

LOKNITI-CSDS NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY POST POLL 2019

Methodology

A post-poll survey was conducted by a team of scholars from all over India as part of the **National Election Study** during the 2019 Lok Sabha elections. The survey was coordinated by the Lokniti Programme at the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (CSDS).

The fieldwork for the post-poll survey was conducted after each phase of voting starting from April 12, 2019. It was completed on May 21. The survey was conducted in 431 assembly constituencies spread across 208 parliamentary constituencies located in 26 states. The total achieved sample size (raw) was 24,236.

For this survey, we initially selected samples from 30 States (*the survey was initially planned in Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram, Tripura and Sikkim as well but could not be conducted eventually*): with a target sample of 20,000 in mind, we first determined the share of each State in the total target sample based on the share of a State's electorate in the total electorate of all States. After arriving at the sample of each State, the sample number of all States was adjusted to the nearest 100. Thereafter, the sample of certain States was increased manually. All States with 5 or less Lok Sabha seats were assigned a fixed sample of 400 each in order to achieve a decent sample from these States. The sample for States such as Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Delhi, Haryana, Jammu and Kashmir, Kerala, Odisha, Punjab, Tamil Nadu, Telangana and West Bengal was also increased manually owing to our special interest in these States for the purpose of analysis.

We then sampled the Parliamentary constituencies in every State. As we decided to conduct 100 interviews per Lok Sabha constituency, the number of PCs to be sampled per State was total sample target of a State divided by 100 (except Jammu and Kashmir where we decided to conduct 140 interviews per PC, and except States that have only 1 or 2 PCs). Within each parliamentary constituency, we decided to sample two Assembly segments (except States with a single PC where 8 ACs were sampled and 2 PCs where 4 ACs were sampled per PC) and within each Assembly segment we selected 3 polling stations (17 interviews per PS), except Tamil Nadu where 4

polling stations ended up being sampled. The Selection at each of these stages was by a random procedure. The constituencies were selected using the Probability Proportionate to Size Method (adjusting the probability of choosing a particular constituency according to the size of its electorate). The polling stations within each of the sampled assembly constituencies were selected using the Systematic Random Sampling (SRS) technique. The respondents were also selected using the SRS method from the most updated electoral rolls. From each polling station 30 persons were selected from the electoral rolls of which at least 17 interviews were to be conducted. Our total target sample therefore came to 22,392. In Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh we later had to add a few new locations to our sample due to fieldwork problems in some of the locations that had been already selected. In Goa, we decided to boost our sample by adding 12 polling stations spread across 4 ACs. The details of the distribution of the sample are given in the table below.

Distribution of the Sample

	Original target after applying state population proportion and then making qualitative adjustments	Total PCs selected (@100 interviews per PC)	Total ACs	Total PSs	Target interviews per PS	Final Target Sample	Additions done later***	Achieved Raw sample	Final weighted sample
Andhra Pradesh	900	9	18	54	17	918	1 PC, 1 AC and 1 PS	929	910
Arunachal Pradesh	400	2*	8*	24*	17*	408*		*	*
Assam	1000	10	20	60	17	1020		1121	586
Bihar	1100	11	22	66	17	1122		1201	1953
Chhattisgarh	500	5	10	30	17	510		548	510
Delhi	700	7	14	42	17	714		683	376
Goa	400	2	8	24	17	408	4 ACs and 12 PSs	603	35
Gujarat	700	7	14	42	17	714		776	1244
Haryana	700	7	14	42	17	714		757	491

	Original target after applying state population proportion and then making qualitative adjustments	Total PCs selected (@100 interviews per PC)	Total ACs	Total PSs	Target interviews per PS	Final Target Sample	Additions done later***	Achieved Raw sample	Final weighted sample
Himachal Pradesh	400	4	8	24	17	408		498	148
Jammu and Kashmir	700	5	10	30	23	700		615	205
Jharkhand	600	6	12	36	17	612		648	623
Karnataka	800	8	16	48	17	816		954	1407
Kerala	1400	14	28	84	17	1428		1667	773
Madhya Pradesh	800	8	16	48	17	816		954	1470
Maharashtra	1400	14	28	84	17	1428		1439	2390
Manipur	400	2	8	24	17	408		409	54
Meghalaya	400	2	8	24	17	408		453	51
Mizoram	400	1*	8*	24*	17*	408*		*	*
Nagaland	400	1	8	24	17	408		381	33
Odisha	900	9	18	54	17	918		900	826
Punjab	600	6	12	36	17	612		635	558
Rajasthan	700	7	14	42	17	714		775	1280
Sikkim	400	1*	8*	24*	17*	408*		*	*
Telangana	700	7	14	42	17	714		800	756
Tripura	400	2*	8*	24*	17*	408*		*	*
Tamil Nadu	1100	11	22	88**	17	1496	1 PC, 1 AC, and 2 PSs	1732	1676
Uttar Pradesh	2500	25	50	150	17	2550	1 PC, 1 AC and 4 PSs, and 2 PSs	2705	3883

