Introduction

Nowadays, the most important factor for obtaining legitimacy to rule India is to win the Parliamentary election. During the Nehru era legitimacy was based, to a great extent, on the historical experience of the Independence Movement, especially that of the Indian National Congress. Though winning elections was also important, legitimacy was fairly dependent on the former factor.

The legitimacy based on the Independence Movement was on the wane with Nehru's death in 1964 and the subsequent political turmoil of the Congress, after which the only factor remaining as legitimizing the power in the Center was to win the Parliamentary election, that is, the Lok Sabha. At present, the election system, including those of the Panchayat, State Assemblies, and Lok
Sabha, can be said to be the essence of Indian democracy. It is, therefore, important to analyze the voting behavior of the electorate in relation to socio-economic changes, especially its continuity and discontinuity in the longer time span, for understanding the basic pattern of political changes. Table 1 is the result of the past Lok Sabha elections.

This paper deals with the nine Lok Sabha elections from 1957 to 1991 covering major States. The election data to be analyzed in this study are limited to those indicating the level of the participation toward the Lok Sabha election. They are the percentage of voter-turnout and the number of candidates per constituencies.
The former shows the level of participation of the electorate and the latter that of party-people interface. The data on political participation are to be correlated with the percentage of votes polled by major political parties and the socio-economic data, which consist of decennial census data, and the data indicating the level of economic development. The 1952 election was not examined in this study. It was the only election carried out before State reorganization in 1956, which had brought about major changes of the State boundary which was so extensive that the comparison between pre-reorganization and post-reorganization election data had become almost impossible.

The pattern which will emerge after examining the correlation of these aggregate data cannot be an elaborate description of voting behavior, but only macro trends, because these data do not contain detailed micro information on the voting behavior. But still, it would be very useful if we find out some long-term macro trends or patterns in the elections, which is the most important form of political participation or mobilization in contemporary India.

The election studies have been done in every major election. All the studies on contemporary Indian politics have something to do with the election. Studies focusing on the electoral behavior are not many. Major interview-based micro studies surveying various aspects of voting behavior of individuals, their perception and their socio-economic status seem to have started appearing after the mid-60s. On the other hand, the studies on aggregate election data, in which this study is included, especially those of Assemblies and Lok Sabha, also seem to have emerged after the 1970’s. Among them, Dasgupta and Morris-Jones (1975), Elkins (1975), Weiner (1977), and Blair (1979) were major ones, after which there had been no major studies till the end of the 1980’s. In the 1990’s, some important studies, such as Sission and Roy (1990), and Gould and Ganguly (1993), have begun to appear again, with increasing interest in the drastic changes of Central Government through Lok Sabha elections on the one hand, and the continuity
and resilience of Indian democracy on the other. These studies, however, have dealt only with a relatively shorter period or limited only to some States. What is needed for understanding the basic macro current in Indian politics would be a description of the long term and macro trends of voting behavior among people, for which the data of the Lok Sabha elections will give ample scope.

Methodology

Stepwise multiple regression analysis is the method I adopt to examine relations between election data and others, because to depict the relations means to select variables most deeply correlated with dependent variables, that is, the election data in this study. The list of variables is presented in Table 2.

Decennial population census data are selected for representing the macro-social environment for the electoral process. In addition, the average value of 41 agricultural crops per hectare adopted from the study done by Bhalla (1989)⁴ is included as an indicator of macro-economic environment, because agriculture has been and is still the main occupation for many people, with 74.3% still being a rural area even in the 1991 census. I have used his data because it covers most of the Indian districts over a period of 20 years for main crops in the form of comparable cross-section data which are deflated by the prices of each district.⁵

It can be criticized that the selection of these independent variables are arbitrary and that there are other variable which is not examined here but might be more important. This is partly right. There are data on land distribution, caste composition, etc., which are considered to be relevant to voting behavior. These variables, however, are simply not available district-wise over the period of 30 years all over India. In this sense, the analysis is incomplete. But such incompleteness does not negate the legitimacy of examining the relevance of the variables listed in Table 2 because these macro variables are, in a sense, comprehensive variables, which means that they are somehow or other related to the variable which
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Name for the variable</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Voter's Turnout</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>57, 62, 67, 71, 77, 80, 84, 89, 91</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of candidates per constituency</td>
<td>CAD</td>
<td>57, 62, 67, 71, 77, 80, 84, 89, 91</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td>Name for the variable</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Data Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Urban population</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>61, 71, 81, 91</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Literate population</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>61, 71, 81, 91</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Cultivators over main workers</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>61, 71, 81, 91</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Agricultural Labors/ main workers</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>61, 71, 81, 91</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Non-Hindu population</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>61, 71, 81</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Scheduled Castes</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>61, 71, 81, 91</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Scheduled Tribes</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>61, 71, 81, 91</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value (Rupee) of 41 main crops/hectare</td>
<td>YH</td>
<td>62–65, 70–73, 80–83</td>
<td>Bhalla*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Candidates per Constituency</td>
<td>CAD</td>
<td>57, 62, 67, 71, 77, 80, 84, 89, 91</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Polling Stations per km²</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>77, 80, 84, 89, 91</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of votes polled by Congress Party</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>57, 62, 67, 71, 77, 80, 84, 89, 91</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of votes polled by Communist Parties</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>51, 62, 67, 71, 77, 80, 84, 89, 91</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of votes polled by Jangh Sangh, BJP</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>57, 62, 67, 71, 84, 89, 91</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of votes polled by Janata Party in 1977</td>
<td>JN</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of votes polled by Janata Party in 1980</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy variables representing States</td>
<td>AP, BI, GU, MP, MA, KA, KE, OR, RA, TN, UP, WB</td>
<td>57, 62, 67, 71, 77, 80, 84, 89, 91</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is not included in this study but which is important in explaining voting behavior. Therefore, to examine these variables listed in Table 2 might amount to the examination, indirectly and partly, of other relevant variables which are not included here.

Lastly, the percentage of votes polled by party is included for checking the party's ability to mobilize the electorate, besides the dummy variable representing each State for checking the existence of specific factors particular to the State. It must be noted that in this study, the votes polled by the Communist Party of India and that of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) have been combined after 1964 when CPI(M) separated from CPI so that the consistency of support base has been maintained throughout the period between 1957 to 1991.

The most serious problem while relating election data to that of population census data and Bhalla's agricultural data is the discrepancy between the geographical boundary of Lok Sabha's constituency and that of the district which is the basic unit for the regression analysis in this study. Boundaries of the constituencies have been delimited several times since Independence as seen in Table 3 in order to equalize the number of electorates in the constituencies. The boundaries of districts also have been changed by State governments frequently. Therefore, it is necessary to fix boundaries of districts throughout the period of this study to get comparable data set for long-term analysis. In this paper I have aggregated election data in accordance with the district boundary used in Bhalla's study shown in Figure 1, for getting the comparable data set. Aggregation of the voter's turnout and the number of candidates could be dealt with in this way, because, as I show
later, the level of election participation is a fairly stable phenomenon over a long time irrespective of boundary changes. The feature of these variables is a contrast to the percentage votes polled by a party which could be changed drastically, for example, as the result of a short-term political event or a seat-adjustment with other parties.

