CHAPTER 7
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Leadership can be understood as the functional aspect of political power in
democratic set up. It is integral to and essential for the functioning of political systems
and for the organization of societies. Leaders as human beings are susceptible to larger
socio-cultural dynamics. The present study can be placed on the conjuncture of patterns
of socio-cultural changes in the society and the evidence of their reflection on the
changing nature of attitudinal patterns of leadership. Such a study assumes importance in
the light of the fact that leaders are the controlling agents who, at least at a formal level,
determine the historical evolution of a society. Leaders are often defined in idealist terms
as ideologically, social and personally as a superior class of human beings. However the
requirements of realpolitik introduce a yawning gap between the idealistic conceptions of
leadership and the real practices in the political life of leaders. It is not unusual, in a
pragmatic sense to associate leadership with several social evils. It is a familiar saying
that politics is the last resort of scoundrels. It is no coincidence that for many people the
world 'politician' has such negative connotations. The present study, however, avoids
both the extremes and proceeds with the assumption that leadership has to be
contextualized in the dynamics of history. The present study is also delimited to the study
of legislative leadership in the state of Punjab. In more precise terms the present study is
an attempt to analyze the changing patterns of legislative leadership in Punjab since 1997
in the context of changing social, economic and political conditions of Punjab after the
period of militancy. During this period four elections to the legislative assembly of
Punjab were held in 1997, 2002, 2007 and 2012. It is note worthy that all the successive
governments formed during this period were able to complete their five year terms. The
importance of the period between 1997 to 2007 lies in the fact that it can be described as
the most normal, peaceful and uninterrupted phase in the history of Punjab and which
has been largely conducive for the effective democratic functioning of the state. The lines
and points of focus on which the study is carried out relates to the changing nature, role,
role perception and constituency linkages and the style of functioning of the legislative
leadership in Punjab. The factual details about the 117 seat of Punjab Assembly related
with the political parties in power during the period between 1997-2002 is as such: 2007
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The political scenario of Punjab is composed of three main parties of the state. These are the regional outfit SAD, a party having its basis in Sikh religious ideology, Bhartiya Janta Party, a party with a pronounced Hindu religious ideology and Congress a party which professes secularism and aims to appeal to both the main communities of the Punjab. The empiricism which is central to the conception of the present study becomes evident in the examination of the changing socio-political background of legislative leadership. Such an examination becomes important to decide whether political power is concentrated in the hands of the elite possessing a high level or socio-economic status or that power is pluralist in its distribution. Generally speaking, the meaning of socio-economic background obtains from the study of variables such age, caste, gender, religion, income, occupation, education, family size, land holding etc. All these variables can be subsumed under the broader categories of economic, education, social and political background. There is a premise that socio-economic life and influences under which the future leaders have grown are essential to understand their behavior in public life, socio-economic traits of the legislators can be used to ascertain their place in the social stratification and, at the same time, serve as an index to the changing pattern in the distribution of power within a society.

The data related with the changing socio-economic dimension of the legislators reveals interesting facts. The study shows a gradual shift from rural to urban sector. The data clearly leads to the conclusion that till 1997 the participation of members of rural areas in politics was greater. While there is a decrease in the percentage of legislators with rural background from 56.3 percent in 1997 to 29.9 percent in 2012, there is a corresponding rise in the participation of members of the urban sector from 26 percent in 1997 to 50.4 percent in 2012. This is indicative of a complex phenomenon which cannot be understood in straight forward terms as a shift from urban to rural sectors. The fact that the BJP has a greater base in urban sectors and that it was a coalition partner in as many as three governments after 1997 can help to explain this trend. This shift can also be understood in the context of the phenomenon of urbanization. The data reveals a significant fact that majority of legislators in Punjab were of rural origin even if they
were living in urban and rural areas. Furthermore given the fact that a greater percentage of Indian and the regional population of Punjab is settled in villages; a shift in the background of political classes from rural to urban centers may not be present in real terms. Rather it could be a result of some superficial and cosmetic reasons mentioned above.

In a similar way, a perception of the greater participation of women in politics as reflected in the data which shows a rise of approximately 5 percent from 7.2 percent in 1997 to 11.1 percent in 2012 has to be subject several moderations. First among these is that the rise in the number of women legislator is restricted to one particular assembly of 2012 whereas their participation remains static and frozen at around 7 percent in the earlier three assemblies. This is also to be linked to the policy of reservation of seats for women. Lastly as was perceived during the process of field studies several of these legislators are merely surrogated entries for powerful and well established male politicians who could not contest because the reservation policy. In addition to this, in most of the cases the entry of the female members was facilitated through the political influence of a male relative existing prior to the induction. In the light of these observations, it can be said that the data is not indicative of the political empowerment of women in Punjab even though the figure of women legislators in 2012 is pitched at 11.1 percent the average of all the four assemblies comes to a mere 7 percent.

