



Voter List Management

Report

Survey on the Quality of Voter Lists in Delhi

July 2015

Research Team: Katie Pyle – Research Manager, Janaagraha Vivek Anandan Nair – Research Associate, Janaagraha Fieldwork undertaken by TNS Global

e-mail: info@janaagraha.org | vivek.nair@janaagraha.org



Introduction

Jana Group was Co-Founded by Ramesh Ramanathan and Swati Ramanathan. It comprises four institutions, all of which are urban-focussed



Janalakshmi, an urban micro finance company serving 2.5 million households across India



Janaadhar, an urban affordable housing company



Jana Urban Space Foundation, a non-profit focussed on spatial planning and design, both policy and practice



Janaagraha, a non-profit having the objective of transforming quality of life in India's cities and towns

About Janaagraha

Janaagraha was founded in December 2001 as a platform for citizen participation in cities. Today, it works with citizens on catalysing active citizenship in neighbourhoods and with governments to institute reforms to city-systems, generally referred to as urban governance.

With an objective of improving quality of life in India's urban centres, Janaagraha believes in addressing the root-cause of existing issues instead of the symptoms through its city-systems framework. This framework consist of four inter-related dimensions critical to the running of world-class cities.

CITY SYSTEMS FRAMEWORK



Urban Planning & Design
Urban Capacities & Resources
Empowered and Legitimate Political Representation
Voter list Management
Transparency, Accountability and Participation

Janaagraha's work on Voter List Management

'Empowered and Legitimate Political Representation' is one of the four components of Janaagraha's city-systems framework. We believe quality of voter lists can potentially influence quality of political leadership in cities. The Voter List Management process in cities however has been a much ignored electoral reform agenda. Voter lists form the basis of democracy by codifying a citizen's right to exercise franchise. But errors in these lists, omissions that lead to disenfranchisement and potential deletions which expose the electoral process to phantom voting, are a reality. This applies particularly to urban areas which witness large scale migrations, from villages to cities, between cities and even within cities. For quality political representation and leadership, the voter list should be free of errors. Poor quality voter lists impact electoral participation and outcomes, and thereby the quality of political leadership.

JCCD has been working on the issue of urban voter lists since 2005, highlights of which include the Jaago Re! campaign, India's largest voter registration drive in cities and a 3-year Memorandum of Understanding with the Election Commission of India for a pilot project on voter list management in Shanthinagar Assemby Constituency in Bangalore. The groundwork in Shanthinagar resulted in the Proper Urban Electoral (PURE) List manual, a new and improved process for voter list management in cities.



Through research studies such as this, we aim to develop a body of irrefutable data and information that can catalyse reforms to voter list management in cities. We believe that such studies, based on both primary surveys and desktop research, are critical to electoral reforms in the country.

Contents

1	Executive Summary	10
2	Introduction	14
3	Background on Design and Methodology3.1 Introduction to the design3.2 Methodological updates	18 18 18
4	Methodology4.1Introduction4.2Sampling4.2.1Overall sampling4.2.2Voter-list phase sampling4.2.3Citizen-centric survey sampling4.3Execution4.3.1List-centric phase execution4.3.2Citizen-centric phase execution4.3.1List-centric phase execution4.3.2Citizen-centric phase execution4.4.1List-centric error conceptualization4.4.2Citizen-centric error conceptualization	22 22 22 23 23 24 24 24 26 27 27 27
5	 Results: The List-Centric Desk Review and Survey 5.1 Sample composition 5.1 Desk research sample composition 5.1.2 Field work sample composition 5.2 Delhi overall findings 5.3 Profile of citizens found shifted from their listed address 5.4 Profile of citizens with errors in their registration details 5.5 Attempts to register on the voter list 5.6 Data alignment with ECI summary revision of voter rolls 5.7 List-centric survey – Delhi results summary 	34 34 36 38 40 41 42 42 43

6	Results: The	e Citizen-Centric Survey and Desk Review	46
	6.1	Sample composition	46
	6.2	Delhi overall findings	48
	6.3	Verification of citizens claiming to be registered	
		elsewhere in Delhi	49
	6.4	Profile of citizens who thought they were on the	
		list but were not	50
	6.5	Profile of citizens omitted from their polling part	
		but registered elsewhere in the city	51
	6.6	Profile of citizens who claim to have applied to	
		register from their current address (but were not	
		found on the list)	53
	6.7	Profile of citizens who have never applied to be on	
		the list or claimed to have applied from some other	
		address as well those who could not recall whether	- 4
	()	they had	54
	6.8	Profile of citizens who were on the list	56
	6.9	Citizen-centric survey – Delhi results summary	59
7			
/	Results: Cor	mbining the List-Centric and Citizen-Centric	
	Research Ph	nases	62
0			
8	Discussion		66
	8.1	Overall discussion	66
	8.2	Methodological reflections	67
\sim			
9	Appendices		72



Executive Summary

1. Executive Summary

The Quality of Lists Study (QoL), a part of the efforts by Janaagraha to improve the accuracy of voter lists in India's urban centres, was conducted in Delhi just before the 2015 assembly elections. This study aimed to serve as a body of objective information that throws light on the issues inherent in Delhi's voter lists*.

It was designed to effectively capture deletions, i.e. people who exist on a voter list but shouldn't be, as well as omissions i.e. people who should be on the voter list but are not. Using a two pronged approach, the study used a Voter List-Centric methodology (to capture deletions) and a Citizen-Centric methodology (for omissions) and went to over 6,000 citizens spread across Delhi in a manner that ensured robust representation. Key findings from the study are as follows:

There is sufficient evidence to indicate that a large part of Delhi's voter lists are unclean and are not up to date.

- The list-centric research, which was based on a sample of citizens who existed on Delhi's lists, found that 41% of these entries included one of a range of errors. Eleven percent of all addresses on the list could not be located on ground despite a desk-based address quality research stage indicating that all but two of these addresses were 'findable'. It was also found that 21% of sampled citizens who were on the list had shifted to another location. A further 7% of citizens had errors in their details mentioned on the list.
- The citizen-centric research, which checked random citizens of Delhi against the voter list, found that 49% were omitted from their polling part voter lists. Twenty eight percent were registered elsewhere in Delhi and 8% claimed to have applied from their current address but were not on the list. Twelve percent had either not/never applied to register on their polling part (PP) list or could not recall if they ever had.

Data from the two surveys indicates that potential deletions and omissions in Delhi's electoral rolls are of a large magnitude. A more nuanced picture emerges when reading the two research phases together.

A large part of required deletions in Delhi may be 'off-set' by omissions due to intra-city migration i.e. a large number of citizens who are not on their polling part lists are registered elsewhere within the city.

- It appears that most citizens who should be 'deleted' from the voter list (23% were not found at the address mentioned against them on the voter list), are actually residing somewhere else within Delhi (in another Polling Part or in another Assembly Constituency). This conclusion is made in relation to the fact that 28% of omitted citizens from the voter list are registered elsewhere in the city.
- Given this, the electoral impact and impact on voter turnout therefore (in the state of Delhi) of having such number of deletions may not be as grave as the magnitude suggests.
- Most of these errors, of deletion and omission, appear as singularities spread across the city and not in bunches, making it difficult for them to be exploited or taken advantage of. Although this still means that the lists are unclean, the potential impact with respect to electoral outcomes, voting malpractices such as phantom/bogus voting etc., in Delhi, require further investigation.

Seven percent of Delhi's citizens reported having errors with their details as mentioned on the voter lists but only two sampled citizens reported facing any issues while casting their vote.

• Errors with citizens' details on the voter list, mostly minor mistakes in addresses, do not appear to prevent a citizen's vote in almost all cases. These errors were also found to be spread more or less evenly across gender, housing type and religion (31-35 year olds had a higher probability of having such errors; at 21%, 1.4 times their representation in the sample).

Twelve percent of Delhi's 18+ citizenry claimed to have never tried to register or could not recall registering from their current address (perhaps pointing to apathy).

• The 12% of citizens who claimed to have never tried to register or could not recall if they ever had, included 7% who had never applied from their current address and 5% who could not recall if they had. Citizens who had not registered cited a lack of knowledge on where and how to register as reasons for not doing do. As well as these, other strong reasons included a perception of the process being too tedious and a belief that they did not possess the right paperwork to register. The youngest age group (18-25 forming a huge 47%), lower SECs (C, D and E at a combined 67%) and Muslims (at 17%, 1.3 times their proportion in the total sample) were more likely to have never registered from their current address.

Overall, there seems to be little doubt that Delhi's electoral rolls are unclean. With large amounts of deletions and additions required to the list, there is a sharp need for improved voter list management processes. This is required regardless of the fact that a large part of the errors in Delhi are due to citizens moving from one address to the other, within the city. Due to the latter however, the effects of these errors on electoral outcomes and voter-turn-out, therefore, may not be as grave as the figures suggest (i.e. 23% 'Deletions' and 49% 'Total Omissions' w.r.t. polling parts). Since a large number of deletions appear to be off-set by omissions, it is entirely possible that citizens registered elsewhere in the city, as long as they are aware and willing, do actually exercise their right to vote on Election Day by going to the polling booths they are registered at.

Deletions and omissions which may relate more directly to electoral outcomes and voter turn-out are those from the categories of 'address not founds' (up to 11% of all on Delhi's lists) and 'repeats/dead/disenfranchised' citizens (1% of all citizens on Delhi's lists). Similarly, the omissions would comprise of citizens who claim to have registered to be on their PP lists but are not on it (8% of Delhi's 18+ population). This means that for any advocacy efforts, a key focus should be on removing those names classified as 'repeats/dead/disenfranchised' and possibly a significant chunk of those classified under 'address not found', though the latter remains an uncertain category. Similarly, in omissions, focus needs to be on making sure that all citizens who have applied to register, are actually added on to the lists. That said, the overall need for better maintenance of the list to ensure citizens are registered in the correct PPs, with the correct information, remains.

Since most of the list errors appear to be spread evenly across the city, it makes little case for them to be exploited for undue gains. From anecdotal evidence, malpractices such as phantom voting/bogus voting or booth capturing etc. tend to take place only in certain areas pointing to a geographic concentration of errors that lend themselves to exploitation; this is something that the Delhi study did not find evidence on, probably partly due to the random sampling approach taken.Whatever may be the reason behind the errors on the list and their consequences, data gathered from this study suggests that those less privileged are usually worse off when it comes to electoral rolls. Deletions and omissions appear to be higher for lower SECs (Socio-Economic Classification type), lower castes and in some cases, Muslims; and among these, the younger and more mobile age groups. Not only this, but this demographic of citizens are also more likely to not have tried to apply from their current addresses because of a lack of awareness and knowledge, clubbed with a perception of the entire process being too tedious and difficult.

While this research has been largely successful in bringing out an objective picture of the state of Delhi's electoral rolls, it also leaves several questions that require further thought and investigation. For example, a large proportion of Delhi's residents appear to have been living in the city for five years or more which may explain why a lot of the errors on the voter list may be intra-city migrations. Other cities with different migration patterns, or a more detailed look at recent migrant communities in Delhi, may throw up different list quality issues. Other cities' lists may also vary in the quality of the address details they hold leading to other concerns of list content. Furthermore, it would be worthwhile to explore different research methodologies to try to better understand issues such as bogus voting/phantom voting or other such malpractices as well as identifying specific issues with the registration process.



Introduction

2. Introduction

During the latest Lok Sabha elections (2014), the lakhs of voters in Mumbai, Nagpur and Pune who were missing from voter lists, and hence denied the right to vote, were well documented in the media. Furthermore, in Nagaland, polling stations are alleged to have had a voter turn-out greater than 100% while Bangalore Rural received allegations of the illegal enrolment of over 25,000 residents of Tamil Nadu as voters in their constituency. The hygiene of voter lists has been repeatedly called into question by such reports, particularly in an urban context.

JCCD has been working on improving the hygiene of urban voter lists for more than a decade and, in this time, has come to learn that the electoral rolls in urban India are not well maintained and in fact are riddled with errors. With increasing urbanisation, large-scale migration between cities and towns and within cities, the accuracy of the voter lists is decreasing. Current processes and systems for voter list management are not capable of guaranteeing accurate voter lists in urban areas.





JCCD has been engaged in efforts to improve the accuracy of the voter list as well as exploring improvements to the processes around the maintenance of lists for over a decade¹. In addition to this, JCCD has also been objectively measuring the hygiene of voter lists in some Assembly Constituencies (ACs) in Bangalore as well as at a city-level across India over the last two years. The importance of this work lies within the fundamental right of citizens in a democracy to have legitimate political representation; one of the major aspects being every citizen's right to vote. If this is in any way being prevented, there is cause for concern. Objective measures of the state of the voter lists serve to highlight, using valid means, whether there is any such block in citizens' democratic rights. As well as the most obvious and commonly discussed concern of citizens being denied their right to vote, other issues can be explored this way. These include the potential for phantom voting (related potentially to margins of victory in elections) as well as considering the implications on voter turn-out statistics, consequently feeding into debates around voter-apathy in urban centres.

This research report documents the methodology and results of measuring the quality of the voter list in Delhi (in December 2014-February 2015), in advance of the state elections held on 7th February 2015. This includes commentary on the development of the methodology for measurement of this quality, which continues to evolve over the course of JCCD's work in this field; the aim being to ascertain the best methods for objectively measuring the hygiene of the voter list in an urban centre.

^{1.} The voter list cleanliness and hygiene program at JCCD, called PURE, has been running for over a decade. Having started as a roots based program, it has expanded over the years to include research as well as policy advocacy; some of JCCDs recommendations have also been acknowledged and absorbed into the recent recommendations by the Law Commission on electoral reforms (the 20th Law Commission of India, Report no 255).



Background on Design and Methodology

3. Background on Design and Methodology

3.1 Introduction to the design

In broad terms, the on-going research into the quality of urban voter lists has been aiming to measure two types of errors on the voter list:

- Errors of deletion: names which are on the list but should not be.
- Errors of inclusion: names which should be included on the list but are not there.

Due to the nature of the errors, typically two different methodologies have been used to capture the extent of these across urban populations. In basic terms these are:

- Voter-list-centric surveys: which are used to measure errors of deletion: The sampling basis for this survey type is a citizen name and associated details on the actual voter list. Essentially in this method, the citizen is pre-selected from the voter-list and surveyors try to locate this citizen. In general terms, either a person is found at their address or not. The latter being an error of deletion.
- **Citizen-centric surveys**: which are used to **measure errors of inclusion**. The sampling basis for this survey type is a household and a random adult over 18 within this household. Essentially in this method a citizen is located by household selection and consequently checked against the voter list. In general terms, a citizen is either on the list or not. The latter being an error of inclusion.

Following a review of all earlier work on measuring the hygiene of urban voter lists, several methodological updates were made to the earlier design. These included:

- Introducing a new layer of verification of the quality of addresses given on voter lists. This is to see if the addresses given within are good enough to find a citizen or not.
- Expand the error type to include all possibilities that may exist on the voter list as well as the photograph on the EPIC (Electoral Photo Identity Card)
- Using a Computer Aided Personal Interviewing system, instead of pen-and-paper to improve data quality, limit data and interviewer errors as well as enhance control on field-work.

In reality there are some subtle complexities and grey areas in not only the methodologies but also the categorisations of these errors which are fully outlined in Section 4.4. For a detailed section on reflection on earlier methodology and updates, refer to the appendix, section 9.10.





Methodology

4. Methodology

4.1 Introduction

The methodology consisted of a voter-list and a citizen-centric phase. The voter-list survey, as a result of the issue of 'address not founds', highlighted earlier, was split into two parts, and the citizen-centric phase, due to required verification of registrations elsewhere and those registered on more recent roll versions, was also split into two parts:

• Voter-list phase

- o Part 1: Desk review of 'findability' of voter-list addresses of sampled citizens
- o Part 2: Field survey of the same sampled citizens as part 1

• Citizen-centric phase

- o Part 1: Field survey of households in the same PPs and ACs as sampled for voter-list phase
- o Part 2: Desk review to verify registration of citizens in other ACs and PPs as well as checking for non-registration following attempts to register using the latest voter rolls.

4.2 Sampling

4.2.1 Overall sampling

Sampling was the first requirement for both phases of work and the base sampling approach for both phases was identical. In the case of the voter-list phase, the unit of sampling was names on the voter list, whereas in the case of the citizen-centric phase, the unit of sampling was the house. For both phases, the same ACs and PPs were sampled unless otherwise mentioned (for example in the citizen-centric phase where access to certain areas/gated communities in some PPs was difficult).

The Urban Local Body (ULB) population in Delhi is 11.03 million. The 2011 census of India indicates that in Delhi, 67% ² of the population is aged 18 or above. Equating this proportion to the ULB population of Delhi leaves the target population at 7.37 million citizens of voting age. To ensure sample representation with a 95% confidence level and a confidence interval of +/- 1.8% at the city level, an achieved sample size of 2963* citizens was required for each survey. Citizens were over-sampled to account for 10% proportion of 'door closed' and 'non-participation' eventualities. This meant a total of 3293 citizens needed to be sampled for each survey.

The citizens were sampled from Polling Parts (PPs) within Assembly Constituencies (ACs)³. Delhi has 70 ACs, of which 41 were classified as 'inner' and 29 were classified as 'periphery' ACs⁴. This classification was determined by taking a 10km radius from the centre of Delhi. Any ACs that fell within this area were classified as 'inner' while any not in that radius were 'periphery' ACs. Any ACs which touched the outer boundary of the ULB were automatically categorized as periphery ACs. To ensure the sample accurately represented both inner and periphery ACs and the geographical spread of ACs, 8 ACs were chosen using semi-purposive stratified random sampling, considering a desired mix of centre and periphery ACs as well as checking for general geographic spread (North, South, East, and West). Within each of the ACs, 34 Polling Parts (PPs) were selected using randomization of the total universe of polling parts per AC and selecting the first 34 randomized parts. Within each PP, 12 citizens were sampled.

The sampling trail reference for ACs, PPs and citizens for Delhi can be found in Appendix 1. The South Delhi AC of Sangam Vihar was included deliberately to allow for quantitative data collection to align with qualitative data as collected by a Janaagraha associate also working in this AC.

^{*} For the purposes of sampling, entire Assembly Constituencies were considered irrespective of the fact that certain areas within these were outside the ULB boundary. The number 2963 is also representative of the entire state of Delhi at the same CL (95%) and CI (+/- 1.8%). This makes the findings generalizable to the entire state of Delhi, something that has been done later in the report. 2. The 2011 census indicates the population of Delhi state to be 16,78,7941. Of this figure, 11,234,061 are 18 or older. This equates to 67% of Delhi state citizens being aged 18 over.

^{3.} October 2014 rolls were used as a sampling base.

^{4.} Classification of Delhi ACs can be found in Appendix 1.

For both phases of the work, the same sampled PPs were used except in a few cases where entry in the PP was denied (usually closed/gated communities). Details of substitution PPs can be found in Appendix 2. Although the number of citizens to achieve was the same for both survey types, the selection method of citizens within each PP was different for the voter-list phase as compared with the citizen-centric phase. These differences are outlined below.

4.2.2 Voter-list phase sampling

For the voter-list phase, the approach as outlined in section 4.2.1 was used to sample the ACs and PPs. Following this, 12 citizens were sampled from the voter list of each of the selected PPs. In each PP, the voter list was split in half. A name was then randomly selected from one half of the list. This was the first citizen sampled. From this citizen, the next five citizens were sampled by skipping 18 names each time (this would equate to skipping approximately 6 households under the assumption that there may be approximately 2-3 adults in one household, consecutively on the voter list). The same process was repeated using the other half of the voter list in that PP. In total therefore, 12 names were sampled from each PP. Surveyors tried to locate these citizens at the address listed for them on the voter list.

4.2.3 Citizen-centric survey sampling

As for the voter-list survey, for the citizen-centric survey, the approach as outlined in section 4.2.1 was used to sample the ACs and PPs. Following this, necessarily a slightly different procedure was used to select the 12 households within each PP and consequently the citizen within the household, for the survey. In each PP, the voter list was again split in half. A name was then randomly selected from one half of the list. The address associated with this name was used as a starting point for the surveyors in the field. From this address, the surveyor would skip 6 households on the field using the right hand rule. This was the first household sampled. Following this, a further 5 households were selected using the same skipping pattern and right hand rule. The same procedure was then repeated for the other half of the voter list.

4.3 Execution

4.3.1 List-centric phase execution

As noted above, the first phase of the list-centric work was a desk review of voter-list addresses of sampled citizens. This was followed by the field survey which was executed by TNS Global. Each of these two phases is detailed below.

4.3.1.1 List-centric desk based work

The aim of the desk-based work was to determine the quality of the addresses of each of the citizens sampled in the list-centric phase of the work. Following the sampling of the citizens from the voter-list (as described in Section 4.2.2), a database was made of the sampled citizens' details on the list. The database was created by TNS associates. Each address was then essentially reviewed against a series of parameters to determine whether it was 'findable' or not in the field. The concept behind this exercise was to use this information to determine whether 'addresses not found' in the field were even findable in the first place or not. If an address was deemed findable by the desk-study but was not found in the field, this would lend more confidence/credibility to that entry on the voter-list requiring deletion. If the address was however, deemed not findable and also not found on the field, the issue could be more one of the quality of the address information on the voter list rather than a genuine deletion. This concept is further expanded below in Section 4.4.

The parameters against which each address was reviewed were the following⁵:

- 1. Building Number/Name
- 2. House/Flat/Door Number/name
- 3. Society/Apartment Name
- 4. Gali number/name
- 5. Road Number/Name
- 6. Landmark
- 7. Block Name/Number
- 8. Area Name/Number
- 9. Village Name
- 10. Tehsil Name
- 11. Pincode
- 12. GIS map
- 13. Hand drawn map
- 14. English map
- 15. Hindi/Kannada map
- 16. Quality of the scan of the map
- 17. Streets named on map
- 18. Citizen's street named on map

Broadly, the parameters looked at included those required to get to an address, such as the person's name, house number etc. as well as aids that could help get to an address effectively and quickly; the latter, were mostly in the form of maps that were attached to each Polling Part's voter list. From the parameters listed above, it can be seen that maps were looked at using three lenses i.e. the kind of map (GIS/non-GIS), its language (Hindi/English) and the quality of its content (scan quality, mention of streets etc.)

For an address to be 'findable' however, it was determined that it must have just **one of each** of the following three parameter categories:

^{5.} Checking the feasibility of the full address with the post office was considered as a parameter to include but rendered invalid. The post office will likely know the feasibility of an address but not relative to a PP. The latter is an important parameter as all assumptions are made relative to the PP. The address listed in a PP may for example be valid but not within the PP listed. Instead, the process described above matches the Post Office's criteria for 'definite' and 'indefinite' addresses as described in the next paragraphs.

1. **IDENTIFIER – THE DOOR/ADDRESS** - At least one of either a building number/name **OR** a house/flat/door number/name

AND

2. **IDENTIFIER – THE IMMEDIATE VICINITY/LOCALITY** - At least one of either a society/apartment name **OR** gali number/name **OR** road number/name **OR** landmark **OR** block name/number

AND

3. IDENTIFIER -- THE LARGER AREA/LOCALITY - At least one of either an area name/number OR village name

These parameters and permutations of findable and not findable address parameters are in line with the India Post's guidelines about 'definite' and 'indefinite' addresses⁶. The former being those addresses deemed to be possible to deliver to. The parameters and permutations here were specifically determined for Delhi. If applied to another city, these criteria would require review.

All citizens sampled were then given an identifier so that this categorization of a findable/not findable address could be matched against their field-outcomes. This fed into the error categorization following part 2 of the work (see Section 4.4). Field surveyors were not in the know of whether any address was deemed findable or not. Further details of this process are available in Appendix 3.

4.3.1.2 List-centric field work

The field work phase of the list-centric work required surveyors to try to locate citizens at the address listed for them on the voter-list and execute the survey accordingly. As described in Section 4.2.2, 12 citizens were sampled in each PP from the voter-list. The database of citizens was loaded onto a computer-aided personal interview (CAPI) system, along with the survey, for the surveyors to use when on the field. The survey was available on the CAPI system in both English and Hindi.

