Kurdish Studies
September 2021
Volume: 09, No: 02, pp 454-459
ISSN: 2051-4883 (Print) | ISSN 2051-4891 (Online)
www.KurdishStudies.net

DOI: 10.67145/ks.v9i2.4150

An Analytical Study of the 2019 Lok Sabha Elections: Determinants, Electoral Mandates, and the Consolidation of the Dominant-Party System

Dr. Shubhangi Shahakarpant Sonar
Late C.M. Kadhi Mahavidyalaya, Achalpur Camp Paratwada, Email- shubhangissonar@gmail.com

Abstract
The 2019 Lok Sabha election marked a significant turning point in the development of India's contemporary party system. The election returned the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) to power with an enlarged parliamentary majority, increasing its representation from 282 seats in 2014 to 303 seats in 2019. Its national vote share also increased from approximately 31% to 37.4%. In contrast, the Indian National Congress (INC) secured only 52 seats despite receiving approximately 19.4% of the national vote. Congress.gov The election therefore represented more than an ordinary alternation or continuation of government: it demonstrated the increasing nationalisation of electoral competition around the BJP and Narendra Modi, the weakening of the Congress as a principal national challenger, and the growing importance of welfare delivery, leadership, nationalism, social coalition-building, and organisational mobilisation. This analyses the principal determinants of the 2019 electoral outcome and evaluates whether the result constituted the consolidation of a new dominant-party system. It uses Election Commission of India (ECI) electoral statistics alongside academic research on Indian electoral behaviour and the BJP's rise. The paper argues that the BJP's victory resulted from the interaction of several factors rather than from a single electoral issue. These included the personalisation of leadership around Modi, national-security appeals following the Pulwama attack and Balakot air strikes, expansion of welfare programmes, social coalition-building across caste groups, organisational strength, digital campaigning, and the fragmentation and strategic weakness of the opposition. At the same time, the concept of a "dominant-party system" requires qualification because the BJP's support remained geographically uneven and several strong regional parties continued to resist its expansion. The 2019 election nevertheless substantially strengthened the BJP's position at the centre of India's party system.

Keywords: 2019 Lok Sabha election, BJP, Narendra Modi, Congress, electoral politics, dominant-party system, welfare politics, nationalism, caste, Indian democracy.

Introduction

The general election to the 17th Lok Sabha was held in seven phases between April and May 2019. It was one of the largest democratic exercises in history, involving more than 900 million registered electors. According to the Election Commission of India, 614.7 million votes were ultimately recorded, producing a national turnout of 67.4%, the highest turnout in India's general-election history up to that point. Female turnout reached 67.18%, almost equal to male turnout of 67.02%. Election Commission of India The outcome was decisive. The BJP won 303 of the 543 Lok Sabha seats, giving it 56% of all seats while receiving approximately 37.3–37.4% of the national vote. The Congress won just 52 seats with approximately 19.4% of the vote. Congress.gov The disparity between vote share and seats illustrates the effects of India's first-past-the-post electoral system: a party does not need 50% of the national vote to obtain a parliamentary majority if its support is geographically concentrated. The significance of the election was therefore both electoral and systemic. In 2014, the BJP had already achieved the first single-party parliamentary majority in India since 1984, winning 282 seats. In 2019, it not only retained power but expanded its parliamentary representation to 303 seats. ECI data show that BJP seats rose from 282 in 2014 to 303 in 2019, while Congress increased only modestly from 44 to 52. Election Commission of India

The argument advanced here is that the 2019 result cannot be explained by nationalism, welfare, leadership, caste, or opposition weakness alone. Rather, the BJP successfully combined these elements into an integrated electoral strategy. The party's organisational capacity transformed political narratives into votes, while opposition fragmentation magnified the electoral consequences of its vote share.

Methodology And Sources

This study uses a qualitative and quantitative analytical approach. Primary electoral data are drawn primarily from the Election Commission of India, including constituency-level and national turnout and party-performance statistics. The ECI recorded 543 parliamentary constituencies, 911.95 million electors and approximately 614.68 million votes in the 2019 election. Election Commission of India

Secondary evidence is drawn from scholarly research on the BJP's electoral expansion, changing social coalitions and the Indian party system. K. C. Suri's analysis of the 2019 election examines social change, caste politics, electoral volatility and the changing Indian voter, while Deshpande and colleagues examine the relationship between welfare schemes and BJP support. Sage Journals Ziegfeld's comparative analysis questions whether the 2019 victory alone was sufficient to establish the BJP as a permanently dominant party. Tandfonline

The analysis therefore combines electoral statistics with political-science interpretations rather than treating the election as the consequence of a single campaign issue.