The fact that there is no retirement age in politics in India has both been celebrated and rued. Whatever the case may be, such a condition allows people to remain active in politics without any age limit. The data on age of the legislators is characterized by consistency and is not reflective of a changing pattern. The dominant age group in all the four legislative assemblies with minor fluctuations is the age group between 56-70. This age group for the purpose of study and research has been labeled the middle age group. In comparison to this group, the age group between 41-55 labeled as young has shown considerable increase in its participation in politics. Whereas, in 1997 the presence of this group was 15.9 percent, it has consistently hovered around 30 percent in successive three assemblies. This data is reflective of the fact that although 56-70 age group remains dominant the participation of second group has increased in spurts.
A fact related to this data is that at the time of entry into the legislative assembly the largest percentage was of people in the age group of 41 to 55 with an average of 49.3 percent in all the assemblies. Those in the age group of 25 to 40, constitute the second largest group at the time of entry with an overall average of 31.3 percent in all the assemblies. The data related with caste wise distribution can be construed to be an evidence of an opening up of the political space. This argument can be built on the basis of the fact that while the participation of the middle and lower castes have shown a sign of expansion, the participation of upper caste has slightly shrunk. This is also an evidence of the politicization of castes in the politics of the state as well as of the policies of affirmative action through which certain seats are reserved for SC/ST communities.

On the other hand, another conspicuous trend which makes itself apparent is the improving levels of literacy. While the number of barely literate has become negligible in 2012 at a level as low as point .08 percent, the percentage of all the other categories that is matriculates, graduates, and post graduate has shown signs of increase. This can be understood in the context of expansion of education, increasing levels of awareness and the social stigma attached with illiteracy. The breakup of the legislative assembly on grounds of religion does not indicate a changing pattern. The Sikh community has been a dominant presence in all the houses with seventy percent average seats. The composition of the population of the state is such that Sikh population is marginally higher than Hindu population. Secondly, the presence of large number of the Sikhs in the legislative assemblies could be owing to the status of the Sikhs as a minority of India. The minority status creates the need for a larger concentration of Sikh representatives in the regional political set up. It is noteworthy that the presence of Sikhs in all the three political parties is significantly larger than that of Hindus. The data related with occupation, family occupation and landed property taken together reveals that among the political classes those with agricultural background and with landed property have traditionally been a formidable presence in all the assemblies. Seen in terms of change, it can be said that most importantly while the percentage of landless in 1997 was merely ten percent by 2012 it gradually went up to 23.7 percent. Secondly the percentage of people with occupational background other than agriculture has kept fluctuation. There is no constant pattern visible either in their increase or decrease. The importance of this data lies in the fact that it shows that the accessibility to representative politics among the landless is also
increasing. This is indicative of a shift in the social-economic makeup of the legislative leadership.

The data related with the annual income shows a maximum number of legislators, almost 47 percent in all, professing to fall in the income group of Rs 5 lack to 15 lack. However much cannot be read into this as figures can be misleading for two reasons. First, income is a financial matter of a very personal nature and there is scope for prevarication. Secondly documents were neither sought nor provided making the data undependable. The data related to the class of the legislative leadership can be taken to be more definitive as multiple aspects connected with their economic status and standard of living were taken to compile this. According to the data, while the participation of the upper class has remained uniform with minor changes, the participation of the upper middle class has shown signs of gradual decrease. What can be significant for the study is the fact that the participation of the middle classes has significantly gone up from 11.7 percent in 1997 to above 20 percent in the rest of the assemblies. This also is reflective of an opening up of the political space and of increasing accessibility for sections which were traditionally excluded.

