



Determinants of Policy Support in India: The Role of Trust and Party Identification

Mihira Gujral

Inventure Academy, India

Email: mhiragujral09@gmail.com

<http://dx.doi.org/10.47814/ijssrr.v9i5.3321>

Abstract

Public opinion and attitude toward certain government policies plays a major role in shaping governance, especially in as politically diverse a nation as India. In recent years, debates have sparked on multiple socio-cultural and economic policies that the government has passed. Therefore, it is crucial to analyse and explore what factors influence citizens to support certain government policies. This study used a survey to gather quantitative data from 64 respondents and analysed the level of trust in the current government, party affiliation and participants' attitudes toward the implementation of the Uniform Civil Code (UCC), Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA), public versus private investment, the privatisation of services, and censorship laws. The study found that increased trust in the government resulted in higher support for all the government policies listed. Additionally, the study found a significant difference in support for identity based policies between the people affiliated with the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) and people affiliated with other political parties. These findings suggest that trust in the government and political party, and party affiliation play a major role in determining how an individual perceives a government policy.

Keywords: *Partisanship; Trust; Public Policy Attitudes; Policy Perception; Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA); Uniform Civil Code (UCC)*

1. INTRODUCTION

India is the world's largest democracy (BBC News, 2025), and as the world's largest democracy, it hosts a vibrant multiparty system, in which dozens of political parties - both national and regional - fight for representation and influence across multiple fields across the country. Within this vast system, these parties each present a different political stance ranging from more traditional and conservative to more progressive and liberal and this stance affects the policies they plan to implement. Some of the aspects their stance influences are economics and finance, socio-cultural matters, and governance.

To understand the Indian political scene better, we must first understand the key party ideologies present in the country. The ruling party, the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), focuses on the idea of an India

that is strongly rooted in Hindu cultures and traditions. Economically, the BJP commonly supports market friendly, pro-business policies. These policies support those targeted at privatisation, foreign investment, and the encouragement of private enterprises. At the same time, the BJP provides large welfare benefits to regular citizens including free rations and cash transfer (Vaishnav, 2019).

The other major party in India, the Indian National Congress (INC) - historically dominant in Indian politics - is built around the idea of secularism, prioritising social welfare for the poor, and promoting a mixed Indian economy where both the private and public sector play important roles in contributing to India's economic growth. The INC usually supports policies that involve government investment and the redistribution of income and wealth to increase social equality. The INC's ideological roots lie in democratic socialism and inclusive nationalism (Khan & Verma, 2024).

In this context, voter perception of policies becomes very important. How citizens react to certain policies and bills on the aspects discussed above not only influences who they vote for, but the acceptability of decisions and policies made in the future. For example, a study showed that Indian voters affiliated with different parties varied significantly in their perception and opinion on political matters as a whole (Barthwal & Refsum Jensenius, 2024).

1.1 Selected policy areas

This paper takes up a few major policy issues in India where economic, social, and cultural matters intersect. The Uniform Civil Code (UCC) and the Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA) have been critiqued as being discriminatory against minority groups, especially the Muslim community (Staff, 2024). These policies have sparked intense debates around secularism, national identity and minority rights (Krishnan, 2024). For example, public opinion surveys have shown strong disagreement among some citizens regarding the implications and motivations behind the CAA (India Today, 2020). Additionally, the privatisation of healthcare (Marimuthu and Azhar, 2013) and education, and the question of investment being mixed between public sector undertakings (PSU's) and private capital (Prabhu, 2025) has raised questions on equity, job security, and quality of the goods and services being produced in the economy. Moreover, Katira et al. (2024) has researched and reported cases of internet bans and censorship in India creating an issue around freedom of expression, citizen rights, and security.

These selected policy areas are deliberately chosen as they represent how politics, government and people's well being connect. The UCC and CAA deal with culture and identity, privatisation and public versus private investment deals with the economy, and censorship and internet bands has to do with freedom and government control. By analysing all these areas together, the study aims to map out how voter partisanship affects how they perceive and react to these major policy changes.

