Vital Stats

Activity of First-term, Young and Women MPs
Budget Session: July-August 2009

How often did first-term, young and women MPs participate in LS debates? How did participation cut across party lines? We attempt to answer these questions using data from the recently concluded Budget Session of Parliament.

Please note that in this analysis, we have excluded Ministers as they represent the Government.

Participation by first-term MPs was lower than average…

- First-term MPs form a significant section of each party (59% on average). At 81%, BSP has the highest proportion of such MPs.
- Each first-term MP participated in about 2.0 debates as compared to 2.5 for an average MP.
- For most parties, participation of such MPs was less than their more experienced colleagues. Though they form 59% of the strength of Lok Sabha, their participation in debates was 49%.

… as was that of young MPs…

- Young MPs from BJP were more active than their older colleagues.
- Their counterparts in INC, SP and BSP participated less than their party averages.

… and women MPs

- While women MPs constitute 11% of Lok Sabha, they recorded a participation of 8%.
- Across most parties, participation by women MPs was slightly lower than party average.
- Women MPs of BJP matched their male counterparts.
All three categories saw fewer proportion of MPs participating than average

- 76% of all MPs participated in debates.
- Among first-term MPs, participation was 73%, while it was 62% for young MPs and 67% for women MPs.

Notes:
1. All debates data was compiled from summaries of daily business of the Lok Sabha as contained in Bulletin I.
2. While calculating average number of debates per MP, we excluded Ministers from our consideration set.
3. Parties with total strength greater than 20 MPs have been shown in the graph above.
4. MPs below the age of 40 years were classified as “young MPs”.
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