytical and quantitative tools. A methodical, multi-stage sampling approach was employed. Primary data has been obtained through the collection of questionnaire responses. The outcomes have been categorised, sorted, and examined in a number of tables.

Sampling Procedure: From among the four KP regions that make up the study's area—PK-93 (Upper Dir-III), PK-50 (Haripur-II), PK-05 (Peshawar-IV), and PK-64 (D.I. Khan-I)—a particular constituency was chosen at random. Additionally, of the aforementioned constituency, 04 Union councils (two from each of the urban and rural districts) were chosen at random, and the popular sampling was gathered utilising a methodical, organised, and random sampling process.

Population/Sample Size: A common sample size was employed for theoretical analysis. 800 voters in total were selected using multi-stage random sampling approaches, which include;

Phase 1: The 99 general elected seats of the KP provincial legislature are split among the four areas that make up the state of KP: the Northern, North-Eastern, Central, and Southern regions. One district and one constituency have been randomly chosen from each of KP's four regions in order to create a suitable sample size for theoretical research.

Phase 2: A total of 16 Union councils made up the sample that was chosen, which indicates that, from each district constituency in a KP region, 04 Union councils were considered, of which 02 were drawn from the constituency's urban areas and 02 from its rural areas. Table 1 lists the union councils' names and populations.

Phase 3: In order to operationalize the electoral theories, a total of 800 voters were selected at random and in an organised manner from the Voters lists for theoretical examination. Initially, 200 voters were selected at random from each region's distinct constituency. These 200 voters were divided equally among the four union councils in the constituency, or 50 votes each. For the sake of theoretical study, these 50 voters were once more selected at random from the equally chosen union councils based on other criteria such as age, gender, profession, monthly income group, and literacy. In order to make sure of this, the first, fourth, and all 50 respondents in a union council were chosen at random. In this way, 400 respondents from urban and 400 respondents from rural areas were questioned out of 800 questionnaires.

Phase 4: Questionnaires were given to the respondents when the list was finalised. Nonetheless, a number of respondents—particularly women, voters who were illiterate, and those who lived in remote areas—did not return the completed questionnaires. Second, several of them seemed too shy to divulge such details. Thirdly, they mostly refrained from responding.

Ethical consideration: The study strictly adheres to the research ethics i.e. ensuring the participants' safety and dignity. To ensure the voluntary participation of the participants their informed consent was sought. Respondents' privacy and secrecy was maintained by removing personal identifiers during storing data. Respondents were treated as per their cultural values and norms during data collection. Participants were given option to withdraw at any time in order to minimize any possible potential threat to their lives and an approval of ethical review board was also obtained in this regard. The study primary aim was to improve the voting behavior of electorates of the study region and to inform the government authorities to reform the voting process.

Results and Discussion

In KP, the most common voting determinants that people select to cast their ballots are "party loyalty/party manifesto," "ethnicity," "clientelism," "religion," and "*baradari*." As a result, it is crucial to assess how such factors affected voting in the above stated general elections for the KP provincial parliament. To gather replies across the province constituencies of KP, the following question was posed to the respondents in this regard;

"On what grounds did you cast your ballot in the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013 for the KP Provincial Assembly?"

i.	Party loyalty/Party manifesto
ii.	Religion
iii.	Baradari
iv.	Ethnicity
v.	Clientelism
vi.	Any other

In the general elections held in KP in 2002, 2008, and 2013, information gathered from the respondents regarding the factors influencing their voting behaviour was examined with regard to various variables, including area, age, gender, profession, monthly salaries, and literacy-based stratifications.

Stratification by Area: In these general elections, respondents from urban and rural areas voted for different political parties and independent candidates according to different criteria. In general elections of 2002 and 2008, more "rural" respondents than "urban" stated that they voted on the basis of "Party Loyalty/Party Manifesto." These same "rural" respondents also stated that "religion" was a determining factor in their voting in all three general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013. In the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013, respondents who identified as "urban" somewhat more frequently chose "*baradari*" and "ethnicity" as their voting criteria.

Table 1
Area Based Stratification and Determinants of Voting Behaviour in 2002 Elections

