

5.

ELECTIONS AND MEDIA: REGULATION OF OPINION POLLS

Aditi Choudhary¹

INTRODUCTION

Media plays one of the most potent and formidable roles in ensuring free, fair, peaceful and transparent elections. Its role as a watchdog is crucially beneficial to the effective conduct of fair and free elections. The efficient dissemination of information and awareness with regard to different aspects of the political parties, candidates and constituencies so involved, further make it an indispensable part in the process of elections. While primarily it functions to realize the electoral rights of the citizens thereby furthering their freedom of speech and expression; certain conflicting paradigms might arise. Opinion polls feature in one such zones of conflict between the electoral rights of the citizens, their freedom of speech and expression and the right to the freedom of the press. Globally, various approaches have been developed to tackle the conflict. This paper traces the conflict that forms the background of the legal debate regarding opinion polls, thereby suggesting innovative methods to resolve it efficiently.

OPINION POLLS: CONFLICTING PARADIGMS

Opinion polls refer to the pre-election surveys carried out to analyse the preferences of the voters. They have been identified as one of the pivotal instruments to enhance awareness of the citizens and encourage public debate on governance and coalescing public opinion.² On the one hand, some analysts argue about their importance as guides to the relative honesty of the elections,³ While on the other hand, in certain extreme instances, their significance has also been emphasised for the determination of gap

¹ Aditi Choudhary is a B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) student of West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences, Kolkata.

² Anand, Aarthi S., and Celia Joanne Jenkins, 'Exit Polls: Debating Freedom or Fairness', *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 39, No. 46/47, Nov. 20-26, 2004: 4971-4973.

³ Sudhanshu Ranjan quoting Dick Morris, a US political consultant, 'Why Ban Them?', *DECCAN HERALD* (Bangalore) available at <http://www.deccanherald.com/content/107515/why-ban-them.html> [accessed on: 29th October 2014].

between actual public opinion and the final electoral verdict, hence bringing to surface inconsistencies which may ultimately point towards the relative fairness of the elections.⁴

However, despite the significance of opinion polls as an important tool of the media to enhance the levels of fairness in the election process, they have been subjected to severe criticisms from different dimensions. It has been argued that such surveys may unduly influence a voter's decision making. Moreover, it has been consistently contended that these polls may be subject to manipulation at many levels, for instance, in the choice of questions, the choice of sample, and the time that these questions were asked, etc.⁵ While on one hand, it may end up reflecting a nonexistent public opinion trend in its results, this may also leave tremendous scope of interpretation for the analysts of the survey which may be subject to misuse. It is often perceived, therefore, that polls and projections may have a distorting effect on the vote, rather than simply reflecting public sentiments.⁶

Another major argument given against these polls is regarding their potential of affecting the voting behaviour, by influencing the independent decision-making by the voters and may prompt them to vote on external motivation of the polls. It may work either way: Herbert A (1954: 245-253) advances a voter may get motivated to vote for the candidate allegedly shown to be ahead according to the polls for psychological motivation of being on the winning side (bandwagon effect) and on the other hand, he may be sympathetically motivated to vote for the losing candidate (underdog effect).⁷ The direction of influence is insignificant. As such, Hennessy (1965) and Fleitas W. (1971: 434-438) argues that these polls might have an effect of hampering the independent decision-making process by the voters.⁸ These arguments have often

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Article 19 Organisation, Global Campaign for Free Expression, *Comparative Study of Laws and Regulations Restricting the Publication of Electoral Opinion Polls*, January 2003, available at www.article19.org/pdfs/publications/opinion-polls-paper.pdf [accessed on: 29th October 2014].

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Simon, Herbert A., 'Bandwagon and Underdog Effects and the Possibility of Election Predictions', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, XVIII (Fall, 1954), 245- 253, available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2745982> [accessed on: 29th October 2014].

