

# Fourteenth Assembly Elections in Punjab

A single day poll to elect the 14th Assembly in Punjab was held on 30 January 2012. The election witnessed high participation. A record 79% of a total of 1,76,82,363 registered voters turned out to vote, the highest ever, and up by 3 percentage points since the last assembly election. Turnout of

**Table 1A: Summary Electoral Participation: Electorate, Turnout and Number of Candidates Compared to the Assembly Election (2007)**

	Assembly Election 2012	Change from 2007 (%)
Total electorate	1,76,82,363	+4.5
Male electorate	93,20,878	+6.3
Female electorate	83,61,485	+2.6
Total voters	1,38,92,638	+9.0
Total turnout	78.6%	+3.2
Male turnout	78.1%	+2.7
Female turnout	79.1%	+3.5
Number of candidates	1,078	+3.2

For electorate, voters and candidates the change is in %, with 2007 as the base. Change in turnout is computed in percentage points, compared to turnout in 2007.

Source: Figures available from the official website of the chief electoral officer, Punjab, <http://ceopunjab.nic.in/>, and Election Commission of India website <http://eci.nic.in/>; accessed on 9 March 2012; data aggregated and recomputed by CSDS data unit.

**Table 2A: Region-wise and District-wise Analysis: Turnout and Performance of Major Alliances and Parties in the Assembly Election (2012)**

Regions/Districts	Total Seats	Turnout (%)	Congress		SAD-BJP		PPP		BSP		Independents		Others	
			Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)
Majha	25	75.0	9	41.2	16	47.2	0	1.2	0	1.1	0	7.7	0	1.5
Gurdaspur	10	76.3	5	42.7	5	45.8	0	0.9	0	1.4	0	8.2	0	1.1
Amritsar	11	71.8	3	38.5	8	48.9	0	0.9	0	1.0	0	8.6	0	2.1
Tarn Taran	4	79.6	1	43.9	3	46.6	0	2.6	0	0.9	0	4.7	0	1.4
Doaba	23	76.4	6	37.1	16	41.3	0	4.0	0	12.1	1	4.5	0	1.1
Kapurthala	4	79.0	2	43.4	2	44.1	0	2.7	0	7.4	0	1.2	0	1.3
Jalandhar	9	75.6	0	37.9	9	43.2	0	3.0	0	12.7	0	2.4	0	0.9
Hoshiarpur	7	75.2	2	35.9	4	40.9	0	3.1	0	9.5	1	9.0	0	1.6
Nawan Shahr	3	79.3	2	29.6	1	32.9	0	11.0	0	21.9	0	4.1	0	0.4
Malwa	69	80.6	31	40.6	36	40.3	0	6.9	0	3.0	2	7.1	0	2.1
Rupnagar	3	77.5	1	37.9	2	41.4	0	10.3	0	5.0	0	3.8	0	1.6
SAS Nagar	3	75.8	2	30.7	1	38.3	0	4.6	0	7.7	0	18.3	0	0.4
Fatehgarh Sahib	3	81.9	2	33.7	1	35.5	0	20.9	0	4.1	0	3.7	0	2.0
Ludhiana	14	76.0	6	40.7	6	39.9	0	4.6	0	3.3	2	10.6	0	0.9
Moga	4	80.5	1	43.2	3	45.2	0	3.8	0	1.5	0	2.3	0	4.0
Ferozepur	8	83.4	3	37.4	5	39.4	0	2.8	0	1.9	0	17.9	0	0.7
Muktsar	4	85.2	2	40.2	2	41.0	0	12.7	0	2.6	0	3.0	0	0.6
Faridkot	3	84.1	1	38.8	2	43.2	0	7.1	0	2.3	0	6.9	0	1.6
Bathinda	6	82.6	2	40.9	4	42.0	0	9.7	0	1.6	0	1.8	0	4.0
Mansa	3	84.4	1	38.4	2	39.6	0	8.7	0	2.6	0	0.7	0	9.8
Sangrur	7	84.5	2	40.4	5	41.5	0	10.9	0	2.9	0	3.4	0	0.9
Barnala	3	81.8	3	45.9	0	40.1	0	4.1	0	4.0	0	1.8	0	4.1
Patiala	8	78.5	5	49.9	3	37.6	0	3.1	0	2.8	0	4.7	0	1.9
Total	117	78.6	46	40.1	68	41.9	0	5.2	0	4.3	3	6.8	0	1.8

"Others" in this table and in Tables 2B, 2C, 2D and 2E include other smaller parties.

