

# Assessment of Conflicts at Village Panchayaths in Karnataka

Dr Chethan S<sup>1</sup>, Dr Yathish Chendra<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, Dept of MBA, VTU

<sup>2</sup>M S Associate Professor, Dept of MBA, VTU

**Abstract:** *The Paper through a light on disagreement factors from various dimension in Village Panchayaths in Karnataka. Multi stage sampling method has been employed. The outcome of the information is cross tabulated with demographic factors to understand the factors from various dimensions. The study has few interesting outcomes and one such is marital status of the respondents play a role in disagreement between public with elected members.*

**Keywords:** Disagreement, Conflict, Panchayath Raj Act, Panchayaths, Village Panchayaths, Village Republics.

## 1. Originality

The current research Paper analyses the disagreement factors in Panchayaths in Karnataka. To ensure that the Panchayaths to function effectively and independently, it is important to identify the impeding factors. One such factor is to assess the level of disagreement. With these objective variables are constructed and cross tabulation is administered to analyse from various dimensions, to this extent the Paper is significant.

## 2. Background

Gandhiji's visualisation on the Indian village system is 360 perspectives. Gandhiji said that he liked to lead his life in villages. He views the real India presence is in the villages (Sharma, 1987). In his view, the villages were referred to as republics, having all, they can find within themselves. Gandhiji felt that, over time, the village community could build its required strength and solidarity, can contribute significant interpersonal connections to empower a feeling of social obligation and the spirit of cooperation, and act as a nursery of civic virtue (Sharma, 1987).

Further, Gandhiji intends to make the individuals as the centre of local administration. Rural people were expected to participate in large number to discuss and find suitable solutions of local concerned and common interests viz production of agriculture and industries, irrigation projects and planning (Sharma, 1987).

## 3. Introduction

Gokhale's definition is emphasised on the elective, i.e., democratic character of the system, whereas in Venkataraingaiya's case an attempt made to provide extensive coverage, i.e., a well - defined administrative unit electing its representative and having the power to raise revenue to meet the essential services. From the above definitions, it is clear that the authors stressed two essential characteristics, that is, autonomy and representation of local self - government. It is difficult to conceptualise this institution without understanding the thoughts of Gandhiji, known as the Father of Nation. Framers of the Constitution

adopted the Gandhian Philosophy in the Indian Constitution as part of the Directive Principles of States Policy in PART IV.

Panchayath Raj Institution was first implemented at Rajasthan after the recommendations of Balwanth Rai Mehta committee. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru inaugurated Independent India's early Panchayath Raj Institution on 2nd October 1959 at Nagaur (Ambardar, 2006). Jawaharlal Nehru applauded the system as one of the revolutionary and historic footsteps in India. He decided to strengthen Panchayath Raj from the lower level. He expressed his similar sentiments towards inaugurating the new Panchayath Raj at Shad Nagar, about 80 km from Hyderabad (Andhra Pradesh) nine days later; Assam followed it, Tamil Nadu and Karnataka in 1960, Maharashtra in 1962, Gujarat and West Bengal in 1963 and 1964 respectively.

From the date of implementation, the Panchayath Raj institutions are receiving more autonomy. The only intention behind is to make these institutions self - reliant. They should be able to function as independent government at Village level. But the objective is not yet realised completely. Hence this current research paper is trying to identify any disagreement exists between the Public and Personals of the Panchayath. Thus, trying to identify the impeding factors of the Panchayath from this dimension.

## 4. Methodology

The study aims at recognising and analysing the conflict management at Panchayaths.

### 4.1 Objectives

Identify the level of disagreement among the personals of Village Panchayath. Assess the conflict management and make suitable suggestions in Village Panchayaths.

#### 4.1.1 Research Questions

Is there any disagreement exists among stake holders of Panchayaths.

Volume 10 Issue 6, June 2021

[www.ijsr.net](http://www.ijsr.net)

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

## 4.2 Research Design

The study is descriptive - analytical (Bowling, 2014) and the study is conducted in the State of Karnataka.