⁸ See, Hennessy, Bernard C., *Public Opinion*, 141, Belmont, Wadsworth Publishing Co. Inc., California, 1965 as cited in Daniel W. Fleitas, 'Bandwagon and Underdog Effects in Minimal-Information Elections', *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 65, No. 2 Jun., 1971, at p. 434-438,

prompted many democratic countries across the globe to control, regulate and also in some cases ban such polls.⁹

Many of these arguments have held ground in India and have been instrumental in forming the current view about opinion polls both in the case of regulatory institutions as well as the civil society. After the major media highlight on this issue in 1999, it was surprising that the issue of opinion polls did not gain much focus in the National Commission to Review the Working of the Constitution (2001). The proposed electoral reforms by the Election Commission of India in 2004,¹⁰ however, identified the influencing potential of opinion polls and suggested that some regulatory mechanisms should be enforced in this regard. The report acknowledges that prohibition of opinion polls would be in contravention to Article 19 (1) of the Indian Constitution. As such, certain measures of information disclosure were suggested to regulate the use of such polls.

Subsequently in the Report of the Electoral Reforms Committee in 2010, the possibility of manipulation of opinion polls was reiterated. However, a stricter position was adhered during this time and prohibition of conduct and need to publish of the opinion polls during the voting process was recommended. The report suggested the extension of the 48-hour blackout in the case of exit polls to opinion polls. Further in 2011, the then Chief Election Commissioner S.Y. Quraishi suggested a ban on opinion polls during a national conference.¹¹

As for the opinion held by the civil society in India, the recommendations of electoral reforms put forward by the Association of Democratic Reforms as well as National Election Watch in 2011 can be illuminative. The recommendations supported the

available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1954459> [accessed on: 29th October 2014]

⁹ Other democracies which have employed regulatory measures against opinion polls include Canada, Greece and so on. See e.g. Article 19 Organization, Kenya: *Publication of Electoral Opinions Polls Bill*, ARTICLE 19 ORG. available at <http://www.article19.org/resources.php/resource/2969/en/kenya:-publication-of-electoral-opinion-polls-bill> [accessed on: 29th October 2014].

¹⁰ *Proposed Electoral Reforms*, Election Commission of India (2004), available at http://eci.nic.in/eci_main/PROPOSED_ELECTORAL_REFORMS.pdf [accessed on: 29th October 2014].

¹¹ DC Correspondent, 'CEC speaks up for politicians, parties', *Deccan Chronicle (Chennai)*, Feb 13, 2011, available at <http://www.adrindia.org/media/adr-in-news/cec-speaks-politicians-parties> [accessed on: 29th October 2014].

position taken by the electoral reforms committee in its background paper in 2010 and suggested inclusion of opinion polls in the purview of Section 126A.

The significant questions that deserve consideration here are, whether the adverse effects of opinion polls grave enough to justify stringent regulations on media? Do these regulations have a legal basis? Are the concerns put forward by the political civil society institutions of India legitimate? Is a blanket ban on these polls, as is being proposed in India almost unanimously by the political parties, the only way to resolve the conflict, or can it be resolved by adhering to certain mid-way mechanisms? These are the questions that the following parts of the paper will strive to answer.

OPINION POLLS: CONTEMPLATING THE CONFLICT

Legal Background

Opinion polls have undeniable free speech elements. Not only do they seek to fulfil the voter's right to information by helping him/her in making an informed choice, it is also prima facie validated by the freedom of speech and expression of the voters as well as the press. As such, any regulations imposed upon them would have to satisfy the legal benchmarks in this regard to gain validity.

On an International level, instruments like Universal Declaration of Human Rights¹² and The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights¹³ guarantee the right to freedom of expression, the right of the public to receive information and ideas, as well as the right of the mass media to impart information and ideas. However, these rights not being absolute in nature do provide for a scope of regulation if certain conditions are met. These conditions broadly include safeguarding of public interest¹⁴ or 'existence of a pressing social need'¹⁵.

¹² Universal Declaration on Human Rights, Article 21; UN General Assembly Resolution 217A(III), adopted 10 December 1948.

¹³ International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 19; UN General Assembly Resolution 2200A(XXI) of 16 December 1966, in force 23 March 1976.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* Article 19(3).

¹⁵ *Sunday Times v. the United Kingdom*, 26 April 1979, *Application No. 6538/74*, para. 59 (European Court of Human Rights).