Once at the address, surveyors followed a systematic flow from the questionnaire to identify the different outcomes related to each citizen. For the avoidance of doubt, the frame of reference was kept as the sampled person at their exact listed address. If the person was not found at that address, the listing was considered an error of deletion for all intents and purposes. The person may live within the PP but their address may actually be wrong but this would not be picked up here (the list-centric survey methodology will not let you find out if actually the citizen lives at number 10 instead of number 1 as listed – the surveyor cannot blindly go and look for the citizen at other houses in the PP). Instead, to mitigate for potential cases where a person might actually be registered with the wrong address but in the same PP, the proportion of these cases could be taken from the citizen-centric survey. In the citizen-centric survey the frame of reference is whether the citizen is registered anywhere in the PP and errors with the address will be picked up. Consequently an adjustment can be made to the error (of deletion) calculation ascertained from the list-centric survey using this data from the citizen-centric survey.

Surveyors were required to spend at least 30 minutes looking for an address sampled and if they encountered any difficulties, were requested to speak to members of the local community and those working in local businesses to help locate addresses. If it was still not found, a supervisor would go onto the field to also try to locate the address. If the door was locked for the desired household, the surveyor would return twice more at different times to try to see if there was anyone home before deeming this person to be 'not available'. This is different to the person not being found which assumes the surveyor has located the address and citizens within it but the person in question has not been found. The latter may happen in particular when large groups of citizens live behind 'one door'. If the specific sampled

citizen was not available for interview at the time of knocking, the surveyors would either request if another adult in the household could respond to the survey on their behalf or make an appointment to return and conduct the survey at a more convenient time.

Ideally, if the surveyor was struggling to find an address, they would return to the location twice more on different days and at different times in order to maximise the chance of being able to talk with different citizens in the local community to try to find the address. However, due to time constraints, this was amended to looking for 30 minutes at the time of trying to locate the address as well as a supervisor visit. If the address was still not found after this, the entry was coded as 'address not found'.

The full list-centric survey can be found in Appendix 4 and the full flow of the survey with associated error categorisations can be found in Section 4.4.

4.3.2 Citizen-centric phase execution

As noted above, the first phase of the citizen-centric work was a field survey which was executed by TNS Global. This was followed by a desk review to verify registration of citizens in other ACs and PPs as well as checking for non-registration following attempts to register using the latest voter rolls. Each of these two phases is detailed below.

4.3.2.1 Citizen-centric field work

The field work phase of the citizen-centric survey required surveyors to approach citizens in random households and cross-verify their presence (or not) on the voter list. For the avoidance of doubt, the frame of reference for the citizen-centric survey was whether the citizen was registered within the PP they live in. If they were not, this was seen as an error of inclusion. If they were, the questionnaire flow would ascertain any errors with their registration etc.

Households were selected to be surveyed as detailed in Section 4.2.3. Once at any one household, surveyors went through a process, which involved a computerized random selection from all 18+ members in a household, to select an eligible adult to be surveyed. The survey was loaded onto a CAPI system for the surveyors to use when on the field and was available in both English and Hindi.

If the door was locked for the desired household as per the skipping pattern, the surveyor would return twice more at different times to try to see if there was anyone home. If the specific sampled citizen (as per the criteria above) was not available for interview at the time of knocking, the surveyors would either request if another adult in the household could respond to the survey on their behalf or make an appointment to return and conduct the survey at a more convenient time.

The full citizen-centric survey can be found in Appendix 5 and the full flow of the survey with associated error categorisations can be found in Section 4.4.

4.3.2.2 Citizen-centric desk based work

Certain data points captured during the field work stage included claims of being on the voter list in a different Polling Part (PP) within the same Assembly Constituency (AC), in a different AC as well as in a different city. Since during the field work, the frame of reference used was registration in the PP a citizen lived in, as a result of which the surveyor only had access to that PP list, it was not possible to verify these claims while on the field. For the purpose of this verification, an additional desk based layer was used.

This layer used key information captured in the citizen-centric questionnaire to try and locate them on the national electoral database as well as Delhi's electoral database⁷. In order to be able to find a person on the above mentioned

^{7.} To locate citizens on lists/areas they claimed to be registered at, the following databases were used:

CEO, Delhi's elector search page - http://164.100.112.153/electorsearchtest.aspx and
 Election Commission of India's NVSP (National voter's services portal) - http://electoralsearch.in/

databases, certain key pieces of information were required:

- 1. Elector's name
- 2. Name of elector's father/mother/husband
- 3. Elector's age and gender
- 4. Assembly Constituency name

The above mentioned parameters, except for point number 3, were a must to be able to find citizens on Delhi's electoral database but the national electoral database allowed for more flexibility, in terms of the AC, age and relative names not being mandatory while searching for an elector.

Depending on where a citizen had claimed to be registered, different search methodologies were adopted to find and confirm their presence on that particular list. A detailed description of the desk based methodology for validation of citizen claims can be found in Appendix 6.

However, before classifying a citizen as found, certain checks were made to be sure that the citizen zeroed in on using this process, was the one interviewed on ground. These checks included matching the age, to as close as possible, that the citizen had stated as well as looking for the citizen's family members on the PP list that had been identified.

4.4 Error conceptualization and calculation

Each of the phases of the list-centric and citizen-centric work conspired to lead to the conceptualisation of errors within the voter list. The sections below outline the study flow to define and capture these errors.

4.4.1 List-centric error conceptualization

Figure 1 below shows the key survey flow to define and capture errors with the voter list using the list-centric method. Other questions to capture other details have been outlined but not defined by flow. The full survey can be found in Appendix 4.

As described earlier, addresses were scored for inclusion of each part of the address to provide an indication of whether the address was substantial enough to be found in the field. Those citizens whose address was deemed not findable were still sought in the field but if the address was not found in the field then it was considered an error with the quality of the address on the voter list. If the address was deemed findable, the entry was either deemed correct (if found on the field) or a deletion (if not found on the field).

4.4.2 Citizen-centric error conceptualization

Figure 2 below shows the key survey-flow to define and capture errors with the voter list using the citizen-centric method. Other questions to capture other details have been outlined but not defined by flow. The full survey can be found in Appendix 5.



Figure 1: Survey-flow to define and capture errors with the voter list using the list-centric method



Figure 2: Survey-flow to define and capture errors with the voter list using the citizen-centric method

Table 1 below summarises the error conceptualization in a tabular form. Below this are given the calculations that will form the basis of the error categories.

Table 1: Tabular summary of error conceptualization

LIST - CENTRIC Part 1 - DESK BASED	Part 2 FIELD WORK			VOTER HYGIENE CATEGORY
Address FINDABLE	Address found	Voter found	No error	1. NO ERROR
			Errors	2. POTENTIAL INABILITY TO VOTE
			Repeated	3. DELETION (proportional)
		Voter not found	Door closed/Non- participation	4. REMOVE FROM SAMPLE
			Shifted/dead/Not found/disenfranchised	5. DELETION [MINUS PROPORTION in LINE 3 in CITIZEN-CENTRIC]
	Address not found			6. DELETION
Address NOT FINDABLE	Address found	Voter found	No error	7. NO ERROR
			Errors	8. POTENTIAL INABILITY TO VOTE
			Repeated	9. DELETION (proportional)
		Voter not found	Door closed/Non- participation	10. REMOVE FROM SAMPLE
			Shifted/dead/Not found/disenfranchised	11. DELETION
	Address not found			12. DELETION* CORE LIST QUALITY
CITIZEN-CENTRIC Part 1 - FIELD WORK				
Door available	Registered on the list in the PP - YES	No error		13. NO ERROR
		Errors	ALL errors	14. POTENTIAL INABILITY TO VOTE
			SUB-SET: Wrong address, same PP	15. PROPORTION TO BE REMOVED FROM DELETIONS in LINE 5 in LIST-CENTRIC
		Repeated		16. DELETION (proportional)
	Registered on the list in the PP - NO			17. OMISSION Part 2 – DESK BASED: Cross-check registrations in other PPs & ACs. Cross-check late registrations on latest voter rolls
Door locked			Door closed/Non- participation	18. REMOVE FROM SAMPLE





Results: The List-Centric Desk Review and Survey

5. Results: The List - Centric Desk Review and Survey

The results section of this report will start with a description of the sample composition, followed by a detailed showcase of the findings from the list-centric survey for Delhi including the composition of errors on the voter list and associated demographic analyses. All quality assurance procedures followed can be found in Appendix 7.

5.1 Sample composition

To ensure sample representation with a 95% confidence level and a confidence interval of +/- 1.8% at the city level, an achieved sample size of 2963 citizens was required (or 2968, allowing for an equal distribution of citizens in each AC i.e. 371 in each). To account for a potential 10% of instances on the field where there was 'no response/door locked' or 'refusal to participate', a total of 3264⁸ citizens were sampled using electoral rolls from Delhi⁹. This sample was spread equally across the 8 selected ACs i.e. 408 in each. In the following sections, the sample composition of the desk research phase and the field work are outlined.

5.1.1 Desk research sample composition

As described in the methodology section, the sampled citizens underwent a desk research stage to ascertain the quality of addresses mentioned in voter lists. The details of all 3264 sampled citizens were analysed and all but six passed i.e. all but six addresses were deemed findable on ground. The table below (Table 3a) shows an AC wise break-up of the number of addresses deemed unfindable.

(n -samples)	Total	Rohini	Trinagar	Palam	RK Puram	Sangam Vihar	Okhla	Gandhi Nagar	Gokalpur
Total Addresses Sampled	3264	408	408	408	408	408	408	408	408
Deemed not-findable	6	1	-	2	-	-	-	2	1

Table 3: Address Quality – Total and Failed

Apart from this information, maps, which were considered to be a good-to-have parameter but not 'must have' to find an address were also analysed. Out of all PP Maps (n = 272), only 19% were found to be GIS maps and all of these were from the ACs Okhla (where all 34 PP maps were GIS), Palam (15 out of 34) and RK Puram (3 out of 34). Eighty percent of all PP maps were hand drawn and 1% i.e. three PP maps, all from Gandhi Nagar, were completely illegible/unreadable such that it was not even possible to determine whether they were hand drawn or GIS. Table 4 shows further details on the quality of maps present on the PP lists sampled.

in the methodology section.

^{8.} The 10% calculation was done on the achieved sample size rather than the total sample to approach and therefore does not match the proposed sample size

^{9.} October 2014 rolls were used as a sampling base

Table 4: Quality of Maps by Assembly Constituencies*

	Is the map in GIS format?	Does the source map seem like one of good quality? ¹⁰	Is the quality of the scan of the map good?	Are any streets labelled on the map?	Is the citizen's street labelled?
ROHINI					
Yes	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	97.1%	88.2%
No	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	11.8%
Unclear/Illegible	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
TRINAGAR					
Yes	0.0%	94.1%	0.0%	91.2%	0.0%
No	100.0%	5.9%	100.0%	8.8%	0.0%
Unclear/Illegible	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
PALAM					
Yes	44.1%	61.8%	88.2%	100.0%	58.8%
No	55.9%	38.2%	11.8%	0.0%	8.8%
Unclear/Illegible	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	32.4%
RK PURAM					
Yes	8.8%	100.0%	97.1%	97.1%	0.0%
No	91.2%	0.0%	2.9%	2.9%	0.0%
Unclear/Illegible	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
SANGAM VIHAR					
Yes	0.0%	67.6%	20.6%	100.0%	8.8%
No	100.0%	32.4%	79.4%	0.0%	8.8%
Unclear/Illegible	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	82.4%
OKHLA					
Yes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
No	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Unclear/Illegible	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
GANDHI NAGAR					
Yes	0.0%	79.4%	52.9%	91.2%	44.1%
No	91.2%	11.8%	38.2%	0.0%	14.7%
Unclear/Illegible	8.8%	8.8%	8.8%	8.8%	41.2%
GOKALPUR					
Yes	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	88.2%	73.8%
No	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%	26.2%
Unclear/Illegible	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

* Percentages are out of a total of 34 maps sampled in each AC; except for the last column, where it is out of 3264 citizens

As can be seen in Table 4, Okhla and Gandhi Nagar had the best maps while Trinagar (where none of the maps were readable because of poor quality scans), Sangam Vihar and Gandhi Nagar had the worst.

5.1.2 Field work sample composition

Surveyors tried to locate all 3264 sampled citizens on the field. However, as Table 5 below shows, the achieved sample for the field survey was 3017. Of the 3264 citizens sampled, 229 were removed due to 'door locked/no response' or 'refusal to participate'. A further 18 citizens were not part of the achieved sample as the PP of these resident did not allow entry; one whole polling part in Trinagar and half a PP in RK Puram¹¹. This left the achieved sample size at 3017. Three ACs were slightly under the desired sample size while the remaining five were either matching or higher than the desired sample. In total, the achieved sample was higher than required allowing for representation with a 95% confidence level and +/- 1.8% confidence interval.

(n -samples)	Total	Rohini	Trinagar	Palam	RK Puram	Sangam Vihar	Okhla	Gandhi Nagar	Gokalpur
Total Required	2968	371	371	371	371	371	371	371	371
Achieved	3017	341	371	399	361	401	358	390	396

Table 5: Sample required versus achieved

57% of the achieved sample was male and 43% were female. Around 72% of the achieved sample was aged 45 or below with the largest group being that of 26-30 year olds. Table 6 below, shows further details.

Table 6: Gender, Age Groups and Housing Type-for all addresses found (n=3017)

Gender		
	n	%
Male	1720	57.0%
Female	1297	43.0%
Third Gender	0	0%
Housing Type ¹² (n=2686)		
	n	%
Upper Class Housing	57	2.1%
Upper Middle Class Housing	521	19.4%
Lower Middle Class Housing	1935	72.0%
One room home/Designated Slum	119	4.4%
Self-Built Informal Slum Housing	54	2.0%

Age Group		
	n	%
18-25	454	15.0%
26-30	528	17.5%
31-35	454	15.0%
36-40	364	12.1%
41-45	357	11.8%
46-50	276	9.1%
51-55	192	6.4%
56-60	128	4.2%
61-65	77	2.6%
66-80	166	5.5%
81+	21	0.7%

These PPs were primarily formed of gated/closed communities who refused entry to the surveyors. Details can be found in Appendix 2.
 Housing Type data is on the base of the total addresses found in the valid sample, 2686. A breakdown of the housing categories is given in Appendix 8.
Among the addresses that were found, the largest chunk was found to be residing in lower middle class housing (72%). In Rohini, 76% of the addresses found could be categorized as either upper class or upper middle class housing, while in Okhla and RK Puram, this number was just a little under a third (at 29% and 30% respectively). In contrast, more than 94% of addresses found in Gokalpur, Palam and Sangam Vihar were lower middle class housing or below. Socio Economic Classification (SEC) data, a parameter that was recorded for citizens who were found residing at their listed addresses, appears to have a close link with housing type data. SEC A¹³, which is the most affluent SEC Category, forms about 30% of all citizens found but this was driven almost entirely by the ACs Rohini, Okhla and RK Puram and also to some extent by Trinagar. Ninety eight percent of the sample reported having lived in the same residence for two years or more. Almost all of the sample (99%) reported that they had been living in Delhi for two years or more (97% stated having lived in the city for 5 years or more).

As shown in Table 7 below, Hinduism was found to be the dominant religion with 84% of those found at their listed addresses stating it to be their religion. This was followed by Islam, at 12%. Hindus remained the dominant religious group across all ACs though in Okhla, nearly half (46.5%) reported Islam as their religion.

Religion	n	%
Hindu	1688	83.9%
Muslim	232	11.5%
Christian	13	0.6%
Sikh	42	2.1%
Jain	33	1.6%
Buddhist	2	<1%
None	0	0%
Do not want to answer	1	<1%
Other	0	0%
Total	2011	100.0%

Table 7: Religion – All Citizens Found (n=2011)

Among Hindus, the dominant sub group was the 'general' category at 56%. Both SCs and OBCs followed at 18% each. Similarly, the largest reported sub group within Muslims was the 'general' category at 45% followed by OBCs at 42%.

Where a particular citizen was not available for interview even after three attempts (but was resident at the address), the instrument allowed another adult in the household, if they felt confident, to answer on the citizen's behalf. This was done to ensure a low rate of refusal and shorter field work time. As a result, out of the 2011 interviews for citizens who were found to be residing at the listed address, as shown in Table 8 below, 56% were answered by others. Out of this number, close to 73% responses were given by immediate family members like fathers, mothers, sons, daughters, brothers, sisters, husbands or wives who felt confident enough to answer.

Table 8: Relationship – citizens who answered on behalf of the sampled citizen (n=1120)

Relation	n	%
Son/Daughter	184	16.4%
Wife	156	13.9%
Brother	126	11.3%
Mother	120	10.7%
Relative (like aunt, uncle etc.)	114	10.2%
Father	105	9.4%
Husband	80	7.1%
Sister	47	4.2%
Grandparent	13	1.2%
Others	175	15.6%

5.2 Delhi overall findings

Overall results of the list-centric survey, which was essentially designed to capture errors of deletion, are as shown in Table 9 below.

Table 9: All major error types and their projection to Delhi population

	Numbers	%	Projected to Delhi Voter pop. (Mn) ¹⁴
Total Citizens Sampled (including 10% buffer)	3246	-	
Refusals to participate /Door Locked	229	-	
Total Effective Sample (n)	3017	100.0%	
Address Not Found (ANF)	331	11.0%	1.4
Out of these - Findable	329	10.9%	1.4
Out of these - Non-Findable	2	<1%	0.01
Total Deletions	683	22.6%	3.0
Shifted	644	21.3%	2.8
Repeats/Duplicated	815	0.3%	0.03
Dead	30	1.0%	0.1
Disenfranchised (in prison)	1	<1%	<0.01
Errors With Registration Details	221	7.3%	1.0
No Errors	1782	59.1%	7.7

As Table 9 shows, while executing the survey, close to 11% of the addresses could not be located on ground. During earlier such studies, a large number of addresses sampled could not be located, especially in cities such as Patna and

^{14.} Delhi Voter Population number from ECI (as of 05/01/2015) - 13085251

Ranchi. This had warranted a change in methodology, as highlighted in the earlier section, of adding a desk based research layer to ascertain the quality of addresses given on voter rolls. This was done for two, interlinked, reasons. Firstly, to enhance the understanding of the potential reasons behind a large number of addresses not found i.e. are these due to poor quality address data being mentioned on the rolls or due to poor on-ground infrastructure. Relatedly, if the address data is of good quality on the rolls, there may be more certainty to conclude entries as deletions if not found in the field. In this study, out of the 331 addresses that could not be located, all but 2 were deemed findable after the desk research stage.

The survey also found that 23% of the effective sample was liable for deletion¹⁶. This means that 23% of the effective sample could potentially be deleted from their respective Polling Part (PP voter lists). Deletions include citizens having shifted, being repeated on the list, having died and having been disenfranchised (in prison). However, out of all the above reasons, it was found that 'shifted' i.e. the citizen having shifted to another location, was the biggest reason, at 21%, out of a total of 23% deletions.

Another 7% of the sample, though found residing at the address listed for them on the voter list, reported having at least one error or more with their details as mentioned in the list. The most common error was with the citizen's address, including parts of the address missing or incorrect and spelling mistakes. Table 10 shows the breakdown of registration errors.

Error with:	n	%
Name	64	29.0%
Relative's Name	63	28.5%
Age	21	9.5%
Gender	2	0.9%
Address	102	46.2%

Table 10: Types of errors with registration details – as mentioned on voter list (n=221)

When asked whether any of these errors had a bearing on their ability to cast a vote, only two out the 221 citizens with errors in their details reported having any such issues. Fifty-nine percent of the total sample were found at the correct address and had no registration detail errors.

5.3 Profile of citizens found shifted from their listed address

As indicated earlier, the largest proportion of entries that warrant deletion from their particular PP was 'shifted'. Using their listed information on the PP voter list, it can be seen that among those classified as shifted, 60% were male and 40% female, reflecting a more or less equal spread as per the achieved sample, which had 57% male and 43% female representation.

Age Groups	n	% of shifted by age groups	Cum. %	Achieved Sample Proportions	Index*
18-25	85	13.2%	13.2%	15.0%	88
26-30	133	20.7%	33.9%	17.5%	118
31-35	124	19.3%	53.1%	15.0%	129
36-40	71	11.0%	64.1%	12.1%	91
41-45	86	13.4%	77.5%	11.8%	114
46-50	51	7.9%	85.4%	9.1%	87
51-55	27	4.2%	89.6%	6.4%	66
56-60	26	4.0%	93.6%	4.2%	95
61-65	10	1.6%	95.2%	2.6%	62
66-80	25	3.9%	99.1%	5.5%	71
81+	6	0.9%	100.0%	0.7%	129

Table 11: Percentage of citizens classified as shifted by age group (n=644)

*Index calculated by dividing % shifted by age group by achieved sample proportion

A look at the shifted population by age group (again, using information listed on the PP voter list), as shown in Table 11, revealed that a larger proportion of those who had shifted, belonged to younger age groups, particularly 26-35. This possibly points towards the younger age groups as being more mobile. The age group of 18-25 were less likely to have shifted, perhaps pointing to less tendency to shift or migrate at this age owing to higher dependencies on their family. Also, from Table 12 it can be seen that citizens listed as residing in more affluent housing types were proportionally less likely to be classified as shifted. It could be that localities with better housing, such as Rohini, Okhla and RK Puram, have better maintained lists, or it could mean that citizens in these areas are less likely to migrate/move within the city.

Table 12: Housing Type for citizens classified as 'shifted' (n=644)

Housing Type	n	% of shifted by Housing Type	Cum. %	Achieved Sample Proportions	Index*
Self-Built Informal Slum Housing	7	1.1%	1.1%	2.0%	55
One room home/Designated Slum	27	4.2%	5.3%	4.4%	95
Lower Middle Class Housing	510	79.2%	84.5%	72.0%	110
Upper Middle Class Housing	91	14.1%	98.6%	19.4%	73
Upper Class Housing	9	1.4%	100.0%	2.1%	67

*Index calculated by dividing % shifted by housing type by achieved sample proportions

5.4 Profile of citizens with errors in their registration details

Among citizens who reported having errors in the details mentioned on the voter list, 53% were male and 47% female. Within age groups, there was a higher proportion of 31-35 year olds who reported errors with their details (see Table 13). Since most of the sampled citizens resided in lower middle class housing, it is not surprising that this group also had the largest share of citizens who reported having errors with their details; at 82.8% of all those reporting such an error, however this is still 12% higher than the overall sample proportion for this housing type. Broadly, errors in registration details were spread more or less equally among major demographic parameters (such as gender, housing type and religion) with slight distortions in age group, as highlighted above, and in Socio Economic Classification (SEC), where SEC B¹⁷ reported the highest proportion of errors (29%), which was significantly more than its proportion in the full achieved sample (23%).

Age Group	n	% of those with registration errors	Cum. %	Achieved sample proportion	Index*
18-25	37	16.7%	16.7%	15.0%	111
26-30	34	15.4%	32.1%	17.5%	88
31-35	46	20.8%	52.9%	15.0%	139
36-40	15	6.8%	59.7%	12.1%	56
41-45	25	11.3%	71.0%	11.8%	96
46-50	24	10.9%	81.9%	9.1%	119
51-55	15	6.8%	88.7%	6.4%	107
56-60	10	4.5%	93.2%	4.2%	107
61-65	5	2.3%	95.5%	2.6%	88
66-80	7	3.2%	98.6%	5.5%	58
81+	3	1.4%	100.0%	0.7%	200

Table 13: Age group composition of citizens who reported errors in their details (n=221)

*Index calculated by dividing % of those with registration errors by achieved sample proportions

Eighty three percent of those with registration errors reported their religion as 'Hinduism' and 13%, Islam. These proportions were quite similar to the total sample, where Hindus were 84% and Muslims, 12%.

The instrument had also asked citizens about the duration of their stay at their current residence and in Delhi. 93% of those who reported errors in their details claimed to have been residing at the listed address i.e. where they were found, for 5 years or more and 96% reported having lived in Delhi for 5 years or more.