### 4.2.1 Research Gap

The literature review revealed that substantial study has undertaken in this area on the efficiency of Panchayath Raj Institutions (PRI) and Local Governance Organizations (LGO). However, the relative research has not been found with respective of identifying and analyzing the disagreement factors. Further, similar kind of study has not



### 4.2.3.2 Sample Design

At the first stage, based on the convenient sampling method, the researcher had chosen Karnataka for the study to identify impeding factors, which cause obstacles for Village Panchayath to act as genuine self - government.

The state of Karnataka divided into four administrative divisions, 30 districts, and 6022 Village Panchayaths for Administrative convenience. At this level, two Panchayaths selected from every district based on a purposive method of sampling considering the Highest and Least Income revenue generated Village Panchayaths in each district.

At the second stage, out of 60 Village Panchayaths, 08 Panchayaths had considered; four each from highest and least Income revenue generated Village Panchayaths for the study based on quota sampling method to ensure equal representation from all the four administrative divisions respectively.

Finally, 100 respondents from 8 selected Village Panchayaths were interviewed based on simple random sampling.

### 4.2.3.3 Sampling Frame

The sampling frame for the proposed study is the List of Districts and administrative divisions from the Department of Revenue and List of Village Panchayaths from the Department of RDPR.

Focus Group for the study were

- 1) Government officials in Village Panchayath - PDO'S and Secretaries.
- 2) Group - D Employees.
- 3) Elected Members of the Panchayaths.

## 4.3 Source of Data

The research depends on both Primary and Secondary data sources.

### 4.3.1 Primary Data

The present study mainly depends on primary data and to mobilise primary data, survey - through structured questionnaires and discussions had adopted. The interview

been undertaken in the region of Karnataka. Hence, this study tries to fill this gap and address the related issue.

### 4.2.2 Study Area

The area of the present study is limited to the State of Karnataka. However, the outcome of the research would be applied broadly for any other part of India.

### 4.2.3 Sampling

Multistage stratified sampling had employed to select 100 random samples for the study.

#### 4.2.3.1 Sampling Framework

schedules prepared specially for the study and pre - tested for their validity and reliability.

### 4.3.2 Secondary Data

The extensive literature review had undertaken. It includes records available with the Village Panchayath, government agencies, previous works, related books, official sources, and other publications like journals, periodicals, newspapers, books and in - house journals, which mentioned in the appendix and reference.

## 4.4 Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire is an essential instrument for this research, and the same has prepared considering the research objectives and research questions with the help of Nominal scale The questionnaire was prepared to collect the data from executives, and non - executives of Village Panchayath, elected members and the heads of the Panchayaths.

In the initial stage, nearly 50 questions were prepared on considering the various variables and the same had scrutinised at several stages, and the experts had contacted to verify the draft questionnaire, which was in close - ended nature for quantitative analysis, prepared for the survey.

### 4.4.1 Validation of the Questionnaire

The following steps were adopted to test the validity of the questionnaire.

- 1) Face Validity
- 2) Pilot test.
- 3) Clean Dataset.
- 4) Reliability Test

#### 4.4.1.1 Pilot Study

Identify variables of interest and decide how to operationalise each one and also to check the methodology, a Pilot Study was conducted for 30 samples drawn randomly in the Village Panchayath of Kakkargolla.

#### 4.4.1.2 Time Framework

The table below mentions the significant activities and the time duration that was taken approximately to undertake the study.

Particulars	Duration
Literature Review	4 Weeks
Research Methodology Design	4 Weeks
Data Collection Tools	2 Weeks
Pilot Study	2 Weeks
Conduction of Survey	8 Weeks
Analysis	2 Weeks
Article writing	2 Weeks

#### 4.5 Major Hypothesis

Hypothesis
<b>Ho:</b> Disagreement between elected members with executives is not connected with the disagreement among the non - executives. <b>H1:</b> Disagreement between elected members with executives is connected with the disagreement among the non - executives.
<b>Ho:</b> Economical status of the personals of the Panchayath is not related with disagreement among the elected members. <b>H1:</b> Economical status of the personals of the Panchayath is related with disagreement among the elected members.
<b>Ho:</b> Martial status of the personals of the Panchayath are not affecting on the disagreement between Public with Elected members. <b>H1:</b> Martial status of the personals of the Panchayath are affecting on the disagreement between Public with Elected members.
<b>Ho:</b> Disagreement between Public with Elected members are not making an impact on the disagreement between public with executives. <b>H1:</b> Disagreement between Public with Elected members are making an impact on the disagreement between public with executives.
<b>Ho:</b> Disagreement between Public with Elected members are not affecting on the disagreement between public with non - executives. <b>H1:</b> Disagreement between Public with Elected members are affecting on the disagreement between public with non - executives.