	Party Loyalty/ Party Manifesto	Religion	*Baradari*	Clientelism	Ethnicity	Any other	Total
Urban	115 (38.6%)	70 (23.5%)	62 (20.8%)	20 (6.7%)	20 (6.7%)	11 (3.7%)	298 (100.0%)
Rural	150 (41.0%)	107 (29.2%)	58 (15.8%)	23 (6.3%)	21 (5.7%)	7 (1.9%)	366 (100.0%)
Total	265 (39.9%)	177 (26.7%)	120 (18.1%)	43 (6.5%)	41 (6.2%)	18 (2.7%)	664 (100.0%)
Chi-Square Value: 6.720 P-value: 0.242							
Area-Based Stratification and Determinants of Voting Behaviour in 2008 Elections							
Urban	118 (39.6%)	44 (14.8%)	76 (25.5%)	26 (8.7%)	23 (7.7%)	11 (3.7%)	298 (100.0%)
Rural	157 (42.9%)	73 (19.9%)	65 (17.8%)	33 (9%)	27 (7.4%)	11 (3%)	366 (100.0%)
Total	275 (41.4%)	117 (17.6%)	141 (21.2%)	59 (8.9%)	50 (7.5%)	22 (3.3%)	664 (100.0%)
Chi-Square Value = 7.846 P-Value = 0.165							
Area-Based Stratification and Determinants of Voting Behaviour in 2013 Elections							

Urban	152 (51.0%)	35 (11.7%)	63 (21.1%)	20 (6.7%)	18 (6.0%)	10 (3.4%)	298 (100.0%)
Rural	185 (50.5%)	63 (17.2%)	62 (16.9%)	27 (7.4%)	19 (5.2%)	10 (2.7%)	366 (100.0%)
Total	337 (50.8%)	98 (14.8%)	125 (18.8%)	47 (7.1%)	37 (5.6%)	20 (3.0%)	664 (100.0%)

Chi-Square= 5.402   P-Value= 0.369

Table No. 1 shows that in the general elections of 2002 and 2008, respectively, "rural" respondents cited "Party Loyalty/Party Manifesto" as their primary voting determinant with 41.0% and 42.9%, respectively, while in the general elections of 2013, "urban" respondents favoured this factor with 51.0%, marginally surpassing "rural" **respondents**. In all three general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013, "rural" respondents also supported "religion" as a vote factor, favouring it with 29.2%, 19.9%, and 17.2%, respectively. In the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013, urban respondents overwhelmingly preferred "*baradari"* as a factor influencing their voting behaviour (20.8%, 25.5%, and 21.1%), followed by "ethnicity" (6.7%,.7.7%, and 6.0%). In the 2002 general elections, "urban" respondents were somewhat more likely to prefer "clientelism" as a vote factor (6.7%), whereas "rural" respondents (9.0% and 7.4%, respectively) were more likely to mention "clientelism" in the 2008 and 2013 general elections. "Any other" factors influencing voting behaviour were chosen by "urban" respondents with a higher percentage (3.7%) in the general elections of 2008 and 2002 compared to 3.4% in the general elections.

The P-values of.0.242 > 0.05, 0.165 > 0.05, and 0.369 > 0.05 in the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013, respectively, express that there was no correlation between area-based stratification and voting behaviour determinants, hence the Chi-Square tests do not yield significant P-Values.

Stratification by Gender: Regarding the division of voters based on gender, "party loyalty/party manifesto" was identified as a significant factor influencing voting behaviour by "male" respondents in all three of the general elections held in 2002, 2008, and 2013. In contrast, "female" respondents in all three of these general elections preferred voting factors such as "religion," "*baradari*," "clienteslim," "ethnicity," and "any other."

Table 2
Gender Stratification and Determinants of Voting Behavior in 2002 Elections

	Party Loyalty/ Party Manifesto	Religion	*Baradari*	Clientelism	Ethnicity	Any other	Total
Male	232 (43.1%)	140 (26.0%)	94 (17.5%)	31 (5.8%)	30 (5.6%)	11 (2.0%)	538 (100.0%
Female	33 (26.2%)	37 (29.4%)	26 (20.6%)	12 (9.5%)	11 (8.7%)	7 (5.6%)	126 (100.0%
Total	265 (39.9%)	177 (26.7%)	120 (18.1%)	43 (6.5%)	41 (6.2%)	18 (2.7%)	664 (100.0%)

Chi-Square Value= 16.845   P-value= 0.005

Gender-Based Stratification and Determinants of Voting Behaviour in 2008 Elections

	Party Loyalty/ Party Manifesto	Religion	*Baradari*	Clientelism	Ethnicity	Any other	Total
Male	238 (44.2%)	91 (16.9%)	112 (20.8%)	45 (8.4%)	36 (6.7%)	16 (3%)	538 (100.0%)
Female	37 (29.4%)	26 (20.6%)	29 (23%)	14 (11.1%)	14 (11.1%)	6 (4.8%)	126 (100.0%)
Total	275 (41.4%)	117 (17.6%)	141 (21.2%)	59 (8.9%)	50 (7.5%)	22 (3.3%)	664 (100.0%)

Chi-Square Value= 10.987   *P-Value*= 0.052

Gender-Based Stratification and Determinants of Voting Behaviour in 2013 Elections