Out of the 221 citizens who had reported errors in details, 86% reported having tried to rectify the error. When asked if these errors had prevented them from voting, only two such citizens claimed facing any such problem. Out of these 221 citizens, about 98% reported having a voted ID card with the correct photograph, a number which matches to the total valid sample, where 98% reported the same.

5.5 Attempts to register on the voter list

Another piece of information that emerges from this study is that more than 92% of citizens who were found, claimed to have applied/tried only once before being successfully registered on the voter list. This varies from a low of 81% in Sangam Vihar, which is a predominantly notified slum area that was very recently regularized by the state government¹⁸, to a high of 98% in Trinagar, an AC that had the lowest overall error rate among all ACs. Table 14 below shows the number of times successfully registered citizens applied to register onto the list.

No of tries	n	%
1	1841	91.6%
2	114	5.7%
3	37	1.8%
4+	18	0.9%

Table 14: Number of times tried before being successfully registered on the voter list (n=2010)

5.6 Data alignment with ECI summary revision of voter rolls

For this study, fieldwork began in December 2014 and sampling was done using the Delhi lists published in October 2014. But the ECI had ordered a summary revision of electoral rolls intending to clean voter lists as much as possible before the January 2015 Assembly Elections. As a result, revised rolls were published on the 5th of January 2015, coinciding with the list-centric field work. In order to account for the changes that the ECI would have made in these revised results, the study added a layer of checks and validations to ensure that any errors that the ECI had corrected, would be accounted for. This layer involved checking the status of all of the survey's respondents with errors (i.e. addresses not found, deletions and errors with registration details) on the lists published on 5th January 2015.

This was done to paint an accurate picture of the state of Delhi's rolls post the summary revisions to counter any possible challenge to the study's findings that were released prior to Delhi Assembly Elections (as shown in Table 15).

Table 15: Alignmen	t oj	^c data	with	the	ECI	summary	revisions
--------------------	------	-------------------	------	-----	-----	---------	-----------

	Numbers from Survey	%	Number of corrections in the sample by the ECI (summary revision)	Numbers from survey after accounting for corrections	Revised % - to reflect Jan'15 summary revisions
Total Citizens Sampled (including 10% buffer)	3246	-			
Refusals to participate /Door Locked	229	-			
Total Effective Sample (n)	3017	100.0%		3017	100.0%
Address Not Found (ANF)	331	11.0%	4	327	10.8%
Out of these - Findable	329	10.9%	4	325	10.9%
Out of these - Non-Findable	2	<0.1%	-	2	<0.1%
Total Deletions	683	22.6%	20	663	22.0%
Shifted	644	21.3%	13	631	20.9%
Repeats/Duplicated	8	0.3%	2	6	0.2%
Dead	30	1.0%	5	25	0.8%
Disenfranchised	1	<0.1%	-	1	<0.1%
Errors With Registration Details	221	7.3%	2	219	7.3%
No Errors	1782	59.1%	-	1808	5 9.9 %

18. The Union Cabinet of India amended the existing guidelines for regularization of unauthorized colonies on 29th December 2014, benefitting 1939 such colonies, Sangam Vihar included

As shown above, out of the 33.6% potential deletions (addresses not found + total Deletions) in the sample, only 2% of the errors had been addressed post the summary revisions. This change has little bearing on the study's findings and the overall Delhi List-centric Survey's results have been stated and analyzed based on the state of Delhi's electoral rolls as of October 2014.

5.7 List-centric survey – Delhi results summary

- 1. Eleven percent of addresses could not be located on ground. This, despite all but two of these addresses being deemed findable following the desk research phase (to identify the quality of addresses).
- Out of the total effective sample of 3017 citizens, 23% were liable for deletion from their particular Polling Parts.
 94% of these were because the citizens had shifted out of their listed residence.
 - a. Those who had shifted were more likely to be of the age group 26-35, making up 40% of all those classified as shifted.
 - b. Those shifted were more likely to have been living in 'lower middle class housing' (before shifting).
- 3. Seven percent of the total effective sample reported having errors with their registration details. Most of these errors were with the addresses mentioned; only 2 out of 221 such citizens reported having faced any issues while casting their vote.
 - a. Overall, errors appeared to be spread more or less equally among most demographic parameters, including religion, except a slight skew towards SEC B (29%) and 31-35 year olds (21%)
 - b. Ninety-three percent of those with errors in registration claimed to have been living at their address for 5 years or more and 86% of them had tried at least once to rectify the error(s).
- 4. Overall, 66% of the population was found to be on the right Polling Part lists. While 7% of this 66% reported having errors, 59% reported having no errors in their details.
- 5. Out of all those found, 92% claimed to have been registered on the list successfully after applying only once.



Results: The Citizen-Centric Survey and Desk Review

6. Results: The Citizen-Centric Survey and Desk Review

Similar to how results of the list-centric survey was structured, this section of the report will start with a description of the sample composition, followed by a detailed showcase of the findings from the citizen-centric survey for Delhi including the composition of errors and associated demographic analyses. All quality assurance procedures followed can be found in Appendix 7.

6.1 Sample composition

Similarly to the list-centric exercise, to ensure sample representation with a 95% confidence level and a confidence interval of +/- 1.8% at the city level, an achieved sample size of 2963 citizens was required (or 2968, allowing for an equal distribution of citizens in each AC, (371)). For this study, a 10% buffer was added to account for potential 'no responses/door closed'. Keeping that in mind, a total of 3264¹⁹ citizens were sampled using electoral rolls from Delhi1²⁰. This sample was spread equally across the eight selected ACs i.e. 408 in each and the same PPs as for the list-centric survey²¹. At the end of field work, a total sample of 3256 was achieved. The break-up is as shown in Table 16 below.

Table 16: Sample required versus achieved

(n -samples)	Total	Trinagar	Gandhi Nagar	Okhla	RK Puram	Gokalpur	Rohini	Palam	Sangam Vihar
Total Required	2968	371	371	371	371	371	371	371	371
Achieved	3256	407	409	410	409	408	400	408	405

In all ACs the required sample size was achieved and the total achieved sample of 3256 allowed for representation with a 95% confidence level and +/- 1.8 confidence interval.

Overall, males comprised 52% of the sample while females formed the rest, 48%. The younger age group of 18-35 formed close to 49% of the total population while 18-50 year olds formed 81% of the total population (as shown in Table 17). Within ACs, Rohini showed a much older population demographic compared to the total with the 56+ age group constituting 20% of all citizens sampled there (relatively higher than the city average of 14%); this was offset by a much lower 18-30 year old population (24%) than the city average of 36%.

Table 17: Gender, Age Groups and Housing Type-for all addresses sampled (n=3256)

Gender				Age Group	Age Group
	n	%			n
Male	1694	52.0%		18-25	18-25 697
Female	1562	48.0%		26-30	26-30 464
				31-35	31-35 427
Housing Type ²² ($n=2686$)				36-40	36-40 430
	n	%		41-45	41-45 352
Upper Class Housing	53	1.7%		46-50	46-50 261
Upper Middle Class Housing	444	14.1%		51-55	51-55 173
Lower Middle Class Housing	2434	77.4%		56-60	56-60 154
	2.0.			61-65	61-65 134
One room home/Designated Slum	122	3.9%		66-80	66-80 148
Self-Built Informal Slum Housing	92	2.9%		81+	81+ 16

19 The 10% calculation was done on the achieved sample size rather than the total sample to approach and therefore does not match the proposed sample size in the methodology section. 20 October 2014 rolls were used as a sampling base

21 In three of the ACs, there were a number of PPs where entry to the surveyors was denied. In these cases, alternate PPs were sampled. Details of these can be found in Appendix 2. 22 Housing Type data was not recorded for 111 respondents The bulk of the population resided in lower middle class housing (77.4%) followed by upper middle class housing (14.1%). A closer look at ACs reveals that the key driver behind 14.1% appearing as upper middle class, was Rohini, where 50% of citizen dwellings were classified so. Rohini also shows an interesting divide, with a larger proportion, compared to the total, residing in comparatively premium dwelling units as well as a larger proportion residing in informal slum housing (15% compared to only 3% in the total sample). Sixty percent of Rohini's respondents resided in upper middle to upper class housing. Also, Gokulpur showed the most uniformity with over 96% respondents residing in lower middle class housing (see Table 18).

Housing Type	ALL	Trinagar	Gandhi Nagar	Okhla	RK Puram	Gokalpur	Rohini	Palam	Sangam Vihar
Self-Built Informal Slum Housing	2.9%	4.0%	0.3%	0.5%	3.2%	0.3%	14.6%	0.0%	0.5%
One room home/ Designated Slum	3.9%	1.7%	1.3%	5.2%	14.2%	1.8%	1.8%	3.2%	2.1%
Lower Middle Class Housing	77.4%	82.2%	87.9%	77.1%	68.7%	96.4%	24.1%	90.9%	92.7%
Upper Middle Class Housing	14.1%	8.9%	10.6%	17.0%	13.9%	1.6%	49.7%	5.9%	4.7%
Upper Class Housing	1.7%	3.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	9.8%	0.0%	0.0%
(n) - sample	3145	405	379	407	380	384	398	408	384

Table 18: Housing Type by AC (in percentages)

Socio Economic Classification data also shows some similar trends to the housing type data, with 52% of Rohini's respondents classified as SEC A²³, the most well-off socio-economic class. Gokulpur and Sangam Vihar have the largest numbers of Lower SECs with 66% and 75% respectively, belonging to SEC C and lower. Overall, Rohini, RK Puram, Okhla and Trinagar appear to be richer ACs with an average SEC A population that is substantially higher than the other ACs as shown in Table 19 below.

Table 19: SEC by AC (n=3256)

SEC	ALL	Trinagar	Gandhi Nagar	Okhla	RK Puram	Gokalpur	Rohini	Palam	Sangam Vihar
SEC A	24.3%	30.0%	16.9%	30.0%	31.5%	10.3%	52.0%	18.9%	5.4%
SEC B	23.7%	30.7%	32.0%	18.3%	16.4%	23.3%	14.5%	34.6%	19.8%
SEC C	23.2%	19.9%	17.1%	21.2%	24.7%	29.7%	12.8%	31.6%	28.4%
SEC D	17.0%	10.8%	24.7%	17.3%	12.2%	21.8%	9.5%	11.5%	27.9%
SEC E	11.8%	8.6%	9.3%	13.2%	15.2%	15.0%	11.3%	3.4%	18.5%
(n)	3256	407	409	410	409	408	400	408	405

Hindus formed the majority group at 82% followed by Muslims at 13%. The percentage of Hindus ranged from 95% in Gokalpur to a 51% in Okhla (where 48% reported themselves to be Muslims). Though overall, Hinduism was the dominant religion, the ACs of Okhla, Gandhi Nagar and Sangam Vihar had proportionally larger Muslim proportions compared to the total population, at 48%, 21% and 16% respectively. Within Hindus, the largest group was that of General/Forward Caste category at 54%, followed by Scheduled Castes (21%) and then Other Backward Castes (18%). What is interesting is that Gokalpur and Sangam Vihar have a higher proportion of SCs and OBCs compared to the total sample. Rohini had the highest proportion of the 'General/Forward Caste Category' at 71% (see Table 20 below).

	ALL	Trinagar	Gandhi Nagar	Okhla	RK Puram	Gokalpur	Rohini	Palam	Sangam Vihar
OBCs	18.2%	15.2%	14.3%	15.8%	14.6%	22.0%	12.3%	23.1%	27.1%
SCs	20.6%	17.1%	20.9%	30.6%	18.6%	38.0%	8.4%	10.1%	25.0%
STs	1.1%	0.8%	1.5%	1.4%	1.9%	0.8%	0.3%	2.3%	0.0%
GEN/FC	53.9%	64.6%	51.6%	44.5%	54.9%	32.3%	71.1%	61.8%	45.7%
DK/CS	5.8%	2.0%	11.7%	7.7%	8.1%	7.0%	7.9%	2.1%	2.1%
Non- Disclosure	0.4%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%
(n)	2675	356	273	209	370	387	367	385	328

Table 20: Hindu Caste Groups by AC (n=2675)

A look at Castes within Muslims shows that the General category forms a majority at 38%, followed closely by OBCs at 36%. About 22% of the Muslim proportion in the study sample reported not knowing their castes. Okhla, which houses the largest Muslim proportion in this study, also has the highest OBC Muslim proportion in our sample. Not unexpectedly, the sample composition for the citizen-centric survey bears similarities with that of list-centric survey.

6.2 Delhi overall findings

Results of the citizen-centric survey, which was designed to effectively capture errors of omission, are as in Table 21 below.

Table 21: Overall Omissions in Delhi (n=3256)

	n	% of total sample	% of total omissions	Projected to Delhi Voter pop. (Mn) ²⁴
Total Sample Achieved	3256	-	-	-
Total Omissions	1595	49.0%	-	6.4
Citizens Registered Elsewhere In Delhi	904	27.8%	56.7%	3.6
In other polling parts	83825	25.7%	52.5%	3.4
In other assembly constituencies	66	2.0%	4.1%	0.3
Citizens Registered Outside Delhi	36	1.1%	2.3%	0.1
Citizens who have applied from current address	275	8.4%	17.2%	1.1
Others (never applied/applied from somewhere else)	223	6.8%	14.0%	0.9
Don't Know/Can't Say	157	4.8%	9.8%	0.6
NOT OMITTED	1661	51.0%	-	6.7

24. Delhi Voter Population number from ECI (as of 05/01/2015) -13085251 voters.

25. One citizen who said they were registered in another PP in the same AC in Delhi also indicated they had applied to be on the voter list at their current address. They are only included in the former category in this table and all further analyses.

Out of a total of 3256 citizens who were surveyed, 49% could not be located on their respective Polling Part list. However, out of this segment, 57% claimed to be registered in either another Polling Part (PP) within their Assembly Constituency (AC) or in another AC within the city. Broadly, a large number of citizens who were omitted from their PP list claimed to be registered elsewhere in Delhi. Another large proportion of omissions, a little over 17%, claimed to have applied or registered from the current address. Fourteen percent of those omitted, a sizeable proportion, displayed some apathy stating that they had never applied or that they had applied from some other address that they did not recall. Lastly, 10% of omissions did not know or could not recall if they were registered anywhere else or if they had applied to vote, which may also be pointing towards voter apathy.

6.3 Verification of citizens claiming to be registered elsewhere in Delhi

Nine hundred and four respondents who could not be located on their Polling Part lists claimed to be registered elsewhere in Delhi. In order to validate these claims, as described in the methodology section, a layer of desk research was added after completion of the fieldwork which involved searching for these citizens on Delhi's electoral database. The methodology adopted was robust and was designed to determine the presence of these citizens to a large degree of certainty. In order to make sure that the citizen found was the one surveyed, most searches were linked to the presence of one or more of the citizen's family members on the same PP list. So, in addition to matching citizen names and age groups, the availability of family members was also used to hone in on the surveyed citizen. Adopting this method increased the probability of the found citizen being the one who was surveyed on field, by a great deal. Further details on the methodology used to try to locate citizens can be found in Appendix 6.

Due to the manner in which Delhi's publicly available electoral database is structured, searching for the largest segment, i.e. citizens claiming to be registered in a different PP within the same Assembly Constituency (AC) was undertaken (n=838). Twenty-two out of the aforementioned category chose to not disclose their name and age, details without which validation could not be done; because of this, the effective number of respondents that were searched reduced to 816. Results from this stage are as in Table 22 below.

AC Name	Names to be validated (n)	Names found (n)	% Names found
Gandhi Nagar	98	65	66.3%
Gokalpur	124	96	77.4%
Okhla	184	91	49.5%
Palam	60	35	58.3%
R K Puram	87	62	71.3%
Rohini	59	36	61.0%
Sangam Vihar	183	97	53.0%
Trinagar	21	16	76.2%
Total	816	498	61.0%

Table 22: Validation of names – Citizens claiming to be in same AC, different PP (n=816)

In order to find a citizen on the Delhi electoral database, the basic parameters needed are:

- 1. Citizen's Name along with surname
- 2. Relative's Name (father/husband/mother etc.)
- 3. AC Name

If these parameters are not available, finding a citizen or finding the right citizen may not be guaranteed. Out of the 816 citizens that were looked for, a total of 601 either had no surname or any other family member or were the eldest among all in their family, effectively negating the use of any family member's name as the relative's name to be entered on the voter search portal²⁶. Moreover, several of the names that were recorded during the survey had spelling mistakes and other minor errors that proved to be an additional hindrance. Despite all of these factors, the desk based stage was able to find 61% of all citizens who claimed to have been registered elsewhere in Delhi. In light of these, there is sufficient evidence to indicate that a large proportion of citizens, perhaps close to 90%, who 'claim' to be registered elsewhere in Delhi are indeed present on the list where they say they are.

6.4 Profile of citizens who thought they were on the list but were not

Citizens were asked, before checking for their names on the list, whether they thought they were registered. To this, 77% responded in the affirmative while 23% said that they were not. Out of the 77% who claimed to be registered at their current address, 34% were in fact not found on the list (i.e. out of 2515 citizens who claimed to be on the list, 858 could not be found). The largest numbers within this segment came from Sangam Vihar and Okhla, at 22% and 21% respectively. The relatively more affluent ACs of Tri Nagar and Rohini had the lowest numbers of citizens who thought they were on the list but were not, at 2% and 5% respectively.

A look at SEC showed that, the segment SEC D, at 22% had a higher proportion of citizens who thought they were registered but were in fact not, when compared to the total sample while SEC A had a significantly lower proportion at 18%. There seems to be an indication that a person, who thinks that he or she is registered at the current address, is more likely to be found omitted if they belong to lower SECs as shown in Table 23.

SEC	zn	% of citizens not on the list (but thought they were)	% proportions in total sample (n=3256)	Index*
SEC A	154	17.9%	24.3%	74
SEC B	211	24.6%	23.7%	104
SEC C	195	22.7%	23.2%	98
SEC D	185	21.6%	17.0%	127
SEC E	113	13.2%	11.8%	112

Table 23: SEC split for citizens who thought they were on the list but could not be found (n=858)

*Index calculated by dividing % of citizens not on the list (but thought they were) by total sample proportions

A look at housing data for citizens who incorrectly thought they were on the list shows that such citizens were less likely to be residing in upper middle class housing and upper class housing and more likely to be in one room home/ designated slum' and 'lower middle class housing (with the latter two housing types having a combined proportion of 89%, compared to 81% in the total sample; see Table 24), corroborating what SEC Data pointed towards.

Housing Type	n	% of citizens not on the list (but thought they were)	% proportions in total sample (3256)	Index**
Self-Built Informal Slum Housing	18	2.2%	2.9%	75
One room home/Designated Slum	48	5.8%	3.9%	149
Lower Middle Class Housing	686	83.1%	77.4%	107
Upper Middle Class Housing	73	8.8%	14.1%	63
Upper Class Housing	1	0.1%	1.7%	7

Table 24: Housing Type split for citizens who thought they were on the list but could not be found ($n = 826^*$)

*Household Type was not available for 32 citizens who thought they were on the list but were not. **Index calculated by dividing % of citizens not on the list (but thought they were) by total sample proportions

6.5 Profile of citizens omitted from their polling part but registered elsewhere in the city

Fifty-seven percent of citizens omitted claim to be registered elsewhere within Delhi. That is a total of 904 respondents in the study. The spread of these citizens across ACs is as given in Table 25 below:

Table 25: AC wise spread	l of citizens	registered else	ewhere in the	<i>city (n=904)</i>
--------------------------	---------------	-----------------	---------------	---------------------

AC Name	n	%
Delhi Total	904	100.0%
Trinagar	23	2.5%
Gandhi Nagar	110	12.2%
Okhla	203	22.5%
RK Puram	101	11.2%
Gokalpur	132	14.6%
Rohini	62	6.9%
Palam	72	8.0%
Sangam Vihar	201	22.2%

As shown in the table, the bulk of these came from the ACs Okhla, Sangam Vihar and Gokalpur; possibly so, as 74% of citizens who claim to be registered elsewhere in the city had also claimed incorrectly of their presence in their Polling Part List. (most of such cases did come from Sangam Vihar and Okhla).

Fifty-five percent of those who claimed to be registered elsewhere were male and 45% female. A look at age groups revealed a direction similar to that in list-centric (where younger age groups, 26-35, were more likely to have been found as shifted), that younger age groups were more likely to be found omitted compared to the total (see Table 26). Another similarity with list-centric data was that there was a smaller proportion of 18-25 year olds who are omitted from the PP (and registered elsewhere) compared to their proportions in the total sample. This possibly reinforces the theory that younger citizens, between the ages 26-35 are more mobile and therefore, likely to have a higher probability of being omitted.

AGE	n	% of citizens registered elsewhere in the city	% proportion in total sample (n=3256)	Index*
18-25	166	18.4%	21.4%	86
26-30	144	15.9%	14.3%	111
31-35	132	14.6%	13.1%	111
36-40	124	13.7%	13.2%	104
41-45	107	11.8%	10.8%	110
46-50	75	8.3%	8.0%	104
51-55	40	4.4%	5.3%	83
56-60	39	4.3%	4.7%	92
61-65	34	3.8%	4.1%	92
66-80	39	4.3%	4.5%	96
81+	4	0.4%	0.5%	88

Table 26: Citizens omitted but registered elsewhere in the city by age (n=904)

*Index calculated by dividing % of citizens registered elsewhere in the city by total sample proportions

There was a higher proportion of citizens residing in 'lower middle class housing' or below and SEC D or below who were omitted from the list (but registered elsewhere within the city) when compared to the total sample as can be seen in Table 27 below.

Table 27: Housing Type and SEC breakdown for citizens who claimed to be registered elsewhere in Delhi

Housing Type (n=864)*	n	% of citizens registered elsewhere in the city	% proportion in total sample (3256)	Index**
Self-Built Informal Slum Housing	36	4.2%	2.9%	144
One room home/Designated Slum	37	4.3%	3.9%	110
Lower Middle Class Housing	701	81.1%	77.4%	105
Upper Middle Class Housing	87	10.1%	14.1%	71
Upper Class Housing	3	0.3%	1.7%	20
		% of citizens		
SEC (n=904)	n	registered elsewhere in the city	% proportion in total sample (3256)	Index**
SEC (n=904) SEC A	n 164	registered elsewhere in the city 18.1%	% proportion in total sample (3256) 24.3%	Index** 75
SEC (n=904) SEC A SEC B	n 164 215	registered elsewhere in the city 18.1% 23.8%	% proportion in total sample (3256) 24.3% 23.7%	Index** 75 100
SEC (n=904) SEC A SEC B SEC C	n 164 215 203	registered elsewhere in the city 18.1% 23.8% 22.5%	% proportion in total sample (3256) 24.3% 23.7% 23.2%	Index** 75 100 97
SEC (n=904) SEC A SEC B SEC C SEC D	n 164 215 203 202	registered elsewhere in the city 18.1% 23.8% 22.5% 22.3%	% proportion in total sample (3256) 24.3% 23.7% 23.2% 17.0%	Index** 75 100 97 131

*Housing Type was not available for 40 citizens who were omitted from the list but claimed to be registered elsewhere in Delhi. **Index calculated by dividing % of citizens registered elsewhere in the city (by Housing Type/SEC) by total sample proportions 76% of those claiming to be registered elsewhere in the city were Hindus and 21% Muslims; Jains were at 1.7% followed by Sikhs at 1%. When compared to religious break-up of the total sample (Muslims form 13%), Muslims have larger representation in those found omitted and claiming to be registered elsewhere in the city.

6.6 Profile of citizens who claim to have applied to register from their current address (but were not found on the list)

The largest proportion of such omissions came from the AC of Palam (31%), followed by Gokalpur (17%) and Sangam Vihar (15%).

Out of all who claimed to have applied to register from their current address, 47% were male and 53% female. The age group of 18-25 formed 40% of this group, a significantly higher proportion than in the total sample as can be seen in Table 28 below.