The section of the study dealing with the changing patterns in the political dimension of the legislative leadership has been utilized to gain an insight into the level of political maturity, experience and understanding of the legislators. The political background in the context of the present study is linked to membership in and record of work in various professional or social welfare organizations. The party affiliations of the leaders, their experience of operating representative institutions at the various levels considered to be of vital nature are other important experiential aspects. It is further linked to their perception about party sponsorship, support base and campaign. As far as the general orientation of the legislative leadership is concerned there is a strong perception of increasing political correctness. Whereas there is greater variety in the answers of legislators of assemblies of 1997 to 2007, this variety comes to an end in 2012. Virtually a negligible number of legislators profess politics to be a career or a hobby. An overwhelmingly large number of legislators respond with the most politically correct responses that politics is social service and commitment. Departing from the superficial appearance of these responses, it is important to understand them as a
compulsion to appear politically correct. Thus, rather than believing that the legislators in 2012 assembly have the greatest sense of commitment to social services, it will be more appropriate to understand these replies as extremely strategic and calculated responses. The study, thus, can safely conclude that such replies cannot be taken to be very genuine. On the contrary, they can be understood as a sign of increasing professionalism. The responses connected with motivational factors betray greater forthrightness. Interestingly, the percentage of social service as a motivational factor for legislative for legislative leadership ceases to be the preferred response with the maximum number of respondents citing personal interest to be the main motivation for joining politics. There is almost equal weightage to family tradition and social service with 13 percent and 24.3 percent respectively citing them to be the main motivational factor. The most remarkable feature of the data connected with motivation is that from approximately 9 percent respondents in the assemblies from 1997 to 2007, the figure of those who cite specific needs of the area to be their motivation goes up to 31.5 percent This Shift in the pattern of responses is notable and important. The respondents’ choice of this alternative can again be linked to a desire for enhancing their appeal as efficient and responsible representatives of their constituencies. This is again a sign which indirectly points towards greater professionalism.

Another changing pattern which is visible is the decreasing participation in anti-establishmentarianism and subversive politics resulting in imprisonment of people who later formally joined the legislative leadership. From 2002 to 2012 almost close to sixty percent legislators denied having undergone political suffering as a result of imprisonment for subversive activities against political power. Whereas 17.6 percent had spent more than one year in jail in 1997 the figure drops to 5.8 percent in 2012. This is clearly an indication that activism and subversive actions are no more a prerequisite for entry into politics. In a society full of imperfections one cannot with any conviction assert that the need for activism has ceased to exist. These figures can only be taken as an indication that there are in contemporary times more convenient channels for entry into politics than the rough road of struggle and activism. The data on family background forms a natural conjunction with this with this data. As many as twenty three percent had said that their families had a political background.
An aspect closely related with the above is the nature and extent of past association and linkage with elected bodies of lower level like Panchyat, Block Samiti, Panchyat Samiti, Zila Parishad etc. It is interesting to note that almost all the legislators have had past association with one or the other body. Although there is no noticeable change in pattern with the Panchyat consistently sending the maximum number of its members to the legislative assembly, the data on past association with local bodies clearly reveals that the legislative leadership does not make a direct entry into the legislative assembly. It is a general practice for them to first gain experience at the lower levels of political administration and local bodies. Closely related with these figures is the experience of the legislators in student politics. Here also the data shows an increasing pattern with more legislators getting entry in the assembly through the route of campus politics. 26.4 percent in 2007 in 23.5 percent in 2012 claimed to have participated in student politics as compared to only 17.6 percent in 1997.

Criminalization of politics has been looked upon as a malaise. The data related with past criminal record reveals an increase in the incidence of criminal implication of legislative leadership. While there were only 5.8 percent legislators in 1997 who admitted that they had past or pending criminal case against them, the fight rose to 14.7 percent in 2012. On the other hand while there were close to 80 percent legislators who did not have any criminal background in 1997, the figure came down to 73.5 in 2012. This is an important piece of evidence which clearly establishes the fact that the culture of politics is becoming murkier with the passing of time and its relationship with crime and criminal activities is of an inextricable nature.

The study also focuses on the presence of defections among the legislative leadership. When asked about the main reasons from defecting from their respective parties, the legislators came out with responses that lead to inconclusive results. There is no one single factor attributed for defections. The legislators, almost in equal proportion mention factors like ideological differences, personality clash and Groupism as factors responsible for charging loyalties.

The study makes a comprehensive analysis about legislators’ perception about party sponsorship which implies the main reasons for the party in choosing a candidate. A notable aspect of the finding is an increase in the perception of the importance of an
individual’s personality in getting party sponsorship. From 50 percent in 1997, the percentage of those who consider personality as the main factor for getting party sponsorship goes up to 61.1 percent in 2012. Even more important than this is the sharp rise in the perception of the importance of money power. Whereas only 26.4 percent considered money to be very important for getting party sponsorship in 1997, the figure went up to 70.5 percent in 2012. There is a corresponding decrease in the perception of caste as an important factor in getting party sponsorship. These figures lend to the conclusion that professionalism and financial implications are now the greatest determinants of the selection of leadership by parties. Money has now a greater role as compared to a person’s record of social activism, history of struggle for social causes or his association to a particular caste.