#### 4.6 Statistical Techniques used

Data collected from the respondents were processed and analysed by employing both descriptive and analytical statistics. Appropriate statistical tools like Central tendency techniques, Correlation analysis been adopted for the analysis purpose. MS Excel and SPSS - version 17 for quantitative analysis.

The researcher has also used conceptual theories, which are mainly developed in Schools of management viz SWOC analysis, PEST analysis, VRIO analysis, '5 Whys' model, SERVQUAL and Six - Box Model to analyses the system.

#### 4.7 Hypothesis Result

Hypothesis	Significance	Result
<b>Ho:</b> Disagreement between elected members with executives is not connected with the disagreement among the non - executives.	0.084	Accepted
<b>Ho:</b> Economical status of the personals of the Panchayath is not related with disagreement among the elected members.	0.045	Rejected
<b>Ho:</b> Martial status of the personals of the Panchayath are not affecting on the disagreement between Public with Elected	0.015	Rejected

members.		
<b>Ho:</b> Disagreement between Public with Elected members are not making an impact on the disagreement between public with executives.	0.047	Rejected
<b>Ho:</b> Disagreement between Public with Elected members are not affecting on the disagreement between public with non - executives.	0.029	Rejected

#### 4.8 Analysis

##### 4.8.1 Variable Analysis

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.765	6

The table (Reliability Statistics) shows that reliability score indicates that the questionnaire is having good internal consistency and can be adoptable for research.

##### 4.8.2 Elected members with executives

Executives			
		Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	22.3	22.3
	No	74.5	96.8
	Can't Say	3.2	100.0
	Total	100.0	

The table (Executives) shows that **74.5 %** of the respondents mentioned that the disagreement is not common between elected members with executives.

##### 4.8.3 Among the elected members

Among Members			
		Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	22.3	22.3
	No	77.7	100.0
	Total	100.0	

The table (Among Members) indicates that **77.7%** of the respondents mentioned that the disagreement is not common among elected members.

##### 4.8.4 Among non - executives

Among non - executives			
		Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	1.1	1.1
	No	98.9	100.0
	Total	100.0	

The table (Among non - executives) indicates that **98.9%** of the respondents mentioned that the disagreement is not common among the non - executives.

##### 4.8.5 Public with elected members

Elected members			
		Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	58.5	58.5
	No	41.5	100.0
	Total	100.0	

The table (Elected members) explains that 58.5% of the respondents have accepted that the disagreement is very common between public with elected members.

Age * Elected members Crosstabulation				
% of Total				
		Elected members		Total
		Yes	No	
Age	18-30		2.1%	2.1%
	31-40	18.1%	14.9%	33.0%
	41-50	25.5%	12.8%	38.3%
	51-60	12.8%	10.6%	23.4%
	60 and above	2.1%	1.1%	3.2%
Total		58.5%	41.5%	100.0%

The table (Age \* Elected members Crosstabulation) explains that 58.5% of respondents have accepted the disagreement is common between public with elected members. In that the 25.5% of the respondents who falls in the age group between 41 - 50 which is comparatively higher rate with respondents who falls different level of age groups also concurred the same.

Position * Elected members Crosstabulation					
% of Total					
			Elected members		Total
			Yes	No	
Position	Staff	% within Position	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	5.3%	6.4%	11.7%
	Member	% within Position	64.6%	35.4%	100.0%
		% of Total	44.7%	24.5%	69.1%
	Secretary	% within Position	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	1.1%	3.2%	4.3%
	PDO	% within Position	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	3.2%	3.2%	6.4%
	President	% within Position	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	4.3%	4.3%	8.5%
Total		% within Position	58.5%	41.5%	100.0%
		% of Total	58.5%	41.5%	100.0%

The table (Position \* Elected members Crosstabulation) indicates within the Positions, 64.6% of the elected members accepted that there is a disagreement between public with elected members. This is the highest percentage comparatively among the other positions participated.