Age Groups	n	% of citizens who have claimed to register from current address	% proportion in total sample (n=3256)	Index*
18-25	111	40.4%	21.4%	189
26-30	44	16.0%	14.3%	112
31-35	38	13.8%	13.1%	105
36-40	26	9.5%	13.2%	72
41-45	17	6.2%	10.8%	57
46-50	9	3.3%	8.0%	41
51-55	10	3.6%	5.3%	69
56-60	11	4.0%	4.7%	85
61-65	3	1.1%	4.1%	27
66-80	6	2.2%	4.5%	48
81+	0	0.0%	0.5%	-

Table 28: Citizens who claimed to have registered from current address by age (n=275)

*Index calculated by dividing % of citizens who have claimed to register from current address by total sample proportions

The bulk of these citizens, 90%, resided in lower middle class housing, a proportion somewhat larger than in the total sample, 77%. In line with housing Data, Socio Economic Classification data showed that SEC C and SEC D had over representation with regards to citizens saying they had registered from their current address but were not in fact on the list (see Table 29).

% of citizens who have claimed % proportion in SEC Index* to register from total sample (3256) current address SEC A 41 14.9% 24.3% 61 98 SEC B 64 23.3% 23.7% SEC C 86 31.3% 23.2%

18.9%

11.6%

Table 29: SEC split for citizens claiming to have registered from current address (n=275)

*Index calculated by dividing % composition of Housing Type/SEC by total sample proportions

A majority of these citizens, at 87% were Hindus with 10% Muslims, compared to 82% and 13% in the total sample respectively. The representation of Hindus was larger since 31% of these citizens came from the AC, Palam where over 94% claimed Hinduism as their religion.

17.0%

11.8%

111

99

When asked how long ago they had applied, 59% claimed to have applied six or more months ago with another 12% claiming to have applied somewhere between two to six months ago (see Table 30).

Table 30: How long ago did you apply? (n=275)

52

32

SEC D

SEC E

54

Time Period (when applied)	n	%
Less than 1 week	8	2.9%
1 week or more but less than 2 weeks	6	2.2%
2 weeks or more but less than 3 weeks	14	5.1%
3 weeks or more but less than 4 weeks	9	3.3%
4 weeks or more but less than 5 weeks	11	4.0%
5 weeks or more but less than 6 weeks	13	4.7%
6 weeks or more but less than 2 months	12	4.4%
2 months or more but less than 6 months	34	12.4%
6 months or more	161	58.5%
Don't know/can't say	7	2.5%

6.7 Profile of citizens who have never applied to be on the list or claimed to have applied from some other address as well those who could not recall whether they had

A total of 380 respondents, i.e. 24% of all omissions said that they had either never registered to apply from their current addresses or that they could not recall whether they had. Twenty-one percent of these citizens were from Okhla and 16% from RK Puram (see Table 31).

Out of 380, 223 had never tried/applied from the current residence i.e. 59% while 41% could not recall if they had applied or not.

	Delhi	Trinagar	Gandhi Nagar	Okhla	RK Puram	Gokalpur	Rohini	Palam	Sangam Vihar
(n)	380	46	38	79	59	30	34	47	47
% - out of ALL who had never registered or could not recall	100%	12.1%	10.0%	20.8%	15.5%	7.9%	8.9%	12.4%	12.4%

Table 31: AC wise break of citizens who never applied/tried or those who cannot remember if they did (n=380)

This segment, i.e. those who never tried to register or those who could not recall if they had, comprised of 46% males and 54% females, while the overall sample had 52% males and 48% females, i.e. females were more likely not to have applied to register or could not recall. Data also showed a big skew towards the 18-25 year old segment not registering/ recalling if they had tried and a slight one towards the 26-30 year olds, compared to overall sample proportions (see Figure 3).





*Never tried means citizens who never tried to register from their current address or the address where they were found to be residing

A look at housing revealed that almost 75% of the population, who had never tried to register or couldn't recall if they had, resided in 'lower middle class housing', which was comparable to the overall sample but 9.2% were found to be residing at 'one room home/designated slum' versus a 4% in the total sample. In alignment, SEC data shows a skew towards the lower SECs C, D and E (see Table 32).

% proportion in SEC % Index* total sample (3256) SEC A 56 14.7% 24.3% 61 SEC B 68 17.9% 23.7% 76 SEC C 27.9% 106 23.2% SEC D 77 20.3% 17.0% SEC E 73 19.2% 11.8%

Table 32: SEC split for citizens who never tried to register from current address/cannot recall (n=380)

*Index calculated by dividing % composition of SEC by total sample proportions

Most of those who had never tried to register or could not recall if they had, reported Hinduism as their religion, with 79% claiming so, followed by Islam, at 17%. The proportion of Muslims, however, was substantially larger than in the total sample (13%).

The 223 citizens, who had said that they never tried to register from their current address, were asked reasons behind their not registering or trying to register from the address that they were found residing at. The top reasons were a lack of knowledge on where and how to register, followed by claims that they did not have the requisite documents to register and that they thought it was too tedious/difficult to do so (see Figure 4).





When asked what the main reason was behind them not registering, 23% cited not having the requisite documents, followed by not knowing where to register (20%), citing that it was too tedious (18%) and citing a lack of knowledge on how to register (18%). It appeared from data that besides a perception of the process being difficult and that there was not enough information on how and where to register, an important factor may also be a lack of understanding on the documentation required.

6.8 Profile of citizens who were on the list

The citizen-centric survey also found about 51% citizens to be on the list, registered at their current residence. Not unsurprisingly, the patterns that emerged out of profiling variables for citizens who were found on the list, appear to be opposite to the picture omissions painted. Nineteen percent, the largest proportion, was from Trinagar followed by RK Puram (17%) and Gandhi Nagar (14%). The lowest proportions were from Okhla, 5.5% and Sangam Vihar, 7% (see Table 33).

AC Name	n	%
All ACs	1661	100%
Trinagar	316	19.0%
Gandhi Nagar	230	13.8%
Okhla	92	5.5%
R K Puram	220	13.2%
Gokalpur	192	11.6%
Rohini	296	17.8%
Palam	199	12.0%
Sangam Vihar	116	7.0%

Table 33: Citizens found on the list by AC (n=1661)

Table 34: Citizens found on the list by age (n=1661)

Age Groups	n	%	% proportion in total sample (n = 3256)	Index*
18-35	642	38.7%	48.8%	79
36-50	616	37.1%	32.0%	116
51+	403	24.3%	19.1%	127

*Index calculated by dividing % composition of AGE by total sample proportions

The age group of 18-35 had an index value of 79 (see Table 34); this showed that the age group had a significantly lower proportion within voter List Inclusions than the total sample.

Reading SEC and housing type data together (shown in Table 35) indicated that the relatively wealthier were less likely to be omitted; SEC A formed over 31% of the segment, substantially higher than the sample proportion of 24% and similarly, there was a skew towards upper middle class housing as well as upper class housing.

Table 35: Housing Type and SEC breakdown for citizens who were not omitted

Housing Type (n = 1611)	n	%	% proportion in total sample (n = 3256)	Index*
Self-Built Informal Slum Housing	48	3.0%	2.9%	103
One room home/Designated Slum	38	2.4%	3.9%	60
Lower Middle Class Housing	1191	73.9%	77.4%	96
Upper Middle Class Housing	287	17.8%	14.1%	126
Upper Class Housing	47	2.9%	1.7%	172

SEC (n = 1661)	n	%	% proportion in total sample (3256)	Index*
SEC A	520	31.3%	24.3%	129
SEC B	418	25.2%	23.7%	106
SEC C	354	21.3%	23.2%	92
SEC D	217	13.1%	17.0%	77
SEC E	152	9.2%	11.8%	78

*Index calculated by dividing % composition of Housing Type/SEC by total sample proportions

Data on religion showed that the proportion of Muslims (8%) included on the voter list was much lower compared to the total sample (13%). Among Hindus, the General/Forward Caste category, at 60%, was a little more likely to be on the list than not, considering their proportion within Hindus in the overall sample was 54%.

Ninety percent of those found on the list had no errors while 10% reported having errors in their registration details as detailed in Table 36 below.

T 11 0 (-	0								
Table 36.	Types	ot errors	with	registration	details - as	mentioned	on voter	list	(n=1)	68)
100000000	- JP CD .	0,00.0		egisti union			0.11 10101		(

Error with:	n*	%
Name	59	35.1%
Relative's Name	50	29.8%
Age	35	20.8%
Gender	0	0.0%
Address	52	31.0%

*Citizens could select as many options as applied

None of the citizens with errors in registration details, reported facing any issues casting their vote. As with the listcentric survey, errors with address details were among the most common errors. Just four citizens had listed the door/ house number as incorrect²⁷. In this survey the most common error was with the name of the citizen (either a spelling mistake, part/whole missing, the wrong name listed). Just two citizens had their name repeated on the voter list.

6.9 Citizen-centric survey – Delhi results summary

- 1. Broadly, results from the citizen-centric study indicated that close to a half of the citizens were omitted from their Polling Part lists 49%.
- 2. A majority of these however, were still residing in the city, either at another polling part within the same AC or in another AC 28% of total sample/57% of omissions
 - a. Data indicates that these tend to be mostly from the young and mobile population (26-35 year olds at 31%), living in 'lower middle class housing' or below dwelling units (close to 90% reside in these) and belonging to lower SECs (D and E form 36%). Also, Muslims have a higher probability of being found omitted (21%)
- 3. Eight percent of the total sample and 17% of all omissions claimed to have registered to be on their Polling Part's list i.e. from their current residential address.
 - a. These tend to be from the youngest age group i.e. 18-25 year olds (40%), belonging to SEC C (31%)
 and residing in lower middle class dwelling units. Hindus form a majority of these citizens (87%),
 higher than the total sample proportion.
- 4. Out of the total omissions pie, close to 24%, claimed either that they have not tried registering from their current address or that they did not recall if they did. This, possibly, a core segment that may be displaying voter apathy, also formed 12% of the total sample size. For citizens who did not try to register, the biggest reasons for not doing so were a lack of knowledge on where and how to registered and despite these, a perception of the process being too tedious and that they did not possess the right paperwork.
 - a. These citizens tend to be young (18-25 forming a huge chunk, at 47%) from the lower SECs (C, D and E together make 67% compared to 52% in the overall sample) and data on religion showed a skew towards Muslims (17%).
- 5. 1661 citizens, or 51% of the total sample was found to be on the list. Out of this, close to 90% reported having no errors with any of their details while 10% did. Out of the citizens who reported having errors with their details, none reported having faced any issues while casting their vote.
 - a. A look at the profile of citizens who were on the list, not unsurprisingly, showed mostly the opposite of what omissions had shown. These were more likely to be older citizens from higher SECs and were less likely to be Muslims.



Results: Combining the List-Centric and Citizen-Centric Research Phases

7. Results: Combining the List-Centric and Citizen-Centric Research Phases

Tables 37 and 38 provide the overall picture of errors that plague voter lists in Delhi. These results, when read together, provide directions into both broad errors i.e. of deletion, from the list-centric phase and of omission, from the citizen-centric phase.

In particular, a key finding from the list-centric survey was that 21% citizens were found to have shifted. At the same time, 28% of citizens in the citizen-centric survey who were omitted from the list indicated they were registered elsewhere in Delhi (either in a different PP in the same AC or in another AC)- see the arrow relating the figures between the two tables. Given both phases of work were undertaken in the same ACs and PPs and both are representative of the Delhi population, it is possible to read the data together and suggest that most of the citizens who were found to be shifted are still likely to be within the city of Delhi.

	Numbers	%
Total Citizens Sampled (including 10% buffer)	3246	-
Refusals to participate /Door Locked	229	-
Total Effective Sample (n)	3017	100.0%
Address Not Found (ANF)	331	11.0%
Out of these - Findable	329	10.9%
Out of these - Non-Findable	2	<1%
Total Deletions	683	22.6%
Shifted	644	21.3%
Repeats/Duplicated	8	0.3%
Dead	30	1.0%
Disenfranchised	1	<1%
Errors With Registration Details	221	7.3%
No Errors	1782	59.1 %

Table 37: Results from the List-centric Survey – all major error types (n=3017)

Table 38: Results from the Citizen-centric Survey – all major error types (n=3256)

	n	% of total sample	% of total omissions
Total Sample Achieved	3256	-	
Total Omissions	1595	49.0%	-
Citizens Registered Elsewhere In Delhi	904	27.8%	56.7%
In other polling parts	838	25.7%	52.5%
In other assembly constituencies	66	2.0%	4.1%
Citizens Registered Outside Delhi	36	1.1%	2.3%
Citizens who have applied from current address	275	8.4%	17.2%
Others (never applied/applied from somewhere else)	223	6.8%	14.0%
Don't Know/Can't Say	157	4.8%	9.8%
NOT OMITTED	1661	51.0%	-

In light of this, arguably, the deletions and omissions which are not migrations within the city may be seen differentially to those which are. In Delhi, out of the total errors found, it appears that these deletions are those from the categories of 'address not founds' (up to 11% of all on Delhi's lists, see Table 37) and 'repeats/dead/disenfranchised' citizens (1.4% of all citizens on Delhi's lists, see Table 37). Similarly, the omissions would comprise of citizens who claim to have registered to be on their PP lists but are not on it (8% of Delhi's 18+ population, see Table 38).

Aside from this, data from both surveys appears to show that the younger age group, especially 26-35, the poorer and marginalized sections of society (lower SECs²⁸ and those residing in lower housing types²⁹) are worse off with respect to errors on the list. Broadly speaking, errors tend to be found more likely for citizens who are relatively less well off, are young and mobile and belong to Hindu lower castes; and in some error types, more likely for citizens reporting Islam as their religion.



Discussion

8. Discussion

8.1 Overall discussion

The findings from this project lead to a range of points for discussion and consideration for improving the quality of the voter lists and associated issues, in particular in Delhi.

Overall, there seems to be little doubt that Delhi's electoral rolls are unclean. With large amounts of deletions and additions required to the list, there is a sharp need for improved voter list management processes. This is required regardless of the fact that a large part of the errors in Delhi are due to citizens moving from one address to the other, within the city. The latter however, does mean that the effects of these errors on electoral outcomes and voter turn-out may not be as grave as their magnitudes suggest. Since a large number of deletions appear to be off-set by omissions, it is possible that citizens registered elsewhere in the city, as long as they are aware and willing, do actually exercise their right to vote by going to the polling booths they are registered at. Having said that, there is also a possibility, perhaps higher, of such errors affecting electoral participation.

Deletions and omissions which may relate more directly to electoral outcomes are those from the categories of 'address not founds' (up to 11% of all on Delhi's lists) and 'repeats/dead/disenfranchised' citizens (1.4% of all citizens on Delhi's lists). Similarly, the omissions would comprise of citizens who claim to have registered to be on their PP lists but are not on it (8% of Delhi's 18+ population). In terms of advocacy, this means a key focus on removing those names classified as 'repeats/dead/disenfranchised' and possibly a significant chunk of those classified under 'address not found', though the latter remains an uncertain category. Similarly, in omissions, focus needs to be on making sure that all citizens who have applied to register, are actually added on to the lists. That said, the overall maintenance of citizens registered in correct PPs with the correct information remains. Furthering the sentiment of requiring better voter list management processes, is the fact that 7% of citizens, though registered in the correct PP, were found to have errors with their details on the list. Though only a small number faced issues voting as a result, the issue of quality list management remains.

In a related point, errors of repetition were not found to be as rife as perhaps suggested given the attention of this issue in the media³⁰. This may, in part, be a methodological issue, given that repeats were only searched for within the same PP and done by the citizen surveyed. A lack of rigour may have been there from the citizens' side, with lack of time and interest perhaps forming a part. It may be better to search for duplications in a more automated fashion using appropriate software. This and further methodological reflections can be found in Section 8.2

As noted, the 11% of 'addresses not found' remains a grey area of interpretation. Although each address went through a quality check for findability and the vast majority were deemed findable, in actuality there may be a lot of parameters on the ground (not captured by desk research) which may impact the findability of an address. One of these could simply be familiarity with an area. More work could be done to further dissect this category of errors, particularly given that the ECI, as part of its electoral registration process, includes a stage of on-ground verification. If 11% of the sampled addresses were not findable, how are the ECI able to verify these addresses?

Most of the errors with the voter list appear to be spread evenly across the city, leaving little case for them to be exploited for undue gains. From anecdotal evidence, malpractices such as phantom voting/bogus voting or booth capturing etc. tend to take place only in certain areas pointing to a geographic concentration of errors that lend themselves to exploitation. This is something that the Delhi study did not find evidence on, probably partly due to the random sampling approach taken rendering it impossible to see/look for clustered patterns of errors. It is suggested that a different research methodology is used to try to better understand issues such as bogus voting/phantom voting or other such malpractices as well as problems in the registration process, for example a structured review of, and discussion with, Booth Level Officers who are integral to the voter list maintenance process.

³⁰ There were several reports, in reputed newspapers and media channels, of the presence of a large number of duplicate entries on the rolls while the study was being conducted. Links to some are as below:

^{1.} The Indian Express - Poll panel finds 90,000 multiple entries in rolls; Source - http://indianexpress.com/article/cities/delhi/poll-panel-finds-90000-multiple-entries-in-rolls/, last accessed - 16042015

^{2.} DNA India – 89 thousand cases of multiple entries found in Delhi electoral rolls; Source - http://www.dnaindia.com/india/report-89-thousand-cases-of-multiple-entries-found-in-delhielectoral-rolls-2050013, last accessed - 16042015

Data from the citizen-centric survey suggests that 12% of the population has either never tried to apply to be on the voter list from their current address or cannot recall if they ever did. This category could arguably form the core of citizens displaying voter apathy. Most of them appear to have been living in their residence for more than two years and yet have not tried or cannot recall having tried to register to be on the voter list at this address. This is more likely to be seen with the less affluent, younger population and also the marginalized. Data shows that this 'apathy' is driven by a lack of awareness on how and where to register and of the documentation required. It also shows that despite a lack of awareness, citizens perceive the process of registration as a very tedious and time consuming one. Therefore, it can be said that efforts to try and get such masses to enrol and exercise their right to vote must start at addressing these problems and such efforts should most definitely reach the marginalized and less affluent sections of society, not to mention the younger population.

While this research has been largely successful in bringing out an objective picture of the state of Delhi's electoral rolls, it also leaves several questions that beg further thought and investigation. For example, a large proportion of Delhi's residents appear to have been living in the city for five years or more which may explain why a lot of the errors on the voter list may be intra-city migrations. Other cities with different migration patterns, or a more detailed look at recent migrant communities in Delhi, may throw up different list quality issues. Other cities' lists may also vary in the quality of the address details they hold leading to other concerns of list content. It is therefore suggested to undertake similar research in other cities, supplemented by other work as outlined, to allow for inter-city comparisons as well as pan-India trends in list quality issues.

8.2 Methodological reflections

Following completion of the project, the following points outline methodological reflections which should be considered for future surveys undertaken using this project's approach.

List-centric survey

- When sampling citizens on the voter list in PPs for the list-centric survey, a better spread of citizens in PPs is suggested. In the current project, the citizens were relatively clustered due to an amended sample approach to save time when on the field. Random selection of all the citizens from the universe of citizens on the PP list is suggested. This increases time in the field as citizens will be more dispersed across the PP. Due to time constraints in this project, this approach was not taken but is suggested for the future to allow a more equal chance of a citizen being selected for the survey.
- Surveyors should search for addresses that cannot be found over three days so as to maximise the chance of
 speaking to more members of the local community to aide in locating the residence. This increases time in the field
 but is a more rigorous approach to finding the address. Due to time constraints in this project, this approach was
 not taken but it is suggested for the future in combination with continuing to look for 30 minutes on each occasion
 and a supervisor checking if the address is still not found after these three attempts.
- Amend the 10% calculation for the over-sampling to ensure this is done on the sample size to approach rather than the sample size to achieve.

Citizen-centric survey

- When sampling citizens in PPs, the skipping pattern should be based on population density with some contingency for a proportion of doors being locked/un-interest in participating in the survey. The number of citizens on the PP voter list could be used as a proxy for this as ground mapping would be time-consuming and expensive and is not really required. The census also does not carry population information at a PP level. This increases time in the field as the skipping pattern would be larger. Due to time constraints in this project, this approach was not taken but is suggested for the future to allow a more equal chance of any one household in a PP being selected for the survey.
- Use a landmark in the PP as a starting point instead of a random citizen from the voter list. As the citizen-centric is mapping citizens to the voter-list, this is a more valid approach.

- When a citizen is found to be omitted from the voter-list and they believe they are registered elsewhere in another PP/AC/city, ask the citizen for the name of the relative whom they think is the named relative on their entry on the voter-list. This will facilitate the back-checking of entries.
- There is no need to over-sample for this survey. As long as the skipping pattern factors in the proportion of doors which may be locked/un-interest in the survey, then this requirement is covered.
- Supplement the data on citizens who have not tried to register to voter (potential apathy), with research looking at the process required for registration (related to the strategic review of data on and interviews with Booth Level Officers (BLOs) as suggested below.
- Ensure length of time lived at address/city is captured/rectified in the CAPI.

General

- Consider checking citizens' voter ID details (i.e. EPIC cards) against the voter list. Given that most citizens indicated their details were correct on their cards, there is some suggestion these are generated from a different list/ incongruent with the voter list. This would be worth exploring.
- Use a different methodology to explore occurrences of phantom voting through a strategic review of data on and interviews with Booth Level Officers (BLOs).
- Use a supplementary method to explore the extent of repetitions on the voter-list, using for example bulk searches or specialised software.
- Consider similar surveys in particular hypothesised 'problem' areas in a city, for example areas of high migration if it is suspected that voter-list quality is particularly poor in those areas.
- Try to source voter lists with citizen's photos included such that these can also be checked for errors when in the field.
- Housing Type may not be the best proxy for class in other cities as there may be little variance. Other parameters may be collected instead or there may need to be more reliance on the SEC calculation.
- Subtracting proportions of those who had an error on the list with their house/door number (in the citizen-centric survey) from those liable for deletion from the list-centric survey, though not done for this survey, can be further explored in future surveys.
- Aligning data on errors with registration details as well as the proportion of 'no errors' between the two surveys may not be required. Each can be reported on separately within each survey analysis.
- Review the survey questionnaires to ensure a more consistent flow, e.g. delete the 'shifted' option from the start of the list-centric questionnaire since this is captured further on. Its removal will ensure surveyors go through the flow of the survey in the correct way.
- Ensure survey voice files and regular interim data files are made available for review during the survey process to allow for timely quality assurance and review.





Appendices

9. Appendices

9.1 Appendix 1: Sampling trail

Delhi AC classification – Inner and Outer

To ensure robust representation of ACs, all of Delhi's 70 ACs were categorized into 'inner' and 'outer' based on their distance from the heart of the city and also on how many 'outer' ACs they shared their boundaries with. Tables A1 and A2 show the resulting inner and outer ACs in Delhi.