It is integral to the study to arrive at valid conclusions about the perception of candidates about the relative importance of different aspects of campaign. Campaigning being integral to the political process any change in the pattern of campaign could be seen as a reflection of larger socio-economic changes. The most prominent shift in the perception of candidates about the techniques of campaign is with regard to the use of print and electronic media. There is clearly a greater dependence on these methods of mass communication in the present day as compared to the past. The rest of the techniques of campaigning like support from friends and relatives, addresses delivered to gatherings, sarpanches/Panches. Community heads, election procession and campaign material etc. do not become unimportant. All the traditional modes of campaign enjoy the favour of legislators. The only other mode of campaign which shows an increasing trend is door to door canvassing. While only 50 percent considered it very important in 1997, the figure rose to 73.5 percent in 2007 and 64.7 percent in 2012. This establishes the centrality of the increasing importance of the voters in the present day election system. As far as the role of various other components of campaign like election symbol, manifesto, emphasis on caste religion and personality is concerned, the data clearly shows that at ostensible level legislators do not make a mention of the importance of emphasizing religion in election campaign. This is in line with the overall orientation of the legislators, responses which show an increasing need of appearing political correct. Very few legislators mention caste as an important component in campaigning. The need to give such answers can be linked to the secular polity of India and the need is present an
image which is not at all of a communal nature. The second notable dimension is that the legislators have started giving greater importance to personality. This again corroborates the perception that careerism and professionalism are now dominant in politics.

The role perception of legislators is central to their understanding of the socio-economic reality around them. Their understanding of the need and nature of political interventions and their idea of the functional and personal dimensions of leadership can be an indicator of their perception. When asked about the reason for contesting elections, a majority of the legislators cited service to the public as very important. This was followed by service to the political party, the socio political organization and community. Compared to 1997, when only 41.1 percent cited the desire for increasing social status as very important, 52.9 percent in 2013 mentioned it as a reason for contesting elections. This again can be taken as corroboration of the fact that personal prestige and self importance are now more important than in the past. The legislators’ views about the perception of their role as MLAs also reveal a greater consciousness of the technical aspects of political governance. Whereas, only 23.5 percent MLAs expressed as consciousness of their role as enactors of laws, the figure rose to almost 30 percent in 2007 and 2012. There is also greater emphasis on the role of the legislators in removing public grievances. Compared to 23.5 percent legislators in 1997 close to 40 percent legislators in 2007 and 2012, felt that removing public grievances was an important part of their role. This can be taken as an evidence of the increasing consciousness among the legislators of their role as law makers and as representatives of the public. About the effectiveness in various bodies like the Council of Ministers, Bureaucracy, political party and public there is a clean change of pattern as compared to 1997. In the perception of legislative leadership, their effectiveness is very high in the political party and the public as compared to 1997 when only 52.9 percent and 41.1 percent felt that they were very effectiveness in the political party and public respectively. 73.5 percent and 79.4 percent in 2012 felt that way. On the other hand the effectiveness in the Council of Ministers and in the Bureaucracy shows a declining trend. Whereas 44.1 percent and 32.3 felt that they were very effective in the Council of Ministers and in the Bureaucracy respectively the figures scaled down to17.6 percent and 14.7 respectively in 2012. This is reflective of two factors. One, that there is increasing perception of popularity in public and two that
the decision making and control within the government and the Council of Ministers is getting centralized.

In relation to the relative weightage given to different objectives service to community received the greatest favour of the legislative leaders. This remains the single most important political goal for the legislative leadership of the four assemblies. Whereas, service to political party was considered to be much important in the assemblies up to 2007, it becomes the most important political goal in 2012. Another change in the pattern of the perception of political goals is the realization of a successful future in politics. Whereas in 1997 only 55.8 percent felt that ambition to realize future goal in politics was very important for them in 2007 and 2012 the percentage of such members is 79.4% and 82.3% respectively. This is again reflective of an increasing consciousness of long term political goals which indicate that the contemporary legislators are more professional in their approach and they do not take politics to be simply a short term engagement.

In the perception of the legislative leadership there is a considerable shift in the relative importance of different factors that can ensure success in leadership. The most significant shift is in the perception of the importance of local issues. As many as 94.1% felt that local issues are important in 2012. The figure is considerably lower in 1997 and 2002. There is also greater emphasis on personal image. Close to 90 percent consider it to be important for success in 2012 compared to 70.5 percent in 1997 and 58.8 percent in 2002. On the other hand, a paradigm shift is also visible in the gradual decrease in the importance of factors like religion and family suffering. The data confirms the overall deductions arrived in the study that the legislative leadership today is characterized by greater professionalism and individual focus is on the centrality of the personal and individual aspects in political life.