Another, though minor, problem was consistency in dealing with the data for the single-member constituency and that of double-member constituency in 1957 election data. For the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of General Election</th>
<th>Total no. of Constituencies</th>
<th>SCs Seats</th>
<th>STs Seats</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Delimitation under President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>403 a</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>First Delimitation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>494 b</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Two-Member Constituencies Abolition Act 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Second Delimitation Commission (1963)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>518 c</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Punjab Reorganisation Act 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Third Delimitation Commission (1973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>542 d</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Goa, Daman, and Diu Reorganisation Act 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>543 e</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. The one triple-member of 1952 constituencies was abolished and the number of double-member constituencies was increased to 91 from 86.

b. The 91 double-member constituencies were divided.

c. Himachal Pradesh representation was cut from 6 seats to 4 on becoming a state.

d. In 1980 elections were not held in 13 constituencies (12 in Assam and one in Meghalaya) where there were no candidates. So there were never more than 529 members in the 1980–84 Lok Sabha.

e. On May 30, 1987 Goa became a state with two Lok Sabha seats while Daman and Diu remained a union territory with one Lok Sabha seat. Prior to that Goa, Daman, and Diu formed a union territory with two Lok Sabha seats.

double-member constituency, I simply adopted the average figure in the case of the Voter’s Turnout and the sum of the candidates in the case of the Number of Candidates. 6)

It would be far better if we could get district boundary based election data by aggregating polling station level data, which is virtually impossible because of the lack of availability of such data. The second best method I have adopted is the aggregation using, as weight, the number of electorates of Assembly constituencies included in the district. Such an aggregation or estimation can be possible because the boundary of the Assembly constituency does

Figure 1 Boundary of District or Districts Combined Used in this Study
not cross the boundary of both the district and Lok Sabha constituency, except for a few cases. In fact, the Lok Sabha constituency is defined as a collection of several Assembly constituencies according to the Representation of the People Acts\textsuperscript{7} and Assembly constituencies are grouped district-wise according to Delimitation Orders except for a few cases.\textsuperscript{8} Figure 2 is the illustration of the relationship of these boundaries, where you can find 3 Lok Sabha constituencies and 1 district, consisting of 16 Assembly constituencies. The estimated voter’s turnout adjusted to the district boundary is defined to be as follows.

The estimated voter’s turnout in the district

$$\text{Va, Vb, Vc} = \frac{(a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_4)Va + (b_1 + b_2 + b_3 + b_4 + b_5)Vb + (c_1 + c_2 + c_3 + c_4)Vc}{(a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_4) + (b_1 + b_2 + b_3 + b_4 + b_5) + (c_1 + c_2 + c_3 + c_4)}$$

where;

\(a_i, b_i, c_i\) = The number of electorates in “i”th Assembly constituency in a’s, b’s, and c’s Lok Sabha constituency.

\(Va, Vb, Vc\) = The percentage voter turnout in a’s, b’s, and c’s Lok Sabha constituency.

\textbf{Figure 2} Illustration of the Adjustment of Election Data
Interpolation or extrapolation is the next step to estimate the census data and the value of agricultural crops in each election year. A simple liner estimation is applied to get figures. After preparing the comparable data set over the period, stepwise multiple regression analysis is to be applied to it. Before stepwise regression, however, Principle Components Analysis (PCA) is applied against the set of independent variables, with one State dummy variable being excluded, in order to check multicollinearity among them. A State dummy variable is removed from the PCA because the combination of all the State dummy variables is linearly dependent by definition and we never need all the State dummy variables in the stepwise regression as the regression model always includes a constant. A State dummy variable is removed and the rest of the independent variables are checked by PCA for multicollinearity, after which the State dummy variable is returned. This process is carried out for all the State dummy variables one by one. The criterion of the existence of severe multicollinearity is that the smallest eigen value for a principle component is less than 0.01 or that the sum of all the reciprocal numbers of the eigen values is bigger than the number of independent variables multiplied by five.  

No case of severe multicollinearity was found except a few. Even in the few cases, the multicollinearity disappeared after removing another arbitrary State dummy variable. The stepwise selection process is basically a forward process, that is, a process of adding variables one by one, in the course of which the independent variable whose F value become less than the cut-off point gets removed, and ending when the F value of all the potentially additional independent variables is less than the cut-off point and the F value of all the independent variables selected are more than the cut-off points. In all the cases of the stepwise regression procedure, at least three State dummy variables remained to be not selected, which ensures that all the stepwise procedures were clear of severe multicollinearity. It should, however, be kept in mind that
multicollinearity can not be removed completely. It is important when interpreting the results of regression. The set of independent variables after checking multicollinearity is to be examined by stepwise regression analysis.

The final point to be explained is how to deal with the missing value. In the case of the voter’s turnout and number of candidates, there is no serious problem because these figures could be found in all the constituencies except a few. In contrast, there are many missing values for the percentage of votes polled by a party, especially so in the case of a small party such as the Communist Parties. In this study I have included the aggregated figure even if it consists of any constituencies which do not have figures as a result, for example, of candidates not being put forward by a party. In this case, the understanding is that if the party does not raise its own candidate it is because of unpopularity which is perceived by the party or seat-adjustment with other parties. If the former is the case, the party might get only a meager percentage of the vote even if it raises its candidate, therefore aggregation including such constituencies (where zero percentage is to be allotted) might be nearly representative of the popularity or extent of support basis of the party. But if the latter is the case we must be careful when interpreting the results of regression.

Continuity

What we should first examine is the continuity of the level of election participation over three decades. Graph 1 to 3 shows the continuity of the Voter’s Turnout, the Number of Candidates, and the Votes polled by the Congress party. In each graph, the Y-axis shows the squared correlation coefficient (or coefficient of determination) between successive two elections. Graph 3 is inserted in order to be a contrast to other two graphs of political participation.

We can easily find a higher level of continuity for Voter’s Turnout, compared to the Number of Candidates and Votes polled by Congress, which show that the level of the people’s participation in
an election is a fairly stable phenomenon, while the others do not. It is a surprise to find such a discontinuity of Congress's votes because the samples (the district level figures aggregated from the data of the Lok Sabha constituencies) used in the calculation do not include samples which are aggregated from the data on constituencies where Congress did not raise its own candidate, which means that the observed discontinuity might not be because of the absence of Congress candidates.10)

In the 1960's, the party system in India was said to be a one party dominant system in which the Congress party was in the center of the system linking other peripheral parties and giving the polity a kind of stability.11) But Graph 3 shows that the support people had given to Congress has been fluctuating. This result shows that the stability the Congress had been giving to the polity in the 1950's or 60's was the stability of the central Government or the structure of the Congress party organization, not the party-people relation at the bottom level. Under the Congress system, the Congress' popularity was thought to be stable to the extent that the Congress established a closer relationship with local leaders who could induce people to vote for Congress. Therefore, the discontinuity of the support basis of Congress in the 50s and 60s, which is revealed in Graph 3, was because of either Congress-local leaders discontinuity or local leaders-local people discontinuity. We can not identify the exact factors of the discontinuity on the basis of our data though there were some studies revealing the existence of both levels of discontinuities.12) It would be no wonder if the instability of these kinds of party-people interfaces spread to the political system as a whole, including the central structure of the Congress party organization, which has actually occurred after the 1970's.