This study references the framework of the partisan identification theory that states that voter partisanship is greatly affected by prior socialisation, such as parental or external influence in childhood, and has a huge impact on an individual's behavior and outlook. Dimdins et al. (2023) supports this theory with evidence that shows that an individual's worldview - liberal or conservative - shapes their values and thereby influences their attitudes towards certain policies. In the Indian context, recent work has shown that an individual's political beliefs cannot be simply classified as "left wing" or "right wing", but rather they are more complex than just taking into account a person's economic viewpoint. Studies have shown that in Indian politics, factors such as religion, culture, and attitudes toward social hierarchy play a major role in shaping one's political beliefs (Yadav et al., 2010).

The partisan identification theory (Campbell et al., 1960) also asserts that people are likely to use their political party's opinions as a shortcut for interpreting government policies. For example, if an individual supports a certain party, they are highly likely to mirror that party's views on matters even if

they don't know all the details. In short, the theory states that your party affiliation and the strength of it plays a very big role in shaping your opinions.

Another very big factor that plays a role in shaping an individual's political opinion is the trust they have in the political party (OECD, 2023). Studies such as Levi and Stoker (2000) and Hetherington (1998, 2005) have shown that the more trust a person has in a party, the more likely they are to agree with the party's policies.

While research on Indian political attitudes has increased over the past years, significant gaps still remain on the topic of how party affiliation influences policy perception across multiple domains. Existing research in this field usually isolates a domain, focusing on economic preferences separate from social or cultural ones. For example, Chhibber (2023) performed an analysis of the Lokniti-CSDS National Election Study that showed Indian party elites held significant ideological biases toward economic policies. BJP elites showed stronger preferences toward privatisation whereas more left aligned elites showed greater preferences for state-led redistribution and economic policies. This study focuses mainly on how ideology influences views on economic policies and not on how it influences views on social and governance policies such as the Uniform Civil Code or the Citizenship Amendment Act.

There is also limited work done on how demographic factors interact with partisanship to influence voter perception of different policies. Many studies such as Kailash (2023) and Bos et al. (2021) have analysed factors such as age, sex, income etc independently but haven't examined how all of them interact with partisanship to shape one's world views. Studying this intersection is essential because an older, low-income Congress supporter and a younger, high-income BJP supporter will have very different opinions on matters such as state intervention or welfare regulation. Studies analysing all of these factors together are scarce.

Another gap includes the role of institutional trust on voter perception of certain policies. Lokniti-CSDS surveys have reported that trust for the Election Commission of India (EC) has fallen since 2019 with only 28% of survey respondents left with "great trust" in the EC. Additionally, in the last 5 years, the percentage of voters who do not trust the EC have doubled. While these surveys track data, there has been little research on the effect of this waning trust on the perceptions of certain policies that the government passes by said voters. This gives way to a large question: Do voters understand and form opinions on certain policies because of their ideology or because they lack trust for the government passing the policy?

In short, this study focuses on the important research question of *How do voters with different party affiliations perceive key economic, social, and cultural policies such as the Uniform Civil Code, the Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA), privatization and internet bans?* This question is further broken down into smaller subtopics such as the interpretation of the Uniform Civil Code based on party affiliation, the attitudes toward the Citizenship Amendment Act across party lines, evaluation of the opinions on the privatisation of healthcare and education, the support for private versus public sector investments, the interaction between demographic factors and party affiliation in shaping perceptions, and the role of trust in a political party on an individual's opinions.

2. METHODOLOGY

The aim of this study is to observe how voters of different demographics and party affiliations react to and perceive economic and socio cultural policies that the government passes - the Uniform Civil Code, The Citizenship Amendment Act, the privatisation of healthcare and education, and internet bans and government controls in particular. The overall significance of this study is that it not only provides a general idea of the political differences between people in India, but it also contributes to a basic

understanding of public opinion and on what basis voters vote in a democratic and diverse society. This study employed a cross-sectional quantitative survey design to examine how political party preference and trust in the current government influence attitudes toward selected public policies in India. The design allowed for the collection of self-reported attitudes from respondents and enabled statistical comparisons between political groups as well as regression analyses examining the predictive role of trust in government.