Moreover there is an increasing consciousness of representativeness at the constituency level. The data reveals that the legislators have started concentrating to a greater extent on their constituencies. The frequencies of visits have gone up as has the quantum of both personal and general complaints of the members of the constituencies.

The legislators also show greater faith in the relevance of the regional parties to Punjab. In 2002 when the congress government was elected to power, only 23.5 percent
affirmed the importance of regional parties. As congress is a national party the reluctance to hold regional parties as important can be understood. In all the other years particularly in 2012 the legislators repose more faith in the capacity of regional political outfits to contribute to the growth of the society. On the secular front also there is an evidence of gradual improvement in legislators’ perception of harmony between Hindus and Sikhs. Whereas only 26.4 percent believed that the relations between the Hindus and Sikhs were harmonious in 1997, the figure goes up to 32.3 percent in 2012. Mention has already been made in the present study that post-1997 period has been the most peaceful period in the history of Punjab. Such an increasing faith in religious harmony is owing to uninterrupted peace in the state.

The legislators were asked specific question about the presence of factionalism and causes of factionalism in politics. It is noteworthy that in the perception of the legislative leadership both factionalism and Groupism have shown signs of increase. In the perception of the legislators in all the four legislative assemblies the election commission plays a constructive role. On the related issue of the age limit for those contesting elections there is a quite a prominent shift in the opinion of the legislators. While close to 50 percent respondents in 1997 felt there should be no limit the percentage of such members came down to nearly 20 percent in 2012. It is important to note here that close to 80 percent felt that there should be an age limit. This is indicative of more mature and responsible thinking and a gradual delinking of the idea of experience and age with political maturity. It is also evidence of the perception that the dynamism of youth should be inducted in politics. On the specific question of age limit the respondent, as we move from 1997 to 2012, show an increased favour for lower age limit. Almost 50 percent respondents in 2012 were of the opinion that it should be fixed at up to 60 years.

On the issue of the support base the shift is visible in lesser dependence on the support of party workers which comes down from close to 70 percent in 1997 to 55 percent in 2012. There is also a corresponding shift in the support base from people with agricultural background to people with business background. Whereas in 1997 the dependence on agricultural support base was very high in 2012 the support from business sections is comparatively higher. Despite the fact that politicians draw considerable support from student organizations and also despite the fact that politicians themselves
have had experience of student politics; there is a visible and gradual shift on the issue of students’ participation in politics from 1997 to 2012. There is a growing feeling that student should not participate in politics. On the issue of FDI again although there is no apparent shift in the perception of the legislators, the opinion can be divided in to two main categories. One section of the legislators has consistently expressed support for FDI. There is a second but smaller section which has consistently remained evasive by not choosing to comment. It could be either because of insufficient knowledge of the issue or because of a desire for remaining non committal on the contentious issue.

To build a comprehensive picture of the changing pattern of legislative leadership, it is equally important to compile their opinions on their perception of issues, problems and policies related to regional, national and international spheres. It is noteworthy that the legislators betray a sense of slight pessimism as far as their perception of the success of successive governments in achieving high standards of fundamental values like social justice, national integrity, secularism and democracy is concerned. Particularly, with regard to the achievement of success in the domains of social justice and democracy, the legislators show signs of disenchantment. Whereas 16.8 percent felt that the government has been able to ensure social justice only 12.7 percent felt so in 2012. In relation to democracy 14.2 percent in 1997 and 10.4 percent in 2012 felt that the government is based on liberty, equality fraternity as compared to 16.6 percent in 1997. While 16.6 percent in 1997 believed that the possibility of revolution is very less the figure rose to 29.5 percent in 2012. This can again be linked to a belief in lesser possibility of revolution.