Education * Elected members Crosstabulation				
% of Total				
		Elected members		Total
		Yes	No	
Education	Primary Education	6.4%	7.4%	13.8%
	Secondary Education	36.2%	12.8%	48.9%
	Higher Secondary	10.6%	12.8%	23.4%
	Degree	5.3%	8.5%	13.8%
Total		58.5%	41.5%	100.0%

The table (Education \* Elected members Crosstabulation) shows that comparatively among those who accepted the variable as yes, 36.2% of the respondents who has secondary education accepted that there is a disagreement between Public with Elected members.

4.8.6 Public with non - executives

Non - executives			
		Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	61.7	61.7
	No	38.3	100.0
	Total	100.0	

The Table (Non - executives) indicates that 61.7% of the respondents have accepted that the disagreement is very common between public with non – executives

Age * Non - executives Crosstabulation				
% of Total				
		Non - executives		Total
		Yes	No	
Age	18-30		2.10%	2.10%
	31-40	20.20%	12.80%	33.00%
	41-50	23.40%	14.90%	38.30%
	51-60	14.90%	8.50%	23.40%
	60 and above	3.20%		3.20%
Total		61.70%	38.30%	100.00%

The table (Age \* Non - executives Cross tabulation) indicates that the 23.4% of the respondents who falls in the age group between 41 - 50 which is comparatively higher rate compare to respondents who falls at different level of age groups, opted disagreement common between public with non - executives.

Position * Non - executives Crosstabulation						
% of Total						
			Non - executives		Total	
			Yes	No		
Position	Staff	% within Position	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%	
		% of Total	5.3%	6.4%	11.7%	
	Member	% within Position	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%	
		% of Total	51.1%	18.1%	69.1%	
	Secretary	% within Position	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%	
		% of Total	1.1%	3.2%	4.3%	
	PDO	% within Position	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%	
		% of Total	1.1%	5.3%	6.4%	
	President	% within Position	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%	
		% of Total	3.2%	5.3%	8.5%	
	Total		% within Position	61.7%	38.3%	100.0%
			% of Total	61.7%	38.3%	100.0%

The Table (Position \* Non - executives Crosstabulation) shows that within the position 73.8% of the elected members accepted that there is a disagreement between public with non - executives. This is the highest percentage comparatively among the other positions participated. But comparatively with in the positions 54.5%, 75% and 83.3% of the staff, secretary and PDO mentioned that there is no disagreement between public with non - executives. So form this, it can be interpret as either members have observed the disagreement with employees of the Panchayath or members have perceived that discussion between public with non - executives as disagreement. Even it can also interpret in this manner where Elected members may be the reason for the disagreement happening between public with non - executives so to avoid self - identification they might have mentioned as no disagreement. The similar kind of analysis will be applicable for the table (Public with executives) which indicates the disagreement with position vs public and executives.



Marital Status * Non - executives Crosstabulation				
% of Total				
		Non - executives		Total
		Yes	No	
Marital Status	Married	60.6%	35.1%	95.7%
	Unmarried	1.1%	3.2%	4.3%
Total		61.7%	38.3%	100.0%

The table (Marital Status \* Non - executives Crosstabulation) exhibits that interestingly very less percentage i. e. only 1.1% of the unmarried respondents accepted that there is a disagreement between public with non - executives.

**4.8.7 Public with executives**

Public with executives			
		Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	60.6	60.6
	No	39.4	100.0
Total		100.0	

The table (Public with executives) indicates that 60.6% of the respondents have accepted that the disagreement is very common between public with executives.

Age * Public with executives Cross tabulation, % of Total				
		Public with executives		Total
		Yes	No	
Age	18-30		2.1%	2.1%
	31-40	20.2%	12.8%	33.0%
	41-50	22.3%	16.0%	38.3%
	51-60	14.9%	8.5%	23.4%
	60 and above	3.2%		3.2%
Total		60.6%	39.4%	100.0%

The Table (Age \* Public with executives Crosstabulation) identifies that the 22.3% of the respondents who falls in the age group between 41 - 50 which is comparatively higher rate with respondents who falls at different level of age groups mentioned for disagreement is common between public with executives.