2.1 Participants and data collection procedure

The study involves a sample of 64 respondents above 18 years of age and citizens of India from all across the country (refer to Table 1). A mix of the snowball and convenience sampling techniques were used in this study, both forms of non probability sampling. This was because the survey was sent out to personal contacts to begin with and said contacts were asked to share it further. The survey was also circulated using social media platforms such as Instagram and WhatsApp.

2.2 Instrumentation

An online survey was created using Google Forms. The beginning of the survey contained two filter questions - a) Are you above the age of 18? b) Are you a citizen of India? Only respondents who selected “yes” for both the statements proceeded ahead in the survey. Demographic details were collected such as gender, education, income, religion, and occupation. The second part of the survey consisted of political details such as party preference, strength of partisanship, frequency of following political news, political ideology supported, main source of political information. Respondents were also asked to rank the order of various political policy domains that they considered of utmost importance such as education, healthcare, national security etc. After the respondents had completed this section, they proceeded onto the next which included questions pertaining to trust in the current government and preferred political party. Then questions regarding specific policies such as CAA, UCC, Censorship, privatization of services, and PSU vs Private capital investment. Overall the survey consisted of 49 questions (excluding the filter questions).

2.3 Variables: The study examined two key independent variables:

- a) Political party preference, categorised as BJP, other political parties (e.g., Congress, AAP), and no political affiliation.
- b) Trust in the current government, measured through survey items assessing the extent to which respondents expressed confidence in the government.

The dependent variables were attitudes toward five policy domains:

- Uniform Civil Code (UCC)
- Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA)
- Privatisation of services
- Private versus public investment
- Government censorship policies

Responses were aggregated to produce composite scores representing support for each policy domain.

2.4 Statistical analysis: Data were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Descriptive statistics (means, medians, and standard deviations) were first calculated to summarise policy attitudes across political party preference groups. Because group sizes were unequal and the distribution of policy scores did not meet parametric assumptions, Kruskal–Wallis H tests were conducted to examine differences in policy attitudes across party preference groups. Where significant differences were observed, Dunn’s post hoc pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni correction were used to identify specific group differences. Additionally, simple linear regression analyses were conducted to examine

whether trust in the current government predicted support for each policy domain. Statistical significance was evaluated at the $p < .05$ level.

2.5 Ethical considerations

There were many ethical considerations taken into account when collecting data. Informed consent was taken from all participants as respondents only filled the survey if they felt comfortable doing so. Additionally, all participants had the right to withdraw at any time while filling out the survey and could choose not to submit their answers. Moreover, the survey was confidential as no personally identifying information was recorded. Finally, while sharing the survey with contacts, clear instructions of how to fill the survey and a briefing of the aims of the study were provided.

3. RESULTS

Table 1 shows *Demographic Characteristics of the Sample (N = 64)*

Variable	Category	n	%
Age	18–24	11	17.2
	25–34	12	18.8
	35–44	16	25.0
	45–54	17	26.6
	55–64	1	1.6
	65+	7	10.9
Gender	Female	38	59.4
	Male	26	40.6
Religion	Hindu	46	71.9
	Christian	8	12.5
	Jain	1	1.6
	None	1	1.6
	Prefer not to say	8	12.5

**Note.* Percentages are calculated based on the total sample ($N = 64$) and rounded to one decimal place.

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the participants included in the study ($N = 64$). With respect to age distribution, the largest proportion of respondents belonged to the 45–54 years age group ($n = 17, 26.6\%$), followed by those aged 35–44 years ($n = 16, 25.0\%$). Participants aged 25–34 years constituted 18.8% ($n = 12$) of the sample, while 17.2% ($n = 11$) were in the 18–24 years category. A smaller proportion of respondents were aged 65 years and above ($n = 7, 10.9\%$), and only 1.6% ($n = 1$) were in the 55–64 years age group. In terms of gender, the sample comprised 38 females (59.4%) and 26 males (40.6%), indicating a higher representation of female participants in the study. Regarding religious affiliation, the majority of respondents identified as Hindu ($n = 46, 71.9\%$). Christian participants

accounted for 12.5% (n = 8) of the sample, while 12.5% (n = 8) preferred not to disclose their religion. A small proportion of respondents identified as Jain (n = 1, 1.6%), or reported no religious affiliation (n = 1, 1.6%). Overall, the sample was predominantly composed of middle-aged adults, female participants, and individuals identifying as Hindu.