The legislators also expressed dissatisfaction with level of democracy in India. The figures related to their perception of democratic functioning of political system and society in India clearly proves this. In 1997 nearly 40 percent felt that India is truly democratic and close to 9 percent said that is only partially democratic, in 2012 the figures change 32.3 percent for the first and 29.4 percent for the second. When asked about the ways of improving Indian democracy the leadership shows increasing faith in an honest press and in honest and able leadership and bureaucracy. From nearly 15 percent legislators who reposed faith in these in 1997 the figure rises to above 30 percent in 2012.
On the issue of corruption an increasing number of legislators held lack of effective management and lack of economic stability to be responsible for increasing corruption. More and more legislators through the successive assemblies demonstrate faith in enactment of strict laws, legislation and transparency as remedies for corruption. India is a federal polity and particularly in the case of Punjab the autonomy of the state has been a crucial issue. Irrespective of the fact whether there was a congress or Akali-BJP coalition in power, there has been a consistent concern for more financial power and more rights for the state. Similarly on the contentious issues of Chandigarh and river water dispute there is consensus in favour of the claim of Punjab over both the approval and water.

There is also an apparent consensus on the approval of major policies like the land acquisition policy, education and the industrial policy. The only policy where there appears to be a visible shift in the perception is the reservation policy. The percentage of those who feel that it should be continued comes down to nearly 14.7 percent in 2012 as compared to 44.1 percent in 1997 and 52.9 percent in 2007. Most of the legislators when questioned further were in favour of the re-formulation of the reservation policy on economic basis. This is a very important paradigm shift which is in evidence in other parts of the study also. Caste, as a factor, is becoming less important in the perception of legislators. Interaction with the legislators of various assemblies revealed that while there was universal praise for the education policy of the state there was particular discontent with regard to the grain procurement policy and transport as well as family and health policy. The legislators complained that the farmers had to suffer because of inefficient grain procurement. They also felt that the transport policy was tweaked to favour particular transporters enjoying political influence.

On the issue of factors which most influence public policy, the single most important factor which is mentioned as very important till 2007 is the priorities of the CM. This single most important factor becomes less important in 2012 with only 67.6 percent holding it as very important. The other important shift as mentioned above is in the importance of caste. While close to 50 percent hold it as very imp in 1997, the percentage hovers around ten to sixteen percent in the other three assemblies. The legislators were also asked to respond to what they perceived as the greatest challenge for
the Punjab. Under development and unemployment which were very important issues in 1997 are not apprehended as major problems in 2012. On the very important issue of Punjab problem the legislators showed consistency in believing that it was a consequence of the presence of misguided and unemployed youth in the state.

The table related with the constituency level problems and the basic problems the state are to some extent overlapping with unemployment among youth, underdevelopment, backwardness and electricity and irrigation, education and health being cited as the main problem. Regarding the constituency level problems and the remedies suggested there is an evidence of greater faith in the intervention of the CM as a remedy. The other two solutions suggested and which received increasing favour over the years are Universalization of education and industrialization. At the state level, on the other hand, while the intervention and initiative of the CM remains an important solution to the problems, maintenance of law and order, removal of corruption are consistently cited as possible solutions. On the larger issues of problems confronting the nation and the world there is no evidence of concentration of opinion in favour of one or the other problem. Throughout the four assemblies problems like, population, unemployment, poverty, corruption, high prices, global warming, lack of national leadership, terrorism, drugs, textile moment are cited as the main problems. Whereas at the global level terrorism, environment pollution, population, corruption, drugs, naxalite moment, environment pollution are cited as the main problems. On the issue of suggested solutions again there is a fair amount of equal distribution in relation to the possible solutions. At the national level, Industrial development, removal of poverty, removal of corruption, welfare programmess, strong leadership, to fulfill basic needs, are suggested and at the global level control on terrorism, protection of environment, united efforts by all countries, changes in policies and programmess of our countries are suggested as remedies by a proportionately equal number of legislators.
QUESTIONNAIRE

Date: ____________
No.: _____________

Name ____________________, Father’s Name____________________________________

Address___________________________________________________________________

Place of residence: Rural___________, Urban________, Semi Urban, __________

Gender: Male, _____ Female, _____  Marital Status: Married,___ Unmarried,___________

Date of Birth __________________________ Place of Birth ________________________

Education________________________________________________________________

Religion ________  Caste, Upper Caste _________Middle caste _____________Lower caste

Constituency from where you were elected ____________________________________

What is your mother tongue _________________________________________________

Proficiency in languages: (speak, read and write) a. Punjabi ____________
                      b. Hindi _________ c. English ___________ d. Any other ___________

Family Type:  a) Nuclear Family__________    b) Joint family__________

Your children ___________________ Sons ____________ Daughters ____________

Your family Occupation:  a) Business_________, b) Agriculture__________,
                       c) Industry________, d) Private Job__________,

Your occupation: a) Agriculture _________ b) Industry ______________________
                      c) Private job ___________ d) Business Trade______ e) Any other _________