AC Number	AC Name	PC Number	PC Name
3	TIMARPUR	2	North East Delhi
4	ADARSH NAGAR	1	Chandni Chowk
5	BADLI	5	North West Delhi
6	RITHALA	5	North West Delhi
9	KIRARI	5	North West Delhi
10	SULTANPUR MAJRA	5	North West Delhi
11	NANGLOI JAT	5	North West Delhi
12	MANGOL PURI	5	North West Delhi
13	ROHINI	5	North West Delhi
14	SHALIMAR BAGH	1	Chandni Chowk
15	SHAKUR BASTI	1	Chandni Chowk
16	TRI NAGAR	1	Chandni Chowk
17	WAZIRPUR	1	Chandni Chowk
18	MODEL TOWN	1	Chandni Chowk
19	SADAR BAZAR	1	Chandni Chowk
20	CHANDNI CHOWK	1	Chandni Chowk
21	MATIA MAHAL	1	Chandni Chowk
22	BALLIMARAN	1	Chandni Chowk
23	KAROL BAGH	4	New Delhi
24	PATEL NAGAR	4	New Delhi
25	MOTI NAGAR	4	New Delhi
26	MADIPUR	6	West Delhi
27	RAJOURI GARDEN	6	West Delhi
28	HARI NAGAR	6	West Delhi
29	TILAK NAGAR	6	West Delhi
30	JANAKPURI	6	West Delhi
31	VIKASPURI	6	West Delhi

Table A1: All ACs in Delhi – Inner
32	UTTAM NAGAR	6	West Delhi
33	DWARKA	6	West Delhi
37	PALAM	7	South Delhi
38	DELHI CANTT	4	New Delhi
39	RAJINDER NAGAR	4	New Delhi
40	NEW DELHI	4	New Delhi
41	JANGPURA	3	East Delhi
42	KASTURBA NAGAR	4	New Delhi
43	MALVIYA NAGAR	4	New Delhi
44	R K PURAM	4	New Delhi
48	AMBEDKAR NAGAR	7	South Delhi
50	GREATER KAILASH	4	New Delhi
61	GANDHI NAGAR	3	East Delhi
66	GHONDA	2	North East Delhi

Table A2: All ACs in Delhi – Outer

AC Number	AC Name	PC Number	PC Name
1	NERELA	5	North West Delhi
2	BURARI	2	North East Delhi
7	BAWANA	5	North West Delhi
8	MUNDKA	5	North West Delhi
34	MATIALA	6	West Delhi
35	NAJAFGARH	6	West Delhi
36	BIJWASAN	7	South Delhi
45	MEHRAULI	7	South Delhi
46	CHHATARPUR	7	South Delhi
47	DEOLI	7	South Delhi
49	SANGAM VIHAR	7	South Delhi
51	KALKAJI	7	South Delhi
52	TUGHLAKABAD	7	South Delhi
53	BADARPUR	7	South Delhi
54	OKHLA	3	East Delhi
55	TRILOKPURI	3	East Delhi
56	KONDLI	3	East Delhi
57	PATPARGANJ	3	East Delhi
58	LAXMI NAGAR	3	East Delhi
59	VISHWAS NAGAR	3	East Delhi
60	KRISHNA NAGAR	3	East Delhi

62	SHAHDARA	3	East Delhi
63	SEEMA PURI	2	North East Delhi
64	ROHTAS NAGAR	2	North East Delhi
65	SEELAMPUR	2	North East Delhi
67	BABARPUR	2	North East Delhi
68	GOKALPUR	2	North East Delhi
69	MUSTAFABAD	2	North East Delhi
70	KARAWAL NAGAR	2	North East Delhi

Out of the total, 59% of Delhi's ACs were categorized as Inner and 41% as Outer (as shown in Table A3 below).

Table A3: Parliamentary Constituencies and the number of inner/outer ACs within

PC	Total number ACs within PC	Proportion (%)	Inner ACs	Outer ACs
Chandni Chowk	10	14%	10	0
New Delhi	10	14%	10	0
West Delhi	10	14%	8	2
East Delhi	10	14%	2	8
North East Delhi	10	14%	2	8
North West Delhi	10	14%	7	3
South Delhi	10	14%	2	8

The sampling process required the selection of 8 ACs, 34 Polling Parts within each AC and 12 Citizens within each Polling Part.

1. Selection of ACs – In line with the overall proportion of Inner and outer ACs in Delhi (as shown in Table A4), it was decided that out of the 8 ACs that the survey was to be conducted in, 5 would be inner and 3, outer.

Table A4: Proportion of inner and outer ACs in Delhi

AC	Number	Proportion (%)	To select
Inner	41	59	5 ACs
Outer	29	41	3 ACs
TOTAL	70	100	8 ACs

From within each list (of inner and outer ACs) ACs were randomly selected. The first AC was selected using a random number generator and the subsequent ACs, using the same process but only after removing the previously selected AC from the selection list. Table A5 shows the final sampled ACs and their classification. The ACs also showed a good geographical spread across the north, south, east and west of the city.

S. No	PC Name	AC Name	Inner/Outer
1	Chandni Chowk	TRI NAGAR	INNER AC
2	East Delhi	GANDHI NAGAR	INNER AC
3	East Delhi	OKHLA	OUTER AC
4	New Delhi	R K PURAM	INNER AC
5	North East Delhi	GOKALPUR	OUTER AC
6	North West Delhi	ROHINI	INNER AC
7	South Delhi	PALAM	INNER AC
8	South Delhi	SANGAM VIHAR	OUTER AC
4 5 6 7 8	New Delhi North East Delhi North West Delhi South Delhi South Delhi	R K PURAM GOKALPUR ROHINI PALAM SANGAM VIHAR	INNER AC OUTER AC INNER AC INNER AC OUTER AC

Table A5: Final ACs and their classification

- **2. Selection of PPs** From within the ACs that were selected, 34 PPs were selected randomly (through random number generation).
- 3. Selection of Citizens From within each PP that was selected, 12 citizens had to be chosen such that each citizen listed on a particular list has an equal chance of being selected. This would have been the ideal method but in order to save time, a slightly different method was adopted.

In each PP, the voter list was split in half. A name was then randomly selected from one half of the list. This was the first citizen sampled. From this citizen, the next five citizens were sampled by skipping 18 names each time (this would equate to skipping approximately 6 households under the assumption that there may be approximately 2-3 adults in one household, consecutively on the voter list). The same process was repeated using the other half of the voter list in that PP. In total therefore, 12 names were sampled from each PP.

9.2 Appendix 2: List of polling parts where entry was denied.

During the field work stage for both surveys, surveyors found it difficult to gain entry to certain gated communities and areas within the city. Details of such areas are as shown in Table A6 and A7 below along with replacement PPs selected for the survey.

AC Name	PP nos. denied entry to	No of Citizens not surveyed as a result
Gandhi Nagar	-	-
Gokalpur	-	-
Okhla	-	-
Palam	-	-
R K Puram	Half of PP 25	6
Rohini		-
Sangam Vihar		-
Trinagar	PP 8	12
Total	-	18

Table A6: List-centric PPs where entry was denied

AC Name	PP Number	Alternate PP No selected*
Rohini	Total 12 PPs	
	104	89
	107	143
	108	130
	39	96
	106	139
	73	6
	74	75
	100	70
	103	7
	62	23
	114	37
	109	10
RK Puram	Total 4 PPs	
	18	148
	105	85
	118	59
	25	7
Trinagar	Total 1 PP	
	8	19

Table A7: List-centric PPs where entry was denied

*Alternate PPs were selected on the basis of a subjective field profiling and similarity with areas that were denied entry to. The substitute PP number shown next to the 'PP denied entry to' does not indicate 'substitution to'. The list is only indicative of all PPs denied entry to and all PPs chosen as a substitute

For the list-centric survey, since 3264 fixed citizens were sampled from voter lists, denial of entry to the areas where they lived meant a loss of sample. In this case, no substitutions could be made. In the case of citizen-centric survey, the number of citizens to be reached was 3264 and since these were not specific names, substitution of areas/PPs was possible. For substituting a PP in the citizen-centric survey, a PP which showed similar housing type and SEC profile was chosen. This, however, was based on a subjective evaluation done by TNS Global.

9.3 Appendix 3: The List-centric desk research

While executing previous PURE surveys on ground, a large number of sampled addresses could not be located by the surveyors. If the address was not found within the polling part, it was considered as a deletion. This issue, of addresses stated on voter lists not being found, was as high as 70-80% of all sampled addresses in the cities of Patna and Ranchi. Equating this to requiring that proportion of names to be deleted from the voter list was felt not intuitively plausible. Essentially this could have been most likely an issue with the quality of the address information on the voter list as well as related infrastructure difficulties.

The sheer scale of addresses being classified as 'not found' on the field forced a rethink on whether the methods adopted before classifying an address as 'not found', were adequate or not. It was due to this, that an additional layer of desk based research was added to the List-centric survey. The output of this stage was to determine the findability of an address (either findable or not) by assessing the listed address parameters for each citizen.

The Address Scoring Process:

The process started with an identification of parameters mentioned on the voter list that could be used to locate an address; this was then compared to those required to find a typical address in Delhi. In order to do the latter, a good working knowledge of how addresses could be located/found inside the state of Delhi was required. It was found, that in certain localities that have a tightly knit community, asking for a person by their name suffices while in others, as long as the door number was available, there was no need for a name. Needless to say, the process intended to find broad quality requirements that applied to most addresses and not just these or similar peculiarities.

Ideally, the process was required to measure the quality of each parameter and attach a 'score' to each sampled address but during the process, it was found that out of all the identified address parameters, some were must haves and others not. So, the process of scoring was changed to that of attaching a minimum 'PASS' of 'FAIL' criteria. That is, based on the 'must haves' an address was either deemed findable and classified as 'PASS' or deemed unfindable and classified as 'FAIL'.

The Parameters:

In order to score an address, all of the address parameters given on a sampled citizen entry were tabulated on an excel sheet. There were a total of 18 parameters as listed below:

- 1. Building Number/Name
- 2. House/Flat/Door Number/name
- 3. Society/Apartment Name
- 4. Gali number/name
- 5. Road Number/Name
- 6. Landmark
- 7. Block Name/Number
- 8. Area Name/Number
- 9. Village Name
- 10. Tehsil Name
- 11. Pincode
- 12. GIS map
- 13. Hand drawn map
- 14. English map
- 15. Hindi/Kannada map

- 16. Quality of the scan of the map
- 17. Streets named on map
- 18. Citizen's street named on map

While information such as the kind of maps and their quality, and availability of a PIN Code were considered 'good-tohave', it was possible to locate an address without having these parameters at all. Similarly, it was found that in order to find an address, it was not the number of parameters that was important but the combination in which they appeared. Finding an address was solely dependent on a basic minimum combination of address parameters; for an address to be 'findable', it was determined that it must have one of each of the following three parameter categories:

1. IDENTIFIER - THE DOOR/ADDRESS - At least one of either a building number/name OR a house/flat/door number/name

AND

2. IDENTIFIER - THE IMMEDIATE VICINITY/LOCALITY - At least one of either a society/apartment name OR gali number/name OR road number/name OR landmark OR block name/number

AND

3. IDENTIFIER - THE LARGER AREA/LOCALITY - At least one of either an area name/number OR village name

These parameters and permutations of findable and not findable address parameters were in line with the India Post's guidelines about 'definite' and 'indefinite' addresses^{A1}. The former being those addresses deemed to be possible to deliver to and the latter being those addresses deemed not possible to deliver to. The parameters and permutations here were specifically determined for Delhi. If applied to another city, these criteria would require review.

All citizens sampled were then given an identifier so that this categorization of a findable/not findable address could be matched against their field-outcomes. Field surveyors were not in the know of whether any address was deemed findable or not.

Execution of the desk research phase:

A total of 3264 citizens were sampled for the List-centric Survey. This meant that 3264 addresses were required to be tested for their quality. Since voter lists in Delhi were available only in PDF form, this meant having to convert data from PDFs into Excel. Due to the nature of these PDFs, automatic conversion of these into an Excel database through software, was considered not feasible. The only option was to type the data manually despite the considerable time this would take.

The survey agency TNS Global was engaged to do this process. They in turn hired a team of freelancers who worked on entering data from selected PDFs into an Excel template designed by JCCD. It was imperative that the freelance team knew exactly how to record data and in order to make sure of it, JCCD conducted a training session for all freelancers working on address scoring. This training, which lasted approximately 3 hours, involved:

- Background information on the project
- A brief introduction to electoral rolls and their format the PDF rolls
- A detailed description of all address parameters their location on rolls, types and examples
- The Excel data entry template how to enter data on the excel template (what and what not)
- An explanation of the importance of the Address Quality Scoring stage.
- Practice Exercises entering a predetermined set of samples on to the Excel template and checks/query clarification by JCCD

Post this training phase, to ensure quality, JCCD also conducted regular checks on interim data sets and was on site, to ensure speedy query resolution and undertake spot checks. The final output of this phase, i.e. the final Excel template with requisite data for all 3264 sampled citizens, was then used by JCCD to score the address as explained in the earlier section.

The Results:

Out of the 3264 citizens sampled only 6 of their addresses were deemed unfindable. The other 3258 citizen addresses were deemed findable. An AC wise break-up of the addresses deemed unfindable is given in Table A8 below:

Table A8: Address Quality – Total addresses sampled and those deemed unfindable

(n – samples)	Total	Rohini	Trinagar	Palam	RK Puram	Sangam Vihar	Okhla	Gandhi Nagar	Gokalpur
Total Addresses Sampled	3264	408	408	408	408	408	408	408	408
Deemed not-findable	6	1	-	2	-	-	-	2	1

9.4 Appendix 4: The list-centric questionnaire

List-Centric Questionnaire December 2014

CENTER		Citizen's name:	Unique ID								
Delhi	1	Voter ID									
Bangalore	2	Father's/Husband's/Mother's/ Other's Name									
		Age-	Gender-		Wa	rd N	lo-				
		Address:									
		Polling part Number									
		Parliamentary Constituency									
		Assembly Constituency									
		Name of supervisor/Team Leader:									
		Name of interviewer:									
		Interviewer's Code:		Date of interview	D	М	М	2	0	1	4

Q 01 Instruction to interviewer – please look for the address given on screen (Screen to display all respondent info) and tick the box below depending on whether you are able to find it or not

इंटरव्यूअर के लिए निर्देश – कृपया स्क्रीन पर दिए गए पते को खोजें और आप उसे खोजने में सक्षम रहे या नहीं इसके आधार पर नीचे बॉक्स में टिक करें

1	CONTINUE TO Q02
2	CAPI TO DISPLAY INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION – Check for 30 minutes and if not found move to the next respondent. Supervisor to do a back check and confirm the case, recorded as a fresh interview. CAPI TO THEN TERMINATE SURVEY
	1 2

Q 02 Instruction to Interviewer – please		
look at the dwelling/house that the		
respondent lives in& and tick the type that		
you think it fits best		
इंटरव्यूअर के लिए निर्देश – कृपया घर/आवास को		
देखें जिसमें रिस्पोंडेंट रहता है एवं उस प्रकार पर टिक		
करें जो आपके अनुसार सबसे अच्छी फिट होता है		
Upper Class Housing	5	CAPI TO DISPLAY IMAGES OF EACH HOUSING
अपर क्लास हाउसिंग	-	TYPE WITH CLEAR LABELS

Upper Middle Class Housing अपर मिडल क्लास हाउसिंग	4	
Lower Middle Class Housing लोअर मिडल क्लास हाउसिंग	3	
One room home/Designated Slum एक कमरे का घर/नियुक्त स्लम	2	
Self-Built Informal Slum Housing स्व–निर्मित अनौपचारिक स्लम हाउसिंग	1	
Q03 instruction to interviewer – Knock on the door and wait for a response इंटरव्यूअर के लिए निर्देश – दरवाज़ा खटखटायें और जवाब का इंतजार करें		
Door opened/response received दरवाज़ा खुला/जवाब मिला	1	CONTINUE TO Q04
Door Locked/No response दरवाज़ा बंद⁄जवाब नहीं मिला	2	DISPLAY INSTRUCTION TO INTERVIEWER AS BELOW AND TERMINATE: "Please visit the house/door twice (2 times)at different times of the day to see whether there is anyone at the house" (tab to, preferably, say "afternoon/morning/evening" randomly depending on the day part at which there was no response or a locked door)
Shifted/ No one lives there कहीं और चले गए हैं/ यहां कोई नहीं रहता	3	CAPI TO TERMINATE INTERVIEW

Q 04 INTERVIEWER TO SAY

इंटरव्यूअर कहे

Namaste! I am_____ (MENTION YOUR NAME) from TNS GLobal, a leading market research organization, working on behalf of Janaagraha Centre for Citizenship & Democracy. We regularly conduct surveys among citizens on various subjects and services. Currently, we are conducting a survey in your locality on voter lists and their quality. Can you please spare some time? Thank you.

नमस्ते! मेरा नाम (अपना नाम बताऐं) है, और मैं टीएनएस ग्लोबल से आया हूँ, जो एक अग्रणी मार्केट रिसर्च कंपनी है, जो नागरिकता एवं लोकतंत्र के लिए जनाग्रह सेंटर की और से काम कर रही है। हम नियमित तौर पर विभिन्न विषयों और सेवाओं पर नागरिकों के बीच सर्वे करते हैं। आजकल, हम वोटर लिस्ट और उनकी क्वालिटी पर आपके क्षेत्र में सर्वे कर रहें हैं। कृपया क्या आप कुछ समय देंगे? धन्यवाद।

Before starting this interview, I wish to confirm that this interview complies with the Market Research Society of India (MRSI) standards and International code of ethics for market research.

इस इंटरव्यू को शुरू करने से पहले, मैं यह पुष्टि कर देना चाहूंगा कि यह मार्केट रिसर्च सोसाइटी ऑफ इंडिया (एमआरएसआई) और मार्केट रिसर्च के लिए अंतर्राष्ट्रीय दिशा निर्देशों के तहत किया जा रहा है।

Please be assured that all information given by you will be kept strictly confidential. The responses collected will be added together with the responses of others before presenting the findings. Under no circumstance will this information be used for sales or any other commercial purpose. Will you be interested in being a part of this survey?

कृपया निश्चित रहें कि आपके द्वारा दी गई सभी जानकारी को पूरी तरह से गोपनीय रखा जायेगा। एकत्र किए गए जवाबों को परिणामों को पेश करने से पहले अन्य लोगों द्वारा दिए गए जवाबों के साथ मिला दिया जायेगा। किसी भी परिस्थिति में इस जानकारी को बिक्री या किसी व्यवसायिक उद्देश्य के लिए इस्तेमाल नहीं किया जायेगा। क्या आप इस सर्वे में हिस्सा लेना चाहेंगें?

Yes हाँ	1	CONTINUE
Yes, but some other time हाँ, लेकिन किसी और समय	2	CONTINUE
No नहीं	3	THANK RESPONDENT & END SURVEY

CAPI TO DISPLAY COMPLETE DETAILS OF THE SELECTED CITIZEN INCLUDING COMPLETE ADDRESS AND SAY – SHOW SCREEN TO RESPONDENT

Q 05 Please take a look at this address and tell us if this is the same as the one we are at right now i.e. the address you live in.

कृपया इस पते को देखें और हमें बताऐं क्या हम अभी इसी पते पर हैं यानि आपका पता।

Yes ਬਾੱ	1	IF CODED '1' IN Q04, GO TO QA1.2 IF CODED '2' IN Q04, GO TO QA1
No नहीं	2	CAPI TO DISPLAY ON SCREEN – INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION – PLEASE TRY SEARCHING FOR THE CORRECT ADDRESS AGAIN, PREFERABLY AT A DIFFERENT TIME OF THE DAY. THEN END INTERVIEW

QAIPlease tell us a day and time of your convenience at which we can come and continue this interview. कृपया हमें अपनी सुविधा के अनुसार एक दिन और समय बताऐं जब हम इस इंटरव्यू को जारी रखने के लिए आ सकते हैं। INTERVIEWER TO RECORD DAY AND TIME OF APPOINTMENT AND VISIT THE HOUSE AGAIN. CAPI TO DISPLAY

DATE & TIME SELECTION GRID TO RECORD THIS. THEN TERMINATE INTERVIEW

इंटरव्यूअर अपाइंटमेंट की तारीख और समय को रिकॉर्ड करें और घर को दोबारा विज़िट करें।

QA1.2 Does Mr/Ms ______ (CAPI TO DISPLAY NAME OF SELECTED CITIZEN) live at this house/ residence?PROBE IF RESPONDENT SAYS 'NO'. Do you know if they used to live here and have now shifted etc. Please look at the options on the screen and answer.

क्या मिस्टर/मिस (कैपी चुने गए नागरिक का नाम दिखायें) इस घर/ आवास में रहते हैं? प्रोब करें यदि रिस्पोंडेंट 'नहीं' कहे। क्या आपको पता है कि वे यहां रहते थे और अब शिफ्ट हो गए हैं आदि। कृपया स्क्रीनर पर विकल्पों को देखें और जवाब दें।

Yes हाँ	1	GO TO QA2
No, person has shifted/moved out नहीं, व्यक्ति ने घर बदल लिया है/चले गए हैं	2	GO TO A1.3
No, person has died नहीं, व्यक्ति की मृत्यु हो गयी है	3	THANK RESPONDENT AND END INTERVIEW
No, person has been disenfranchised (in prison) नहीं, व्यक्ति को बेदखल कर दिया गया है (जेल में है)		THANK RESPONDENT AND END INTERVIEW
No, they live somewhere else नहीं, वे कहीं और रहते हैं	4	GO TO QA1.3
No न्हीं	5	
No one by this name lived in this house इस घर में इस नाम का कोई नहीं रहता है	6	THANK RESPONDENT AND END INTERVIEW

QA1.3You said that the person has shifted/moved out. Are you aware of when they may have moved or shifted out and can you tell us how long ago they moved out?

आपने बताया कि व्यक्ति शिफ्ट हो गए हैं/चले गए हैं। क्या आप जानते है कि वे कब शिफ्ट हुए हैं और क्या आप हमें बता सकते हैं कि वे कितने समय पहले यहां से गए थे?

Less than a month ago एक महीनें पहले से कम	1	
A month to two months ago एक महीनें से दो महीनों पहले	2	
Two to three months ago दो महीनों से तीन महीनें पहले	3	
Three to four months ago तीन महीनें से चार महीनों पहले	4	
Four to five months ago चार से पांच महीनों पहले	5	THANK RESPONDENT AND END INTERVIEW
Five to six months ago पांच महीनों से 6 महीनें पहले	6	
Six months to a year ago 6 महीनें से एक साल पहले	7	
More than a year ago एक साल से ज्यादा पहले	8	
Don't know/Can't say पता नहीं / कह नहीं सकते	9	
QA2 Can we talk to	(CAPI TO DI	SPLAY NAME OF THE SELECTED CITIZEN)? As discussed

earlier, we would like to ask them a few questions.

क्या हम (कैपी चुने गए नागरिक का नाम दिखायें)से बात कर सकते है? जैसे पहले बताया गया, हम उनसे कुछ सवाल पूछना चाहेंगें।

Yes/Yes, l am that person हाँ / हाँ, मैं वो व्यक्ति हूँ	1	GO TO SECTION 2
ls not here at the moment but will be available later वे अभी यहां नहीं है लेकनि बाद में उपलब्ध होंगे	2	GO TO AQ2.1
No नहीं	3	

QA2.1 We would like to know whether you can answer a few questions on behalf of ______ (CAPI TO DISPLAY NAME OF THE SELECTED CITIZEN) on details in the voter list. Are you confident that you know their details, such as their exact name, age etc.? Please look at the screen and answer the question with the help of the options shown.

हम जानना चाहेंगें क्या आप वोटर लिस्ट में विवरण पर (कैपी चुने गए नागरिक का नाम दिखायें) की तरफ से कुछ सवालों के जवाब दे सकते हैं। क्या आप सुनिश्चित हैं कि आप उनके विवरण को जानते हैं, जैसे उनका सही नाम, उम्र आदि? कृपया स्क्रीन को देखें और दिखाये गए विकल्पों की मदद से सवालों का जवाब दें।

Yes, I can answer on their behalf हाँ, मैं उनकी तरफ से जवाब दे सकता हूँ	1	CONTINUE TO A.2.1.1
Not Sure, but can try पक्का नहीं, लेकिन कोशिश कर सकता हूँ	2	CONTINUE TO A2.1.1

No, not confident/No नहीं, विश्वास नहीं / नहीं	3	IF CODED '2' IN QA2, SCREEN TO DISPLAY 'INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION-REQUEST FOR AN APPOINTMENT ON THE DAY AND TIME THAT THEY MAY BE AVAILABLE AND DO A REVISIT'.IF CODED '3' IN QA2, THANK THE RESPONDENT AND END THE INTERVIEW CAPI TO DISPLAY DATE & TIME SELECTION GRID TO RECORD APPOINTMENT
Not interested/ Respondent is not available for more than a month	4	THANK AND END THE INTERVIEW

A2.1.1. Could you please tell me your name and relation with (CAPI TO DISPLAY NAME OF THE SELECTED CITIZEN)? क्या आप मुझे अपना नाम और रश्तिा (कैपी को चुने गए व्यक्त किा नाम डसिपले करना है) के साथ रश्तिा बता सकते हैं?