In the case of the United States of America, where the expressional freedom has been given quite broad purview, the conditions are similar. Although the Congress has been eager to regulate the conduct and publication of election projections during elections,¹⁶ the judicial position in this regard is not supportive.¹⁷ As early as in 1988, the legislation regulating early election projections was held to be unconstitutional and in contravention to the First Amendment which guarantees free speech and free press.¹⁸

In the Indian context, The right to freedom of expression guaranteed by Article 19(1)(a) of the Indian Constitution, recognised as a basic feature of the Constitution, can be curtailed only on specific grounds mentioned in Article 19(2).

As is discussed above, the broad arguments pressed against opinion polls pertain to their unreliability, potential of manipulation and their effect on the voting behaviour. In the Indian context, among others, this forms the basis of increasing demands of a blanket ban on opinion polls.¹⁹ In theory, these arguments do not seem to fall under any of the conditions that may justify regulation on the conduct and propagation of such polls. Therefore, to determine the position of opinion polls in this legal backdrop, the practical gravity of its alleged effects on the electoral behaviour needs to be gauged.

Adversities of Opinion Polls: In Practice

Ideally, an independent decision making is expected of the voters. Secret ballot helps preserve this independence. Opinion polls, on this view, jeopardise the independent decision-making requirement of voting by tempting the voters to follow the opinions of others. Mehta forwards the secondary argument in this regard is that opinion polls may bring elections to a premature close, by influencing voters.²⁰

¹⁶ Henry Cohen, 'Election Projections: First Amendment Issues', *CRS Report for the Congress*, available at <http://www.law.umaryland.edu/marshall/crsreports/crsdocuments/RS20762.pdf> [accessed on: 29th October 2014].

¹⁷ Jackie Kinney, 'Restraining Network Election Projections: Questions of Legality and Propriety', *6 Comm. Law. 3 1988*.

¹⁸ *CBS Inc. v. Smith*, 681 F. Supp. 794 (1988).

¹⁹ See *supra* n.3.

²⁰ Pratap Bhanu Mehta, 'Exit from Exit Polls', *Tehelka*, available at http://www.tehelka.com/story_main1.asp?filename=op050104Exit.asp [accessed on: 29th October 2014].

While concerns regarding the effects of such polls on the voting behaviour have been recognised broadly, they are not sufficient to license broad restrictions on opinion polls, in part because they overestimate the effect of these polls on the independence of voters.²¹

These polls are majorly said to affect the indecisive and relatively uninformed voters and it is this set of people that the majority of arguments of influencing voting behaviour are directed at. The Canadian Supreme Court, while assessing this issue, made an interesting observation in this regard. It held that the government “cannot take the most uninformed and naïve voter as the standard by which constitutionality is assessed.”²² Courts in many other established democratic countries have questioned the assumption implicit in bans that voters are uninformed and naive, as well as the implications of blanket bans on opinion polls.²³

There is no research that establishes such surveys significantly influence the way the electorate votes in India. However, Fleitas W. (1971: 434-438) concludes that in United States of America, mere poll results are insufficient to impel the voters to switch their votes, except in the cases of minimal information elections characterized by lack of identification and debate on the issues, little evocation of interest on part of the voters, etc.²⁴ It is submitted that election process in India with massive campaigns and media coverage cannot be characterized as such.

But even if one were to concede that they could have some impact, the possible influence from other quarters cannot be negated as well, such as the possible influence from newspaper columnists, politicians, etc. who tend to predict the victory of one party or another in the midst of the election, falls under similar classification.²⁵ These media

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² *Thomson Newspapers Co. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, [1998] 1 S.C.R. 877.

²³ See *supra* n. 5.

²⁴ Daniel W. Fleitas, ‘Bandwagon and Underdog Effects in Minimal-Information Elections’, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 65, No. 2, Jun., 1971 at pp. 434-438, available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1954459> [accessed on: 29th October 2014].