If agriculture, how much land do you own ______________________________

Do you belong to: a) Upper class _____ b) Upper-middle class ______
 Hollywood Class _______ c) Middle class ______

Do you own landed property, Yes/ No, If Yes, Specify,    Landless_____,

Below 10 Ackers_____, 10- 20 Ackers_______, More than 20___________

Do you pay income tax?  Yes___,   No_____

Total annual income from all sources:

a) less than 5 lakh _____________ b) 5-10 lakh ________________________

 c) 10-15 lakh _________________ d) more than 15 20 lakh _____________

 e) 20-25lakh __________________  f) more than 25_____________________

Do you read newspaper: If Yes, for which purpose _________________________

Do you like to watch TV?  Yes/No

If yes, what type of programs do you like to watch?
Do you know to operate computer? Yes/No
If yes, for what purpose do you use computer? _____________________________

What is your main hobby:
   a) Reading ________  b) Social Service ______
   c) Foreign visits ______  d) Gardening and sports _____ e) Any other_________

Orientation
Do you take politics as:  
   a) hobby ________  b) career ______
   c) commitment ______ d) social service

Do you belong to the same constituency from where you elected?  Yes/No

Your inspiration behind your entry into politics:
   (a) Personal interest ____  (b) Family tradition____
   (c) Particular event ____  (d) Social service ____
   (e) Commitment to some ideology ______ (f) Requirements of areas________
   (g) Any other __________

Have you ever been a member of any organisation? Yes/No If yes:
   a) Panchayat ________  b) Municipality __________________
   c) Zila Prashid _______  d) Panchayat Samiti __________
   e) Block Samiti                                   f) Any other __________

Have you ever been a member of any organisation and the pressure group (socio-political organisation) before your joining the politics? Yes/No
If Yes, Tick from the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of organisation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Religious Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Youth Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Social/ Economic Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Student Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Trade Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Any other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you ever contested the election during your student days? Yes/No
If yes, explain _____________________________________________________________

Was there any role of the following in your success? If so, to what extent
Factors | Very Imp. | Important | Less Important
--- | --- | --- | ---
a) Religion/ caste
b) Your or yours family suffering
c) Local issues
d) Your honesty and integrity
e) Support from party
f) Served wine and money
g) Any other

Name the political party on whose ticket you contested the election: ______________

Have you ever changed your party? Yes/No,

If yes, what were the main reasons?

Which of the following factors made you contest the election to the state legislature?
   a) Your own enthusiasm _________  b) Your political interest ___________
   c) Encouragement from senior party leaders, workers _________________
   d) Encouragement from friends, supporters and relatives _______________
   e) Encouragement from some organisation ___________ f) Any other __________

What is the relative importance of the following factors in getting your party nomination?

Factors | Very imp. | Important | Less important
--- | --- | --- | ---
a) Personality
b) Money Power
c) Support from Senior Party Leaders
d) Caste factor
e) Political experience
f) Influence among the electorates
g) Family background

Where and when did you first become active in politics _____________________

Where and when did you first enter the legislature? Year ____ age at that time ____

Name of the constituency from where you won the election: ______________________

Were you ever sent to jail for your political activities?
Yes/No, If yes for how long time:____________

Is there any criminal case against you?    Yes/No
If yes, what type of case it is? _____________________________________________

Whether any of your close relative is in politics?    Yes/No?

Do you favour the following values of Indian Political system?
   a) Social Justice _________   b) National Unity and Integrity _________________
   c) Democracy ___________   d) Secularism __________ e) Any other _______

Do you think government is successful in achieving these values?
   a) Social Justice: yes/no   b) National Unity and Integrity: yes/no
   c) Democracy: yes/no   d) Secularism: yes/no.

What has been the importance of the following in your opinion in your election campaign and in what order of priorities (use 1, 2, 3 etc. to indicate priorities)?
   a) Election symbol _______   b) Role of money ___________
   c) Religion ___________   d) Caste/sub caste _________ e) Occupation _________
   f) Party manifesto ____________   g) Personality ______________

How important were the following factors in your election campaign?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Support from the party at the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. National level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. State level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. District level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Local level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Door to door canvassing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Support from friends and relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Press reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)Addresses delivered to gathering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Support from:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Sarpanches and Panches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Community leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What were the assurances which you gave to your voters during election campaign?
   a) To uplift the weaker section of society, ____________________
   b) To start
b) Development Programmes, c) To solve their problems, d) To implement manifesto of Party.