Source: As in Table 1B.

women voters at 79% exceeded that of men voters by 1 percentage point. There was also an increase in the number of

contestants, from 1,045 last time to 1,078 candidates in this election (Table 1A).

As always, the main contest in this election was between the Shiromani Akali Dal-Bharatiya Janata Party (SAD+/SAD-BJP) alliance and the Indian National Congress (INC/Congress) which contested the elections on its own fielding candidates in all 117 seats. The Bahujan Samaj

**Table 1B: Summary Results: Seats Contested, Won and Votes Secured by Major Parties and Alliances, Compared to the Assembly Election (2007)**

	Seats Contested	Seats Won	Gain/Loss of Seats since 2007	Vote Share (%)	Vote % Per Seat Contested	Vote Swing since 2007 (% Points)
Shiromani Akali Dal + (SAD+)	117	68	0	41.91	41.91	-3.46
Shiromani Akali Dal (SAD)	94	56	+7	34.73	42.40	-2.36
Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP)	23	12	-7	7.18	39.73	-1.10
Indian National Congress (INC)	117	46	+2	40.09	40.09	-0.81
Sanjha Morcha	115	0	0	6.14	6.27	+5.10
People's Party of Punjab (PPP)	92	0	0	5.16	6.58	+5.16
Communist Party of India (CPI)	14	0	0	0.82	6.94	+0.06
Communist Party of India (Marxist) – CPI(M)	9	0	0	0.16	2.02	-0.12
Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP)	117	0	0	4.29	4.29	+0.16
Nationalist Congress Party (NCP)	13	0	0	0.03	0.33	-0.08
Shiromani Akali Dal Amritsar – Simranjit Singh Mann (SAD-M)	57	0	0	0.28	0.57	-0.24
Others	124		0	0.51	–	-0.60
Independents	418	3	-2	6.75	–	-0.07
Total	1,078	117	0	100	–	0

"Others" in 2012 include Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) (Liberation), Shiv Sena, Lok Janshakti Party, Rashtriya Janata Dal and other parties. "Others" in 2007 included Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) (Liberation), Shiv Sena, Lok Janshakti Party, Janata Dal (Secular), Rashtriya Janata Dal, Republican Party of India, Forward Bloc, Revolutionary Socialist Party and other parties.

Source: Detailed constituency level results downloaded from Election Commission of India website <http://eciresults.ap.nic.in/>; accessed on 9 March 2012. Data aggregated and recomputed by CSDS data unit.

Party (BSP) too contested all the seats on its own. A significant change this time was the entry of the People's Party of Punjab (PPP) led by former SAD leader Manpreet Singh Badal. PPP contested the elections in an alliance with the left parties, namely, the Communist Party of India (CPI) and the Communist Party of India-Marxist (CPI(M)).

The final outcome of the election did not follow the pattern of government alteration. In a state where no ruling party had ever been voted back to power since reorganisation in 1966, the SAD+ alliance created history by returning to power with a simple majority of 68 seats, the same as last time. While SAD won 56 seats, a gain of 7 since 2007, the BJP, its alliance partner, won 12 seats, down 7

since 2007. However in terms of vote share both the parties lost 2% and 1% votes, respectively, garnering a combined total of 42% votes. The Congress Party, which was widely expected to win the election, could increase its 2007 seat tally by a mere two seats, winning a total of 46 seats this time. In terms of vote share, it dropped 1% of its 2007 votes, securing 40% of the total vote. The PPP did not win any seat but secured an impressive 5% of the vote. The BSP too gained in terms of votes but failed to win any seat (Table 1B, p 71).