²⁵ Opinion, ‘Obsessions die hard’, *The Hindu (Delhi)*, February 20, 2009, available at <http://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-opinion/obsessions-die-hard/article358489.ece> [accessed on: 29th October 2014].

aids usually exert a subtle but disguised influence on the voters, among which election polls come out to be a fairly rational and neutral aid.²⁶

Also, Pre-censorship in India is permitted only if the conditions mentioned under Article 19(2) of Indian Constitution are met, otherwise it is rendered unconstitutional.²⁷ As mentioned before, this is not the case with opinion polls. As such, imposition of a blanket ban just on the mere chance of manipulation and undue influence may amount to pre-censorship which would impose an unreasonable restriction upon free speech.²⁸

Getting rid of opinion polls would only lead to exposure of the public to unscientific and probably inaccurate assertions about the situation, in many cases presented by individuals or organizations who take an extremely partisan or ideological approach to presenting the facts.²⁹ As such, opinion polls should not be perceived as an exceptional tool to distort the decisions of the voters, but as a scientific method, which, if efficiently used, can aid in meeting the ends of democracy. In such a scenario, enforcing safeguards and regulatory measures to mitigate the negative impact of opinion polls seems like a better option than their outright rejection from the political scene.

In this regard, Noorani AG (2009) argues on similar lines in the Indian context, that excluding any kind of influence in an open society to protect the voter is neither possible nor desirable³⁰. He opines:

“(A voter) cannot have his mind sealed from “external factors”. A voter has every right to know the election trends if he is to make an intelligent choice. One voter might wish to do his bit to arrest the winning trend, another, to accentuate it. The choice is his.”

²⁶ Wolfgang Donsbach, ‘Who is afraid of Election Polls? Normative and Empirical Arguments for the Freedom of Pre-Election Surveys’, ESOMAR, February 2001, available at <http://wapor.unl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/who-is-afraid-of-opinion-polls.pdf> [accessed on: 29th October 2014].

²⁷ See *Thellur M. Dharmarajan, Editor v. The Union Of India*, (1977) 2 MLJ 22.

²⁸ See *supra* n.2.

²⁹ See *supra* n.26.

³⁰ AG Noorani, ‘E.C. and Opinion Polls’, *Frontline*, Volume 26 - Issue 15, Jul. 18-31, 2009.

Opinion and exit polls enrich voters' understanding of popular perceptions and how they shape the democratic process. While it is true that they do have a potential to be manipulated, a credible poll would make it a point to publish information about who commissioned it, which agency conducted it, the sample size and other relevant methodological details.³¹

Furthermore, in the modern world, where access to the Internet and satellite television is becoming ever more commonplace, bans of these sort barely stanching toll national borders may no longer be viable. The international nature of Internet, now newly empowered by the tools of social networking, has rendered measures like election reporting blackouts obsolete.³² Other variants, such as podcasting, the transmission of audio files, RSS (Really Simple Syndication) and peer-to-peer networks are further enhancing the challenge of regulation. A better approach therefore would be to enhance the reliability, efficiency and propagation mechanism of such polls so as to resolve the conflict.

RESOLVING THE CONFLICT

Opinion polls have undeniable benefits which justify the legal position that prevents them from being made unlawful.³³ Nonetheless, to strike a balance between the rights of the voters, the rights of the press as well as need for free, fair and independent electoral process, certain regulatory measures may be taken. Global developments in this regard may be looked into to construct an efficient regulatory mechanism.

Regulatory Mechanisms

An extremely liberal approach can be to leave the regulation to the market forces with different media houses coming up with different opinion polls and cancelling out any effect of manipulation. Alternatively, regulation of media can be broadly done through the approaches of self-regulation, co-regulation or external regulations.

Self-Regulatory Framework is the system by which a media organisation deals with its own disciplinary and legal issues, without being publicly regulated by an external body.

³¹ See *supra* n.25.

³² ACE Project, *Media and Elections: "New" Media*, available at <http://aceproject.org/ace-en/topics/me/meb/meb03/meb03b/default/?searchterm=internet> [accessed on: 30 October 2014].

³³ See *supra* n.2.

This model applies normally to the private press that issues internal codes of conduct and guidelines on professional ethics.³⁴ An instance of self-regulation being adopted by the media houses is the BBC's internal self-regulation guidelines, which give due . Another instance can be the United States where many voluntary associations of mass-communication specialists have adopted codes of ethics or standards of practice that govern the conduct of their members.³⁵ For instance, electronic journalists are signatories of codes like the Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct of the Radio Television News Directors Association UNCLEAR Sentence. As Kaid & Jones (2004) suggests, this Code calls for news professionals to conduct themselves according to specific standards in six areas: public, trust, truth, fairness, integrity, independence and accountability.³⁶

The process and methodology used in the aforementioned examples can be imported and customised to suit the needs of the Indian political scenario. The Press Council of India can play a central role here to integrate the media community and adopt a mid-way feasible methodology concerning the conduct and publication of opinion polls.