INTERVIEWER TO RECORD NAME : इंटरव्यूअर को नाम दर्ज करना है:	
INTERVIEWER TO RECORD CONTACT NUMBER : इंटरवयुअर को फोन नंबर दरज करना है	
INTERVIEWER TO POST CODE RELATION: इंटरव्यूअर को रश्तिा नीचे कोड करना है:	
Husband ਧਰ	1
Wife पत्नी	2
Father पत्तिाजी	3
Mother मां	4
Son/ Daughter बेटा/बेटी	5
Grandparent दादा/दादी	6
Relative (like aunt, uncle, niece, etc.) रशि्तेदार (जैसे चाची, चाचा, भतीजी आदी)	7
Others अनय	8

CAPI-INSTRUCTION:

FOR EACH OF THE FIELDS, I.E. MEMBER NUMBER/AGE/GENDER/REGISTERED TO VOTE/VOTED IN LAST ELECTIONS, GIVE THE LAST DROP-DOWN OPTION AS 'CITIZEN DOES NOT WANT TO DISCLOSE THIS INFORMATION'

SECTION 2 – CAPI TO SHOW CONCERNED CITIZEN'S SERIAL NUMBER & VOTER ID

INSTRUCTION TO INTERVIEWER: TAKE OUT THE VOTER LIST FOR THIS POLLING PART AND SHOW IT TO THE CITIZEN/PERSON ANSWERING ON BEHALF OF THE CITIZEN. THEN, ASK THE QUESTIONS IN THIS SECTION INTERVIEWER TO READ OUT – WHILE ANSWERING THE NEXT QUESTIONS, PLEASE KEEP IN MIND THAT THESE ARE FOR (CAPI TO DISPLAY NAME HERE)

QB1Please take a look at the SERIAL				
number & VOTER ID number displayed				
on screen and using those, look for your				
details in this list and tell us whether				
all the information is entered correctly.				
(INTERVIEWER TO HELP CITIZEN BY				
POINTING TO WHERE SERIAL NUMBER				
AND VOTER ID ARE SHOWN ON THE LIST)				
कृपया स्क्रीन पर दिखायी गयी क्रम संख्या एवं वोटर				
आईडी नम्बर को देखें और उनका इस्तेमाल करते हुए,				
लिस्ट में अपना विवरण देखें और हमें बताऐं क्या सभी				
जानकारी सही से दर्ज की गयी है।				
Yes				
हाँ]	GO TO QB5		
No	2			
नहीं	2	GO TO QB2		

QB2 What details have been mentioned incorrectly?

कौन सी जानकारियों को गलत बताया गया है?

QB3 Please tell us what type of error it is by looking at the options on the screen. Please tell us about all errors that apply.

कृपया स्क्रीन पर दिए गए विकल्पों को देखते हुए गलती का प्रकार बताएें। कृपया हमें लागू होने वाली सभी गलतियों के बारे में बताएें। QB4.1 Also, please tell us the correct information for the error i.e. the information that should have been there साथ ही, कृपया हमें गलती के लिए सही जानकारी भी बताएें यानि जानकारी जिसे वहां होना चाहिए

QB4.2 How many times have you tried to rectify this error in details (CAPI TO SHOW A DROP DOWN HERE WITH OPTIONS – NEVER, 1 TIME, 2 TIMES, 3 TIMES OR MORE)

आपने विवरण में इस गलती को कितनी बार ठीक कराने की कोशिश की है

INTERVIEWER TO RECORD DATA FOR QUESTIONS QB2 TO QB4.2 IN GRID BELOW

CAPI TO SHOW QB2 FIRST AND THEN QB3 BASED ON WHETHER ERROR FIELD HAS BEEN TICKED IN QB2 OR NOT. SHOW QB4.1 & 4.2 IN A SIMILAR MANNER CAPI TO HAVE LOGIC IN PLACE I.E. IF NAME IS TICKED FOR ERROR IN SPELLING, THE OPTION 'MISSING' SHOULD NOT SHOW

Error Field (QB2) (TCK ALL OPTIONS THAT APPLY)	Error Type 1 (QB3)-A	Error Type 2 (QB3)-B	Error Type 3 (QB3)-C	Error Type 4 (QB3)-D	ENTER CORRECT DATA (QB4.1)	ATTEMPTS TO RECTIFY ERROR (QB4.2)
1. Name नाम	Spelling Mistake स्पेलिंग में गलती	Part of name incorrect (surname etc.) नाम का हिस्सा गलत है (उपनाम आदि)	Missing मिसिंग	Part Missing कोई हिस्सा मिसिंग है		
2. Father's/ Husband's/ Mother's/ Other's Name पिता का/ पति का/ माता का/ अन्य नाम	Spelling Mistake स्पेलिंग में गलती	Part of name incorrect (surname etc.) नाम का हिस्सा गलत है (उपनाम आदि)	Missing मिसिंग	Part Missing कोई हिस्सा मिसिंग है		
3. Age उम्र	Wrong गलत	Missing मिसिंग				
4. Gender लिंग	Wrong गलत	Missing मिसिंग				
5. Address पता	Spelling mistake स्पेलिंग में गलती	Part missing कोई हिस्सा मिसिंग है	Part incorrect कोई हिस्सा गलत है			
QB5 Do you/ (CAPI TO DISPLAY NAME OF CITIZEN CONCERNED HERE) have a voter ID card? Please look at the screen and answer with the help of the options shown. क्या आप/ (कैपी संबंधित नागरिक का नाम दिखायें) के पास कोई वोटर आईडी कार्ड है? कृपया स्क्रीन पर देखें और दिखाये गए विकल्पों की मदद से जवाब दें।						
Yes I have the ID & photo displayed on it is correct हाँ मेरे पास आईडी है और उस पर दिखायी गयी फोटो सही है 1					1	
Yes I have the ID & photo displayed on it is incorrect हाँ मेरे पास आईडी है और उस पर दिखायी गयी फोटो गलत है					2	
Yes, I have the ID but there is no photo on it हाँ मेरे पास आईडी है लेकिन उस पर कोई फोटो नहीं है					3	
No, I don't have the ID but have applied for it नहीं, मेरे पास आईडी नहीं है लेकिन मैनें इसके लिए अप्लाई किया है 4						4

l do not have a voter ID card मेरे पास वोटर आईडी कार्ड नहीं है

l do not have and have not applied for it मेरे पास नहीं है और इसके लप्ति आवेदन नहीं कयाि

INTERVIEWER TO SAY – PLEASE GO THROUGH THE ENTIRE LIST FOR THIS POLLING PART AND CHECK IF DETAILS OF (CAPI TO DISPLAY NAME OF THE CONCERNED CITIZEN) HAVE BEEN REPEATED OR NOT ANYWHERE ON THIS LIST

इंटरव्यूअर कहे – कृपया इस पोलिंग पार्ट के लिए पूरी लिस्ट को देख लें और जांच करें यदि (कैपी संबंधित नागरिक का नाम दिखायें) की जानकारियों को दोहराया जा रहा है या इस लिस्ट पर कहीं नहीं है।

QB6.1 Are details of (CAPI TO DISPLAY NAME OF CITIZEN CONCERNED HERE)/YOU repeated anywhere on the list? By repeats, I mean are the same details mentioned anywhere else on the list, or if (CAPI TO DISPLAY NAME OF CITIZEN CONCERNED HERE)/YOU feel their/your name has been duplicated?

क्या(कैपी संबंधित नागरिक का नाम दिखायें)/आपकी जानकारियां लिस्ट में कहीं दोहरायी गई है? दोहराने से, मेरा मतलब क्या एक ही जानकारी को लिस्ट पर कहीं और बताया गया है, या क्या(कैपी संबंधित नागरिक का नाम दिखायें)/आपको लगता है कि उनका/आपका नाम डूप्लिकेट है?

Yes ਜ਼ੱ	1	CONTINUE TO QB6.2
No नहीं	2	IF CODED '01' IN QB1, GO TO QB8, ELSE GO TO QB7.1
Refused इंकार कयिा	3	IF CODED '01' IN QB1, GO TO QB8, ELSE GO TO QB7.1

QB6.2 INTERVIEWER TO RECORD DETAILS OF REPEATS IN THE BELOW GRID

इंटरव्यूअर नीचे ग्रिड में दोहराने की जानकारी को रिकॉर्ड करना है

CAPI INSTRUCTION - ONCE THE REPEAT IS TICKED, OPTIONS TO ENTER SERIAL NUMBER & VOTER ID SHOULD BE ACTIVATED/NUMBER OF REPEATS LIST ON SCREEN SHOULD BE 6

Repeat 1 (tick) दोहराना 1 (टिक)	Serial Number in list लिस्ट में क्रम संख्या	Voter ID वोटर आईडी
Repeat 2 (tick) दोहराना 2 (टिक)	Serial Number in list लिस्ट में क्रम संख्या	Voter ID वोटर आईडी
Repeat 3 (tick) दोहराना 3 (टिक)	Serial Number in list लिस्ट में क्रम संख्या	Voter ID वोटर आईडी

CAPI INSTRUCTION – IF CODED '01' IN QB1, GO TO QB8; IF CODED '6' IN B5 GO TO SECTION 3, ELSE CONTINUE

5

6

QB7.1 You told us about the errors in your/their details on the voter list. Has (CAPI TO SHOW NAME OF CITIZEN CONCERNED)/ have you ever been prevented from voting in elections?

आपने हमें वोटर लिस्ट पर अपने/उनके जानकारी में गलतियों के बारे में बताया। क्या(कैपी संबंधित नागरिक का नाम दिखायें)/ आपको कभी चुनावों में वोट डालने से रोका गया है?

Yes ਵਾੱ	1	CONTINUE	
No नहीं	2	SKIP TO QB8	
Don't know/Can't say irk ugha@ dg ugha ldrs	3		

QB7.2 Can you tell us about the reasons given by the officials at the polling booth for not allowing a vote? PROBEAny others?RECORD VERBATIM

क्या आप हमें पॉलिंग बुथ पर अधिकारियों द्वारा आपको वोट डालने से रोकने के लिए दिए गए कारणों के बारे में बता सकते हैं? कोई अन्य?

SPACE TO TYPE IN ANSWER FOR QB7.2

QB8 How many times did (CAPI TO DISPLAY NAME OF CITIZEN CONCERNED)/you have to register for voting before it was successful i.e. before the name got included in the list? ______ INTERVIEWER TO TICK OPTION APPLICABLE BELOW

......(कैपी संबंधित नागरिक का नाम दिखायें)/ आपने लिस्ट में सफलतापूर्वक नाम शामिल होने से पहले वोटिंग के लिए कितनी बार रजिस्टर किया था?

1	2	2	Λ	5	6	7	Q	0	
1	4	2		9	0	/	0	7	IO OK MOKL

QB9. Did you/(CAPI TO DISPLAY NAME OF CITIZEN CONCERENED) vote in the previous Lok Sabha elections? क्या आपने /(कैपी में संबंधति नागरकि का नाम डसिप्ले करें) ने पछिले लोक सभा चुनावों में वोट डाला था?

Yes	1
No	2
Was not eligible to vote during previous elections	3
Don't Know/ Can't say	4

SECTION3 – DEMOGRAPHICS AND OTHER SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND RELIGIOUS QUESTIONS

Interviewer to say: Now, we would be asking you a few questions on the citizen's (CAPI TO DISPLAY CITIZEN'S NAME)/ your education, occupation, religion etc.

QC1 What is the maximum level to which (CAPI TO DISPLAY CITIZEN'S NAME) has/you have studied? SHOW SCREEN TO RESPONDENT

.....(कैपी नागरिक का नाम दिखायें)/आपने अधिकतम कहां तक पढ़ाई की है?

llliterate अशिक्षित	1
School up to 4 years स्कूल 4 साल तक	2
School 5-9 years स्कूल 5–9 साल	3
SSC/HSC एसएससी ∕ एचएससी	4

Some college but not a graduate कुछ कॉलेज लेकिन ग्रेजुऐट नहीं	5
Graduate/ Post Graduate – general ग्रेजुऐट/ पोस्ट ग्रेजुऐट – जनरल	6
Graduate/ Post Graduate – professional (e.g. Engineering, Architecture, Doctor, Law, CA) ग्रेजुऐट/ पोस्ट ग्रेजुऐट – प्रोफेशनल (जैसे इंजीनियरींग, आर्किटैक्चर, डॉक्टर, वकील, सीए)	7
Graduate + Professional diploma (women's polytechnic) ग्रेजुऐट + प्रोफेशनल डिप्लोमा (वुमेन्स पॉलीटैकनीक)	8

Unskilled अकुशल कर्मचारी	1
Skilled worker कुशल कर्मचारी	2
Petty Trader छोटे व्यापारी	3
Shop Owner दुकान मालिक	4
Businessmen/Industrialists with no. of employees – None बिजनेसमैन⁄उद्योगपति के साथ कर्मचारियों की संख्या – कोई नहीं	5
Businessmen/Industrialists with no. of employees – 1 to 9 बिजनेसमैन⁄उद्योगपति के साथ कर्मचारियों की संख्या– 1 से 9	6
Businessmen/Industrialists with no. of employees – 10+ बिजनेसमैन⁄उद्योगपति के साथ कर्मचारियों की संख्या – 10+	7
Self Employed professional सेल्फ एम्पलॉयड प्रोफेशनल	8
Clerical/Salesmen क्लर्क / सेल्समैन	9
Supervisory level सुपरवाइज़री स्तर	10
Officers/Executives – junior ऑफिसर्स ∕ एग्जिक्यूटिव्स – जूनियर	11

Officers/Executives – middle or senior ऑफिसर्स / एग्जिक्यटिब्स – मिडल या सीनियर	12
Housewife गृहणी	13
Student छात्र/छात्रा	14
Unemployed	15

QC3 Can you please tell me about (CAPI TO DISPLAY CITIZEN'S NAME)'s/your marital status? SHOW SCREEN TO)
RESPONDENT	

कृपया मुझे(कैपी नागरिक का नाम दिखायें)/अपना वैवाहिक स्तर बताऐं?			
Married विवाहित	1		
Single अकेले	2		
Divorced तलाकशुदा	3		
Widowed विधवा ∕ विधुर	4		

QC4 What type of family does the citizen (CAPI TO DISPLAY CITIZEN'S NAME)/do you live in? SHOW SCREEN TO RESPONDENT

नागरिक(कैपी नागरिक का नाम दिखायें)/आप किस प्रकार के परिवार में रहते हैं?

Single Vdsys	1	
Nuclear family/ only husband & wife/ partners/live in एकल परिवार/केवल पत्ति एवं पत्नी/पार्टनर्स/लिव इन	2	
Nuclear family with parents (No Children) माता–पिता के साथ एकल परिवार (बच्चे नहीं)	3	
Nuclear family with parents and children माता–पिता और बच्चों के साथ एकल परिवार	4	
Nuclear family with children (No Parents) बच्चों के साथ एकल परिवार (माता–पिता नहीं)	5	
Extended joint family विस्तृत संयुक्त परिवार	6	
Others/Unspecified अन्य/अस्पष्ट	7	
Do not want to answer जवाब नहीं देना चाहते	8	
QC5Which religion does <mark>(CAPI TO DISPLAY CITIZEN'S NAME)</mark> / do youfollow? SHOW SCREEN TO RESPONDENT (कैपी नागरिक का नाम दिखायें)/आप किस धर्म का पालन करत्ते हैं?		

Hindu 1 GO TO QC6.1 हिन्दू

Muslim मुसलमान	2	GO TO QC6.2		
Christian ईसाई	3			
Sikh सिख	4			
Jain जैन	5			
Buddhist बौद्ध	6	GO TO QC7		
None कोई नहीं	7			
Do not want to answer जवाब नहीं देना चाहते	8			
Others (Specify) अन्य (बताएँ)	99			
QC6.1 Which social group does (CAPI TO DISP RESPONDENT	PLAY CITIZEN'S I	NAME)/do you belong to? SHOW SCREEN TO		
(कैपी नागरिक का नाम दिखायें)/आप किस सामानि	जेक समुह से संबंधित	<u>څ</u> ?		
OBC – Other Backward Caste ओबीसी–अन्य पिछड़ी जाति	1			
SC – Scheduled Caste एससी– अनुसूचित जाति	2			
ST – Scheduled Tribes एसटी – अनुसूचित जनजाति	3			
GEN – General/Forward Caste सामान्य – सामान्य/अग्रिम जाति	4			
Don't Know/Can't say पता नहीं ⁄ कह नहीं सकते	5			
Do not want to answer tokc ugha nsuk pkgrs	6			
QC6.2 Which social group does (CAPI TO DISPLAY CITIZEN'S NAME)/do you belong to? SHOW SCREEN TO RESPONDENT (कैपी नागरिक का नाम दिखायें) / आप किस सामाजिक समह से संबंधित हैं?				
OBC – Other Backward Caste ओबीसी–अन्य पिछड़ी जाति	1			
GEN – General/Forward Cast सामान्य – सामान्य/अग्रिम जाति	2	CO TO OC7		
Don't Know/Can't say पता नहीं / कह नहीं सकते	3	GO 10 QC/		
Do not want to answer जवाब नहीं देना चाहते	4			

QC7 Is **(CAPI TO DISPLAY CITIZEN'S NAME)** the chief wage earner of the household? By the term 'chief wage earner', I mean the member who makes the maximum contribution to family expenditure.

क्या (कैपी नागरिक का नाम दिखायें) घर के मुख्य कमाने वाले सदस्य हैं? मुख्य कमाने वाले सदस्य से, मेरा मतलब सदस्य जो परिवार के खर्चो के लिए अधिकतम योगदान करते हैं।

Yes ฮ [ั]	1	CAPI TO CALCULATE SEC BASED ON GRID GIVEN AFTER QC8 USING QUESTIONS QC1 AND QC2. THANK THE RESPONDENT AND END INTERVIEW
No नहीं	2	GO TO QC8.1

QC8.1Now, I would like to know something about the person who makes the maximum contribution to the family expenditure. When I mean family, I mean family of (CAPI TO DISPLAY CITIZEN'S NAME).

अब, मैं उस व्यक्ति के बारे में कुछ जानना चाहूंगा जो परिवार के खर्चो के लिए अधिकतम योगदान करता है। परिवार से मेरा मतलब, (कैपी नागरिक का नाम दिखायें) के परिवार से है।

What is the maximum level to which the chief wage earner has studied? Please look at the screen and answer with the help of the options shown

llliterate अशिक्षित	1
School up to 4 years स्कूल 4 साल तक	2
School 5-9 years स्कूल 5–9 साल	3
SSC/HSC एसएससी⁄एवएससी	4
Some college but not a graduate कुछ कॉलेज लेकिन ग्रेजुऐट नहीं	5
Graduate/ Post Graduate – general ग्रेजुऐट/ पोस्ट ग्रेजुऐट – जनरल	6
Graduate/ Post Graduate – professional (e.g. Engineering, Architecture, Doctor, Law, CA) ग्रेजुऐट / पोस्ट ग्रेजुऐट –प्रोफेशनल (जैसे इंजीनियरींग, आर्किटैक्वर, डॉक्टर, वकील, सीए)	7
Graduate + Professional diploma (women's polytechnic) ग्रेजुऐट + प्रोफेशनल डिप्लोमा (वुमेन्स पॉलीटैकनीक)	8

मुख्य कमाने वाले व्यक्ति ने अधिकतम कहां तक पढ़ाई की है? कृपया स्क्रीन को देखें और दिखाये गए विकल्पों की मदद से जवाब दें

QC8.2 Could you please tell me the occupation of the chief wage earner?

(IF RETIRED: What was the chief wage earner's occupation before they retired?)Please look at the screen and answer with the help of the options shown

कृपया मुझे मुख्य कमाने वाले सदस्य का व्यवसाय बताऐं? (यदि रिटायर्ड : रिटायर होने से पहले मुख्य कमाने वाले सदस्य का व्यवसाय क्या था?) कृपया स्क्रीन को देखें और दिखायें गए विकल्पों की मदद से जवाब दें

Unskilled अकुशल कर्मचारी

1

Skilled worker कुशल कर्मचारी	2
Petty Trader छोटे व्यापारी	3
Shop Owner दुकान मालिक	4
Businessmen/Industrialists with no. of employees – None बिजनेसमैन⁄उद्योगपति के साथ कर्मचारियों की संख्या –कोई नहीं	5
Businessmen/Industrialists with no. of employees – 1 to 9 बिजनेसमैन/उद्योगपति के साथ कर्मचारियों की संख्या– 1 से 9	6
Businessmen/Industrialists with no. of employees – 10+ बिजनेसमैन/उद्योगपति के साथ कर्मचारियों की संख्या – 10+	7
Self Employed professional सेल्फ एम्पलॉयड प्रोफेशनल	8
Clerical/Salesmen क्लर्क / सेल्समैन	9
Supervisory level सुपरवाइज़री स्तर	10
Officers/Executives – junior ऑफिसर्स ∕ एग्जिक्यूटिव्स – मिडल या जुनियर	11
Officers/Executives – middle or senior ऑफिसर्स∕ एग्जिक्यूटिव्स – मिडल या सीनियर	12

SEC GRID		EDCUCATION (QC8.1)	Illiterate1	School: upto 4 years	School: 5-9 years	SSC/ HSC	Some college but not graduate	Graduate/ Post graduate general	Graduate / Post graduate professional
OCCUPATION (QC	8.2)		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Unskilled Worke	er		E2	E2	E1	D	D	D	D
2. Skilled worker			E2	E1	D	С	С	B2	B2
3. Petty trader			E2	D	D	С	С	B2	B2
4. Shop owner			D	D	С	B2	B1	A2	A2
Businessmen/ Ind	ustrialists with no. of en	nployees							
5. None			D	С	B2	B1	A2	A2	A1
6. 1-9			С	B2	B2	B1	A2	A1	A1
7. 10+			B1	B1	A2	A2	A1	A1	A1
8. Self-employed I	Professional		D	D	D	B2	B1	A2	A1
9. Clerical / Salesr	man		D	D	D	С	B2	B1	B1
A. Supervisory lev	el		D	D	С	С	B2	B1	A2
B. Officers/Execut	ives- Junior		С	С	С	B2	B1	A2	A2
C. Officers/Execut middle / senior	ives		B1	B1	B1	B1	A2	A1	A1

QA3 How long has (CAPI TO DISPLAY NAME HERE)/have you lived at this particular address? Please look at the screen and answer using the options shown

	देखें और दिखायें गए विकल्पों के अनुसार
जवाब दें।	
Less than 1 month	1
1-3 months	2
3-6 months	3
6 months – 1 year	4
1 – 1.5 years	5
1.5 yrs – 2 years	6
2 yrs -2.5 years	7
2.5 yrs – 3 years	8
3 yrs – 4 years	9
4 yrs – 5 years	10
5 or more years	11
Don't know/Can't Say	12

QA4 How long has (CAPI TO DISPLAY NAME HERE)/have you lived in this city, DELHI? Please look at the screen and answer using the options shown

......(कैपी यहां नाम दिखायें)/आप इस शहर, दिल्ली में कितने समय से रहते हैं? कृपया स्क्रीन को देखें और दिखायें गए विकल्पों के अनुसार जवाब दें।

CAPI INSTRUCTION – HAVE A LOGIC CHECK FOR QUESTIONS QA3 & QA4 i.e. IF 6 IS CODED IN QA3, NO VALUE BELOW 6 CAN BE CODED FOR QA4

Less than 1 month	1	
1-3 months	2	
3-6 months	3	
6 months – 1 year	4	
1 – 1.5 years	5	
1.5 yrs – 2 years	6	
2 yrs -2.5 years	7	
2.5 yrs – 3 years	8	
3 yrs – 4 years	9	
4 yrs – 5 years	10	
5 or more years	11	
Don't know/Can't Say	12	
QA5 Is (CAPI TO DISPLAY NAME HERE)/Are you a tenant or the owner of this address?	Tenant किरायेदार	1
क्या (कैपी यहां नाम दिखायें) क्या आप इस पते पर मालिक या किरायेदार है?	Owner मालिक	2

QA6 Could you please provide us with the your/ (CAPI TO DISPLAY NAME HERE)'s contact number? क्या आप हमें अपना /(कैटी को यहा नाम डसिएले करना है) का फोन नंबर बता सकते हैं?