If we look at the region-wise break-up, SAD+ won more seats than the Congress across all the three regions of the state, namely Majha, Doaba and Malwa. In both the Majha and Doaba regions,

SAD+ retained its 2007 lead over the Congress winning 16 seats each (performing particularly well in Amritsar and Jalandhar districts). The Congress managed to win only nine and six seats in Majha and Doaba, respectively. While the Congress improved its seat tally in both these regions compared to 2007, the gains for the party were not enough to offset the losses it suffered in Malwa, the region with 13 of Punjab's 20 districts and more importantly the region with the highest number of assembly seats (69). It is in Malwa where the big turnaround of this election took place. The Congress which had won 37 seats from the region in 2007 saw its tally decline to 31 seats this time. SAD+ on the other hand won 36 seats here,

**Table 2B: Category-wise Analysis: Turnout and Performance of Major Alliances and Parties by Reserved and General Constituencies in the Assembly Election (2012)**

Category	Total Seats	Turnout (%)	Congress		SAD-BJP		PPP		BSP		Independents		Others	
			Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)
Reserved (SC)	34	78.0	10	40.1	24	42.3	0	5.3	0	6.1	0	3.5	0	2.7
General	83	78.8	36	40.1	44	41.8	0	5.1	0	3.5	3	8.1	0	1.4
Total	117	78.6	46	40.1	68	41.9	0	5.2	0	4.3	3	6.8	0	1.8

Source: As in Table 1B.

**Table 2C: Locality-wise Analysis: Turnout and Performance of Major Alliances and Parties by Rural-Urban Nature of Constituency in the Assembly Election (2012)**

Locality	Total Seats	Turnout (%)	Congress		SAD-BJP		PPP		BSP		Independents		Others	
			Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)
Rural	66	81.0	23	39.5	42	43.8	0	5.4	0	4.7	1	5.0	0	1.6
Semi-urban	34	78.6	17	40.8	17	39.0	0	6.2	0	4.1	0	7.8	0	2.1
Urban	17	68.9	6	41.2	9	39.8	0	1.6	0	3.0	2	12.7	0	1.8
Total	117	78.6	46	40.1	68	41.9	0	5.2	0	4.3	3	6.8	0	1.8

Rural constituencies are those constituencies where less than 25% electors live in urban areas. Semi-urban constituencies are those constituencies where 25% and more but less than 75% of electors live in urban areas. Urban constituencies are those constituencies where 75% or more electors live in urban areas. The classification of constituencies is based on Census 2001 and description of constituency boundary provided by the Delimitation Commission 2002 read with the urban/rural location indicated on the top sheet of electoral rolls for each Polling booth area. Computation and classification has been done by the CSDS data unit.

Source: As in Table 1B.

**Table 2D: Dominant Community-wise Analysis: Turnout and Performance of Major Alliances and Parties by Major Community in the Constituency in the Assembly Election (2012)**

Dominant Community	Total Seats	Turnout (%)	Congress		SAD-BJP		PPP		BSP		Independents		Others	
			Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)
Hindu	19	74.4	4	34.8	13	38.2	0	3.5	0	6.0	2	16.5	0	1.1
Sikh	62	81.2	26	41.8	36	43.6	0	6.5	0	2.5	0	3.4	0	2.2
Mixed	36	76.2	16	39.7	19	40.6	0	3.6	0	6.7	1	8.1	0	1.4
Total	117	78.6	46	40.1	68	41.9	0	5.2	0	4.3	3	6.8	0	1.8

Hindu concentrated constituencies are those constituencies where 60% or more population are Hindus. Sikh constituencies are those constituencies where 60% or more population are Sikh. Mixed constituencies are those where both Hindu and Sikh constitute less than 60% of the population. The classification of constituencies by religious groups is based on Census 2001 and description of constituency boundary provided by the Delimitation Commission 2002. However, it may be noted that Census does not provide information on religion below tehsil/taluka/block level and that a constituency often cuts across these administrative units. So, in order to arrive at constituency level estimates of religious groups, the "principle of proportionality" was used to aggregate and disaggregate population below these administrative units. It may also be noted that these categories are not mutually exclusive, since the constituencies falling in each category defined by concentration of one community can and do overlap with concentration of another community as well.

Source: As in Table 1B.