Alternatively, a Co-regulation model can also be adopted. It is the model combining elements of self-regulation (and self-monitoring) and traditional public regulation to form a new and self-contained regulatory system for media coverage of elections. In this system, the regulatory body often supervises the implementation of rules freely determined by the media. Adoption of this system would require the integration of the legislature, the Election Commission, the Press Council as well as representatives from the main stream media to come together and discuss and contemplate their respective interests so as to come up with a workable and feasible regulation system.

The third regulatory model is the model of external regulation. It is the system where rules and laws issued by public institutions govern the activity of broadcasters during the election period. This regulatory model is primarily useful in imposing stricter regulations in nations with a history of government control over the State media or where there is a lack of confidence among political parties, journalists, and

³⁴ Giovanna Maiola, Michael Meyer-Resende, 'Regulation of Mass Media Activities during Elections', *Project for the OSCE*, in Ukraine 23 September 2008, available at www.osce.org/ukraine/37893 [accessed on: 30 October 2014].

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ L.Lee kaid, C.A. Jones about United States of America, in *The Media and Elections: A Handbook and Comparative Study*, B.P. Lange and D. Ward (eds.), London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2004.

institutions.³⁷ However, imposing balanced regulations which are directed to tap the potential of the media with adequate safeguards can make this model workable in the Indian scenario. Measures like setting and checking the information disclosure requirements, ensuring minimal bias during the process of opinion polls can be enforced efficiently through this model. However care must be taken that the active involvement of the public institutions don't render the regulatory framework a puppet in the hands of the ruling parties

Benchmarks for Regulation

For achieving the purpose, certain basic principles should be incorporated in the framework of the regulatory mechanism. The primary concern should be to enable the audience to make an informed choice with minimal interpretational ambiguities. The publication and interpretation of the opinion polls can lead to major misunderstandings and debates. Therefore, certain basic information must be provided to the readers so as to provide the opportunity of judging for themselves the evidence presented and deciding whether or not they agree with any conclusions drawn from the research. As Yadav (2013) opines the details like the track record of the organisation carrying out the survey, details of the sponsor; sampling frame, sample size and the exact technique used to draw the sample; the social profile of the achieved sample; where, when and how were the interviews conducted; the exact wording of the question and sequence of questions asked, etc. should be mandated to be disclosed.³⁸ Adhering to such practice will ensure that the voters have reasonable access to the key information and standards which form the basis of the survey, so as to reduce the risk of the published reports of the findings to be misleading.³⁹

Taking a step ahead in this direction, the pre-election polls can be standardized to enable the comparison of survey results and to enhance their credibility and trust in their results.⁴⁰ Also, assessments from experts and the public can be used to gain and enhance

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ Yogendra Yadav, 'Opinion Polls- the way forward', The Hindu, Nov 21, 2013, available at <http://www.thehindu.com/opinion/lead/opinion-polls-the-way-forward/article5339890.ece> [accessed on: 30 October 2014].

³⁹ See *supra* n.26.

⁴⁰ World Movement for Democracy, 'How Can Civil Society Actors Use Public Opinion Research to Improve and Strengthen Democracy?' available at: <http://www.wmd.org/assemblies/third-assembly/workshops/research/how-can-civil-society-actors-use-public-opinion-research> [accessed on: 30 October 2014].

credibility and trust in survey results. Here, an obvious hurdle in the path of standardization of the polls would be integrating the numerous polls conducted by various media houses in and outside the country. A possible solution can be issuing of a consolidated report on these polls by a set of experts facilitated by organizations like the Press Council of India in partnership with the Election Commission to lay down a clear picture of the data obtained from all the sources.

Secondly, steps must be taken to make sure that the masses understand the limitations involved in the survey process and the distinction between public opinion and beliefs as demonstrated by the survey viz-a-viz the actual behavior.⁴¹ The audience should be made aware of the element of estimation and inexactness involved in the process. The results of the opinion polls should in no manner be projected as future projection of the results but as observations made from a social experiment with a scientific basis.