Electoral Background: From 2014 to 2019

The 2019 election needs to be understood against the transformation of Indian politics after 2014. The BJP's 2014 victory ended a period in which coalition governments had been the dominant pattern at the Union level. The party won 282 seats in 2014, compared with only 116 in 2009. By 2019, it had increased its tally further to 303. Election Commission of India

Table 1: Selected Lok Sabha Election Indicators

Indicator	2014	2019
Total electors	834.1 million	911.95 million
Voter turnout	66.44%	67.40%
Total votes polled	554.2 million	614.7 million
BJP seats	282	303
Congress seats	44	52
BJP vote share	~31%	~37.3–37.4%
Congress vote share	~19.5%	~19.4%
Female turnout	65.54%	67.18%

Source: Election Commission of India; CRS compilation of ECI results. Election Commission of India

The table demonstrates two important developments. First, participation increased considerably. The electorate expanded by nearly 78 million between 2014 and 2019, while total votes cast increased by roughly 60 million. Election Commission of India Second, the BJP did not merely retain its previous support; it increased its national vote share and parliamentary representation. This distinguishes 2019 from a simple incumbency election. The incumbent government was not merely protected from anti-incumbency; it was returned with a stronger mandate.

Determinant I: Narendra Modi and the Presidentialisation of Parliamentary Politics

One of the most important characteristics of the 2019 election was the centrality of Narendra Modi. Although India has a parliamentary system, the campaign increasingly resembled a presidential-style contest in which the political image and leadership of Modi became central to electoral choice. The BJP campaign presented Modi as a decisive, strong and development-oriented national leader. The electoral contest was framed not simply as a choice between local parliamentary candidates but as a choice between Modi and a relatively fragmented opposition.

This personalisation benefited the BJP in several ways. First, Modi provided a common national identity to a geographically diverse party. Second, his personal popularity helped overcome local variations in BJP organisation and candidate quality. Third, the campaign transformed an election involving 543 separate constituencies into a national referendum-like contest. The contrast with the opposition was particularly important. The Congress lacked a comparable national leadership advantage, while opposition parties often retained strong regional identities. Academic analysis of the election emphasises that the opposition remained poorly coordinated, while the BJP expanded beyond its traditional strongholds.

Leadership therefore functioned as an electoral multiplier. It did not independently produce the BJP's victory, but it allowed diverse issues development, welfare, nationalism and Hindu identity to be incorporated into a single national political narrative.

Determinant II: National Security and the Pulwama-Balakot Effect

National security became particularly important during the final phase of the election campaign following the Pulwama terrorist attack in February 2019 and India's subsequent Balakot air strike in Pakistan.

The BJP successfully associated itself with an image of muscular national security and decisive leadership. The issue strengthened the party's ability to present the election as a choice concerning national sovereignty and security rather than simply economic performance.

This was significant because the BJP faced economic criticisms relating to unemployment, rural distress and economic slowdown. The prominence of security politics changed the political agenda. Rather than allowing the election to be determined primarily by economic dissatisfaction, the BJP campaign broadened the basis of electoral choice.

This should not, however, be interpreted as meaning that nationalism alone produced the BJP victory. National-security appeals were embedded within a larger campaign strategy involving leadership, welfare and social mobilisation.

Determinant III: Welfare Politics and the Expansion of the BJP's Social Base

A particularly important feature of the BJP's second electoral victory was the role of welfare delivery. Programmes associated with the Modi government included the Pradhan Mantri Ujjwala Yojana, Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojana, housing programmes and sanitation initiatives. Research by Deshpande and colleagues suggests that voters who benefited from programmes such as Ujjwala, Jan Dhan and Awas were more likely to support the BJP, although the relationship varied by programme and beneficiary group. This evidence challenges the interpretation that the BJP won simply through cultural or ideological mobilisation. Welfare policies allowed the party to establish connections with economically disadvantaged groups, including sections of rural and lower-income voters.