	Party Loyalty/ Party Manifesto	Religion	*Baradari*	Clientelism	Ethnicity	Any other	Total
Male	291 (54.1%)	77 (14.3%)	92 (17.1%)	35 (6.5%)	30 (5.6%)	13 (2.4%)	538 (100.0%)
Female	46 (36.5%)	21 (16.7%)	33 (26.2%)	12 (9.5%)	07 (5.7%)	07 (5.6%)	126 (100.0%)

| Total | 337 (50.8%) | 98 (14.8%) | 125 (18.8%) | 47 (7.1%) | 37 (5.6%) | 20 (3.0%) | 664 (100.0%) |

Chi-Square=15.736   P-Value= 0.008

According to Table No. 2, "male" respondents in the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013 were primarily favouring "party loyalty/party manifesto" as a determinant of voting behaviour, with 43.1%, 44.2%, and 54.1%, respectively. In contrast, "female" respondents in the same general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013 were primarily choosing "religion" as a determinant of voting behaviour, with 29.4%, 20.6%, and 16.7%, "*baradari*" with 20.6%, 23.0%, and 26.2%, "clientelism" with 9.5%, 11.1%, and 9.5%, "ethnicity" with 8.7%, 11.1%, and 5.7%, and "any other" with 5.6%, 4.8%, and 5.6%.

For the general elections of 2002 and 2013, the Chi-Square test yielded significant P-values of 0.005 < 0.05 and 0.008 < 0.05, respectively, indicating the existence of co-relations between gender-based stratification and voting behaviour determinants. However, for the general elections of 2008, the Chi-Square test did not yield a significant P-value of 0.052 > 0.05, indicating the absence of co-relations between gender-based stratification and voting behaviour determinants.

Stratification by Age: Regarding age-based stratification, young respondents (18–40 years old) primarily chose "party loyalty/party manifesto" as a determinant of voting behaviour in the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013. In contrast, elderly respondents (above 40 years old) primarily mentioned "religion," "clienteslim," and "ethnicity" as determinants of voting behaviour in the general elections of 2008 and 2013.

Table 3
Age-Based Stratification and Determinants of Voting Behaviour in 2002 Elections

	Party Loyalty/ Party Manifesto	Religion	*Baradari*	Clientelism	Ethnicity	Any other	Total
18-40	113 (40.5%)	78 (28.0%)	50 (17.9%)	18 (6.5%)	14 (5.0%)	6 (2.2%)	279 (100.0%)
Above 40	152 (39.5%)	99 (25.7%)	70 (18.2%)	25 (6.5%)	27 (7.0%)	12 (3.1%)	385 (100.0%)
Total	265 (39.9%)	177 (26.7%)	120 (18.1%)	43 (6.5%)	41 (6.2%)	18 (2.7%)	664 (100.0%)
	Chi-Square Value= 1.954		*P-value*= 0.013				
Age-Based Stratification and Determinants of Voting Behaviour in 2008 Elections							
18-40	132 (47.3%)	40 (14.3%)	61 (21.9%)	22 (7.9%)	16 (5.7%)	8 (2.9%)	279 (100.0%)
Above 40	143 (37.1%)	77 (20.0%)	80 (20.8%)	37 (9.6%)	34 (8.8%)	14 (3.6%)	385 (100.0%)
Total	275 (41.4%)	117 (17.6%)	141 (21.2%)	59 (8.9%)	50 (7.5%)	22 (3.3%)	664 (100.0%)
	Chi-Square Value= 9.963		*P-Value*= 0.076				
Age-Based Stratification and Determinants of Voting Behaviour in 2013 Elections							
18-40	166 (59.5%)	29 (10.4%)	51 (18.3%)	18 (6.5%)	08 (2.9%)	07 (2.5%)	279 (100.0%)
Above 40	171 (44.4%)	69 (17.9%)	74 (19.2%)	29 (7.5%)	29 (7.5%)	13 (3.4%)	385 (100.0%)
Total	337 (50.8%)	98 (14.8%)	125 (18.8%)	47 (7.1%)	37 (5.6%)	20 (3.0%)	664 (100.0%)

Chi-Square: 20.528   P-Value= 0.001

Table 3 demonstrates that, with regard to age-based stratification in the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013, young respondents in the '18-40' age range favoured the factor 'party loyalty/party manifesto' as a voting behaviour determinant with 40.5%, 47.3%, and 59.5%, respectively. In the general elections of 2002, the factor 'religion' was ranked

second with 28.0%. Older respondents who were "above 40" years old noted that factors "ethnicity" accounted for 7.0%, 8.8%, and 3.4% of voting behaviour in the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013, whereas factors "any other" accounted for 3.1%, 3.6%, and 3.4% of voting behaviour. Elderly respondents who are "above 40" years of age strongly supported the determinants "clientelism" (9.5%) and "religion" (20.0% and 17.9%) of voting behaviour in the general elections of 2008 and 2013, respectively. In contrast, in the general elections of 2002 and 2013, the same elderly respondents who are "above 40" years more strongly supported the determinant "*baradari*" (18.2% and 19.2%, respectively).