The exception is the continuity between the 1977 election and 1980, which again is a surprise because the period between 1975 and 1980 was one of the most turbulent periods in terms of the party system in India. 1975 was the year when Prime Minister
Mrs. Gandhi proclaimed the national Emergency and suspended the party system as a whole. The 1977 Lok Sabha election was the judgment by the electorate against the Emergency, in which newly-formed Janata Party took power from the Congress for the first time since Independence, which had lasted only for two years and collapsed because of the internal contradiction between the original parties which made up the Janata Party, resulting in the dysfunction of governance. The 1980 election was a response by the electorate toward such dysfunctionality, leading to the return of Mrs. Gandhi’s Congress. It might be that the pattern of people’s party preference had not been changing so much because of the very turbulence of the party system itself. Too much turbulence might not give much possibility for the electorate to change

Graph 1  Continuity of Voter’s Turnout (R²: Squared correlation coefficient in the correlation between Vs of the continual 2 elections)

n (number of sample) for “All” = 244
n for Min Reorg = 82 (The States are Bihar, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, and West Bengal)
n for Max Reorg = 148 (The States are Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, and Tamil Nadu)

Note: 1. The samples which include the constituency where election was not held are excluded.
   2. The figures within in the Graph show the R² for “all” category.
Graph 2  Continuity of the Number of Candidates (R^2: Squared correlation coefficient in the correlation between CADs of the continual 2 elections)

Note: The samples which include the constituency where no candidate was found are excluded.

Graph 3  Continuity of Votes Polled by Congress (R^2: Squared correlation coefficient in the correlation between INs of the continual 2 elections)

Note: The samples, which include the constituency where no Congress candidate was found, are excluded.
their party preference. Anyway, this point could not be examined in detail in a macro study like mine.

In comparison to the votes polled by Congress, the continuity of the voter's turnout is apparent as Graph 1 shows. The Graph shows a feature that the correlation between 1957 and 62 elections, and those of 1977 and 71 or 80 are lower than the other correlations, that is, the lowering of the continuity could be observed in 1957 and 77 elections. 1957 was just one year after the State reorganization was completed. It is most probable that the impact of the reorganization of State boundaries, therefore, the change of State government for a large number of people had caused remarkable changes in their participatory behavior. To examine this point, the Graph contains two lines, that is, one showing the $R^2$ for the States with a minimum influence of State reorganization (Bihar, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, and West Bengal) and the other with maximum influence (Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, and Tamil Nadu). As expected the $R^2$ of the latter between 1957 and 62 was lower than the former, showing the impact of the State reorganization in the latter.

In the case of 1977, the event which had contributed most to the confusion of the participatory behavior might be the national Emergency which was the first experience since Independence where the Central Government wielded its coercive power, directly and massively, against the mass of people, especially in north India like Uttar Pradesh. The image of Mrs. Indira Gandhi's Congress, as a pro-poor progressive party, must have finally been destroyed in the eyes of the ordinary masses. There were no other events which could cause such a major change.

In spite of these two disruptions the level of the continuity is much higher than the Votes polled by Congress, or the Number of Candidates. And, it is noteworthy that there were no discernible effects stemming from the delimitation of the Lok Sabha constituencies in 1966 on the correlation as $R^2$ of V62–67 showed no fall-
ing-down. In the case of the 1976 delimitation, we could not discern the influence of the delimitation on the $R^2$ of V71-77 from that of the Emergency. But its impact might be a minor one if we take into account the fact that the $R^2$ of V77-80 showed much sharp falling-down, revealing more discontinuity even though there was no major delimitation in the period.

The stability of the participatory behavior of the people suggests that it is related more with stable parameters of the polity rather than short-term political events, which would become clear afterward.

Concerning the continuity of the number of candidates, the graph’s pattern is similar to that of Voter’s Turnout though the average level of continuity is much lower than the Voter’s Turnout. But the fact that it has a similar pattern as the Voter’s Turnout reveals that there are some common factors to the two variables. The years of 1957 and 1977 had shown the lowest level of continuity, the reason of which were the same as in the case of Voter’s Turnout. State reorganization in the case of the 1957 election and the Emergency and the formation of the Janata party in the case of 1977 respectively were the events which disrupted the parties-people interface to a great extent, which was reflected in the falling-down of $R^2$.

Generally candidates, including both candidates from party and independents, can be considered to have a role of connecting people and the party system. The number of candidates, therefore, is a function of both the degree of fragmentation of party system and the level of political mobilization or participation of the fragmented Indian society. It might be considered as a variable of the party to people interface. The party-people interface can be said to be more diffusive if more parties raise their candidates or if more independent candidates run in the election. In this sense, the number of candidates can be an appropriate variable showing the degree of the diffusion of party-people interface.

Graph 4 shows the change in the number of candidates per
constituencies. The increasing number of candidates is the basic pattern except for 1977 election when the most remarkable kink occurred. No doubt, the amalgamation of major opposition parties into the Janata Party had contributed to the reduction in the number of candidates, causing the kink. In addition, it must be noted that the slope of the graph was fairly different before 1977 and after. The rapid growth of the number of candidates after 1977 is in contrast against that before 1977. A large number of candidates coming to the election scene after 1977 were independent candidates, which might show the basic change in the nature of the party-people interface between the two periods. Region-wise, as the Graph shows, the samples in the Hindi belt (Bihar, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh) have had more candidates than other regions. The Hindi belt was a region where the Janata Party succeeded in returning a maximum number of candidates in 1977. Therefore, the basic change in the nature of the party-people interface after 1977, if anything, might most probably be related to the Janata Party phenomenon.

Janata Party phenomenon, I think, might have had two aspects.

**Graph 4 Average Number of Candidates**

n = 259 (for all samples), 136 (for Hindi belt samples in Bihar, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh).

Note: Same as Graph 2.
First, the Janata Party, however loosely it was organized, might have had the function of dissuading potential candidates from running in the election through informal persuasion or the adjustment process. The Congress party until the 70’s had a similar function as is shown later in this paper. Such a function seems to have nearly disappeared after the 1980’s with the collapse of the Janata Party, and the further transformation of the Congress Party. The second aspect was its and the Emergency’s impact amounting to the politicization of people and political groups representing the people. These two factors seemed to have contributed to an increasing number of candidates, and therefore the diffusion of the party-people interface. Graph 4 shows us the increasing diffusion of the party-people interface in India after 1977.