The political importance of welfare was enhanced by the centralisation of credit. Beneficiaries could associate tangible improvements such as access to LPG connections, bank accounts or housing assistance with the national government and Modi's leadership. In electoral terms, this created a form of programmatic linkage between the state and citizens.
The BJP's welfare strategy thus complemented rather than replaced identity politics. A voter could simultaneously support the party because of welfare benefits, leadership, nationalism and ideological identification.

Determinant IV: Caste and the Construction of a Broad Social Coalition
Indian elections have historically been strongly influenced by caste. The 2019 BJP strategy did not eliminate caste politics; instead, it reorganised caste-based political competition. The BJP sought support beyond its traditional upper-caste base, particularly among Other Backward Classes (OBCs), sections of Dalits and non-dominant backward-caste groups. This strategy weakened the ability of regional parties to monopolise particular caste constituencies.
The BJP's coalition was therefore not socially homogeneous. It was a multi-class and multi-caste electoral coalition. The significance of this transformation is highlighted in research on social change and the changing Indian voter. Suri's study specifically identifies caste politics and social cleavages as central to understanding the BJP's consolidation in 2019. The BJP's strategy was particularly effective where it could combine national-level leadership with local caste calculations. This explains why the party could perform strongly across states with very different social structures.

Determinant V: Women's Electoral Participation
The increasing participation of women was another important structural development. The ECI recorded female turnout of 67.18% in 2019, compared with 67.02% for men. This represented a historic reversal: nationally, female turnout slightly exceeded male turnout. Moreover, women's turnout exceeded men's in 23 states and Union Territories.

Table 2: Gender and Electoral Participation

Indicator	2014	2019
Female turnout	65.54%	67.18%
Male turnout	67.00%	67.02%
Gender turnout gap	1.46 percentage points	-0.16 percentage points

Source: Election Commission of India. Election Commission of India
The narrowing of the gender gap had significant implications for electoral politics. Women's political participation increasingly became an independent electoral variable rather than merely a reflection of household voting patterns. The BJP's welfare policies especially those concerning LPG, sanitation, housing and financial inclusion were potentially relevant to women's everyday experiences. Although it would be methodologically incorrect to assume that all women voted for the BJP because of these programmes, welfare politics provided the party with an important mechanism for reaching female voters.

Determinant VI: Opposition Fragmentation and the First-Past-the-Post System
Perhaps the most important structural advantage enjoyed by the BJP was the fragmentation of the opposition. The BJP did not need to win a majority of all votes nationally. It needed to win more votes than its principal competitor in individual constituencies. The first-past-the-post system therefore magnified the electoral consequences of opposition division. The contrast between the BJP's approximately 37.4% vote share and its 303 seats demonstrates this effect. The BJP won 56% of the seats while obtaining less than 40% of the national vote. By comparison, Congress received approximately 19.4% of the vote but won only 52 seats. This illustrates the importance of geographical distribution. A party can receive a substantial national vote share while winning relatively few constituencies if its support is inefficiently distributed. The opposition also suffered from strategic difficulties. Although several parties formed alliances in particular states, there was no uniformly coordinated national anti-BJP coalition. Academic analyses of the election point to the weakness and lack of coordination of the opposition as a significant contributor to the BJP's victory.

Regional Expansion of the BJP
The BJP's 2019 victory was especially important because it was not confined to the Hindi-speaking heartland. The party expanded its electoral presence in states where it had historically been weaker, including West Bengal, Odisha and Telangana. Scholarly analysis notes that the BJP maintained much of its previous strength while expanding into new geographical areas.
This expansion is crucial for understanding the dominant-party argument. A truly national dominant party must have the ability to compete beyond a narrow geographical core. The BJP's 2019 performance suggested that it was increasingly capable of doing so. Nevertheless, the expansion remained incomplete. Strong regional parties continued to dominate several states, including Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Odisha and West Bengal to varying degrees. Consequently, BJP dominance at the national level did not imply uniform dominance across all Indian states.