The findings of the Pearson Chi-Square tests for the general elections of 2002 and 2013 suggest a substantial correlation between age-based stratification and voting behaviour determinants, with P-values of 0.013 < 0.05 and 0.001 < 0.05, respectively, however, in the 2008 general elections, the P-value of 0.076 > 0.05 indicates that there is no correlation between the factors influencing voting behaviour and age-based stratification, so the Chi-Square test yields no significant Probability value.

Stratification by Literacy: Regarding literacy-based stratification, in the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013, "literate" respondents overwhelmingly backed "ethnicity" as a vote criterion, while "illiterate" respondents primarily supported "party loyalty/party manifesto" and "religion."

Table 4
Literacy-based Stratification and Determinants of Voting Behaviour in 2002 Elections

	Party Loyalty/ Party Manifesto	Religion	*Baradari*	Clientelism	Ethnicity	Any other or Sorry	Total
Literate	194 (40.2%)	133 (27.6%)	82 (17.0%)	34 (7.1%)	26 (5.4%)	13 (2.7%)	482 (100.0%)
Illiterate	71 (39.0%)	44 (24.2%)	38 (20.9%)	9 (4.9%)	15 (8.2%)	5 (2.7%)	182 (100.0%)
Total	265 (39.9%)	177 (26.7%)	120 (18.1%)	43 (6.5%)	41 (6.2%)	18 (2.7%)	664 (100.0%)
	Chi-Square Value= 4.366 , P-value= 0.008						
Literacy-based Stratification and Determinants of Voting Behaviour in 2008 Elections							
Literate	200 (41.5%)	87 (18%)	106 (22%)	43 (8.9%)	30 (6.2%)	16 (3.3%)	482 (100.0%)
Illiterate	75 (41.2%)	30 (16.5%)	35 (8.8%)	16 (8.8%)	20 (11%)	6 (3.3%)	182 (100.0%)
Total	275 (41.4%)	117 (17.6%)	141 (21.2%)	59 (8.9%)	50 (7.5%)	22 (3.3%)	664 (100.0%)
	Chi-Square Value= 4.647 P-Value= 0.460						
Literacy-based Stratification and Determinants of Voting Behaviour in 2013 Elections							
Literate	253 (52.5%)	75 (15.6%)	85 (17.6%)	32 (6.6%)	25 (5.2%)	12 (2.5%)	482 (100.0%)
Illiterate	84 (46.2%)	23 (12.6%)	40 (22.0%)	15 (8.2%)	12 (6.6%)	08 (4.4%)	182 (100.0%)
Total	337 (50.8%)	98 (14.8%)	125 (18.8%)	47 (7.1%)	37 (5.6%)	20 (3.0%)	664 (100.0%)

Chi-Square= 5.675 P-Value= 0.339

Table 4 demonstrates that in the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013, "literate" respondents favoured "ethnicity" with 8.2%, 11.0%, and 6.6% of voting behaviour, while "illiterate" respondents favoured "party loyalty/party manifesto" with 40.2%, 41.5%, and 52.5%, and "religion" with 27.6%, 18.0%, and 15.6%, respectively. "Illiterate" voters supported "*baradari*" more in the general elections of 2002 and 2013, with 20.9% and 22.0% of the vote, respectively. In the general elections of 2008 and 2013, these same "illiterate" voters primarily chose "clientelism," with 7.1% and 8.9% of the vote, respectively. In the general elections of 2013, "illiterate" voters again supported "any other" determinants, with 4.4% of the vote.

In the general elections of 2008 and 2013, the Pearson Chi-Square tests did not yield a significant Probability Value because P-values of 0.460 > 0.05 and 0.339 > 0.05 indicate that there is no co-relation between the literacy-based stratification and the determinants of voting behaviour. In contrast, in the general elections of 2002, the P-value of 0.008 < 0.05 indicates that there is a strong association between the literacy-based stratification and the determinants of voting behaviour.

Stratification by Profession: Regarding profession-based stratification, in the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 201 "non-government servant" respondents, "party loyalty/party manifesto" was strongly supported. In the general elections of 2002, "house wives" pointed out that "religion" was a major factor, while respondents in the general elections of 2008 and 2013 indicated that they voted "other."