Factors Explaining Voter’s Turnout

Table 4 is the result of the stepwise multiple regression analysis. The criterion used for the selection of the variables is that a variable is to be selected if the F value of the variable in the regression equation is more than 3.5 and removed if it is less than 3.5. I fixed the F value for the selection at 3.5 instead of 2.0 or 2.5, which is generally recommended in many cases, so that too many variables which are not statistically significant at the level of 1% are not included in the regression equation. I included the variables, the Number of Candidates per Constituency in the case of the regression for the Voter’s Turnout and the Voter’s Turnout in the regression for the Number of Candidates per Constituency in order to see their correlation. In addition, the variable of the Number of Polling Stations per km² is added in the case of the 1977 election and after in order to assess the influence of distance from polling station on people’s participatory behavior. Corresponding data for 1971 election and before were simply not available in the Reports of the Election Commission for 1971 election and before.

In addition, a variable “dV” is included which is the residual
portion of the Voter's Turnout in previous elections which is not explained by the original independent variables in the regression equation.\textsuperscript{19) I added the dV for assessing habitual aspect of the participatory behavior. It is based on the assumption that once the habitual behavior of electoral participation is formed people vote continually irrespective of their socio-economic and political environment, and such habitual behavior is most probably represented in the residual portion of the Voter's Turnout in previous elections which is not explained by the socio-economic or political variables in the regression equation. The dV for 1957 could not be calculated because of the absence of data in the 1952 election. Therefore, the regression for 1957 could not be comparable strictly with those in other years.

\textbf{State Dummy Variables}

As Table 4 shows, generally State dummy variables as well as socio-economic variables are more important than electoral variables in explaining the Voter's Turnout.

Among State dummy variables, Orissa (represented as "OR") shows a statistically very significant negative correlation with Voter's Turnout during the period between 1962 and 1980, which is judged from the F value. It is not strange in a backward State like Orissa that the people had shown less tendency to participate in elections than other more developed States. But it should be noticed that the participatory level was less than what other socio-economic variables, such as the literacy rate or the percentage of Scheduled Tribes could anticipate. It suggests that there might be some structural constraints which tended to prevent people from participating in the election. After 1980 the F value has fallen down, which shows that the Voter's Turnout in Orissa has risen near a general level in which socio-economic or electoral variables could be anticipated. In a nutshell, Orissa has come near to an ordinary State in terms of the Voter's Turnout after 1980.

It seems to be apparent that the changes in the importance of the
### Table 4 Variables Explaining Voter’s Turnout-Stepwise Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>57</th>
<th>62</th>
<th>67</th>
<th>71</th>
<th>77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRC</strong></td>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sg</strong></td>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sg</strong></td>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>6.7853</td>
<td>12.7 **</td>
<td>8.6002</td>
<td>45.0 **</td>
<td>11.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>-6.8828</td>
<td>34.8 **</td>
<td>-4.5866</td>
<td>15.6 **</td>
<td>-9.8151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU</td>
<td>-4.2735</td>
<td>17.7 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.2933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA</td>
<td>17.6957</td>
<td>55.8 **</td>
<td>10.9546</td>
<td>52.9 **</td>
<td>16.3550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KA</td>
<td>6.6772</td>
<td>18.7 **</td>
<td>2.9423</td>
<td>9.6 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KE</td>
<td>-6.4276</td>
<td>68.3 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-8.0193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.0728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>6.7214</td>
<td>24.6 **</td>
<td>2.4791</td>
<td>8.6 **</td>
<td>-12.4934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>-8.9924</td>
<td>17.5 **</td>
<td>-30.2885</td>
<td>474.3 **</td>
<td>-15.8350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>4.4205</td>
<td>30.9 **</td>
<td>9.2477</td>
<td>40.4 **</td>
<td>3.2947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>9.1505</td>
<td>49.0 **</td>
<td>13.1607</td>
<td>117.2 **</td>
<td>10.9562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP</td>
<td>4.8459</td>
<td>20.1 **</td>
<td>-1.8501</td>
<td>6.0 *</td>
<td>-9.2775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>-4.0934</td>
<td>14.1 **</td>
<td>5.4107</td>
<td>28.6 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

- **PRC** = Partial Regression Coefficient
- **F** = F Value
- **Sg** = Level of Statistical Significance (**** = Significant at 1% level, ** = Significant at 5% level)
- **dV** = residual variable of Voter’s Turnout in previous election which
is not explained by the original independent variables in the previous election, "Con’t" = Constant, “Stt(%)” = the sum of variations which are explained “purely” by each State dummy variable in the regression equation as a percentage of all the variation of the Voter’s Turnout.

2 Number of samples is 244 in all the cases above.

3 Strict comparison of the regression in 1957 election with others is not possible.

State dummy variables have been corresponding to major political events in the States. For example, the State dummy variable “HA” which represents Haryana shows a peak of F value in the 1967 election. Undoubtedly it was reflecting the exalted political mood among people in Haryana against the bifurcation of the old Punjab State into new Punjab and Haryana States in 1966 after the prolonged Punjabi Suba agitation led by Akali Dal.20) Tamil Nadu (“TA”) also had a peak of F value in 1967, which was a political response of people against the Congress State Government during anti-Hindi agitation, resulting in the first installation of a non-Congress State Government in Madras State which was later renamed as Tamil Nadu by the new Government, that is, Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam.21) It seems to be the same in the case of Andhra Pradesh (“AP”) where political fluidity reached a high level after the mid-1960s through a few agitation incidents such as those for the steel plant in the Vishakapatnam district or separate Telangana State.22)

Generally, the 1967 election was politically the most agitated one during the period from the 1950s to the 60s, some of the important reasons of which were the death of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru in 1964 and resulting conflicts and confusion in the Congress party in the center and the severe drought condition during the successive 2 years from 1965/66 to 66/67 which caused a severe famine situation in several parts of India. These economic difficulties and political turmoil in the center had caused widespread discontent among people, which, when combined with disruptive political factors peculiar to the States had resulted in raising anti-
ruling party feeling in many States. Such a politicized mood among people would most probably lead to an increasing level of electoral participation in the States, which actually occurred.

In the 1971 election, besides Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, and Bihar were conspicuous in their lower performance in Voter's Turnout according to the Table, which shows the relative backwardness of political consciousness among people in these Hindi belt States.

After the 1977 election, the most remarkable State was West Bengal after 1980. Undoubtedly, the reason for the remarkable increase in Voter's Turnout was the installation of the Left Front Government led by Jyoti Basu of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) in 1977. It is quite sure that the penetration of their political influence through their grass-roots level party organizations or local governmental or semi-governmental bodies such as Panchayati Raj institutions or cooperative societies has raised the level of electoral participation. Through these structures, patronage has been distributed among the rural masses, especially the poor. In addition, important land reforms have been carried out under the Government, among which Operation Barga is most famous. What is important is the Left Front in the Government. The combination of two factors, that is, the Left Front Parties and its installation in the State Government, was critical for the significant policy changes which were carried out more efficiently than the previous Congress Government, leading to the increasing electoral support to the Left Front in the rural area and the rising level of electoral participation. Therefore, it is not strange that it was not in 1977 when the Left Front took Government, but in the 1980 election, and after, that the participatory level of West Bengal has shown a really remarkable increase.