Electoral Mandate: What Did the 2019 Result Actually Mean?
The concept of an "electoral mandate" requires careful interpretation. The BJP's 303 seats constituted a clear parliamentary majority. It exceeded the 272-seat threshold required for a simple majority by 31 seats. Its seat total also exceeded its 2014 performance by 21 seats. Yet the BJP received approximately 37% of the national vote, meaning that a majority of voters did not vote for it. This distinction is essential. An electoral mandate in a parliamentary democracy does not necessarily

mean that more than half of citizens voted for the winning party. Rather, it refers to the constitutional and parliamentary authority generated by winning enough constituencies to form a government.
The 2019 mandate can therefore be described as strong in parliamentary terms but plural in popular-vote terms. The election nevertheless gave Modi and the BJP considerable political legitimacy to pursue their policy programme because they had not merely retained power but increased both their vote share and seat total.

Consolidation of a Dominant-Party System?
The most contested issue is whether 2019 marked the establishment of a new dominant-party system. The evidence is substantial but not conclusive. On one side, the BJP possessed several characteristics associated with dominant parties:
1.A large parliamentary majority.
2.A substantial national vote share.
3.A strong and increasingly national organisation.
4.A powerful national leader.
5.Expansion beyond traditional regional strongholds.
6.Weakness of the principal national opposition party.
7.Ability to form broad social coalitions.
8.Capacity to win successive national elections.

These characteristics led scholars to argue that the BJP had become the central pole of Indian politics. Suri's analysis describes the 2019 election as a consolidation of the BJP among changing social groups. However, the dominant-party thesis should not be overstated. Ziegfeld argues that although the BJP's victory was impressive, predictions of long-term dominance remained premature because the party lacked several characteristics historically associated with dominant parties, including an exceptionally broad and deep support base across all regions. Similarly, academic work published before the 2019 election had already questioned whether BJP dominance necessarily meant that India's previous multi-party system had disappeared. It argued that the BJP's rise had placed the earlier party system under severe pressure but did not automatically establish a completely new party system. The appropriate interpretation is therefore that 2019 consolidated BJP dominance at the national level without eliminating India's federal and regional party competition.

Quantitative Assessment of the Dominant-Party Argument

Table 3: BJP Parliamentary Performance

Election	BJP seats	Change from previous election
2004	138	—
2009	116	-22
2014	282	+166
2019	303	+21

Source: Election Commission of India. Election Commission of India
The most striking feature is the dramatic transition between 2009 and 2014 and the consolidation between 2014 and 2019. The BJP's 2019 result was particularly significant because incumbents frequently face anti-incumbency pressures. Instead, the BJP increased its seats. At the same time, the Congress remained electorally weak. Its 52 seats were insufficient to become a credible parliamentary alternative. The result created an asymmetric national party system: one highly successful national party and one substantially weaker national challenger, alongside numerous regional parties. This asymmetry is one of the defining features of India's post-2014 political environment.

The Role of Electoral Participation
The election's high turnout also deserves attention. The ECI recorded 67.4% turnout in 2019, compared with 66.44% in 2014 and 58.21% in 2009.

Table 4: Long-Term Turnout

Election	Turnout
2009	58.21%
2014	66.44%
2019	67.40%

The increase suggests that Indian elections had become more participatory. Importantly, this occurred alongside the increasing competitiveness of political mobilisation. Higher turnout does not automatically favour one party. However, it indicates that the 2019 mandate was produced through exceptionally broad participation. Approximately 615 million people voted. The increasing participation of women is particularly noteworthy because it suggests a changing electoral constituency and potentially greater autonomy in voting behaviour.

Major Weaknesses of the Opposition
The BJP's victory cannot be separated from the crisis of its principal opponents.

Congress faced several structural problems:

- weak organisational networks in many states;
- leadership constraints;
- inability to establish a compelling alternative national narrative;
- limited geographical competitiveness;
- difficulties in coordinating opposition parties;
- inability to match the BJP's campaign machinery.

Regional parties were individually strong but nationally fragmented. They could defeat the BJP in particular states or constituencies but could not easily transform those victories into a national alternative. The result was an asymmetrical contest. The BJP could present itself as the natural national governing party, while opposition parties often appeared as state-specific alternatives. This distinction was especially important under India's electoral system. Where opposition votes were divided among two or three parties, the BJP could win constituencies with substantially less than 50% of the vote.