**Table 2E: Turnout-wise Analysis: Performance of Major Alliances and Parties in Constituencies Where Female Turnout Was Greater Than Male Turnout in the Assembly Election (2012)**

Turnout Category	Total Seats	Turnout (%)	Congress		SAD-BJP		PPP		BSP		Independents		Others	
			Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)
Female turnout greater than male turnout	58	77.9	19	39.5	37	43.2	0	3.8	0	6.1	2	6.1	0	1.4
Male turnout greater than female turnout	59	79.3	27	40.7	31	40.7	0	6.5	0	2.6	1	7.4	0	2.2
Total	117	78.6	46	40.1	68	41.9	0	5.2	0	4.3	3	6.8	0	1.8

Source: As in Table 1B.

**Table 3A: Social Basis of Voting: Survey Based Estimates of Vote for Major Alliances/Parties by Gender, Age, Education, Locality, Class and Caste/Community in Assembly Elections (2007 and 2012)**

	Congress		SAD-BJP		PPP		BSP		Others		N in 2012
	2007	2012	2007	2012	2007	2012	2007	2012	2007	2012	
<b>Age groups</b>											
Up to 25 years	39	40	47	43	NA	6	5	3	9	8	399
26-35 years	45	42	42	40	NA	5	4	4	9	9	758
36-45 years	40	42	45	43	NA	4	5	5	11	7	679
46-55 years	42	39	47	41	NA	6	4	5	8	10	529
56 years and above	37	38	48	43	NA	5	3	5	12	9	674
<b>Gender</b>											
Men	41	41	44	40	NA	6	4	4	11	8	1,678
Women	41	40	48	44	NA	4	5	5	7	9	1,362
<b>Level of education</b>											
Non-literate	45	43	44	42	NA	4	4	4	8	8	777
Up to primary	43	35	40	42	NA	7	7	9	11	8	471
Up to matric	42	41	44	42	NA	4	5	5	9	8	986
College and above	38	39	50	42	NA	7	2	1	9	10	799
<b>Locality</b>											
Rural	41	40	45	44	NA	6	5	4	10	7	2,137
Urban	42	42	46	36	NA	5	3	5	10	13	902
<b>Class</b>											
Upper	NA	38	NA	44	NA	7	NA	1	NA	9	1,187
Middle	NA	37	NA	43	NA	5	NA	7	NA	7	991
Lower	NA	46	NA	37	NA	3	NA	6	NA	9	767
Poor	NA	46	NA	35	NA	3	NA	1	NA	15	94*
<b>Caste community</b>											
Upper Caste Hindu	45	48	43	34	NA	4	1	2	11	12	411
Hindu OBC	51	37	36	40	NA	8	2	0	12	15	112
Hindu dalit	53	37	29	33	NA	1	11	23	7	6	330
Jat Sikh	31	31	60	52	NA	9	1	1	9	7	904
Khatri Sikh	37	35	49	50	NA	5	1	0	13	11	179
OBC Sikh	44	44	42	46	NA	3	9	0	5	8	253
Dalit Sikh	50	51	30	34	NA	4	13	5	8	7	553
Others	43	42	37	41	NA	5	4	3	16	10	295

(1) All figures except 'N' are in % and rounded off.

(2) 'N' stands for sample size for the relevant row. In some cases the sample size is too small and figures indicated with \* need to be read with caution.

(3) Educational categories are defined as follows. Non-literate: A person who can neither read nor write in any language. Up to primary: It includes the persons who received formal schooling; either completed the whole primary cycle (I-V) or completed one or other grades of it. Up to matric: It includes persons ranging from those who received schooling beyond the primary cycle to those who actually completed the 10th standard. College and above: It includes persons who went to college but could not receive a degree and those who completed five years of education in college and those who received education beyond graduation either in general education or in specialised streams/courses.

(4) The class scheme used here takes into account two elements of material wealth – durable household assets and monthly household income. Upper are those who had car/jeep/tractor or colour TV, scooter, telephone, fridge, air conditioner, pumping sets (rural) and LPG (rural), or whose monthly household income was above Rs 20,000. Middle class respondents are those who had any three out of four assets such as telephone, colour TV, scooter/motor cycle and fridge in their households or whose monthly household income was above Rs 5,000 and up to Rs 20,000. Lower class respondents are those who had any three out of four assets such as B/W TV, electric fan, bicycle and LPG in their households or whose monthly household income was above Rs 2,000 and up to Rs 5,000. Poor are those who had no more than two out of the household assets or whose monthly household income was Rs 2,000 and less.