Kerala is another State where Leftist parties have been powerful. But compared to West Bengal, the F value was not high in 1967 and 80 when they won State Assembly elections. It was because of the short duration of governance, which did not allow
them to construct a stable political basis among people through governmental or semi-governmental institutions. But the F value was much higher in the cases of the 1989 and 91 election. It was because the Left Democratic Front Government led by E. K. Nayanar of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) had taken government from 1987. The Kerala case also shows the importance of the combination of the two factors mentioned above.

It would be very interesting to see the explanatory power of these State dummy variables as a whole over three decades. We could make an indicator “Stt” defined as; the sum of the variation of Voter’s Turnout which can be explained purely by each State dummy variable in the partial regression as a percentage of the total variation of Voter’s Turnout. Graph 5 shows the fluctuation of the explanatory power of the State dummy variables.

“Stt” in the graph shows that it was at the level approximately between 30 to 35 % from 1962 to the 1971 election, around 20 % from 1977 to 1984 and rapidly going up after 1989. The relatively lower level of Stt from 1977 to 1984 elections means that in these
elections the State-conscious political behavior among electorate had played a relatively minor role in Lok Sabha elections compared to others. In this sense, Politics, or the series of political events in the center had played a more important role. It might be because the separation of State Assembly elections and Lok Sabha elections after 1971 might have an effect for the State-oriented political consciousness to become relatively less important in the Lok Sabha election. However, it could be said that the effect of the separation might not be a serious one as Stt in 1971, when both levels of elections were first conducted separately, was at the level of 29%.

The factor which had caused the decrease in the explanatory power of State dummy variables from 1977 to 84 was, I think, the impact of the Emergency and successive political events after that, like the establishment of Janata Party in the center, the return of Mrs. Gandhi’s Congress in 1980, and the assassination of Mrs. Gandhi in 1984. These events had caused wide-spread political disturbance, which, ironically, had strengthened the tendency of intermingling the political perceptions among people against State politics and that against the Center’s politics. In this sense, the decade from the mid-1970s to the mid-80s can be said to be a period when the political current of the State mixed with that of the center most closely after Independence. It was after the 1989 election that the level of such linkage began to fall, which is shown in the graph as a rising Stt after 1989.

**Literacy**

Turning to socio-economic variables, it is a percentage of the literate population which is the most important variable. It was especially so in 1962 and 67 elections according to F value, showing clearly the positive correlation with the Voter’s Turnout. In fact, it was the single most important variable among all the independent variables. But its significance had been gradually declining after 1971 and no explanatory power is recognized in the 1991
election. The declining explanatory power is not difficult to understand if we see the increasing literacy rate during the four decades, from 18.3% in 1951, 28.3% in 61, 34.5% in 71, 43.6% in 81, and 52.2% in 91.\textsuperscript{32} The rising literacy level all over the India has made it less important in distinguishing the high Voter’s Turnout areas from that of low Voter’s Turnout area.

**Agricultural Productivity**

Concerning other developmental variables, the variable related to agricultural productivity, that is, Yield per hectare of 41 main agricultural crops, is significant. It became significant from 1977 onwards, showing a positive correlation to Voter’s Turnout. As I said this variable can be a rough indicator of overall development of the rural economy in each area. Therefore, we could say that the more agriculturally developed areas tend to have more participatory behavior among people. It might be because economic development would tend to activate or fluctuate the rural society, which in turn would lead to a higher level of political participation in some way or other. The important point is that it is after the 1977 election that it has become significant, which means that from 1977 onwards a situation has come where economic development tends to lead to a higher level of political participation. Again we should emphasize the political impact of the Emergency for such a situation to emerge.

**Urbanization**

The two developmental variables mentioned above have a positive correlation with Voter’s Turnout, which can be easily anticipated. But the correlation of the percentage of Urban population with the Voter’s Turnout is not consistent with the general anticipation that Urbanization correlates positively with Voter’s Turnout. We must take into account the possibility of spurious negative correlation due to multicollinearity because the signs of the partial regression and that of the simple correlation are different in many
elections as the latter show 0.329, 0.388, 0.345, 0.326, 0.228, 0.189, 0.116, 0.045, and -0.030 from the 1957 to 1991 election respectively. But the fact that all the signs in partial regressions in the table are consistently negative reveals that the negative correlation might be a real correlation which is hidden in simple correlation analysis but which comes out in the multiple regression because of other significant independent variables being included simultaneously. There is no firm theoretical basis that urbanization automatically leads to more participatory behavior in India. It might be opposite to the real situation.\textsuperscript{33} The degree of institutionalization of social and political organizations in the rural areas, such as caste organization, panchayats, or agricultural cooperatives, which tend to raise the participatory level of the people through their institutional mobilization, are relatively lower in urban areas, which might explain the negative partial correlation coefficient.

**Scheduled Tribes**

Turning to other social variables, it is clear that the percentage of the Scheduled Tribes is the most significant variable, showing a negative correlation consistently from the 1962 to 1991 election, which means that the ST people have less tendency to participate in the election. There might be two reasons. First, the area where ST people live is generally backward area in terms of communication and other infrastructures, which tends to keep people from reaching a polling station, and second, there might be a socio-economic or political obstacle which prevents the political perception of ST people from coming near to the political main stream.\textsuperscript{34}

**Agricultural Laborers**

Other socio-economic variables is generally less significant or, if significant, the F value is rather smaller, but still a few variables shows some interesting facts. Especially, Agricultural Labor as the percentage of Main Workers was sometime significantly and positively correlated with the Voter’s Turnout, showing that the area
with more agricultural labor tends to show more participatory behavior among people.

**Electoral Variables**

Lastly, concerning the electoral variables, in many cases, they were not statistically significant in explaining Voter’s Turnout, or the level of significance were not high when it was selected. The percentage of votes polled by the Indian National Congress showed a negative correlation with Voter’s Turnout in 1962 and a positive correlation in 1991, while Communist Parties votes (votes polled by the Communist Party of India and Communist Party of India (Marxist) combined) being correlated positively in 1971 and Jangh Sangh or Bharatiya Janata Party (hereafter BJP) votes correlated positively in 1971 and 89 respectively.