Table 5
Profession-based Stratification and Determinants of Voting Behaviour in 2002
General Elections

	Party Loyalty/ Party Manifesto	Religion	*Baradari*	Clientelism	Ethnicity	Any Other	Total
Govt. Servant	91 (42.7%)	58 (27.2%)	37 (17.4%)	9 (4.2%)	12 (5.6%)	6 (2.8%)	213 (100.0%)
Non-Govt. Servant	43 (44.8%)	25 (26.0%)	12 (12.5%)	10 (10.4%)	5 (5.2%)	1 (1.0%)	96 (100.0%)
Businessman & Shopkeeper	64 (40.0%)	40 (25.0%)	34 (21.2%)	8 (5.0%)	11 (6.9%)	3 (1.9%)	160 (100.0%)
House Wife	22 (26.5%)	25 (30.1%)	16 (19.3%)	9 (10.8%)	8 (9.6%)	3 (3.6%)	83 (100.0%)
Other	45 (40.9%)	29 (26.4%)	21 (18.75%)	7 (6.4%)	5 (4.5%)	5 (4.5%)	112 (100.0%)
Total	265 (39.9%)	177 (26.7%)	120 (18.1%)	43 (6.5%)	41 (6.2%)	18 (2.7%)	664 (100.0%)
Chi-Square Value= 29.551 , *P-value*= 0.012							
Profession-based Stratification and Determinants of Voting Behaviour in 2008 Elections							
Govt. Servant	90 (42.3%)	43 (20.2%)	46 (21.6%)	13 (6.1%)	13 (6.1%)	8 (3.8%)	213 (100.0%)
Non-Govt. Servant	45 (46.9%)	11 (11.5%)	22 (22.9%)	8 (8.3%)	8 (8.3%)	2 (2.1%)	96 (100.0%)
Businessman & Shopkeeper	64 (40%)	25 (15.6%)	31 (19.4%)	19 (11.9%)	15 (9.4%)	6 (3.8%)	160 (100.0%)
House Wife	26 (31.3%)	15 (18.1%)	20 (24.1%)	11 (13.3%)	9 (10.8%)	2 (2.4%)	83 (100.0%)
Other	50 (45.5%)	23 (20.9%)	22 (19.6%)	8 (7.3%)	5 (4.5%)	4 (3.6%)	112 (100.0%)
Total	275 (41.4%)	117 (17.6%)	141 (21.2%)	59 (8.9%)	50 (7.5%)	22 (3.3%)	664 (100.0%)
Chi-Square Value= 26.203 *P-Value*= 0.397							
Profession-based Stratification and Determinants of Voting Behaviour in 2013 Elections							
Govt. Servant	111 (52.1%)	37 (17.4%)	37 (17.4%)	09 (4.2%)	14 (6.6%)	05 (2.3%)	213 (100%)
Non-Government Servant	61 (63.5%)	09 (9.4%)	13 (13.5%)	09 (9.4%)	03 (3.1%)	01 (1.0%)	96 (100%)
Businessmen & Shopkeeper	77 (48.1%)	20 (12.5%)	30 (18.8%)	14 (8.8%)	13 (8.1%)	06 (3.8%)	160 (100%)
House Wife	34 (41.0%)	10 (12.0%)	24 (28.9%)	07 (8.4%)	05 (6.0%)	03 (3.6%)	83 (100%)
Other	54 (49.1%)	22 (20.0%)	19 (17.3%)	08 (7.3%)	02 (1.8%)	05 (4.5%)	112 (100%)
Total	337 (50.8%)	98 (14.8%)	125 (18.8%)	47 (7.1%)	37 (5.6%)	20 (3.0%)	664 (100%)

Chi-Square= 38.730   P-Value= 0.039

As can be seen from Table No. 5, "non-government servant" respondents overwhelmingly chose the determinant "party loyalty/party manifesto" in the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013, with 44.8%, 46.9%, and 63.5%, respectively. "House wives" followed with 30.1% for the determinant "religion" in the general elections of 2002, and "other" respondents with 20.9% and 20.0%, respectively, in the general elections of 2008 and 2013. In general elections of 2002, respondents who identified as "businessman and shopkeeper" (21.2%) and "house wives" (24.1% and 28.9%, respectively) were the main supporters of the determinate "*baradari*."

In general elections of 2002 and 2008, respondents who identified as "house wives" (with 10.8% and 13.3%) and respondents who identified as "ethnic" (with 9.6% and 10.8%) were more likely to vote for the determinant "clientelism" than in respondents who identified as "non-government servants" (9.4%) and respondents who identified as "businessmen and shopkeepers" (8.1%). In the general elections of 2002, respondents who identified as "other" (4.5%) overwhelmingly selected the determinant "any other," followed by "government servants" (3.8%) and "businessman and shopkeepers" (3.8%) in the general elections of 2008.