Position * Public with executives Crosstabulation					
			Public with executives		Total
			Yes	No	
Staff	% within Position	36.40%	63.60%	100.00%	
	% of Total	4.30%	7.40%	11.70%	
Member	% within Position	73.80%	26.20%	100.00%	
	% of Total	51.10%	18.10%	69.10%	
Secretary	% within Position	25.00%	75.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	1.10%	4.30%		
PDO	% within Position	50.00%	50.00%	100.00%	
	% of Total	3.20%	3.20%	6.40%	
President	% within Position	12.50%	87.50%	100.00%	
	% of Total	1.10%	7.40%	8.50%	
Total	% within Position	60.60%	39.40%	100.00%	
	% of Total	60.60%	39.40%	100.00%	

The table (Position \* Public with executives Crosstabulation) explains that within the position 63.6% of the staff and 75% of the secretary of the Panchayath opted for there is no disagreement between Public with executives, in other side 73.8% of the elected members mentioned as there is a disagreement.

Education * Public with executives Crosstabulation				
% of Total				
		Public with executives		Total
		Yes	No	
Education	Primary Education	12.80%	1.10%	13.80%
	Secondary Education	35.10%	13.80%	48.90%
	Higher Secondary	9.60%	13.80%	23.40%
	Degree	3.20%	10.60%	13.80%
Total		60.60%	39.40%	100.00%

The table (Education \* Public with executives Crosstabulation) indicates that comparatively among those who opted as yes, 35.1% of the respondents who has secondary education accepted that public and executives will have disagreement.

Marital Status * Elected members Crosstabulation				
% of Total				
		Elected members		Total
		Yes	No	
Marital Status	Married	58.50%	37.20%	95.70%
	Unmarried	NIL	4.30%	4.30%
Total		58.50%	41.50%	100.00%

The table (Marital Status \* Elected members Crosstabulation) explains that interestingly none of the unmarried respondents accepted that there is a disagreement between public with elected members.

**5. Findings**

- 1) 77% of the respondents mentioned that the disagreement is not common among elected members.
- 2) 98.9% of the respondents mentioned that the disagreement is not common among the non - executives.
- 3) 58.5% of the respondents have accepted that the disagreement is very common between public with elected members.
- 4) Majority of the elected members, themselves accepted that there is a disagreement between public with elected members.
- 5) 61.7% of the respondents have accepted that the disagreement is very common between public with non - executives.
- 6) Comparatively in common and in majority, the respondents who opted as yes for the presence of disagreement are falls in the age group of 41 to 50.
- 7) 73.8% of the elected members accepted that there is a disagreement between public with non - executives and also public with executives.
- 8) 60.6% of the respondents have accepted that the disagreement is very common between public with executives.
- 9) Comparatively the personals who appointed by the government have mentioned that there is no disagreement between public with non - executives and also public with executives.
- 10) None of the unmarried respondents accepted that there is a disagreement between public with elected members.
- 11) Disagreement between elected members with executives is not connected with the disagreement among the non - executives.

- 12) Economical status of the personals of the Panchayath is related with disagreement among the elected members.
- 13) Marital status of the personals of the Panchayath are affecting on the disagreement between Public with Elected members.
- 14) Disagreement between Public with Elected members are making an impact on the disagreement between public with executives.
- 15) Disagreement between Public with Elected members are affecting on the disagreement between public with non - executives.

**6. Suggestions and Conclusion**

- 1) The personals of the Panchayath should work efficiently to earn the confidence of the Villagers.
- 2) The Panchayath should deliver basic services appropriately to the Public to improve the relationship with Public.
- 3) The Government and the Panchayath should organise the awareness campaign to villagers to understand the limitations of the Panchayath.
- 4) Most of the elected members are belongs to BPL (Below Poverty Line) status. Hence the government should conduct an inclusive programme to help the elected members to move from BPL status to APL (Above Poverty Line).