Table 2 shows *Descriptive Statistics for Policy Attitudes by Current Political Party Preference (N = 64)*

Policy Domain	Party Preference	n	M	Mdn	SD
CAA	Other parties (Congress, AAP, etc.)	11	13.45	13.00	3.42
	None/No affiliation	37	17.03	17.00	4.42
	BJP	16	22.00	21.00	4.37
UCC	Other parties (Congress, AAP, etc.)	11	13.36	13.00	4.03
	None/No affiliation	37	14.78	15.00	3.87
	BJP	16	19.63	18.50	3.65
Privatisation	Other parties (Congress, AAP, etc.)	11	14.55	15.00	3.05
	None/No affiliation	37	15.59	16.00	3.85
	BJP	16	16.81	16.50	4.00
Censorship	Other parties (Congress, AAP, etc.)	11	12.55	12.00	3.24
	None/No affiliation	37	14.41	14.00	5.43
	BJP	16	19.63	18.00	4.62
Investment	Other parties (Congress, AAP, etc.)	11	15.18	14.00	3.87
	None/No affiliation	37	17.27	18.00	3.19
	BJP	16	20.63	19.00	3.50

Descriptive analysis of policy attitudes revealed distinct policy endorsement patterns across political party preference groups. BJP supporters consistently reported the highest mean and median scores across all policy domains, with particularly strong endorsement of identity-linked policies such as the CAA and UCC, as well as higher acceptance of censorship and investment-oriented policies. Politically unaffiliated respondents demonstrated moderate and relatively balanced scores across policy areas, suggesting issue-based rather than ideologically driven evaluations. In contrast, supporters of other political parties reported lower endorsement of identity-centric and state authority policies, while showing comparable attitudes toward economic policies such as privatisation and investment. This pattern indicates that party preference in the present sample was more strongly associated with identity and governance-related policies than with economic policy orientations.

Table 3 shows *Kruskal–Wallis Tests Comparing Policy Attitudes Across Political Party Preference*

Policy Domain	χ^2	df	p
Uniform Civil Code (UCC)	16.42	2	< .001
Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA)	19.44	2	< .001
Privatisation	2.52	2	.283
Investment	13.57	2	.001
Censorship	13.50	2	.001

*Note. *Kruskal–Wallis H tests were conducted to examine differences in policy attitudes across political party preference groups.*

Table 3 presents the results of *Kruskal–Wallis tests* examining whether attitudes toward selected policies differed across political party preference groups. The analyses revealed statistically significant differences across party preference for attitudes toward the Uniform Civil Code, $\chi^2(2) = 16.42, p < .001$; the Citizenship Amendment Act, $\chi^2(2) = 19.44, p < .001$; investment policies, $\chi^2(2) = 13.57, p = .001$; and censorship policies, $\chi^2(2) = 13.50, p = .001$. These findings indicate that respondents’ political party preference was associated with differences in support for these policy domains. However, no statistically significant difference was observed in attitudes toward privatisation, $\chi^2(2) = 2.52, p = .283$, suggesting that support for privatisation did not vary significantly across political party preference groups in the present sample.

Table 4 shows *Post Hoc Pairwise Comparisons for Policies With Significant Group Differences (Dunn–Bonferroni Tests)*

Policy	Comparison	Adj. p
UCC	Other parties – None	.975
	Other parties – BJP	.001
	None – BJP	.001
CAA	Other parties – None	.080
	Other parties – BJP	< .001
	None – BJP	.006
Investment	Other parties – None	.397
	Other parties – BJP	.001
	None – BJP	.013
Censorship	Other parties – None	.874
	Other parties – BJP	.003
	None – BJP	.005