The Pearson Chi-Square test yielded significant Probability Values (P-values) of 0.012 < 0.05 and 0.039 < 0.05 in the general elections of 2002 and 2013, respectively, indicating a strong correlation between the determinants of voting behaviour and the literacy-based stratification. However, the P-value of 0.397 > 0.05 in the general elections of 2008 indicates that there is no significant correlation between the determinants of voting behaviour and the literacy-based stratification.

Stratification by Monthly Income: In terms of monthly-based stratification, the respondents whose monthly income is '20,000 & below' primarily support the determinant 'party loyalty/party manifesto' in the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013. The respondents whose monthly income group is 'any other or sorry' exhibit the determinant 'religion,' which they support second.

Table 6
Monthly Income-based Stratification and Voting Determinants in 2002 Elections

	Party Loyalty/ Party Manifesto	Religion	*Baradari*	Clientelism	Ethnicity	Any other or Sorry	Total
20,000 & Below	86 (46.0%)	48 (25.7%)	32 (17.1%)	10 (5.3%)	10 (5.3%)	01 (0.5%)	187 (100.0%)
Above 20,000	122 (41.8%)	77 (26.4%)	57 (19.5%)	15 (5.1%)	12 (4.1%)	09 (3.1%)	292 (100.0%)
Any other or Sorry	57 (30.8%)	52 (28.1%)	31 (16.8%)	18 (9.7%)	19 (10.3%)	08 (4.3%)	185 (100.0%)
Total	265 (39.9%)	177 (26.7%)	120 (18.1%)	43 (6.5%)	41 (6.2%)	18 (2.7%)	664 (100.0%)
	Chi-Square Value= 23.303			*P-value*= 0.010			

Monthly Income-based Stratification and Voting Determinants in 2008 Elections

	Party Loyalty/ Party Manifesto	Religion	*Baradari*	Clientelism	Ethnicity	Any other or Sorry	Total
20,000 & Below	97 (51.9%)	21 (11.2%)	40 (21.4%)	13 (7%)	13 (7%)	03 (1.6%)	187 (100.0%)
Above 20,000	119 (40.8%)	54 (18.5%)	65 (22.3%)	26 (8.9%)	16 (5.5%)	12 (4.4%)	292 (100.0%)
Any other or Sorry	59 (21.5%)	42 (22.7%)	36 (19.5%)	20 (10.8%)	21 (11.4%)	07 (3.8%)	185 (100.0%)
Total	275 (41.4%)	117 (17.6%)	141 (21.2%)	59 (8.9%)	50 (7.5%)	22 (3.3%)	664 (100.0%)
	Chi-Square Value= 25.803		*P-Value*= 0.004				

Monthly Income-based Stratification and Voting Determinants in 2013 Elections

20,000 & Below	115 (61.5%)	15 (8.0%)	35 (18.7%)	14 (7.5%)	06 (3.2%)	02 (1.1%)	187 (100.0%)
Above 20,000	151 (51.7%)	46 (15.8%)	55 (18.8%)	16 (5.5%)	15 (5.1%)	09 (3.1%)	292 (100.0%)
Any other or Sorry	71 (38.4%)	37 (20.0%)	35 (18.9%)	17 (9.2%)	16 (8.6%)	09 (4.9%)	185 (100.0%)
Total	337 (50.8%)	98 (14.8%)	125 (18.8%)	47 (7.1%)	37 (5.6%)	20 (3.0%)	664 (100.0%)

Chi-Square= 31.116　　　　　P-Value= 0.001

Table 6 demonstrates that in the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013, the respondents whose monthly income is '20,000 and below' support the determinant 'party loyalty/party manifesto' with 46.0%, 51.9%, and 661.5%, respectively. These respondents also support the determinant 'religion,' which is supported by those whose monthly income group is 'any other or sorry,' with 28.1%, 22.7%, and 20.0%, respectively, the determinant 'clientelism,' which is supported by those with monthly income groups of 'any other or sorry,' with 9.7%, 10.8%, and 9.2% respectively, and the determinant 'ethnicity,' with 10.3%, 11.4%, and 8.6%, respectively, as their voting behaviour. The general elections of 2002 and 2008 saw a greater support for the determinant "*baradari*" from respondents whose monthly income is "above 20, 000," with 19.5% and 22.3%, respectively. In contrast, the general elections of 2003 and 2008 saw a greater emphasis on the determinant "any other," which is primarily highlighted by respondents whose monthly income group is "any other or sorry," with 4.3% and 4.9%, respectively, and in 2008, respondents whose monthly income is "above 20, 000" with 4.4% as their voting behaviour.

The results of the Pearson Chi-Square tests for the general elections in 2002, 2008, and 2013 indicate that there is a strong correlation between the factors influencing voting behaviour and the literacy-based stratification. The P-values are 0.010 < 0.05, 0.004 < 0.05, and 0.001 < 0.05, respectively.