INTERVIEWER TO RECORD CONTACT NUMBER इंटरव्**यूअर को फोन नंबर दर्**ज करना है Refused/ Don't know/ Can't say 1 बताने से मना कयाि/ पता नहीं/ कह नहीं सकते

END OF SURVEY – THANK YOU

9.5 Appendix 5: The citizen-centric questionnaire

CENTER		Polling Part Number			CA	PI TO) GI	VE D	RO	Ρ	
Delhi	1	Parliamentary Constituency			DO	WN	S FC)R E	ACH	I OF	
Bangalore	2	Assembly Constituency			TH	ESE	FIEL	DS			
		Name of supervisor/Team Leader:									
		Name of interviewer:									
		Interviewer's Code:	Date of interview	D	D	М	М	2	0	1	4

CAPI to generate a unique ID for each respondent. Format : "ACno./PPno./S.no."

Q04.1 INTERVIEW TYPE - CAPI TO PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING BUTTONS:

Random रैंडम Revisit 1 रीवजिटि 1 Revisit 2 रीवजिटि 2 Substitution from within family परविार में ही कसीि से बदला गया है Substitution from the same locality उसी इलाके में ही कसीि से बदला गया है

For revisit – Capture the details of the appointment and Interviewer to enter the unique ID generated for that respondent. The appointment date must not exceed 7 days from date of interview. If it does, substitute within family. Each re-visit would be a fresh interview with the unique ID generated by CAPI linking the re-visits. Also, the following details to be captured:

रीवजिटि के लपि - एप्वाइंट की जानकारयों को लें और इंटरव्यूअर को उस रस्पिपोन्डेंट के लपि बनी अनोखी आईडी को दर्ज करना है। एप्वाइंटमेंट की तारीख इंटरव्यू की तारीख से 7 दनि से ज्यादा बाद की नहीं होनी चाहपि। यद हि तो, रस्पिपोन्डेंट की जगह परविार में कसिी और को चुनें। प्रत्येक री-वजिटि कैपी द्वारा री-वजिटि को जोड़ने के दौरान बनी अनोखी आईडी के साथ एक नया इंटरव्यू होगा:

Full Name पूरा नाम: Age उम्र: Gender लगि:

If Substitution within Family – Interviewer to enter the unique ID of the respondent who is being substituted and continue with the interview with the available family member. It would be a fresh interview with the unique ID linking the interviews.

यद रिसिपोन्डेंट को परविार में कसिंग से बदला/सब्सीट्यूट कयिा गया है - इंटरव्यूअर को बदले गए/नए रसिपोन्डेंट की अनोखी आईडी को दर्ज करना है और इंटरव्यू को उपलब्ध परविार के सदस्य के साथ करना है। यह इंटरव्यू से जुड़ी अनोखी आईडी के साथ एक नया इंटरव्यू होगा।

If Substitution within locality – Interviewer to go to the next household and CAPI to do a forced selection post capturing

all details of the new household and the unique ID of the respondent being substituted with. It would be a fresh interview with the unique ID linking the interviews.

यदरिसिपोन्डेंट को उसी इलाके में कसिी से बदला/सब्सीट्यूट कयिा गया है - इंटरव्यूअर को अगले घर में जाना है और कैपी को नए घर की सभी जानकारयों को लेने के बाद फोर्स सलिक्शन करना है और बदले गए रसिपोन्डेंट के लएि अनोखी आईडी देनी है। यह इंटरव्यू से जुड़ी अनोखी आईडी के साथ एक नया इंटरव्यू होगा।

LOGIC CHECK: "4/5" coding in 04.1 possible only after "2 and 3" has been coded for each unique ID for each respondent. लॉजकि चेक: 04.1 में "4/5" कोडगि केवल प्रत्येक रसि्पोन्डेंट के लएि हर एक अनोखी आईडी के लएि "2 या 3" कोड करनेके बाद ही संभव है

LOCATION INFORMATION:

Q01 Instruction to Interviewer – please record the number and address of the house that you have approached in the below grid. Make sure to enter all details such as the door/house number or name, street or gali name/number, area name, Pin Code etc.

इंटरव्यूअर के लगि नरि्देश - कृपया नीचे ग्रडि में घर का नंबर और पता रकिॉर्ड करें जसिसे आपने संपर्क कयिा है। सुनशि्चति करें क सिभी जानकारयिों जैसे क डिोर/घर संख्या या नाम, स्ट्रीट या गली नाम/संख्या, एरयाि/क्षेत्र का नाम, पनि कोड आद िको दर्ज कर दयिा है।

Address Line 1

Address Line 2

Pin Code

Q02 Instruction to Interviewer – please look at the dwelling/house that the respondent lives in & and tick the type that you think it fits best

इंटरव्यूअर के लगि नरि्देश - कृपया घर/आवास को देखें जसिमें रसि्पोंडेंट रहता है और उस प्रकार पर टकि करें जो आपके अनुसार सबसे अच्छी फटि होता है

Upper Class Housing अपर क्लास हाउसगि	5	CAPI TO DISPLAY IMAGES OF EACH HOUSING TYPE WITH CLEAR LABELS
Upper Middle Class Housing अपर मडिल क्लास हाउसगि	4	
Lower Middle Class Housing लोअर मडिल क्लास हाउसगि	3	
One room home/Designated Slum एक कमरे का घर/नयिुक्त स्लम	2	
Self-Built Informal Slum Housing स्व-नरि्मति अनौपचारकि स्लम हाउसगि	1	

Q03 instruction to interviewer – Knock on the door and wait for a response

इंटरव्यूअर के लगि नरि्देश - दरवाज़ा खटखटायें और जवाब का इंतजार करें

Door opened/response received दरवाज़ा खुला/जवाब मलाि	1	CONTINUE TO Q04
Door Locked/No response दरवाज़ा बंद/जवाब नहीं मलिा	2	DISPLAY INSTRUCTION TO INTERVIEWER AS BELOW AND TERMINATE: "Please end this interview and go to the next household" ''कृपया इस इंटरव्यू को बंद करें और अगले घर पर जायें"

Q04 INTERVIEWER TO SAY

इंटरव्यूअर कहे

Namaste! I am_____ (MENTION YOUR NAME) from TNS Global, a leading market research organization, working on behalf of Janaagraha Centre for Citizenship & Democracy. We regularly conduct surveys among citizens on various subjects and services. Currently, we are conducting a survey in your locality on voter lists and their quality. Can you please spare some time? Thank you.

नमस्ते! मेरा नाम (अपना नाम बताएें) है, और मैं टीएनएस ग्लोबल से आया हूँ, यह एक अग्रणी मार्केट रसिर्च कंपनी है, जो जनाग्रह सेंटर फोर सटिौजनशपि एण्ड डेमोक्रेसी की तरफ से काम कर रही है। हम नयिमति तौर पर वभिन्िन वर्षियों और सेवाओं पर नागरकीं के बीच सर्वे करते हैं। आजकल, हम वोटर लसि्ट और उनकी क्वालटिौ पर आपके क्षेत्र में सर्वे कर रहें है। क्या आप अपना थोड़ा सा समय दे सकते हैं? धन्यवाद।

Before starting this interview, I wish to confirm that this interview complies with the Market Research Society of India (MRSI) standards and International code of ethics for market research.

इस इंटरव्यू को शुरू करने से पहले, मैं यह पुष्ट किर देना चाहूंगा क यिह मार्केट रसिर्च सोसाइटी ऑफ इंडयाि (एमआरएसआई) और मार्केट रसिर्च के लपि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय दशाि नरि्देशों के तहत कयाि जा रहा है।

Please be assured that all information given by you will be kept strictly confidential. The response collected will be added together with the responses of others before presenting the findings. Under no circumstance will this information be used for sales or any other commercial purpose. Will you be interested in being a part of this survey? कृपया नशिचति रहें क आपके द्वारा दी गई सभी जानकारी को पूरी तरह से गोपनीय रखा जायेगा। परणामों को पेश करने से पहले एकत्र कपि गए जवाबों को अन्य लोगों द्वारा दपि गए जवाबों के साथ मलाि दयाि जायेगा। कसीि भी परस्थिति में इस जानकारी को बकि्री या कसिी व्यवसायकि उद्देश्य के लपि इस्तेमाल नहीं कयाि जायेगा। क्या आप इस सर्वे में हसि्सा लेना चाहेंगें?

Yes हाँ	1	CONTINUE
Yes, but some other time हाँ, लेकनि कसिी और समय	2	INTERVIEWER TO ASK IF THERE IS SOMEONE ELSE IN THE HOUSE THAT THEY COULD TALK TO. IF THE ANSWER IS STILL 'NO', REQUEST AN APPOINTMENT AND VISIT THE HOUSE AT THE FIXED TIME इंटरव्यूअर को पूछना है क कि्या घर में कोई और है जनिसे बात कर सकते हैं। यदजिवाब अभी 'नहींहैं' तो एपवाइंट के लपि अनुरोध करें और तय समय पर घर में जाये। CAPI INSTRUCTION – CAPI TO SHOW A DATE AND TIME SELECTION GRID AND RECORD IT. THEN END INTERVIEW
No नहीं	3	DISPLAY INSTRUCTION TO INTERVIEWER AS BELOW AND TERMINATE: "Please end this interview and go to the next household" "कृपया इस इंटरव्यू को समाप्त कर दें और अगले घर में जायें"

Q05.1 Can you please tell me number of members living in this particular household aged 18 and above? कृपया मुझे इस घर में रह रहे 18 साल और अधकि उम्र के सदस्यों की संख्या बतायें?

INTERVIEWER TO RECORD : ______ इंटरव्यूअर को दर्ज करना है:

Q05.2 Can you please tell me the name, age and gender of all your family members living in this particular household aged 18 and above? We are asking for this so that we can then randomly select any one person above 18 from your household to take part in this survey. (INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION - Explain that family includes the people who are related to each other, who regularly stay together in the same address, and who share resources with each other)

क्या आप मुझे इस घर में रह रहे 18 साल या अधकि उम्र के सभी परविार के सदस्यों के नाम, उम्र और लगि बता सकते हैं? हम इसे इसलपि पूछ रहे हैं ताक हिम बाद में इस सर्वे में भाग लेने के लपि आपके घर से 18 साल से अधकि उम्र के कसी एक सदस्य को चुन सकें। (इंटरव्यूअर नरि्देश - समझाएं क पिरविार में उन सदस्यों को शामलि करें जो एक दूसरे से संबंधति हैं, जो नयिमति रुप से एक ही पते में साथ रहते हैं, और संसाधनों/सुवधिाओं को एक साथ मलिकर इस्तेमाल करते हैं) INTERVIEWERS TO RECORD DETAILS (NAME, GENDER AND AGE) OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS WHO ARE AGE 18 YEARS AND ABOVE IN DESCENDING ORDER ONE BY ONE, STARTING FROM OLDEST TO YOUNGEST. MAKE SURE TO ENTER EXACT NAMES AND OTHER DETAILS; GET THE RESPONDENT TO VERIFY THEM ONCE THESE ARE ENTERED FOR SPELLING ERRORS ETC.

इंटरव्यूअर को घर के सदस्यों की जानकारयों (नाम, लगि और उम्र) को दर्ज करें जो 18 साल और अधकि उम्र के हैं। सही नाम और अन्य जानकारयों को दर्ज करना सुनश्चिति करें; स्पेलगि गलतयों आदि के लपि दर्ज की गयी जानकारयों की रस्पिपोन्डेंट से पुष्ट किरनी है।

Sr. Number	Name	Age
	नाम	उम्र
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		

IN SUBSTITUITON IN FAMILY INTERVIEW: IF CODED '4' IN Q04.1, PROVIDE A BUTTON WHICH SAYS 'GO TO FORCED SELECTION'. IF PRESSED, SURVEY SHOULD GO TO Q06.1

Q06 CAPI INSTRUCTION – IN RANDOM/ SUBSTITUTION FROM SAME LOCALITY INTERVIEW (CODED '1/5' IN Q04.1): CAPI TO SELECT ONE OF THE ABOVE LISTED MEMBERS RANDOMLY AND DISPLAY THEIR INFORMATION BELOW AS SHOWN:

SELECTED MEMBER NAME – चूने गए सदस्य का नाम

AGE-	GENDER-
उम्र	লगি

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION - INTERVIEWER TO CHECK AVAILABILITY OF THE SELECTED MEMBER AND CONTINUE THE INTERVIEW

इंटरव्यूअर नस्दिंश - इंटरव्यूअर को चुने गए सदस्य की उपलब्धता की जांच करनी है और इंटरव्यू जारी रखना है IF NOT AVAILABLE:

यद ि उपलब्ध नहीं हैं

CAPI INSTRUCTION -

FOR RANDOM INTERVIEW: CHECK FOR AVAILABILITY AND TAKE APPOINTMENT.

IN CASE OF AN APPOINTMENT, CAPI TO PROVIDE A DATE AND TIME SELECTION GRID HERE AND RECORD THE ENTRY. ENTRY SHOULD NOT BE POSSIBLE BEYOND 30 DAYS FROM DATE OF INTERVIEW. TERMINATE INTERVIEW. INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: IN CASE RESPONDENT IS NOT AVAILABLE FOR MORE THAN A WEEK, END INTERVIEW AND START FRESH INTERVIEW BY SELECTING '4/5' IN INTERVIEW TYPE.

इंटरव्यूअर नस्दिश: यदरिसिपोन्डेंट एक हफ्ते से ज्यादा समय के लपि उपलब्ध नहीं है तो, इंटरव्यू बंद कर दें और इंटरव्यू प्रकार में '4/5' चुनते हुए नए इंटरव्यू से शुरुआत करें।

IN SUBSTITUITON IN LOCALITY INTERVIEW: IF CODED '5' IN Q04.1, PROVIDE A BUTTON WHICH SAYS 'GO TO FORCED SELECTION'. IF PRESSED, SURVEY SHOULD GO TO Q06.1

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION – IF AFTER TWO VISITS, THE SELECTED MEMBER IS NOT AVAILABLE, THEN SUBSTITUTE WITH A PERSON IN THE HOUSEHOLD OF AROUND THE SAME GENDER & AGE. IF THAT IS NOT POSSIBLE, SUBSTITUTE A PERSON WITHIN THE HOUSEHOLD & IF THAT'S ALSO NOT POSSIBLE, ONE FROM WITHIN THE SAME LOCALITY

इंटरव्यूअर नरि्देश - यददिो वजिट्सि के बाद, चुना गया सदस्य उपलब्ध नहीं होता है, तो व्यक्त को घर में उसी लगि और उम्र के सदस्य से सब्सीट्यूट करें। यदसिंभव नहीं है, तो घर में ही कसीि व्यक्त सि सब्सीट्यूट करें और यदविह भी संभव नहीं है तो उसी इलाके में से कसीि को चुनें।

CAPI TO SHOW GRID WITH DATA ENTERED IN Q05.2 AND ALLOW INTERVIEWER TO SELECT ANY ONE ELIGIBLE CITIZEN

Q06.1 Interviewer to select any one citizen from the grid below:

इंटरव्यूअर नीचे ग्रडि से कसीि एक नागरकि को चुनें:

Sr. Number	Name	Age
क्रम संख्या	नाम	उम्र
1		
2		
3		
4		

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION – SPEAK TO THE SELECTED MEMBER AND IF THEY ARE NOT THE SAME AS THE ONE YOU SPOKE TO AT THE DOOR/CONTACTED EARLIER, INTRODUCE YOURSELF AGAIN AND PROVIDE DETAILS OF THE STUDY

इंटरव्यूअर नरि्देश - चुने गए सदस्य से बात करें और यदविे वहीं है जनि से आपने दरवाजे पर बात की/ पहले संपर्क कयिा था, अपना परचिय दुबारा से दें और सटडी की जानकारी प्रदान करें।

Namaste! I am_____ (MENTION YOUR NAME) from TNS Global, a leading market research organization, working on behalf of Janaagraha Centre for Citizenship & Democracy. We regularly conduct surveys among citizens on

various subjects and services. Currently, we are conducting a survey in your locality on voter lists and their quality. Can you please spare some time? Thank you.

नमस्ते! मेरा नाम (अपना नाम बताएं) है, और मैं टीएनएस ग्लोबल से आया हूँ, जो एक अग्रणी मार्केट रसिर्च कंपनी है, जो जनाग्रह सेंटर फोर सटिीजनशपि एण्ड डेमोक्रेसी की तरफ से काम कर रही है। हम नयिमति तौर पर वभिन्िन वर्षियों और सेवाओं पर नागरकीं के बीच सर्वे करते हैं। आजकल, हम वोटर लसि्ट और उनकी क्वालटिी पर आपके क्षेत्र् में सर्वे कर रहें हैं। कृपया क्या आप कुछ समय देंगे? धन्यवाद।

Before starting this interview, I wish to confirm that this interview complies with the Market Research Society of India (MRSI) standards and International code of ethics for market research.

इस इंटरव्यू को शुरू करने से पहले, मैं यह पुष्ट किर देना चाहूंगा क यिह मार्केट रसिर्च सोसाइटी ऑफ इंडयि। (एमआरएसआई) और मार्केट रसिर्च के लपि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय दशिा नरि्देशों के तहत कयिा जा रहा है।

Please be assured that all information given by you will be kept strictly confidential. The response collected will be added together with the responses of others before presenting the findings. Under no circumstance will this information be used for sales or any other commercial purpose.

कृपया नशि्चति रहें क आिपके द्वारा दी गई सभी जानकारी को पूरी तरह से गोपनीय रखा जायेगा। परणािमों को पेश करने से पहले एकत्र कपि गए जवाबों को अन्य लोगों द्वारा दपि गए जवाबों के साथ मलाि दयाि जायेगा। कसीि भी परसि्थति मिं इस जानकारी को बकि्री या कसीि व्यवसायकि उद्देश्य के लपि इस्तेमाल नहीं कयाि जायेगा। क्या आप इस सर्वे में हसि्सा लेना चाहेंगें?

QA1.1 Are you registered in the voter list at this present address? (INTERVIEWER

INSTRUCTION – Wait for the selected citizen to answer and then code.

क्या आपने इस वर्तमान पते से वोटर लसि्ट में रजसि्टर्ड कयिा है? (इंटरव्यूअर नरि्देश- चुने गये नागरकि को जवाब देने के लएि र्कें और फरि कोड करें)

नरि्देश - चुने गए नागरकि के जवाब देने तक रुकें और उसके बाद कोड करें।

QA1.2 INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION - Please look through the voter list of this particular polling part and check if the selected citizen is present or not.

इंटरव्यूअर नरि्देश- कृपया इस पोलगि पार्ट की वोटर लसि्ट को देखें और चेक करें यदचिुने गये नागरकि उसमें मौजूद है या नहीं।

If present, code 'yes', else 'no'. If not present, while they answered 'yes', inform them that their name is not on the list for this particular polling part)

यदमिौजूद है, तो 'हां' कोड करें, नहीं तो 'नहीं' कोड करें। यदमिौजूद नहीं है, जबक उिन्होंने 'हां' में जवाब दयाि है तो उन्हें बतायें क उनका नाम इस पोलगि पार्ट की लसि्ट में नहीं है।

	QA1.1	QA1.2
Yes, definitely हां, नशि्चति रुप से	1	1
Yes, l think l am हां, मेरे वचिार से मैंने कयिा है	2	
Don't know/Can't say पता नहीं/ कह नहीं सकते	3	
No	4	4

QA2.1 Please look at the options shown on screen and tell us which all apply to you

कृपया स्क्रीन पर दखिाये गये वकिल्पों को देखें और हमें बतायें क आपके कौन-कौन से लागू होते हैं

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION – PROMPT IF THEY ANSWER ANY FROM 1/2/3 IF THEY HAVE ALSO APPLIED FROM THIS ADDRESS

इंटरव्यूअर नरि्देश - प्रॉम्प्ट करें यद िउन्होंने 1/2/3 में से कोई भी जवाब दयिा है यद िउन्होंने इस पते से भी अप्लाई कयिा है।

	Tick wherever applicable	GENERAL CAPI INSTRUCTION – ALLOW '1/2/3' TO BE CODED ALONG WITH '5'. NO OTHER CODES SHOULD BE ALLOWED TOGETHER
Registered to vote in the same Assembly Constituency but in a different area/part/ polling part उसी वधिानसभा नरि्वाचन क्षेत्र में वोटगि के लपि रजसि्टर्ड कयाि है लेकनि अलग एरयाि/ क्षेत्र/पार्ट पोलगि पार्ट में	1	IF CODED '5' AS WELL AS 1/2/3, GO TO QA2.2 & THEN QA2.3. IF ONLY 1/2/3 CODED, GO TO QA2.3 CAPI INSTRUCTION – CODE '5' CAN BE TICKED WITH 1/2/3
Registered to vote in the same city, some other Assembly Constituency उसी शहर लेकनि कसीि अन्य वधिानसभा नरि्वाचन क्षेत्र में वोटगि के लपि रजसि्टर्ड कयिा है	2	
Registered to vote in a different city or village etc. अलग शहर या गांव आदमिं वोटगि के लएि रजसि्टर्ड कयाि है	3	
Registered to vote from this address इस पते से वोटगि के लएि रजसि्टर्ड कयिा है	4	GO TO QA2.2, THEN QA2.4 & THEN QA2.6
Have applied from current address वर्तमान पते से आवेदन कयिा है	5	IF ONLY '5' CODED IN QA2.1, GO TO QA2.2 & THEN QA2.6
Have not/never registered to vote वोटगि के लएि रजसि्टर्ड नहीं/कभी नहीं कयिा	6	GO TO QA2.5
Have applied from a different address अगले पते से अप्लाई कयिा	7	GO TO QA2.5
Don't Know/ Cant Say पता नहीं/कह नहीं सकते	8	GO TO A2.4 AND THEN TO SECTION 3
QA2.2 How long ago did you register to vote from this address? आपने इस पते से वोटगि के लप्ति कतिने समय पहले रजसि्टर कयिा था?		
Less than 1 week 1 हफ्ते से कम	1	IF CODED 1/2/3 IN QA2.1, GO TO QA2.3. IF CODED ONLY '5' IN QA2.1, GO TO QA2.6
1 week or more but less than 2 weeks 1 हफ्ता या ज्यादा लेकनि 2 हफ्ते से कम	2	

2 weeks or more but less than 3 weeks 2 हफ्ते या ज्यादा लेकनि 3 हफ्ते से कम	3	
3 weeks or more but less than 4 weeks 3 हफ्ते या ज्यादा लेकनि 4 हफ्ते से कम	4	
4 weeks or more but less than 5 weeks 4 हफ्ते या ज्यादा लेकनि 5 हफ्ते से कम	5	
5 weeks or more but less than 6 weeks 5 हफ्ते या ज्यादा लेकनि 6 हफ्ते से कम	6	
6 weeks or more but less than 2 months 6 हफ्ते या ज्यादा लेकनि 2 महीने से कम	7	
2 months or more but less than 6 months 2 महीने या ज्यादा लेकनि 6 महीने से कम	8	
6 months or more 6 महीने या ज्यादा	9	
Don't know/can't say पता नहीं/कह नहीं सकते	10	

QA2.3 You told us that you are registered to vote, but not in this particular polling part. Can you please tell us where exactly are you registered?

आपने हमें बताया कजिाप वोट डालने के लऐि रजसि्टर्ड हैं, लेकनि इस पोलगि पार्ट/केन्द्र में नहीं। कृपया हमें बतायें क आपने वास्तव कहां पर रजसि्टर्ड कयिा है?

CAPI INSTRUCTION – IF CODED 1 IN QA2.1, ONLY ALLOW 'AREA NAME TO BE ENTERED, THE REST TO BE AUTOMATICALLY DISPLAYED. IF CODED 2 IN QA2.1, ONLY ALLOW FIELDS 1 & 2 TO BE ENTERED AND THE REST TO BE AUTOMATICALLY DISPLAYED. IF CODED 3 IN QA2.1, ALLOW FIELDS 1,2,3 & 4.

FIELD 5 TO BE ALLOWED AT ALL TIMES AND ONLY ONE OUT OF THE TWO CAN BE CODED. IF '5' IS CODED, BLANK OUT ALL OTHER FIELDS.