*Note. *p values adjusted using Bonferroni correction.*

Table 4 presents the results of post hoc pairwise comparisons using Dunn’s test with Bonferroni adjustment for policy domains where the Kruskal–Wallis test indicated significant differences across political party preference groups. For attitudes toward the Uniform Civil Code (UCC), statistically significant differences were observed between BJP supporters and both politically unaffiliated respondents ($p \text{ adj} = .001$) and supporters of other political parties ($p \text{ adj} = .001$). However, no significant difference was found between politically unaffiliated respondents and supporters of other parties ($p \text{ adj} = .975$). A similar pattern was observed for attitudes toward the Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA). BJP supporters reported significantly higher levels of support compared to supporters of other political parties ($p \text{ adj} < .001$) and politically unaffiliated respondents ($p \text{ adj} = .006$). The difference between politically unaffiliated respondents and supporters of other parties was not statistically significant after Bonferroni correction ($p \text{ adj} = .080$). For investment policies, significant differences were again found between BJP supporters and the other two groups. BJP supporters showed significantly higher endorsement compared to supporters of other political parties ($p \text{ adj} = .001$) and politically unaffiliated respondents ($p \text{ adj} = .013$). However, the difference between politically unaffiliated respondents and supporters of other parties was not significant ($p \text{ adj} = .397$). Similarly, for censorship policies, BJP supporters demonstrated significantly higher levels of support than both supporters of other political parties ($p \text{ adj} = .003$) and politically unaffiliated respondents ($p \text{ adj} = .005$), while no significant difference was observed between politically unaffiliated respondents and supporters of other parties ($p \text{ adj} = .874$). Overall, the post hoc comparisons indicate that BJP supporters consistently reported higher endorsement of several policy domains compared to the other groups, whereas politically unaffiliated respondents and supporters of other political parties generally did not differ significantly from one another.

Table 5 shows *Summary of Linear Regression Models Predicting Policy Support from Trust in Current Government*

Outcome Variable	B	SE	β	t	p	R ²	Adj. R ²
Censorship	2.26	0.41	.57	5.44	< .001	.33	.32
Investment	1.37	0.30	.50	4.49	< .001	.25	.23
Uniform Civil Code	1.56	0.34	.50	4.57	< .001	.25	.24
Citizenship Amendment Act	2.08	0.38	.58	5.54	< .001	.33	.32
Privatisation	1.36	0.28	.52	4.83	< .001	.27	.26

***Note.** Predictor variable = trust in current government. All models significant: Censorship $F(1, 62) = 29.56$, Investment $F(1, 62) = 20.18$, UCC $F(1, 62) = 20.88$, CAA $F(1, 62) = 30.66$, Privatisation $F(1, 62) = 23.31$.

Table 5 presents the results of simple linear regression analyses examining whether trust in the current government predicts support for different policy domains. Across all models, trust in the current government emerged as a significant positive predictor of policy support. Higher levels of trust were associated with greater support for censorship policies, $B = 2.26$, $SE = 0.41$, $\beta = .57$, $t = 5.44$, $p < .001$. The model explained 33% of the variance in censorship attitudes ($R^2 = .33$, Adjusted $R^2 = .32$). Similarly, trust significantly predicted support for investment policies, $B = 1.37$, $SE = 0.30$, $\beta = .50$, $t = 4.49$, $p < .001$, accounting for 25% of the variance in investment attitudes ($R^2 = .25$, Adjusted $R^2 = .23$). Trust in the current government was also a significant predictor of support for the Uniform Civil Code, $B = 1.56$,

SE = 0.34, $\beta = .50$, $t = 4.57$, $p < .001$, explaining 25% of the variance in UCC attitudes ($R^2 = .25$, Adjusted $R^2 = .24$). Likewise, higher trust predicted stronger support for the Citizenship Amendment Act, $B = 2.08$, SE = 0.38, $\beta = .58$, $t = 5.54$, $p < .001$, with the model explaining 33% of the variance in CAA attitudes ($R^2 = .33$, Adjusted $R^2 = .32$). Finally, trust significantly predicted support for privatisation policies, $B = 1.36$, SE = 0.28, $\beta = .52$, $t = 4.83$, $p < .001$, accounting for 27% of the variance in privatisation attitudes ($R^2 = .27$, Adjusted $R^2 = .26$). Overall, these findings indicate that greater trust in the current government is consistently associated with stronger support for a range of economic, governance, and socio-cultural policies.