The sampling method used should also be disclosed, as this might have strong implications on the representative trends that are eventually obtained.⁴² This factor has a special significance in the pluralistic Indian society which often votes in accordance with certain pre-determined allegiances of caste and community.

Journalists, women's groups, human rights groups, etc., play a major role in interpretation and assimilation of the results of such polls to the public. As such, they should be made aware and if necessary trained specially on how to understand public opinion surveys so they can interpret, use, and disseminate the results and correct errors in survey reports.⁴³

The pollsters conducting opinion polls can be encouraged to extend the scope of the survey to exploring of the reasons for party choice and opinions on important campaign issues, rather than confining themselves to mere determination of voting intentions.⁴⁴ This would not only enhance the socio-political significance of the polls but would also help in propagating the inference of scientific social research, rather than a mere number

⁴¹ See *supra* n.16.

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ See *supra* n.38.

⁴⁴ See *supra* n.26.

game. In addition, all the public opinion groups and members of the civil society could be involved and asked to provide their input in conceptualizing the research process while conducting an opinion poll.⁴⁵

A Suggested Model

It is required that the Election Commission, the civil society as well as the press integrate and establish an efficient and interactive framework towards this objective. A possible arrangement in this direction is suggested hereunder. A specialized independent body can be established, with the responsibility of formulating a standard code of conduct for the media houses and pollsters in lines with International research codes and guidelines, for instance the ESOMAR Charter. This role can also be delegated to the Press Council of India or the News Broadcasters Association, provided care is taken to ensure a specialized focus on this issue while taking into account all the aspects including detailed disclosure of research methods, accuracy, as well as issues of ethics and public influence. Further, during the elections, a time limit should be set after which the media houses should not be allowed to conduct any surveys.

After this deadline is reached, all the data collected and portrayed by the media houses should be consolidated by the experts of the aforementioned independent body to form a report which analyses and compares the data provided, with special emphasis on factors like the research method used in the surveys, the target groups, and also the reasoning behind the choices of the respondents. This will not only put forward an integrated analysis of the numbers but will also tell the audience what those numbers really signify. Civil society organizations like ADR and agencies like Market Research Society of India can provide expert support in this regard, while also keeping into the check the autonomy and impartiality of the final report. Further, all the media houses, whether electronic or print, which were party to the collection of the data used should be mandated to broadcast the particulars of this report. As such, care must be taken that the deadline for conducting opinion polls is well in advance so as to leave a margin for the integrated analyses to be carried out.

This is one possible model which may be adopted to ensure regulated, transparent and impartial usage of opinion polls during elections. It can be further polished and modified for practical enforcement. Further, many other permutations and combinations may be arrived at, which successfully cater to the interest of all the stakeholders

⁴⁵ See *supra* n.38.

involved in the election process and ensure that opinion polls may become a part of the elections process without hampering its fairness.

CONCLUSION

In the light of the above discussion, it is essential to note that any sort of ban or regulation on opinion polls, restricting the right to free expression requires a strong legal justification to accord for validity. The case of opinion polls clearly lacks it, under the national as well as international legal frameworks. Contemplating the potential infringement of rights of the voters as well as the press which is inherent in the issue of opinion polls, any stringent regulatory measure cannot be supported in this regard.

Many rightly argue that the major issue concerning opinion polls is not of democratic right to information but transparency in conduction such polls. As Vrinda G. (2014) suggests if a detailed methodology of the election projections shown is provided, there would be minimal room for impartial and unethical practices in this regard.⁴⁶ This would enhance public confidence in such polls and would mitigate the need for a stringent regulatory framework. To ensure that international standards of transparency and disclosure are followed in this regard, an innovative model of self-regulations should be adopted which aims at utilization of opinion polls as an effective tool to formulate an informed public opinion, while preventing its abuse. Systematic public opinion is crucial in a democratic culture⁴⁷ and it would be better is we recognise its importance and ensure its efficient usage rather than dismissing it on political whims.

⁴⁶ Gopinath, Vrinda., 'Not a ban, says Partha Rakshit, Indian rep to ESOMAR', *Altgaze*, November 4, 2014, available at <http://www.altgaze.com/?p=1103> [accessed on: 30 October 2014].

⁴⁷ See *supra* n.38.