(5) Since the analysis uses data-file weighted by actual vote shares, it holds on the assumption that any discrepancy between the reported vote in the post-poll survey and the actual vote share is evenly distributed across all the social groups.

(6) PPP is a new party and was not in the fray in 2007.

(7) NA refers to not available or not applicable.

(8) "Others" in this table (column) include other smaller parties and independents.

Source: All figures are based on a post-poll/exit poll surveys carried out by CSDS in 2007 and 2012. Total sample size in 2007 was 4,935. Total sample size in 2012 was 3,250; In these surveys the respondents were asked to indicate who they voted for by using a ballot paper that carried the list of candidates their party names and symbols as on the EVM in their constituency. Figures reported here are for respondents who said they voted. The investigators checked if these respondents carried a mark on their finger. Those without a finger mark have been excluded from this analysis. The raw survey figures were weighted by actual vote share obtained by major alliances/parties in the final results.

12 more than last time. Barring Barnala, Patiala, Fatehgarh Sahib, sAS Nagar, Ludhiana and Muktsar, the Congress trailed SAD+ in terms of seats in the rest of the seven districts of the Malwa region (Table 2A, p 71).

SAD+ performed much better than the Congress in both the reserved scheduled caste seats (winning 24 of the 34 seats) and the general seats (44 out of 83) (Table 2B, p 72). It also outdid the Congress in the almost entirely rural

**Table 4A: Level of Satisfaction with the Incumbent Government (2012)**

Citizens' Satisfaction with SAD-BJP Government	
Satisfied with performance	55
Dissatisfied with performance	38
No opinion	7

(1) All figures are in % and rounded off.

(2) Question asked in the survey – What is your assessment of the work done by the SAD-BJP coalition government in Punjab during the last five years? Would you say that you are satisfied or dissatisfied with it? (Probe further whether "fully" or "somewhat" satisfied or dissatisfied). Categories of "Fully satisfied" and "Somewhat satisfied" have been merged together as "Satisfied"; categories of "Fully dissatisfied" and "Somewhat dissatisfied" have been merged together as "Dissatisfied".

Source: Figures are based on a post-poll survey carried out by CSDS. Data set weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances. Total sample size: 3,250.

constituencies winning 42 of 66 such seats. It was in the urban and semi-urban seats where the contest between SAD+ and the Congress was much tighter both in terms of seats and vote share (Table 2c, p 72).

SAD+ not only performed better than the Congress in seats where Sikhs constitute more than 60% of the population, but also outdid the Congress in constituencies with a high concentration of Hindu population, winning 13 of the 19 such seats. In seats where no single community dominated (Sikh or Hindu), the Congress performed slightly better, but even here it trailed the SAD-BJP combine (Table 2D, p 72).

Women voters also seem to have favoured the SAD-BJP combine this election, a point corroborated by survey evidence. Out of the 58 constituencies where the turnout of women voters had been higher than that of men voters, SAD-BJP won 37, while the Congress managed to win 19 such seats (Table 2E, p 72).

Taking this further, if we analyse in terms of how men and women voted based on the CSDS post-poll survey data, then we find that while SAD+ lost votes among both men and women compared to 2007, it still maintained a comfortable and significant lead of 4 percentage points over Congress among the women. In other words it is not men but women who seem to have played a major role in the SAD+ victory this time. Among men voters the contest was much tighter with the Congress having a 1 percentage point edge. The biggest losses for the SAD-BJP alliance were in the urban areas and among upper caste Hindus, both of

which are considered to be BJP's core voters and had voted for the BJP in large numbers five years ago. While among urban voters, SAD-BJP lost up to 10% votes since last time, among upper caste Hindus the losses were up to 9%. However what is interesting is that these losses did not result in any significant gains for the Congress among these two sections. SAD+ also dropped nearly 8% votes among Jat Sikhs, and all of it seems to have gone to the PPP and not the Congress. The losses suffered by SAD+ among Jat Sikhs, upper caste Hindus and urban voters, were offset by gains among