	Original target after applying state population proportion and then making qualitative adjustments	Total PCs selected (@100 interviews per PC)	Total ACs	Total PSs	Target interviews per PS	Final Target Sample	Additions done later***	Achieved Raw sample	Final weighted sample
							<i>dropped</i>		
Uttarakhand	400	4	8	24	17	408		443	225
West Bengal	1400	14	28	84	17	1428		1610	1772
	23,200	211-6* =205	(460-32*= 428)	1,402 - 96*= 1,306)		(24,024- 1,632*= 22,392)		24,236	24,235

*Survey was planned but could not be conducted eventually

** 4 PSs sampled in per AC in Tamil Nadu

***Additions either due to fieldwork problem in locations already selected or due to decision to do a booster.

Once we identified our sample of the electorate, trained investigators were sent to meet them. They were asked to interview only those whose names were given to them. Our investigators sat down in the homes of people whose names were selected from the electoral roll, and asked them a detailed set of questions, Interviews during the surveys took about 40-50 minutes. The questionnaire designed for the study was standardized and semi-structured with a mix of both close-ended and open-ended questions. There were two sets of questionnaires – Set A and B. All the questionnaires were translated to local languages – in Gujarat it was in Gujarati, in Karnataka in Kannada and so on.

While asking the question on who they voted for, we gave the respondents a dummy ballot paper on which they could mark their choice. They were then asked to place the ballot paper in a dummy ballot box. The process was designed to ensure that the people interviewed knew they would remain anonymous. This enabled us to collect detailed information about the respondents' work and background, and allowed us to place voting decisions and political opinions within the context of broader social and economic factors. Before going to the field, the FIs, like always, were imparted skills about how to administer the questionnaire in the field through two-day-long training workshops held in each State (except Delhi and Haryana where only one-day workshops were conducted).

When grouping all the States together, for our all-India analysis, we adjusted the figures using a statistical technique known as weighting, which means that each State was proportionately represented in the analysis. This means that we were able to produce an accurate assessment of regional and State level situations, as well as having a balanced and authoritative over-view at the national level.

Profile of the achieved national sample

	Share in the achieved raw survey sample (%)	Share in the weighted sample after applying state proportion (%)	Actual share in India's total population as per Census 2011 (%)
Women	49	47	49
Urban	25	26	31
SC	17	19	17
ST	12	10	9
Muslim	14	14	14
Christian	7*	2	2
Sikh	2	2	2

Note: Figures have been round off.

*Higher than average percentage is on account of oversampling in Kerala and Goa.

The survey was designed and analysed by a team of researchers at Lokniti, CSDS. The team included Amrit Negi, Amrit Pandey, Anurag Jain, Dhananjay Kumar Singh, Himanshu Bhattacharya, Jyoti Mishra, Manjesh Rana, Sakshi Khemani, Shreyas Sardesai and Vibha Attri. The survey was directed by Prof. Sanjay Kumar, Prof. Suhas Palshikar and Prof. Sandeep Shastri of Lokniti.

The survey was coordinated by scholars from the Lokniti Network: E Venkatesu and Srinivas Rao Gangiredla (Andhra Pradesh), Dhruva Pratim Sharma and Nurul Hassan (Assam), Rakesh Ranjan (Bihar), Lakhan Choudhary (Chhattisgarh), Biswajit Mohanty and (Delhi), Alaknanda Shringare (Goa) Mahashweta Jani and Bhanu Parmar (Gujarat), Kushal Pal and Anita Agarwal (Haryana), Ramesh K Chauhan and Sunil Kumar (Himachal Pradesh), Ellora Puri, Aijaz Ashraf Wani, Syed Kashif and Aijaz Ashraf Wani (Jammu and Kashmir), Harishwar Dayal and Amit Kumar (Jharkhand), Veenadevi and K L Nagesh (Karnataka), Sajad Ibrahim (Kerala), Yatindra Singh Sisodia and Ashish

Bhatt (Madhya Pradesh), Nitin Birmal (Maharashtra), Senjam Mangi Singh (Manipur), R K Satpathy and Mary Kurbah Lyngdoh (Meghalaya), Amongla Jamir and Achanger Aier (Nagaland), Gyanaranjan Swain and Balaram Pradhan (Odisha), Ashutosh Kumar, Jagroop Singh Sekhon, Jagroop Kaur and Hardeep Kaur (Punjab), Sanjay Lodha and Nidhi Seth (Rajasthan), P Ramajayam (Tamil Nadu), Vageeshan Harathi and Ramya C (Telangana), Mirza Asmer Beg, Shashikant Pandey and Sudhir Khare (Uttar Pradesh), Rakesh Negi (Uttarakhand) and Suprio Basu and Jyotiprasad Chatterjee (West Bengal).

National Election Study 2019 (NES 2019) is a post poll survey conducted during the recently held Lok Sabha elections by a team of scholars from all over India and coordinated by Lokniti, Programme for Comparative Democracy at the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (CSDS). The NES 2019 is a large and comprehensive social scientific study of India's national elections and continues the series begun in 1967 by the CSDS (with a break between 1971 and 1996). It must be noted that the Post Poll survey conducted by CSDS is very different from an exit poll in which voters are approached outside the polling booth on voting day. Instead voters randomly selected from the electoral rolls were approached by the field investigators for an interview at their place of residence after votes had been cast in their respective constituencies, but before the results were known. The purpose of the post poll survey was not just to try to understand voting behaviour, but more importantly to understand the reasons why voters chose the parties and candidates they did.