In the case of the Communist parties, their mobilizational ability, especially when ruling the State Government, could lead to a higher level of political participation as I explained. But we are not sure whether it could be said that the area where more people support Congress, Jangh Sangh or BJP shows a higher or lower level of participatory behavior, if taking into account the lower level of F values and their sporadic nature in entering the regression equation. For example, in the case of votes polled by Congress in 1991, it would be the assassination of the former Prime Minister and Congress President Mr. Rajiv Gandhi which resulted in the higher level of electoral participation in the areas where Congress is more popular.\(^35\) It is the political impact of the assassination which is the cause of the rising Voter’s Turnout, not the degree of Congress popularity (the percentage votes polled by Congress). That is, the correlation between the Voter’s Turnout and Congress votes might be spurious.

In addition, the fact that political parties sometimes make an electoral coalition or do seat adjustments makes the interpretation of the result of the regressions difficult as in the case of BJP votes in 1989 when BJP made the electoral coalition with the main oppo-
sition parties in many seats. In this case, we could not simply say whether it was BJP’s or another coalitional party’s popularity which raised the Voter’s Turnout.

Among other electoral variables, the Number of Candidates per Constituency was correlated significantly and negatively in 1967, and the 1977 election, which means that the Voting Turnout was higher in the constituency where fewer candidates run in the election. It might be that the election in which only a limited number of candidates with influential party background run might lead to tough electoral competition, which resulted in the increase in the Voter’s Turnout. Such correlation could not be found in the period after the 1980 election when the Number of Candidates started to increase rapidly, which also suggests the change in the nature of electoral competition after 1980. In spite of these important implications we should be cautious in understanding the result of the regression because of their lower level of F values.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that the variable, the area per polling station is not selected in the regression in all the cases after 1977. It shows apparently that the physical distance from the polling station has not been a major obstacle for most of the electorate, at least, after 1977.

Factors Explaining the Number of Candidates per Constituencies

Table 5 shows the result of the stepwise regression analysis. The criteria of F value to select or eliminate the variable is the same as in the case of the Voter’s Turnout, that is, 3.5. In the stepwise selection after 1962 election, a variable “dC” is included which is the residual portion of the Number of Candidates per Constituency in the previous election which is not explained by the original independent variables in the regression equation. The reason of the inclusion is the same as in the case of dV in the regression of the Voter’s Turnout. And the Voter’s Turnout was also included as an independent variable for the selection. Most of the independent
variables selected were statistically significant at the level of 1% or below.

First of all, we can easily find that the explanatory power of these regressions (R²) are generally lower compared to those of the Voter’s Turnout, meaning that there might be other important variables which should be taken into account. In spite of that, still, I think, the table reveals very important factors explaining it.

**State Dummy Variables**

Among State dummy variables, States in the Hindi belt showed a positive correlation with the Number of Candidates. There is no exception, which shows that the Hindi belt States have generally had more candidates in the election, meaning they have more diffused party-people interface throughout the period examined here. Compared to the Hindi belt States, other States have shown, by and large, a negative correlation. There were only 4 cases out of 23 for non-Hindi States indicating a positive correlation in the table, among which the case of Tamil Nadu in 1957 should be removed because the result of 1957 could not be compared strictly. Even in the remaining three cases they were an exceptional phenomenon rather than the rule. The contrast between the Hindi belt and other States is clear, which was also shown in Graph 2.

The reason for the Hindi belt States to have more diffusive party-people interface might be related to their diffusive social and political structures. Approximately, it can be said that the Hindi belt States have more competitive and unstable social stratification than other States in terms of castes or classes. For example, it is often pointed out that there is no stable dominant caste system covering the entire State in a State like Uttar Pradesh, which is a contrast to States in South India. If a State has a limited number of dominant castes, such as Marathas in Maharashtra, Reddies and Kammas in Andhra Pradesh, or Lingayats and Vokkaligas in Karnataka, which have cohesive political influence throughout the State, such a structure might have a tendency to restrain new poli-
ticians emerging through election within the political influence of the dominant caste system, which might naturally result in the number of candidates to be restrained to a certain level. It is true that the theory of dominant castes in an election has been criticized by many scholars. But its validity would be a matter of degree depending on the specific electoral situation, which means that the theory could, at least partly, explain voting behavior.

**Urbanization**

Turning to socio-economic variables, the most remarkable phenomenon is the change in their explanatory power in the election in and before 1977, and those after 1977. Until 1977 their explanatory power was very limited compared to State dummy variables. Among socio-economic variables, Urbanization has been most important. And if taking into account the spurt of candidates beginning from the 1980 election, just the same election in and after which the F value of Urbanization has jumped to a high level, it is apparent that it is Urbanization which explains the phenomenon. The major portion of the number of candidates emerging in and after the 1980 election consists of independents. Therefore, it follows that Urbanization after the 1980 election explains the spurt of independents. It is not that the Urbanization itself has been accelerated after 1977. The percentage of urban population in 1961, 71, 81, 91 was 18.0, 19.9, 23.3, and 25.7 respectively. It might be that some constraints which prevented the correlation between the Number of Candidates and Urbanization from appearing had been removed or weakened after 1980, as a result of which the level of correlation has been much improved. Again we should point out the impact of the Emergency and the formation of the Janata Party, which, in a sense, removed or weakened social constraints hitherto hindering potential political activism among various social groups from coming to the surface.
Scheduled Tribes

The next important variable is the percentage of the ST population in and after the 1980 election. The area with more ST population have shown a lesser number of candidates, especially so in the 1989 and 91 election. As in the case of Voter’s Turnout, it can be said that the ST people have a tendency to refrain from political participation as candidates. It is important that it is in and after the 1980 election that the ST population has emerged as a significant variable, the basic reason for which might be the same as in the case of Urbanization. Namely, the differential impacts of the Emergency for the ST people and the people other than ST. The ST people have been politically less activated by the impact of the Emergency than general population, which clearly have resulted in a lesser number of candidates among ST people.

Agricultural Productivity

It appears to be somewhat strange that the variable of agricultural productivity, that is, the value of yield of 41 main crops per hectare, has been showing a negative correlation in the 1967, 84, and after the 84 election. It means that the agriculturally more developed area has shown a less diffusive tendency in the party-people interface, especially in and after the 1984 election. Or it could be that a less prosperous area has tended to produce more candidates in the elections after 1984. It might be that agricultural stagnation would incline to lead to discontent with politics not only in the rural area but also in the urban area. The tendency is clear and consistent in and after the 1984 election. It can be said that political discontent resulting from economic stagnation has come to light more easily in the politicized atmosphere in and after the 1984 election in the form of more candidates per constituency.

Electoral Variables

The most remarkable aspect of electoral variables in explaining the number of candidates is the fact that the variables of percentage
votes obtained by parties always correlates negatively with the number of candidates. There is no exception. That is, the more popular parties are in a constituency, the fewer candidates the constituency tends to have. Among parties, Congress had been the most important party till the 1984 election in restraining the diffusive tendency of the party-people interface. It was especially so in the 67 and 77 elections when F values show as high as 57 and 54 respectively. The second important party was Janata Party in 1977 according to the F value. Two major parties, that is, Janata Party and Congress, showed a strong restraining effect against the diffusive tendency of the party-people interface in 1977, which, in other words, meant that the 1977 election was fought in a severe tension between the two major parties, which led to a decreasing number of candidates.