other communities, namely, the Hindu Other Backward Classes (OBCs) (up by 4 percentage points since 2007), OBC Sikhs (up 4 percentage points) and Hindu dalits (up 4 percentage points). The Congress, on the other hand, lost votes among most of these sections compared to 2007, the highest losses being among Hindu dalits at 16 percentage points and Hindu OBCs at 14 percentage points. In fact, the lead of the Congress over SAD+ among Hindu dalits came down from 24 percentage points last time to just 4 percentage points this time (Table 3A, p 73).

The CSDS post-poll survey found strong evidence of positive rating for the work done by the incumbent SAD-BJP government and Chief Minister Parkash Singh Badal. A total of 55% of the respondents were satisfied with the Badal government's performance (Table 4A, p 73). On key areas of governance, such as, condition of farmers, supply of electricity, the SAD-BJP government was rated higher and more positively than the Congress government was in 2007. Only on the issue of controlling corruption was it rated much worse (Table 4B).

Parkash Singh Badal's personal popularity has remained as high as it was five years ago and he was yet again the most preferred choice for chief minister (38%) among respondents, particularly women and farmers (Tables 4C and 4D). Amarinder Singh of the Congress was a close second at 33%. However compared to 2007, his popularity is down by 5%, giving his main rival Parkash Singh Badal a clearer lead over him this time.

Parkash Singh Badal was also rated more positively by the voters on governance. While 35 to 37% of the voters opted for the 84-year-old Badal when

**Table 4B: Citizen's Assessment of the Work Done by the Government during Its Tenure for Various Public Goods and Services**

Assessment of Governance Issues	SAD-BJP Government 2012		Congress Government 2007	
	Improved	Deteriorated	Improved	Deteriorated
Condition of farmers	54	29	51	41
Supply of electricity	64	29	56	37
Irrigation facilities	49	26	59	31
Control of corruption	30	54	54	36
Employment opportunities	46	40	47	45

(1) All figures are in % and rounded off; rows do not add up to 100 as those who said "Don't know" have not been reported here.  
 (2) Question asked in the surveys- "Now I will ask you about the assessment of the work done by the government in the state in the last five years. Do you think the condition of the following has improved or deteriorated?" (Probe whether fully or somewhat improved or deteriorated) categories of "fully improved" and "somewhat improved" have been merged together as "improved"; categories of "fully deteriorated" and "somewhat deteriorated" have been merged together as "Deteriorated".  
 Source: All figures are based on post-poll surveys carried out by CSDS. Data sets weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances. Sample size in 2007 was 501; Sample size in 2012 was 3,250.

**Table 4C: Trend in Popularity of Major Political Leaders as Most Preferred CM (2002-12)**

Chief Minister Choices	2002	2004	2007	2009	2012
Parkash Singh Badal	32	31	39	27	38
Amarinder Singh	24	29	38	31	33
Rajinder Kaur Bhattal	6	6	1	2	1
Sukhbir Singh Badal	2	2	2	2	5
Manpreet Singh Badal	NA	NA	NC	NC	5

(1) All figures are in % and rounded off; respondents who said "don't know" or gave other choices have been excluded; responses above are to an open-ended question.  
 (2) Question asked in the surveys: After this election, who would you prefer as the next chief minister of Punjab? (No names were offered to those being interviewed; all responses are spontaneous and were post-coded).  
 (3) NC: Names not coded in those years as the responses were insignificant; NA: Not applicable.  
 Source: All figures are based on post-poll/exit poll surveys carried out by CSDS. Data sets weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances. Sample size in 2002 was 1,147; Sample size in 2004 was 815; Sample size in 2007 was 4,935; Sample size in 2009 was 1,107; Sample size in 2012 was 3,250.

**Table 4D: Popularity of Parkash Singh Badal and Amarinder Singh as Most Preferred CM among Women and Farmers (2012)**

Chief Minister Choices	All	Among Farmers	Among Women
Parkash Singh Badal	38	47	40
Amarinder Singh	33	28	30

All figures are in % and rounded off.  
 Source: Figures are based on a post-poll survey carried out by CSDS; data set weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances.