Across all variables, including area, age, gender, profession, literacy, and monthly income, it was found that respondents overwhelmingly supported the voting determinants "party manifesto/party loyalty" in the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013 with 39.9%, 41.4% and 50.8% respectively. These results were followed by "religion" with 26.7%, 1.7.6%, and 14.8%, and "*baradari*" with 18.1%, 21.2%, and 18.8%, respectively. During the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013, the determinant "clientelism" garnered the most support with 6.5%, 8.9%, and 7.1%, respectively. This was followed by the determinant "ethnicity" with 6.2%, 7.5%, and 5.6%, respectively, while all respondents across all variables chose the determinant "any other" with 2.7%, 3.3%, and 3.0%, respectively.

Applying the three electoral theories to the vote trends in the general elections in the 2002, 2008, and 2013 for the KP provincial assembly is the study's method of gathering quantitative data in the form of questionnaire responses.

Firstly, the sociological theory is applied to the quantitative data. In the general elections of 2002, 2008 and 2013, according to the calculations, it is more applicable in terms of area, age, gender, occupation, monthly income, and literacy, with 51.0%, 46.3%, and 39.2%, respectively.

Secondly, the application of the psycho-sociological/party identification theory forms the basis of the quantitative data as well. It states that the theory is somewhat applicable to the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013, with 39.9%, 41.4%, and 50.8%, respectively, in the electoral politics of KP. It is further examined in terms of many variables.

Thirdly, the application of the rational/Downs' Axis theory forms the basis of the quantitative data as well. It contends that the theory has very limited applicability to the

electoral politics of KP in the general elections of 2002, 2008, and 2013, with respective percentages of 6.5%, 8.9%, and 7.1%.

Conclusion

Electoral politics and voting behaviour in KP has been influenced by different factors ingrained in the region culture. Social structure of KP is considerably different from the rest of the provinces of Pakistan and that corresponding impacts on their voting behaviour. Keeping in mind the distinct social set up of this region this study examined the variables that were expected to influence voters' choices in the KP general elections in 2002, 2008, and 2013. The findings of the general elections of 2002 and 2008 indicated that the social factors—religion, which accounted for 26.7% and 17.6% of the votes, *baradari*, which accounted for 18.1% and 21.2% of the votes, and ethnicity, which accounted for 6.2% and 7.5% of the votes respectively—had an effective role as determinants of voting behaviour in the electoral politics of KP. Meanwhile, in the general elections of 2002 and 2008, the political factor—party manifesto/party loyalty, which accounted for 39.9% and 41.4% and economic factor "clientelism," with 6.5% and 8.9% respectively—had a limited role. The situation is different in the 2013 general elections because the political component garnered 50.8% of the vote, followed by the social factor (39.2%). The economic factor 'clientelism' accounting for 7.1% of the total, played minor role in determining voting behaviour in KP's electoral politics.

Unlike the other provinces of Pakistan, voting behaviour in KP during the stated period has not been static, rather it changed by each of the three succeeding elections. It was because of this dynamic nature of KP electoral politics that none of the ruling party was able to form government for second time during the stipulated period. An important factor behind the volatile nature of their electoral behaviour is their free spirit enshrined in *Pakhtunwali*-a Pashtun code of life- which does not let them to lean to any particular party or candidate for ever. They always retaliate with overwhelming majority to any forced decision, be it internal or of external nature. Political parties and candidates both religious and seculars with their attractive narratives have made the best use of their anti-American and pro- religious sentiments in order to garner their erratic and free votes.

Recommendations

- It was observed that electoral candidates, political parties, groups and alliances always use these determinants for the purpose of getting majority in the battle of the polling. Therefore, it is imperative that the utilization of these factors should averted and elections should be conducted in a very free, fair and in just way.
- It was noted that it also depends upon the political system of the State that whether it permits freedom of opinion, expression, and union of the citizens. Only existence of electoral system does not fulfill the needs of good and democratic political society because choice of citizens is shown through voting behaviour in elections and so, all autocratic, doctoral, undemocratic and unjust ways such as malpractices, manipulation, and rigging required to be eliminated in the elections process.
- It is no doubt to say that there are only some archetypal families who have hold, cuddle and ascendancy from top to bottom on politics in the area. In this case, there should be created an atmosphere where every citizen of the area may access to politics and think about to be elected as a member of parliament.

References

Amin, Tahir. (December 16th, 2012). Poor Performance, Rampant Corruption: ANP, PPPP Coalition Government in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa may not retain previous positions. *Business Recorder*

Amir, Intikhab. (January 14, 2012). The Rise of PTI in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. *Dawn*.