4. DISCUSSION:

The study looked at whether trust in the current government was a factor that influenced support for certain social, economic, and governance related policies. The results revealed a consistent pattern, highlighting how for all policies trust in the current government played a major role in support provided to the policy. This has been supported by previously conducted studies, with Levi and Stoker (2000) reporting that increased trust in government increased the support for policies and government decisions, even the decisions that raised controversy. Additionally, Hetherington (1998, 2005) found that increased trust in the current government led to increased support for decisions that expanded the government's power and authority to more regions. Later research such as Hetherington & Rudolph (2008) further demonstrated this finding. Moreover, this study's findings are supported by Graham and Svobik (2020) who found that the strength of partisanship and trust in the government makes it more likely to trade off on regular democratic practices such as the freedom of speech and expression.

One factor that could explain the relationship between trust and policy support is the participants' party affiliation. This explanation is supported by the partisanship identification theory (Campbell et al., 1960) that states that people who have long term associations to a certain political party begin mirroring said political parties' opinions. Therefore, people evaluate policies based on the stance of the preferred political party rather than by individually evaluating the aspects of the policy. Moreover, this explanation is backed by the findings of Bartels (2002). This study found that a citizen's assessment of a policy is highly influenced by partisan bias, meaning that a political party's policy is more likely to be supported by their supporter base and criticised by the opposition's supporter base.

Additionally, the descriptive pattern suggests stronger and more pronounced differences for socio-cultural and identity-linked policies, such as the UCC and CAA, between participants affiliated with the BJP and those affiliated with other political parties. In contrast, differences were comparatively weaker for economic policies such as privatisation, suggesting that party affiliation plays a more decisive role in shaping attitudes toward identity-based policies than toward economic ones. This finding is supported by studies such as Chhibber and Verma (2018) who found that partisanship is more linked to ideology rather than actual policies, economic policies being an example. It also stated how the BJP supporter base is rooted in Hindu nationalism and therefore, is much more likely to support the identity based policies rather than the economic ones. Additionally Verma and Chhibber (2023) showed that the regular voter stands at the centre-left economic position and therefore, differences in ideology and partisanship between regular voters stems from social and cultural policies rather than economic ones.

5. CONCLUSION

Understanding how citizens form attitudes towards different policies and political parties is important especially in a politically complex and diverse economy like India's. The present study highlights how trust in the government is a strong and consistent factor in determining the support and attitude toward different government policies, including economic policies like the privatisation of

services such as health care and education and public versus private investment, and socio-cultural policies such as censorship, the Uniform Civil Code and the Citizenship Amendment Act. Moreover, party affiliation was more significant in determining the support toward identity linked policies such as the UCC and CAA compared to economic policies. By analyzing the effect of affiliation on support for a vast range of policies, this study extends prior research that has focussed on these domains separately.

This study adds value to prior studies done around electoral behaviour by providing quantitative data linking trust and party affiliation to support for different government policies. These findings have important real world implications. For policymakers, the findings highlight the importance of trust and legitimacy in policy acceptance, even for those that may be controversial. For political parties, these findings suggest that emphasizing on identity based policies creates more support from the core follower base while emphasizing on economic policies is more likely to attract citizens with different party affiliation. Overall, the findings of this study have suggested that having strong affiliation with a particular party are likely to influence decisions with respect to the policies. There needs to be more objectivity in the citizens when it comes to decisions affecting the nation. Researchers can examine in depth the psychology of voters and offer grounded techniques on how voters can stray clear of biases and have a more logical approach towards the policies that affect millions nationwide.

5.1 Limitations of the study

This study had some limitations. Firstly, this study had a low sample size of only 64 participants. Therefore, it lacks generalisability meaning the study's findings may not be applicable to the rest of the Indian voter base population. Additionally, there were very few responses from non-Hindu voters. This could have been due to the current political environment, which may have caused certain minority demographics to prefer keeping their religious identity private. Moreover, this study was conducted as a survey. Therefore, there may have been biases in the responses as participants may have been faced by the social desirability bias, meaning they may have wanted to give answers that were "correct" rather than their honest opinions. Lastly, this study lacked a standardised survey affecting the reliability of the scale used to measure different factors.