Why did you contest elections?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With an aim of</th>
<th>Very Imp.</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Less Imp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Increasing social status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Service to political party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Service to socio-political organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Service to community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Ambition to realise future goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Service to public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you satisfied with the role of election commission?
Strongly agreed, Agreed, Not Agreed.

What weightage do you give to the following for joining the public office?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Very imp</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not imp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Service to community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Urge to influence public policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Service the political party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Wish to develop social contacts and make friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Service to trade unions and associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Ambition to realise future in politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Any other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much effective do you think you are in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Council of ministers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Bureaucracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Political party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should the legislators give more importance to the interests of general public than the interests of his supporters and friends? Yes/ No  
Explain________________________________________________________________

Have you ever rendered support to your supporters against the moral principles? Yes/ No

Will you contest the next elections? Yes___/ No____, Doubtfully____.

Will you like your children to be in politics? Yes, ____/ No___, Doubtfully____.

Should there be any upper age limit for contesting leadership positions for political institutions? Yes/No If yes, what should be the age limit ____________

What are your views about democratic system of government?

What are the merits and demerits of democracy?

Merits: ________________________________________________________________

Demerits: _____________________________________________________________

Is India a truly democratic country? Yes/ No, If yes explain:

________________________________________________________________________

Would you like to suggest some changes in Indian democratic system?

How do you perceive the role of an MLA? (Please fix priorities 1,2,3).

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) To get the laws enacted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) To control the executive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Look after constituency needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) To act as the mediator of the organised interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) To remove public grievances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

vi
Give the following information in respect of your strong supporters in the constituency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Party workers/friend/relative</th>
<th>Did you render financial help?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think that students should take part in politics? Yes/ No Reasons____________________

How much time do you devote, on an average, during a month for your constituency people?
Less than one week_____, one to two weeks______, More than two weeks,__________

Do you receive complaints and grievances from the people of your constituency? Yes/ No,
If yes, what is the nature of those complaints?
__________________________________________________________________________________

How do you redress those grievances?
1. Contact with CM _______   2) Contact with Concerned Authorities______
2. Solution at personal level____   4) Difficult to solve_______

What kind of relationship between Hindus and Sikhs share in Punjab after the alliance of SAD and BJP in 1997?
__________________________________________________________________________________

Do you think there are factions in your party? Yes/ No explain causes:

Why regional political parties are so important in present coalition politics era?
__________________________________________________________________________________

Are you associated with any educational or charitable institution in your constituency?
Close linkage______________, No linkage___________________.

Which method will you like to employee in order to contact the people? Give in of preference.
(a) Personal contact ________   (b) Public meeting ____________
(c) Correspondence _________   (d) Any other

What are the most important problems of:

a) Your Constituency _____________________________________________________________
b) State  Adamantly  ____________________________________________________________
c) Country _________________________________________________________________
d) World _________________________________________________________________
What were the causes of emergence of Punjab problem?
   a) Unemployment among youth ____________  b) Foreign hand ____________
   c) Party problems ________________       d) Any other ________________

Whom do you consider to responsible for the Punjab problem?
   (a) Politics of Akali Party _____________
   (b) Sant Jarnail Singh Bhindrawala and his associates ______________
   (c) Politics of Congress Party ______________
   (d) Central Government _______________   (e) Any other ____________

What was the nature of this movement?
   (a) It was a demand for Khalistan _______
   (b) It was a problem of unemployed and misguided youth ____________
   (c) It was foreign inspired movement ____________
   (d) It was for more autonomy _____________  (e) any other _____________

What are your views about Chandigarh issue?

______________________________________________________________________

What are your views about river water dispute?

______________________________________________________________________

What are your views about state autonomy?
   a) More financial power for the state from centre __________________________
   b) Reducing power of the centre __________________________________________
   c) More rights for the state ____________________ d) Any other ______________

Do you believe in Foreign Direct Investment? Yes/No, explain:

______________________________________________________________________

What are the main reasons for increase of corruption in the country?

Is there any solution of corruption? Yes/ No

If yes, explain: __________________________________________________________

Are you satisfied with policies and programmes of your party?

Support_________ Do not support______________.

If no, give reasons: _________________________________________________
How far the policy making is influenced by the following factors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Less Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Party ideology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Caste and class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Bureaucracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) His cabinet colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Personality of the Chief Minister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Organised interests (Trade Union and Associations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Wealth and vested interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should reservation policy be continued?  Yes/ No

If yes, why ______________________________________________________________

If no, why _______________________________________________________________

How far do you favour the following policies of the government?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Land ceiling policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Industrial policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Food grain policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Health and family planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>