Concerning other parties, the percentage votes gotten by Jangh Sangh from the 1962 to the 1971 election, and the new Janata Party in 1980 which was left by Lok Dal led by Charan Singh, and the most important unit of which was Jangh Sangh, were significant in restraining the diffusive tendency. Thus the Jangh Sangh factor also had shown a restraining effect though its effectiveness was, by and large, lower compared to that of Congress. The same thing can be said for the Communist Parties combined (CPI plus CPI(M)) in 1980.

Voter’s Turnout was also important in 1957, 62, and 71, showing a positive correlation with the number of candidates. It can be said that the participatory tendency of candidates and the electorate were correlated with each other, which might have been concealed by other influential independent variables after 1977.

Finally it has been very clear that after 1984 the diffusive tendency of the party-people interface has not been restrained by any major party, which has been a basic cause contributing to the higher level of fluidity of the party coalition after 1989.\textsuperscript{42}
Table 5  Variables Explaining the Number of Candidates per Constituency-Stepwise Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>57</th>
<th>62</th>
<th>67</th>
<th>71</th>
<th>77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRC F Sg</td>
<td>PRC F Sg</td>
<td>PRC F Sg</td>
<td>PRC F Sg</td>
<td>PRC F Sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>-1.616</td>
<td>25.6 **</td>
<td>1.1535</td>
<td>15.9 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU</td>
<td>0.0133</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0303</td>
<td>53.0 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KA</td>
<td>-1.402</td>
<td>12.4 **</td>
<td>1.5017</td>
<td>36.9 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.8943</td>
<td>38.2 **</td>
<td>0.6359</td>
<td>8.7 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>0.6867</td>
<td>8.9 **</td>
<td>2.0516</td>
<td>81.6 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>0.7477</td>
<td>32.2 **</td>
<td>0.3346</td>
<td>18.8 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>0.0143</td>
<td>6.5 **</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>27.7 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>0.0126</td>
<td>6.9 **</td>
<td>0.0199</td>
<td>10.7 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>33.0 **</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>21.6 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>0.6867</td>
<td>8.9 **</td>
<td>2.0516</td>
<td>81.6 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>0.7477</td>
<td>32.2 **</td>
<td>0.3346</td>
<td>18.8 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>3.1709</td>
<td>3244.5 **</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>96.4 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con*t</td>
<td>0.3135</td>
<td>0.5527</td>
<td>0.5119</td>
<td>0.4677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R2 | 0.3135 | 0.5527 | 0.5119 | 0.4677 | 0.4668 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>80</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRC F Sg</td>
<td>PRC F Sg</td>
<td>PRC F Sg</td>
<td>PRC F Sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>4.8191</td>
<td>38.6 **</td>
<td>5.4987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU</td>
<td>4.4574</td>
<td>18.7 **</td>
<td>11.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KA</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>9.3 **</td>
<td>2.5721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KE</td>
<td>2.6741</td>
<td>27.2 **</td>
<td>2.0918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.4266</td>
<td>33.5 **</td>
<td>2.9097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>3.8981</td>
<td>51.3 **</td>
<td>6.9612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>47.3 **</td>
<td>0.5378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>0.1117</td>
<td>69.4 **</td>
<td>0.1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>4.5 **</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>0.1117</td>
<td>69.4 **</td>
<td>0.1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>31.9 **</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>0.0549</td>
<td>18042.2 **</td>
<td>3.9174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con*t</td>
<td>0.5682</td>
<td>0.6152</td>
<td>0.6309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 Abbreviation: “PRC” = Partial Regression Coefficient, “F” = F Value, “Sg” = Level of Statistical Significance (“**” = Significant at 1% level, “*” = Significant at 5% level), “dC” = residual variable of Number of Candidates per Constituency in previous election which is not explained by the original independent variables in the previous election, “Con’t” = Constant.
2 Number of samples is 259 in all the cases above.
3 Strict comparison of the regression in the 1957 election with others is not possible.
Concluding Observation

The comparison of the Tables 4 and 5 reveals an interesting contrast between the Voter's Turnout and the Number of Candidates. The former is more closely correlated with independent variables examined in this study than the latter. The $R^2$ of the former ranges from 0.83 to 0.89 during the period from 1957 to 1991 while the latter ranges from 0.46 to 0.67. In addition, the level of the continuity from election to election was much higher in the case of Voter's Turnout, which is apparent when comparing the F value of $dV$ and that of $dC$. In these two points, the former is more linked to society and polity and more stable than the latter.

Although the Voter's Turnout has been more closely correlated to society and polity, the nature of the correlation has changed election by election. The most important change occurred in 1977, after which and till 1984 a socio-political situation peculiar to the States became less reflected in the Voter's Turnout. At the same time, issues and events in the center seemed to have captured people's minds more firmly than in other periods. After the 1989 election the particular socio-political situation in each State became important again, even more important compared to the period before 1977.

The Number of Candidates have been less linked to society and polity. But it is clear that the level of linkage has become higher after the 1977 election, which is apparent if we compare the $R^2$ before and after the 1977 election. It means that the basic socio-economic or political structure has been more directly reflected in the party system after 1977 through a more diffusive party-people interface. The event leading to such a situation was the Emergency in 1975 and the resultant Lok Sabha election in 1977. Such major political events, in turn, have brought central political issues more closely to the people and accelerated the socio-political process which has diffused the party-people interface further. The Table 6 is a summarization of major trends of party-people interface and the participation of the electorate. The period between 1957 and
1967 was a period for a lower level of Voter’s Turnout (see Table 1), and therefore distinguished from other periods.

In the 90’s, many scholars have started to discuss the diffusive and centrifugal tendency of Indian politics. Such a trend can be said to be confirmed in this quantitative study using the Lok Sabha election data, besides other fact-finding. If State-oriented political participation together with highly diffusive party-people interface is a basic trend in and after the 1990’s, the logical conclusion will be the strengthening of the State level parties and a fluid and unstable party system in the center, which seems to be emerging as the actual situation.43)

**Table 6** Party-People Interface and the Participation of the Electorate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of diffusion</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of socio-political linkage</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of electorate</td>
<td>Center-State orientation</td>
<td>State oriented</td>
<td>State oriented</td>
<td>Center oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes


5) In July 1995, while querying officials of the Ministry of Agriculture it became apparent that even the Ministry in New Delhi could not provide such a data set which was comparable with each other for over 20 years. Virtually, it was only Bhalla’s study which is available for my study.

6) For % of Voter’s Turnout, it is: (% of Voter’s Turnout for general seat + % of Voter’s Turnout for Scheduled Castes’ or Scheduled Tribes’ seat) / 2 ; For number
of candidates, it is: Number of candidates for general seat + Number of candidates for Scheduled Castes' or Scheduled Tribes' seat. The double-member constituency (general seat plus SCs' or STs' seat) was approximately twice as large as that of single-member constituency. Therefore, the ratio of the number of the candidates for both seats combined against the number of the electorate is expected to be at the same level as that of the single-member constituency. This consistency might be important when examining the data-set including both single and double member constituencies.