**Table 4E: Citizens' Assessment of Leaders: Who Is Best for Running the Government and for State's Development?**

Who Is Best for ...	Parkash Singh Badal	Amarinder Singh	Sukhbir Singh Badal	Manpreet Badal	Rajinder Bhattal
Running the government	37	32	3	5	1
Punjab's development	35	32	4	7	1

(1) All figures are in % and rounded off; rest of the respondents had no opinion.  
 (2) Question asked in the survey: Now I will ask you to compare five prominent leaders of Punjab – Parkash Singh Badal, Amarinder Singh, Sukhbir Singh Badal, Manpreet Badal and Rajinder Kaur Bhattal. According to you who among them is best for running the government and best for the development of Punjab?  
 Source: Figures are based on a post-poll survey carried out by CSDS; Data set weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances.

**Table 4F: Citizens' Assessment of Leaders: Who Is More Corrupt and More Nepotistic?**

Who Is ...	Parkash Singh Badal	Amarinder Singh	Sukhbir Singh Badal	Manpreet Badal	Rajinder Bhattal
More corrupt	18	20	7	1	1
More nepotistic	23	19	4	0	1

(1) All figures are in % and rounded off; rest of the respondents had no opinion.  
 (2) Question asked in the survey: Now I will ask you to compare five prominent leaders of Punjab – Parkash Singh Badal, Amarinder Singh, Sukhbir Singh Badal, Manpreet Badal and Rajinder Kaur Bhattal. According to you who among them is more corrupt and more nepotistic?  
 Source: Figures are based on a post-poll survey carried out by CSDS; Data set weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances.

**Table 4G: Citizens' Opinion on Sukhbir Singh Badal as Chief Minister**

Opinion on Sukhbir Singh Badal as Chief Minister	All	Among Traditional SAD Supporters	Among Traditional BJP Supporters
He is suitable to be CM now	17	32	20
Not ready to be CM now, should wait	24	33	27
Not suitable for post of CM	32	16	13

(1) All figures are in % and rounded off; rest of the respondents had no opinion.  
 (2) Question asked in the survey: People have different opinions about Sukhbir Singh Badal becoming chief minister. Some say he is suitable to become chief minister now. Others say he is not ready to be chief minister now and should wait for some time, and some others say that he is not at all suitable for the post of chief minister. What is your opinion?  
 Source: Figures are based on a post-poll survey carried out by CSDS; Data set weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances.

**Table 4H: Awareness and Reach of SAD-BJP Government's Populist Schemes**

Scheme	Heard	Benefited (from among Those Who Had Heard)
Atta-dal scheme (responses of poor only)	80	70
Free power to tube wells for farmers (responses of farmers only)	85	68
Free power to dalit families (responses of dalits only)	78	55

(1) All figures are in % and rounded off; rest of the respondents had not heard or had not benefited/had no opinion.

(2) Question asked in the survey: Now I will ask you about a few schemes of the state government. Please tell me have you heard about them? (If heard) Have you or any member of your family benefited from them?

Source: Figures are based on a post-poll survey carried out by CSDS; Data set weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances.

**Table 4I: Most Important Election Issue in Punjab**

Most Important Election Issue	%
Price rise	41
Unemployment	22
Development of State	12
Corruption	9
Issue of drug addiction	7
Farmers' problems	5
Electricity, road, water	3
Religion, Panth, Dera	2

(1) All figures are in % and rounded off.

(2) Question asked in the survey: Now I will read out certain issues. Please tell me how important were they to you while voting – very much, somewhat or not at all? Once the respondent had given an answer to each of the issues put before him/her, a follow-up question was asked to the respondent where only those answer categories where the respondent had said "very much" in the first question were read out again, and the respondent was asked to choose from among them the single-most important election issue.

Source: Figures are based on a post-poll survey carried out by CSDS; Data set weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances.

it came to running the government and Punjab's development, 32% chose Amarinder Singh. The latter was also seen as more corrupt (20%). However on the question of who among them was more nepotistic, most respondents (23%) said Badal (Tables 4E and 4F, p 74).