5.2 Future recommendations

1. Cross cultural comparison: Future research conducted in the field could conduct cross cultural examinations between India and other democratic countries. By examining how trust in the government impacts support for social, cultural and economic policies will help determine whether such trends apply to the vast global context or are unique only to Indian politics.
2. Larger and representative samples: Future studies should employ a larger and more representative sample to improve the generalisability of the study's findings. This includes participants of different age groups, genders, religions, party affiliation, and socioeconomic backgrounds.
3. Recommendations for the people/citizens: Citizens and voters should be encouraged to educate themselves on the different public policies and political parties and consume knowledge from a vast variety of platforms.
4. Triangulation: Future research could include multiple forms of data collection such as surveys and interviews to gain deeper insights into why individuals trust certain political parties and support certain policies.
5. Recommendation for policymakers and stakeholders: The findings highlight that trust is a major factor for support. Therefore, policymakers and political parties should recognise the importance of maintaining the citizen's trust and do so by clearly communicating the aims and aspects of the policies they plan to implement.

References

- Barthwal, A., & Refsum Jensenius, F. (2024, March 22). Partisanship's striking resilience in India. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2024/03/partisanship-striking-resilience-in-india?lang=en>
- Bartels, L. M. (2002). Beyond the running tally: partisan bias in political perceptions. *Political Behavior*, 24(2), 117–150. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1021226224601>
- BBC News. (2025, March 10). India country profile. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-south-asia-12557384>
- Bell, E., & Kandler, C. (2015). The origins of party identification and its relationship to political orientations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 83, 136–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.04.002>
- Bos, A. L., Greenlee, J. S., Holman, M. R., Oxley, Z. M., & Lay, J. C. (2021b). This one's for the boys: How gendered political socialization limits girls' political ambition and interest. *American Political Science Review*, 116(2), 484–501. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0003055421001027>
- Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., Miller, W. E., & Stokes, D. E. (1960). *The American voter*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Centre for the Study of Developing Societies. (2007). CSDS/CNN-IBN/Indian Express Pre-Poll survey U.P. State Assembly Election-2007. In CSDS/CNN-IBN/Indian Express Pre-Poll Survey U.P. State Assembly Election-2007. https://www.lokniti.org/media/PDF-upload/1536140406_27246000_download_questionnaire.pdf
- Chhibber, P. K., & Verma, R. (2018). *Ideology and identity: The changing party systems of India*. Oxford University Press.
- Chhibber, R. V. & P. K. (2023). Economic ideology in Indian politics: Why do elite and mass politics differ? [ideas.repec.org. https://ideas.repec.org/a/sae/indpol/v11y2023i2p274-288.html](https://ideas.repec.org/a/sae/indpol/v11y2023i2p274-288.html)
- Dimdins, G., Montgomery, H., & Sandgren, M. (2023). Worldviews and values as bases for political orientations. *International Review of Social Psychology*, 36(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.5334/irsp.741>
- Graham, M. H., & Svobik, M. W. (2020). Democracy in America? Partisanship, polarization, and the robustness of support for democracy in the United States. *American Political Science Review*, 114(2), 392–409. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0003055420000052>
- Hetherington, M. J. (1998). The political relevance of political trust. *American Political Science Review*, 92(4), 791–808. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2586304>
- Hetherington, M. J. (2005). *Why trust matters: Declining political trust and the demise of American liberalism*. Princeton University Press.
- Hetherington, M. J., & Rudolph, T. J. (2008). Priming, performance, and the dynamics of political trust. In P. Norris (Ed.), *Democratic deficit: Critical citizens revisited* (pp. 791–808). Cambridge University Press. https://web.archive.org/web/20170811033649id_/https://sites.hks.harvard.edu/fs/pnorris/Books/Democratic%20Deficit/Articles/Hetherington_Rudolph.pdf