Disagreement leads to conflict and ineffective conflict management act as an impeding factor for the Panchayaths to function effectively. Hence it was essential to identify where does the disagreement presence. In the research its found that there is no conflict among the personals of the Panchayath. But there is a presence of disagreement exists between public with personals of the Panchayath. It needs to be address to ensure better coordination between Panchayath and Public.

**References**

- [1] Aiyar, M. S. (2010). Local government in India and China. *Brown J. World Aff.*, 17, 221.
- [2] Deepali P Karmali (2006), O. G. Panchayath Finance in Goa Panchayath Finance in Goa.
- [3] Bowling, A. (2014). *Research methods in health: investigating health and health services*. McGraw - hill Education (UK).
- [4] Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of psychology*.
- [5] Robson, W. A. (1953). Local government in Encyclopedia of Social Science, p 574.
- [6] Sharma, M. L. (1987). *Gandhi and democratic*

- decentralisation in India*. South Asia Books), - pp. .1307 - 1308.
- [7] SomAmbardar, Public Administration in India, New Delhi: Dominant Publishers and Distributors, 2006, p.251.
- [8] Teets, J. C. (2013). Let many civil societies bloom: The rise of consultative authoritarianism in China. *The China Quarterly*, 213, 19 - 38.
- [9] The World Bank. (2000/01). World Development Report: Attacking Poverty. Washington D. C.: The World Bank.
- [10] The World Bank. (2000b). Overview of Rural Decentralization in India: Volume I. Washington D. C.: The World Bank.
- [11] Tiebout, C. M. (1956). A pure theory of local expenditures. *Journal of political economy*, 64 (5), 416 - 424.
- [12] Venkatarangaiya, M., & Pattabhiram, M. (1969). *Local government in India: select readings*. Allied Publishers.
- [13] Von Hippel, E. (2005). Democratizing innovation: Users take Centre stage.
- [14] Warner, M. E., & Hefetz, A. (2008). Managing markets for public service: the role of mixed public - private delivery of city services. *Public administration review*, 68 (1), 155 - 166.
- [15] Warren, M. E. (1995). *The self in discursive democracy*. na.
- [16] Weber, M., Gerth, H. H., & Mills, C. W. (1946). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology: Essays in Sociology*. Oxford university press.
- [17] Wei, S. - J. (2000). *Natural Openness and Good Government*. Working Paper No.7765. Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- [18] Wilhelm, A. G. (2000). *Democracy in the digital age: Challenges to political life in cyberspace*. Routledge.
- [19] Yu, J., & Li, H. (2011). Community Civil Society Development and Social Management Innovation: A Case Study of Ningbo Haishu District. *Journal of Zhejiang Province Community Party School*, 40 - 46.
- [20] Yusifli, E. (2013). Impediments to Effective Decentralisation in Azerbaijan: The Problem of Competencies and Resources in Local Self - Government.
- [21] Zavestoski, S., Shulman, S., & Schlosberg, D. (2006). Democracy and the environment on the internet: electronic citizen participation in regulatory rulemaking. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 31 (4), 383 - 408.
- [22] Zerbinati, S., & Souitaris, V. (2005). Entrepreneurship in the public sector: a framework of analysis in European local governments. *Entrepreneurship & regional development*, 17 (1), 43 - 64.

**Appendix**

**Questionnaire**

Demographic Profile					
Gender	1) Male			2) Female	
Age	1) 18 - 30	2) 31 - 40	3) 41 - 50	4) 51 - 60	5) Above 60
Education	1) Primary Education			2) Secondary Education	
	3) Higher Secondary			4) Degree	
Marital Status	1) Married			2) Unmarried	

Designation	1) Executive	2) Non - Executive	3) Elected Members			
Position	1) Staff	2) Member	3) Secretary	4) PDO	5) President	
Social Category	A) SC		B) ST		C) OBC	D) General
Computer Literate	A) Yes		B) No			
Economic Status	A) BPL		B) APL			

Disagreements are frequent among the following participants of the PO are tabled below (Yes/No/Can't say)		
1	Elected members with executives	
2	Among the elected members.	
3	Among the non - executives.	
4	Public with elected members.	
5	Public with non - executives.	
6	Public with executives.	