7) The Representation of the People Acts (43 of 1950 and 43 of 1951) Article 13 D of Part II.

8) Election Commission of India 1957; Election Commission of India 1967; Election Commission of India 1976.

9) These figures for the criterion, 0.01 and 5 times, were adopted from the following; Chatterjee, S. and B. Price 1977, chapter 9, section 9.

10) Even in the 1950s or 60s it might be the rule rather than the exception that grass-root level support for Congress among people changed election by election corresponding to changes in local politics centering on factions, castes, communities etc. The fluidity of grass-roots level support for Congress seemed to be related to the tendency of "group-voting," in which a vote-leader such as a caste or community leader had a great influence on his followers. Such a vote-leader could multiple the fluctuation of votes polled by party thereby accelerating changes in the voter's preference. See for example, Weiner, M. and Kothari, R. (ed.) 1965; Indian Council of Social Science Research 1972.


16) Concerning this point see, Weiner, Myron 1967.

17) Concerning this see, Manor, J. 1988.

18) Generally, the inclusion of an independent variable which is basically not relevant in explaining a dependent variable might cause to a skewing of partial regression coefficients of other independent variables which is really relevant in explaining the dependent variables. Therefore, the inclusion of too many variables is not desirable.

19) "dV" is defined as follows;

\[ V_i = a + bX_i + cY_i + dZ_i + res_i \]

\[ dV = res_i \]

Where, "Vi" is % of Voter's Turnout in "i" year; "Xi", "Yi", and "Zi" are independent variables in "i" year selected in the stepwise regression; "a" is a constant in the regression; "b", "c", and "d" are partial regression coefficients for each independent variable; "resi" is the residual in the "i" year. This dV is to be included as the independent variable and examined in a stepwise regression for "j" year's data, in which "j" is the year of the next election to the "i" year's election.
20) Concerning the agitation see for example, Brass, P. R. 1974: Part IV.
22) Concerning the agitation see for example, Innaiah, I. 1986: pp. 101-122.
23) Concerning this see for example, Frankel, F. 1978: pp. 341-87.
27) For example, suppose that the result of the stepwise regression is the equation below;
\[ V = a + bS1 + cS2 + dS3 + eX + fY + \text{res} \]
where, “V” is % of Voter’s Turnout; “a” is constant; “b”, “c”, “d”, “e”, and “f” are partial regression coefficients for each independent variable selected; “S1”, “S2” and “S3” are State dummy variables; “X” and “Y” are independent variables selected other than State dummy variables; and “res” is the residual.
Then “Stt” is defined as follows;
\[ \text{Stt} = 100 \left( \frac{G1 + G2 + G3}{G\text{all}} \right) \]
where, “Gall” is all the variation of “V”; “G1”, “G2” and “G3” are part of the variations of “V” explained “purely” by the State dummy variables, “S1”, “S2” and “S3” respectively in the given set of independent variables in the equation. Gi (i = 1, 2 and 3) is defined as follows;
\[ Gi = FiK \] (i = 1, 2 and 3)
where, “Fi” is F-value for each State dummy variable; and “K” is the variance of the “res”.
28) Opinion poll conducted just before the 1984 General Election revealed the widespread psychological impact of Mrs. Gandhi’s assassination all over India. In the poll, 47% of respondents (11,297 persons) answered that “National integration” was the most important issue. The prevalence of such a sense of political crisis all over India was quite unusual in ordinary times, which could lead to the situation that the electorate tended to vote for Congress all over India uniformly. See, India Today, December 31, 1984.
29) The era of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi was often characterized as an era of political centralization. Her frequent interventions in State politics might be an important factor promoting such intermingling. But at the same time, it would become apparent later that such frequent interventions and the resultant erosion of Congress organization in the States lead to severe repercussions from the electorate in the States. See for example, Brass, P. R. 1982.
30) The result of “Stt” for 1989 and 1991 elections are not surprising because of the two mutually related factors. One is that the increasing tendency of fragmentation or growth of regional parties in the party system. And the other is that no longer there has been any truly national character, like Mrs. Indira Gandhi, who can be a centripetal political force after 1984. See for example, Hardgrave, R. L., Jr. 1993.
31) Literacy in 1957 was not strictly comparable though the importance of literacy can not be denied when we look at the F value.
32) Literacy rates for 1951, 61, and 71 relate to those who were aged 5 years and above, while the rates for 1981 and 91 relate to the population aged 7 years above accord-
ing the definition of population census in each year. Figures for 1951, 61, 71, and 81 are from, Bose, A., 1991: Figure for 1991 is from, Office of the Registrar General and Census Commissioner, Census of India 1991-Primary Census Abstract-General Population (Series-1, Part II-B (i), Volume-I), Manager (Government of India), Delhi, 1994, pp. 10–12.

33) Some studies insisted that urban turnout was generally higher. But it was quite unsatisfactory not to identify the factor contributing to such a pattern. See for example, Weiner, M. and J. O. Field 1977: p. 44. The higher turnout in urban areas may be attributable to other factors. Among the other factors, literacy might be quite important. The literacy in rural and urban area are; 19.0% and 47.0% in 1961, 23.7% and 52.4% in 1971, 29.7% and 57.4% in 1981, and 36.6% and 61.7% in 1991 respectively (these percentages are for the total population). Generally, the higher turnout in urban areas might be attributable to the literacy or other independent variables, but not the urbanization, the real effect of which would be to the contrary.

34) Concerning this see, for example, Bose, P. K. 1990.
35) Concerning the impact of Rajiv Gandhi’s assassination, see Kondo, Norio 1993.
38) See, for example, Mayer, P. 1982: pp. 36–39.
40) The residual portion of the dependent variable (Number of Candidates), that is, the portion remaining after subtraction of the portion which can be explained by independent variables except the Value of Yield per hectare was plotted against the Value of Yield per hectare in a graph to find out the correlation between the residual and the Value of Yield per hectare and to check the randomness of the distribution. The result still show clear negative correlation and randomness of the distribution, which means that the most probably the negative partial correlation of the Value of Yield per hectare with the Number of Candidates was not spurious.
41) Some studies reported the tendency of a decrease in votes polled by ruling party when economic performance under the ruling party had deteriorated. See Meyer, R. C. and D. S. Malcolm 1993. Generally, economic deterioration might lead to some kind of symptom of political discontent. The increasing number of candidates in economically backward areas may be one such symptom.
42) Concerning this see, Kohli, A. 1990.
43) The rapid growth of the Bharatiya Janata Party after 1989 is considered to be closely related to such fluidity of the party system. See, Kondo op cit. and Malik, Y. K. and V. B. Singh 1994: pp. 179–213.
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