- India Today. (2020b, January 23). Most Indians say CAA, NRC are attempts to divert attention from unemployment: MOTN poll. [https://www.indiatoday.in/mood-of-the-nation/story/most-indians-say-
caa-nrc-are-attempts-to-divert-attention-from-unemployment-motn-poll-1639567-2020-01-23?](https://www.indiatoday.in/mood-of-the-nation/story/most-indians-say-caa-nrc-are-attempts-to-divert-attention-from-unemployment-motn-poll-1639567-2020-01-23?)
- Kailash, K. K. (2023b). Age and Party Choice: Generational Shift in India. *Studies in Indian Politics*, 11(2), 208–224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23210230231203784>
- Katira, D., Samsudin, S. N., & Carreno Pineda, T. (2024). IMAP India 2024 Internet Censorship Report. In Sinar Project, Sinar Project. [https://imap.sinarproject.org/reports/2024/imap-india-2024-internet-
censorship-report/imap-india-2024-internet-censorship-report.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com](https://imap.sinarproject.org/reports/2024/imap-india-2024-internet-censorship-report/imap-india-2024-internet-censorship-report.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- Khan, S., & Verma, A. (2024). Comparison of political parties in India and Pakistan. *International Research Journal of Humanities and Interdisciplinary Studies*, 5(3), 221–234. <http://irjhis.com/paper/IRJHIS2403026.pdf>
- Krishnan, M. (2024, February 14). *India: Why is a civil code stirring controversy?* dw.com. <https://www.dw.com/en/india-why-is-a-civil-code-stirring-controversy/a-68245692>
- Kumar, A. (2024, April 12). Lok Sabha polls: CSDS survey reveals dip in trust in Election Commission. *Business Standard*. [https://www.business-standard.com/politics/lok-sabha-polls-csds-survey-reveals-
dip-in-trust-in-election-commission-124041200812_1.html](https://www.business-standard.com/politics/lok-sabha-polls-csds-survey-reveals-dip-in-trust-in-election-commission-124041200812_1.html)
- Levi, M., & Stoker, L. (2000). Political trust and trustworthiness. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 3(1), 475–507. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.3.1.475>
- Marimuthu, K. N., & Azhar, S. (2013). Privatization of healthcare industry in India: Prospects & problems. *EXCEL International Journal of Multidisciplinary Management Studies*, 3(2). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/379258705_PRIVATIZATION_OF_HEALTHCARE_INDUSTRY_IN_INDIA_PROSPECTS_PROBLEMS
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (n.d.). *Trust in government*. <https://www.oecd.org/en/topics/sub-issues/trust-in-government.html>
- Prabu, M. V. (2025). Disinvestment of public sector undertakings in India and its effects, challenges and trends. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts (IJCRT)* (Vol. 13, Issue 8) [Journal-article]. <https://www.ijcrt.org/papers/IJCRT2508609.pdf>
- Rohmetra, A., & Rohmetra, A. (2025, March 1). *Percentage of voters who don't trust ECI nearly doubled in last 5 yrs — CSDS-Lokniti survey*. ThePrint. [https://theprint.in/politics/percentage-of-voters-who-
dont-trust-eci-nearly-doubled-in-last-5-yrs-csds-lokniti-survey/2040206/](https://theprint.in/politics/percentage-of-voters-who-dont-trust-eci-nearly-doubled-in-last-5-yrs-csds-lokniti-survey/2040206/)
- Staff, A. J. (2024, March 13). *Why is India's Citizenship Amendment Act so controversial?* Al Jazeera. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2024/3/12/why-is-indias-citizenship-amendment-act-so-controversial>
- Vaishnav, M. (2019, April 4). *The BJP in power: Indian democracy and religious nationalism*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. [https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2019/04/the-bjp-in-
power-indian-democracy-and-religious-nationalism?lang=en](https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2019/04/the-bjp-in-power-indian-democracy-and-religious-nationalism?lang=en)
- Verma, R., & Chhibber, P. K. (2023). Economic ideology in Indian politics: Why do elite and mass politics differ? *Studies in Indian Politics*, 11(2), 274–288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23210230231209450>



Yadav, Y., MacMillan, A., Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (CSDS), Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin, & Department of Political Science, University of Sheffield. (2010). *Does ideology matter in Indian elections? Ideological space and issue cleavages in contemporary India*. <https://macmillan.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/indiandemocracy/locked/yadav.pdf>

Copyright Notice

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.