Digital Politics, Organisation and Campaign Technology

Another major determinant was the BJP's sophisticated campaign organisation. By 2019, Indian elections had become deeply integrated with social media, digital communication, targeted messaging and online mobilisation. The BJP possessed extensive organisational infrastructure extending from the national level into state and constituency networks. Digital communication enhanced the personalisation of politics around Modi. It also enabled the party to distribute campaign narratives rapidly and repeatedly. The importance of organisational capacity is often underestimated in electoral explanations. Popularity alone cannot convert votes into 303 parliamentary seats. It requires candidates, local workers, voter mobilisation, booth-level organisation, fundraising and strategic alliances. The BJP's electoral machine therefore functioned as the institutional mechanism through which leadership appeal and campaign narratives became constituency-level victories.

Economic Performance and the Limits of the Economic Explanation

A major puzzle of the 2019 election was that the BJP won despite substantial concerns surrounding unemployment, rural distress and economic growth. This creates an important theoretical question: Why did economic dissatisfaction not produce a stronger anti-incumbent vote?

One explanation is that economic voting was only one component of electoral choice. Voters evaluated the government through several dimensions simultaneously. National security, leadership, welfare, identity and perceptions of India's international position could compensate for dissatisfaction in other areas. The welfare evidence is particularly important here. Deshpande and colleagues note that the 2019 BJP victory occurred amid concerns about economic conditions, but their research found associations between certain central welfare benefits and BJP support. Thus, the election should not be interpreted as proof that economic issues were irrelevant. Rather, economic concerns competed with alternative forms of political evaluation.

Conclusion

The 2019 Lok Sabha election represented a major stage in the transformation of India's party system. The BJP's victory was based on the interaction of multiple factors: the personal popularity and leadership image of Narendra Modi; national-security politics; welfare delivery; social coalition-building; organisational strength; digital mobilisation; women's increasing electoral participation; and, critically, fragmentation among opposition parties.

The statistical evidence demonstrates the magnitude of the victory. The BJP increased its parliamentary representation from 282 seats in 2014 to 303 in 2019, while its vote share rose from approximately 31% to 37.3–37.4%. Congress remained at the margins of national parliamentary competition with only 52 seats.

The election also demonstrated the continuing importance of India's first-past-the-post electoral system. The BJP's 37% national vote translated into 56% of Lok Sabha seats. Conversely, Congress's nearly 19.4% vote share produced only 10% of the seats.

The 2019 election can therefore reasonably be described as a consolidation of BJP-led national dominance, but the term "dominant-party system" requires qualification. Regional parties remained powerful, and the BJP's support was still uneven across India's federal political landscape. As Ziegfeld argues, the long-term durability of BJP dominance could not be established solely from the 2019 result.

Nevertheless, 2019 was historically significant because it transformed the BJP from a successful national challenger into the principal organising force of national electoral competition. The election demonstrated that the party could win a second consecutive single-party majority while simultaneously expanding its social and geographical base.

In this sense, the 2019 election was not merely a referendum on the performance of one government. It represented a deeper restructuring of Indian electoral politics—from a system characterised by fragmented national competition toward one increasingly organised around a dominant national party confronting a heterogeneous collection of regional and national opponents.

The long-term significance of 2019 consequently lies in the interaction between electoral mandate and party-system transformation. The BJP's victory was large enough to reshape the strategic calculations of virtually every major political party, while the continued strength of regional parties ensured that Indian democracy remained fundamentally plural and federal. The 2019 election thus simultaneously demonstrated the strength of centralised national political leadership and the resilience of India's multi-level party competition.

References

1. Deshpande, R., Kailash, K. K., & Tillin, L. (2019). The BJP's welfare schemes: Did they make a difference in the 2019 elections? Studies in Indian Politics, 7(2), 219–233.
2. Election Commission of India. (2021). Lok Sabha Elections 2019: A Comprehensive Overview / Election Atlas. New Delhi: Election Commission of India.
3. Election Commission of India. (2019). General Election to Lok Sabha 2019: Statistical and Electoral Data. New Delhi: Election Commission of India.
4. Government of India, Election Commission of India. (2022). Electoral Statistics. New Delhi: Election Commission of India.
5. Suri, K. C. (2019). Social change and the changing Indian voter: Consolidation of the BJP in India's 2019 Lok Sabha election. Studies in Indian Politics, 7(2), 234–246.
6. Ziegfeld, A. (2020). A new dominant party in India? Putting the 2019 BJP victory into comparative and historical perspective. India Review, 19(2), 136–152.
7. U.S. Congressional Research Service. (2020). India's 2019 National Election and Government Formation. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service.