Anwar, Muhammad. (April 27, 2016). Reviving the ANP. *The Express Tribune.*

Azhar, M.M., Waris, M., & Naqvi, F. (2019). Intra-Part Democracy In Pakistan: Myth Or Reality?. *Pakistan Journal of Society, Education and Language (PJSEL),* 5 (2), 133-144.

Badshah, L., Rehman, A.U., & Muhammad, N. (2018). Political Determinants of Voting Behaviour in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *Liberal Arts and Social Sciences International Journal (LASSIJ),* 2(1), 1-10.

Blais, Andre., & et al. (2001). Measuring Strategic Voting in Multiparty Plurality Elections. *Electoral Studies,* (20), 343-352.

Data calculated from Election Commission of Pakistan. (2016). *General Election Report Vol. II: Comparative Statistics for General Election 2002, 2008 and 2013*. Islamabad: Government Printing Press.

Definition of 'Political Party', Collins English Dictionary, New York: Harper Collins Publishers

Fareed, G., Muzaffar, M., & Riaz, A. (2019). Enigma of Political Parties in Political Socialization of Pakistan: A Case Study of Muslim League, Pakistan Social Sciences Review, 3(II), 268-281

Government of Pakistan. (2016). *Report on the General Elections-2013.* vol-I, Election Commission of Pakistan.

Hamdani, Yasser Latif. (January 25, 2014). The rise of Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaf and Politics of Charisma. *Criterion quarterly*, 9(1), 142-156.

Haqqani, H. (2004). The Role of Islam in Pakistan's Future. *The Washington Quarterly,* Vol. 28, No. 1, 83-96.

Hassan, M., & Taieb, M. (2021). Kinship and emergence of political leaders in *Pakhtun* society: A comparison of ANP and JUI-F in electoral politics in Charsadda, Pakistan. *Journal of Humanities, Social and Management Sciences (JHSMS)*, *2*(2), 26-41.

Hofmeister, Wilhelm., & Grabow, Karsten. (2011). *Political Parties: Functions and Organization in Democratic Societies*. Singapure: Konrad Adenauer Stifung.

Key, Jr.V.O. (1966). *The Responsible Electorate*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Khan, Jamshed. (2014). The Rise of Political Islam in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa: The Case of Muttahida Majlis-e-Amal (MMA). *Dialogue (Pakistan)*, 9(3), 299-312.

Khan, Kamran. Aziz. (2011). 2002 Elections in Pakistan: A Reappraisal. *Journal of Political Studies*, 18(1), 93-108.

Khan, Ziagham. (May 2, 2016). The Fall of the PPP, the Rise of the PTI. *The New*.

Khattak Accuses ANP, PPPP Govt. of Massive Corruption, (2016, December 11). *Dawn*.

Lewis, Danielle Colbert. (23 March 2012). 9/11 Encyclopedia (2nd Edition). *Emerald Group Publishing Ltd*, 26(3), 1-17.

Mahar, N. & Malik, T. ((2021). Changing Patterns of Political Dynamics in Pakistan. *Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES).*

Mahmood, A. (2017). Restoration of Democracy under Siege: A Study of Junejo Government in Pakistan 1985-1988. *Pakistan Perspectives*, *22*(1), 73-96.

Morris, Chris. (18 August, 2008). Pervez Musharraf's Mixed Legacy. *Special Report BBC News, Islamabad*.

Perveen, S., & Dasti, H. A. (2014). Feudalism: A pastime of power, economic and political influence in Pakistan. *Pakistan Vision*, *15*(1), 59-75.

Pye, Lucian W. (1988). *Asian Power and Politics: The Cultural Dimensions of Authority*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Raisani, Raosen Taj. (April 04, 2018). Electoral Politics in Balochistan. *The Express Tribune*.

Shafqat, Saeed., & Khosa, Maheen Saleem. (2014). *Electoral Politics and Electoal violence in 2013 Elections: The Case of Punjab*. Lahore: Centre for Public Policy and Governance.

Timeline: Major Political Events from 2008-2013. (2013, March 16). *Dawn*.

Ullah, T., & Khan, G. ((2022). Voters' Behaviour in Pakistan in the General Elections of 2013: A Case Study of District Peshawar. *Human Journal of Social Sciences,* 2 (4), 432-447.

Waseem, M. (2006). *Democratization in Pakistan: A Study of the 2002 Elections*: Oxford University Press, USA

Yaseen, Z., Jathol, I., & Muzaffar, M. (2021). Political Parties and their Participation in Pakistan's Democratic System, *Journal of Arts and Social Sciences 8* (1), 65-71

Yousafzai, Rahimullah. (October 2016). PTI's Performance in KP. *News-Line-Magazine*

Yusuf, Huma. (2011, October 31,). Explaining the rise of Imran Khan. *The South Asia Channel*.