Parkash Singh Badal may be the most popular and best rated leader, his son and Deputy Chief Minister Sukhbir Singh Badal does not enjoy similar goodwill. While 24% of the respondents said that Sukhbir is not ready to become chief minister and should wait, an ever higher 32% said he is not suitable for the post at all. Even among traditional SAD and BJP supporters, most were of the view that he should wait (Table 4G, p 74).

Most people seem to have heard of the populist schemes launched by the

SAD-BJP government during the last five years and among those who have heard of them, majority seems to have benefited. For instance 80% of the poor have heard of the Atta-Dal scheme meant for poor families and among them 70% have benefited. Similarly, 85% of farmers have heard of the policy that gives free power for tube wells and 68% of them said that they had benefited (Table 4H).

The post-poll survey confirms the widespread belief among political observers that after a long time an election in Punjab had gone beyond the old Panthic agenda of political parties. When asked which was the most important election issue for them, 41% of the respondents said price rise and 22% said unemployment. Panth was an issue for only 2% of the voters (Table 4I).

### Survey Methodology

The findings presented here are based on a post-poll survey conducted by the CSDS, Delhi, in Punjab. A total of 3,250 persons, randomly selected from the latest electoral rolls, were interviewed in the first week of February 2012 (after polling but before counting of votes) in 178 locations in 45 constituencies spread across the state. The assembly constituencies and four polling booths within each sampled constituency were selected using the systematic random sampling technique. The respondents

were sampled randomly (oversampling to allow for non-completion) from the updated electoral rolls of the selected polling booths. Of the 5,760 sampled respondents, 3,250 could be interviewed within the stipulated time.

The social profile of the respondents interviewed largely matched the demographic profile of the state (Table 5). The interviews were conducted by specially trained field investigators. The respondents were interviewed in the face-to-face interview situation using a structured interview schedule in Punjabi and Hindi. Respondents were mostly interviewed at their home, preferably alone. The voting question was asked using a dummy ballot paper and dummy ballot box.

**Table 5: Sample Profile**

Social Background	Census 2001	Survey 2012
Women	46.7	44.9
Urban	33.9	30.8
Dalit	28.9	33.2
Hindu	36.9	30.6
Sikh	60.0	67.4

All figures are in %.

The fieldwork of the survey in Punjab was coordinated by Ashutosh Kumar (Punjab University, Chandigarh) and Jagroop Singh Shekhon (Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar). The survey was designed and analysed by a team of researchers at the CSDS, Delhi which included Banasmita Bora, Dhananjai Kumar Singh, Himanshu Bhattacharya, Jyoti Mishra, K A Q A Hilal, Kanchan Malhotra, Kinjal Sampat, Rupali Warke, Shreyas Sardesai, Sohini Mookherjee, Vibha Attri, and Yogendra Yadav. Sanjay Kumar of the CSDS directed the survey.

## Economic & Political WEEKLY

### REVIEW OF WOMEN'S STUDIES

October 22, 2011

- Subverting Policy, Surviving Poverty: Women and the SGSY in Rural Tamil Nadu – *K Kalpana*
- Small Loans, Big Dreams: Women and Microcredit in a Globalising Economy – *Kumud Sharma*
- Women and Pro-Poor Policies in Rural Tamil Nadu:  
An Examination of Practices and Responses – *J Jeyaranjan*
- Informed by Gender? Public Policy in Kerala – *Seema Bhaskaran*
- Addressing Paid Domestic Work: A Public Policy Concern – *Nimushakavi Vasanthi*
- Reproductive Rights and Exclusionary Wrongs:  
Maternity Benefits – *Lakshmi Lingam, Vaidehi Yelamanchili*
- Reinventing Reproduction, Re-conceiving Challenges:  
An Examination of Assisted Reproductive Technologies in India – *Vrinda Marwah, Sarojini N*

For copies write to:  
Circulation Manager,

**Economic and Political Weekly,**

320-321, A to Z Industrial Estate, Ganpatrao Kadam Marg, Lower Parel, Mumbai 400 013.

email: circulation@epw.in