S. NO	LOCATION FIELD	ENTER DATA HERE
1	Area Name- एरयिं/क्षेत्र का नाम	
2	Assembly Constituency Name- वधािनसभा नरि्वाचन क्षेत्र का नाम	
3	City Name- शहर का नाम	
4	State Name- राज्य का नाम	
5	Don't know/can't say पता नहीं/कह नहीं सकते	

QA2.4 You told us that you are registered to vote, but not in this particular polling part. Can you please tell us if you voted in the last Lok Sabha elections from where you are registered? कृपया हमें बतायें क किया आपने जहां से आप रजसिटरड हैं वहां से पछिले लोक सभा चूनावों में वोट डाला था?			
Yes हां	1	IF '4/5' CODED IN QA2.1, GO TO QA2.6, ELSE GO TO SECTION 3	
No नहीं	2		
Do not want to disclose बताना नहीं चाहते	3		
QA2.5.1 Can you please tell us why you haven't registered to vote from this address? Please take a look at the options below and tell us all that apply. PROBE. Any other? (MULTIPLE CODING) कृपया हमें बतायें क आिपने इस पते से वोटगि के लपि रजसि्टर्ड क्यों नहीं कयिा? कृपया नीचे दयि गये वकिल्पों को देखें और हमें वे सभी बतायें जो लागू होते हैं। प्रोब करें- कोई अन्य? QA2.5.2 And which one is the most important reason? (SINGLE CODING) और इनमें से सबसे महत्वपूर्ण कारण कौन सा है?			
lt's too tedious/difficult a process to reg रजसि्टर करना बहुत थका देने वाली/ मुश्क	ister लि प्रक्रयाि है	1	
l don't know how to register मुझे मालूम नहीं है क किसे रजसि्टर करना है		2	
l don't know where to register मुझे मालूम नहीं है क किहां रजसि्टर करना है		3	
l already have a photo ID & don't feel the need to get another one मेरे पास पहले से फोटो आईडी है और दूसरा बनाने की जरुरत महसूस नहीं होती		4	
This is not my permanent residence & hence I did not feel the need to यह मेरा स्थायी पता है और इसीलपि मुझे इसकी जरुरत महसूस नहीं हुई		5	
। am not interested in politics मेरी राजनीत मिं रूच निहीं है		6	
l am not interested in voting/don't think my vote will make much difference वोट डालने में मेरी रुच निहीं है/ मुझे नहीं लगता क मिरे वोट से ज्यादा फर्क पड़ेगा		7	
l do not have the required documents to register मेरे पास रजसि्टर करने के लएि पर्यापत कागजात नहीं है		8	
l am not going to be here/in this city for मैं इस शहर में लंबे समय तक नही रहने वा	long ला हूं	9	
Any Others? (Specify) कोई अन्य? (बतायें)		99	

CAPI INSTRUCTION – IF '4/5' NOT CODED IN QA2.1, GO TO SECTION 3

QA2.6 How many times have you applied for voter registration from this particular address? Please look at the screen and answer using the options shown.

आपने इस पते से कतिनी बार वोटर रजसि्ट्रेशन के लपि अप्लाई कयिा है? कृपया स्क्रीन को देखें और दखिाये गए वकिल्पों के अनुसार जवाब दें।

1 time	1 बार	1
2 times	2 बार	2
3 times	3 बार	3
4 times	4 बार	4
5 times	5 बार	5
More than 5 times	5 बार से अधकि	6
Don't know/Can't say	पता नहीं/ कह नहीं सकते	7

CAPI INSTRUCTION – GO TO SECTION 3 FOR ALL THOSE CODING '4/5' IN QA1

SECTION 2

INSTRUCTION TO INTERVIEWER: TAKE OUT THE VOTER LIST FOR THIS POLLING PART AND RECORD THE SERIAL NO. AND VOTR ID OF THE RESPONDENT:

इंटरव्यूअर के लगि नरि्देश: इस पोलगि हसि्से/केन्द्र की वोटर लसि्ट नकिालें और रसि्पोन्डेंट की वोटर आईडी और क्रम संख्या दर्ज करें:

SERIAL NUMBER क्रम संख्या	
VOTER ID वोटर आईडी	

SHOW THE VOTER LIST ENTRY TO THE CITIZEN. ASK THEM TO LOOK FOR THEMSELVES IN THE VOTER LIST. नागरकि को वोटर लसि्ट एंट्री दखिायें। उन्हें खुद को वोटर लसि्ट में ढूंढने के लपि कहें।

QB0 INTERVIEWER TO CODE THE LANGUAGE OF THE VOTER LIST SHOWN TO THE RESPONDENT. इंटरव्यूअर रस्पिपोंडेन्ट को दखिाई गयी वोटर लसि्ट की भाषा कोड करे।

English Voter List इंग्लशि वोटर लसि्ट	1
Hindi Voter List हन्दिी वोटर लस्टिट	2

QB1 Please take a look at your details in this list and tell us whether all the information is entered correctly. Please look at the list in a way that makes sure it is a correct entry i.e. look at whether your family or neighbours are located close to you on the list etc. (INTERVIEWER TO HELP CITIZEN BY POINTING TO WHERE VOTER ID, ADDRESS, OTHER INFO ETC ARE SHOWN ON THE LIST)

कृपया इस लसि्ट में अपनी जानकारी को देखें और हमें बतायें क कि्या सभी जानकारी सही ढ़ंग से दर्ज की गयी हैं। कृपया लसि्ट को इस तरह देखें जसिसे यह सुनशि्चति हो सके कयिह जानकारी सही है यान दिखें क कि्या आपके परविार वाले या आपके नजदीकी पड़ोसी लसि्ट में हैं आद

(इंटरव्यूअर को उस ओर इशारा करते हुए मदद करें जहां वोटर आईडी, पता, अन्य जानकारी आदकिो लसि्ट में दखिाया गया है)

Yes	1	GO TO QB5
000		
No	2	CONTINUE
0000		

QB2 What details have been mentioned incorrectly?

कौन सी जानकारयांं गलत दी गयी हैं?

QB3 Please tell us what type of error it is by looking at the options on the screen. Please tell us about all errors that apply.

कृपया सक्रीन पर दर्णि गए वकिल्पों को देखते हुए गलती का प्रकार बताएं। कृपया हमें लागू होने वाली सभी गलतयिों के बारे में बताएं।

QB4.1 Also, please tell us the correct information for the error i.e. the information that should have been there साथ ही, कृपया हमें गलती के लप्ति सही जानकारी भी बताएं यानजानकारी जसि वहां होना चाहपि

QB4.2 How many times have you tried to rectify this error in details (CAPI TO SHOW A DROP DOWN HERE WITH OPTIONS – NEVER, 1 TIME, 2 TIMES, 3 TIMES OR MORE)

आपने वविरण में इस गलती को कतिनी बार ठीक कराने की कोशशि की है (कैपी को यहां ड्रॉप डाउन ऑप्शन्स के साथ दखिाना है - कभी नहीं, एक बार, 2 बार, 3 बार या ज्यादा बार)

INTERVIEWER TO RECORD DATA FOR QUESTIONS QB2 TO QB4.2 IN GRID BELOW

इंटरव्यूअर को नमि्न ग्रडि में QB2 से QB4.2 के लएि जानकारी दर्ज करनी है।

CAPI TO SHOW QB2 FIRST AND THEN QB3 BASED ON WHETHER ERROR FIELD HAS BEEN TICKED IN QB2 OR NOT. SHOW QB4.1 & 4.2 IN A SIMILAR MANNER

CAPI TO HAVE LOGIC IN PLACE I.E. IF NAME IS TICKED FOR ERROR IN SPELLING, THE OPTION 'MISSING' SHOULD NOT SHOW

Error Field (QB2) (TCK ALL OPTIONS THAT APPLY)	Error Type 1 (QB3)-A	Error Type 2 (QB3)-B
Name	Spelling Mistake	Part of name incorrect (surname etc.)
नाम	स्पेलगि में गलती	नाम का हस्सिा गलत है (उपनाम आदा)
Father's/ Husband's/ Mother's/ Other's Name पताि का/ पतकिा/ माता का/ अन्य का नाम	Spelling Mistake स्पेलगि में गलती	Part of name incorrect (surname etc.) नाम का हस्सिा गलत है (उपनाम आदी)
Age	Wrong	Missing
उम्र	गलत	छूटा हुआ
Gender	Wrong	Missing
লगি	गलत	छ्टा हुआ
Address	Spelling mistake	Part missing
पता	स्पेलगि में गलती	कोई हसि्सा छूटा हुआ नहीं है

QB5 Do you have a voter ID card? Please look at the screen and answer with the help of the options shown. क्या आपके पास वोटर आईडी कार्ड यान मितदाता पहचान पत्र है? कृपया स्क्रीन पर देखें और दखािये गए वकिल्पों की मदद से जवाब दें।

Yes I have the ID & photo displayed on it is correct हाँ मेरे पास आईडी है और इस पर दखिायी गयी फोटो सही है	1	
Yes I have the ID & photo displayed on it is incorrect हाँ मेरे पास आईडी है और उस पर दखाियी गयी फोटो गलत है	2	
Yes, I have the ID but there is no photo on it हाँ मेरे पास आईडी है लेकनि उस पर कोई फोटो नहीं है	3	
No, I don't have the ID but have applied for it नहीं, मेरे पास आईडी नहीं है लेकनि मैनें इसके लपि अप्लाई कयाि है	4	
l do not have a voter ID card मेरे पास वोटर आईडी कार्ड नहीं है	5	
l do not have and have not applied for it मेरे पास नहीं है और इसके लएि अप्लाई नहीं कयिा	6	

INTERVIEWER TO SAY – PLEASE GO THROUGH THE ENTIRE LIST FOR THIS POLLING PART AND CHECK IF YOUR DETAILS HAVE BEEN REPEATED, OR IF YOU HAVE BEEN DUPLICATED ANYWHERE ON THIS LIST

इंटरव्यूअर कहे - कृपया इस पोलगि पार्ट/केन्द्र के लएि पूरी लसि्ट को देख लें और जांच करें यद िआपकी जानकारयों को दोहराया गया है या इस लसि्ट पर आपकी जानकारयां दोहरायी गयी हैं यान िएक से ज्यादा बार हैं।

QB6.1 Are your details repeated anywhere on the list? By repeats, I mean are the same details mentioned anywhere else on the list, or if you feel their/your name has been duplicated?

क्या आपकी जानकारयां लसि्ट में कहीं दोहरायी गई है? दोहराने से, मेरा मतलब है कणिक ही जानकारी को लसि्ट पर कहीं और भी दयाि गया है, या क्या आपको लगता है कडिनका/आपका नाम दोबारा आया है?

Yes	
No नहीं	
Refused	
इंकार कयिा	
QB6.2.1 INTERVIEWER TO RECORD NUMBER OF REPEATS: इंटरव्यूअर दोहराने की संख्या रकािँर्ड करें:

1 REPEAT	1 बार दोहराया गया है	1
2 REPEATS	2 बार दोहराया गया है	2
3 REPEATS	3 बार दोहराया गया है	3
4 REPEATS	4 बार दोहराया गया है	4
5 REPEATS	5 बार दोहराया गया है	5
6 REPEATS	6 बार दोहराया गया है	6

QB6.2.2 INTERVIEWER TO RECORD DETAILS OF REPEATS IN THE BELOW GRID

इंटरव्यूअर नीचे ग्रडि में दोहराने की जानकारी को रकिॉर्ड करना है

CAPI INSTRUCTION - ONCE THE REPEAT IS TICKED, OPTIONS TO ENTER SERIAL NUMBER & VOTER ID SHOULD BE ACTIVATED/NUMBER OF REPEATS LIST ON SCREEN SHOULD BE 6

Repeat1(tick) दोहराना 1 (टकि)	Serial Number in list लसि्ट में क्रम संख्या 	Voter ID वोटर आईडी
Repeat 2 (tick) दोहराना 2 (टकि)	Serial Number in list लसि्ट में क्रम संख्या 	Voter ID वोटर आईडी
Repeat 3 (tick) दोहराना 3 (टकि)	Serial Number in list लसि्ट में क्रम संख्या 	Voter ID वोटर आईडी

CAPI INSTRUCTION - IF CODED '01' IN QB1, GO TO QB8, ELSE CONTINUE

QB7.1 You told us about the errors in your details on the voter list. Have you ever been prevented from voting in Lok Sabha or Assembly elections?

आपने हमें वोटर लसि्ट पर अपनी जानकारी में गलतयोंि के बारे में बताया। क्या आपको कभी लोक सभी या वधिानसभा चूनावों में वोट डालने से रोका गया है?

Yes हाँ	1	CONTINUE
No नहीं	2	SKIP TO QB8
Don't know/Can't say पता नहीं/ कह नहीं सकते	3	

QB7.2 Can you tell us about the reasons given by the officials at the polling booth for not allowing a vote? PROBE Any others? RECORD VERBATIM

क्या आप हमें पॉलगि ब्र्थ पर अधकिारयों द्वारा आपको वोट डालने से रोकने के लपि दपि गए कारणों के बारे में बता सकते हैं? कोई अन्य? कहे अन्सार लखिं

SPACE TO TYPE IN ANSWER FOR QB7.2

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	10 OR MORE
								10 या अधकि

QB9. Did you/(CAPI TO DISPLAY NAME OF CITIZEN CONCERENED) vote in the previous Lok Sabha elections? क्या आपने पछिले लोक सभा चुनावों में वोट डाला था?

Yes हां	1				
No नहीं	2				
Was not eligible to vote during previous elections पछिले चुनावों के दौरान वोट देने के लएि योग्य नहीं थे	3				
Don't Know/ Cant say पता नहीं/कह नहीं सकते	4				

SECTION3 – DEMOGRAPHICS AND OTHER SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND RELIGIOUS QUESTIONS

Interviewer to say: Now, we would be asking you a few questions on your education, occupation, religion etc इंटरव्यूअर कहे : अब, हम आपकी शक्षि, काम/व्यवसाय, धर्म आदपिर कुछ सवाल पूछेंगें|

QC1 What is the maximum level to which you have studied? SHOW SCREEN TO RESPONDENT आपने अधकितम कहां तक पढ़ाई की है? रसिपोनडेंट को सकरीन दखिायें

llliterate अशक्षिति	1				
School up to 4 years स्कूल 4 साल तक	2				
School 5-9 years स्कूल 5-9 साल	3				
SSC/HSC एसएससी/एचएससी	4				
Some college but not a graduate कुछ कॉलेज लेकनि ग्रेजुऐट नहीं	5				
Graduate/ Post Graduate – general ग्रेजुऐट/ पोस्ट ग्रेजुऐट - जनरल	6				
Graduate/ Post Graduate – professional (e.g. Engineering, Architecture, Doctor, Law, CA) ग्रेजुऐट/ पोस्ट ग्रेजुऐट - प्रोफेशनल (जैसे इंजीनयिरींग, आर्कटिक्चर, डॉक्टर, वकील, सीए)	7				

Graduate + Professional diploma (women's polytechnic) ग्रेजुऐट + प्रोफेशनल डप्लिमा (वुमेन्स पॉलीटैकनीक)	8				
QC2 Could you please tell me your occupation? SHOW SCREEN TO RESPONDENT. IF RETIRED: What was your occupation before retirement? कृपया मुझे बताऐं क आप क्या काम करते हैं? रसि्पोन्डेंट को स्क्रीन दखाियें। यद रिटाियर्ड हैं: रटिायरमेंट से पहले आप क्या काम करते थे?					
Unskilled अकुशल कर्मचारी	1				
Skilled worker कुशल कर् <i>म</i> चारी	2				
Petty Trader छोटे व् यापारी	3				
Shop Owner दुकान मालकि	4				
Businessmen/ Industrialists with no. of employees – None बजिनेसमैन/उद्योगपत - कर्मचारयों की संख्या - कोई नहीं	5				
Businessmen/ Industrialists with no. of employees – 1 to 9 बजिनेसमैन/उद्योगपत - कर्मचारयोंि की संख्या- 1 से 9	6				
Businessmen/ Industrialists with no. of employees – 10+ बजिनेसमैन/उद्योगपत - कर्मचारयों की संख्या - 10+	7				

Self Employed professional सेल्फ एम्पलॉयड प्रोफेशनल	8			
Clerical/Salesmen क्लर्क/सेल्समैन	9			
Supervisory level सुपरवाइज़री स्तर	10			
Officers/Executives – junior ऑफसिर्स/एग्जकि्यूटवि्स - जूनयिर	11			
Officers/Executives – middle or senior ऑफसिर्स/एग्जकि्यूटवि्स - मडिल या सीनयिर	12			
Housewife गृहणी	13			
Student छात्र/स्टूडेंट	14			
Unemployed बेरोजगार	15			

QC3 Can you please tell me about your marital status? SHOW SCREEN TO RESPONDENT कृपया मुझे अपनी वैवाहकि सथति बताएं? रसिपोन्डेंट को सक्रीन दखिायें

C 5 .						
Married वविाहति	1					
Single अकेले	2					
Divorced तलाकशुदा	3					
Widowed वधिवा/वधिुर	4					
QC4 What type of family d आप कसि प्रकार के परवािर	oes the citizen do you liv में रहते हैं? रसि्पोन्डेंट को	e in? SHOW S(स्क्रीन दखाियें	CREEN TO F	RESPONDE	NT	
Single अकेले	1					
Nuclear family/ only husband & wife/ partners/live in एकल परवािर/केवल पत एवं पत्नी/पार्टनर्स/लवि इन	2					

Nuclear family with parents (No Children) माता-पताि के साथ एकल परवािर (बच्चे नहीं)	3				
Nuclear family with parents and children माता-पताि और बच्चों के साथ एकल परवािर	4				
Nuclear family with children (No Parents) बच्चों के साथ एकल परवािर (माता-पताि नहीं)	5				
Extended joint family बड़ा संयुक्त परविार	6				
Others/Unspecified अन्य/अस्पष्ट	7				
Do not want to answer जवाब नहीं देना चाहते	8				

QC5Which religion do you follow? SHOW SCREEN TO RESPONDENT आप कसि धर्म का पालन करते/मानते हैं? रसि्पोन्डेंट को स्क्रीन दखिायें

Hindu हन्दिू	1	GO TO QC6.1				
Muslim मुसलमान	2	GO TO QC6.2				
Christian ईसाई	3					
Sikh सखि	4					
Jain जैन	5					
Buddhist बौद्ध	6	GO TO QC7				
None कोई नहीं	7					
Do not want to answer जवाब नहीं देना चाहते	8					
Others (Specify) अन्य (बताएें)	99					
QC6.1 Which social group do you belong to? SHOW SCREEN TO RESPONDENT						

आप कसि सामाजकि समुह से संबंधति हैं? रस्पिोन्डेंट को स्क्रीन दखिायें

OBC – Other Backward	1	GO TO QC7			
Caste					
ओबीसी-अन्य पछिड़ी जात					

SC – Scheduled Caste एससी- अनुसूचति जात	2							
ST – Scheduled Tribes एसटी - अनुसूचति जनजात	3							
GEN – General/Forward Caste सामान्य - सामान्य/अग्रमि जात ि	4							
Don't Know/Can't say पता नहीं/कह नहीं सकते	5							
Do not want to answer जवाब नहीं देना चाहते	6							
QC6.2 Which social group do you belong to? You can choose not to answer if you do not wish to. SHOW SCREEN TO RESPONDENT आप कसि सामाजकि समुह से संबंधति हैं? यद बिताना नहीं चाहते तो आप 'जवाब नहीं देना चाहते' चुन सकते हैं रसि्पोन्डेंट को सकरीन दखिायें								
OBC – Other Backward Caste ओबीसी-अन्य पछिड़ी जात ि	1							
SC – Scheduled Caste एससी- अनुसूचति जात	2							
ST – Scheduled Tribes एसटी - अनुसूचति जनजात	3							
GEN – General/Forward Caste सामान्य - सामान्य/अग्रमि जात	4							
Don't Know/Can't say पता नहीं/कह नहीं सकते	5							
Do not want to answer जवाब नहीं देना चाहते	6							

QC7 Are you the chief wage earner of the household? By the term 'chief wage earner', I mean the member who makes the maximum contribution to family expenditure. क्या आप घर के मुख्य कमाने वाले सदस्य हैं? मुख्य कमाने वाले सदस्य से, मेरा मतलब वह सदस्य जो परवािर के खर्चो के लपि अधकितम योगदान करते हैं। Yes 1 CAPI TO CALCULATE SEC BASED ON GRID GIVEN AFTER QC8 हां USING QUESTIONS QC1 AND QC2. THANK THE RESPONDENT AND END INTERVIEW

No	2	GO TO QC8.1
नहीं		

QC8.1 Now, I would like to know something about the person who makes the maximum contribution to the family expenditure.

अब, मैं उस व्यक्त कि बारे में कुछ जानना चाहूंगा जो परविार के खर्चो के लएि अधकितम योगदान करते हैं। What is the maximum level to which the chief wage earner has studied? Please look at the screen and answer with the help of the options shown

मुख्य कमाने वाले व्यक्त िने अधकितम कहां तक पढ़ाई की है? कृपया स्क्रीन को देखें और दखिाये गए वकिल्पों की मदद से जवाब दें

Illiterate अशक्षिति	1				
School up to 4 years स्कूल 4 साल तक	2				
School 5-9 years स्कूल 5-9 साल	3				
SSC/HSC एसएससी/एचएससी	4				
Some college but not a graduate कुछ कॉलेज लेकनि ग्रेजुऐट नहीं	5				
Graduate/ Post Graduate – general ग्रेजुऐट/ पोस्ट ग्रेजुऐट - जनरल	6				
Graduate/ Post Graduate – professional (e.g. Engineering, Architecture, Doctor, Law, CA) ग्रेजुऐट/ पोस्ट ग्रेजुऐट -प्रोफेशनल (जैसे इंजीनयिरींग, आर्कटिक्चर, डॉक्टर, वकील, सीए)	7				
Graduate + Professional diploma (like women's polytechnic) ग्रेजुऐट + प्रोफेशनल डपि्लोमा (जैसे वुमैन्स/ महलाि पॉलीटैकनीक)	8				

यम प्रवसाय प्रवा पाः) पृष		49 JIK	पाखाप गर	414/(14) 4/	ոսս	रा जपाष	ч	
Unskilled अकुशल कर् म चारी	1							
Skilled worker कुशल कर्मचारी	2							
Petty Trader छोटे व् यापारी	3							
Shop Owner दुकान मालकि	4							
Businessmen/ Industrialists with no. of employees – None बजिनेसमैन/उद्योगपत - कर्मचारयों की संख्या -कोई नहीं	5							
Businessmen/ Industrialists with no. of employees – 1 to 9 बजिनेसमैन/उद्योगपत ि- कर्मचारयों की संख्या- 1 से 9	6							
Businessmen/ Industrialists with no. of employees – 10+ बजिनेसमैन/उद्योगपत - कर्मचारयों की संख्या - 10+	7							
Self Employed professional सेल्फ एम्पलॉयड प्रोफेशनल	8							
Clerical/Salesmen क्लर्क/सेल्समैन	9							
Supervisory level सुपरवाइज़री स्तर	10							
Officers/Executives – junior ऑफसिर्स/एग्जकि्यूटवि्स - जूनयिर	11							
Officers/Executives – middle or senior ऑफसिर्स/एग्जकि्यूटवि्स - मडिल या सीनयिर	12							

answer with the help of the options shown कृपया मुझे मुख्य कमाने वाले सदस्य का व्यवसाय बताएँ? (यदरिटीयर्ड हैं: रटीयर होने से पहले मुख्य कमाने वाले सदस्य का वयवणाय कया भार) कपया प्रकारित को देखें और दखियों या वक्तियां की पहले में चवान दें

QC8.2 Could you please tell me the occupation of the chief wage earner? (IF RETIRED: What was the chief wage earner's occupation before they retired?)Please look at the screen and QA3 How long have you lived at this particular address? Please look at the screen and answer using the options shown.

आप इस पते पर कतिने समय से रहते हैं? कृपया स्क्रीन को देखें और दखिायें गए वकिल्पों के अनुसार जवाब दें।

Less than 1 month	1 महीने से कम	1			
1-3 months	1-3 महीने	2			
3-6 months	3-6 महीने	3			
6 months – 1 year	6 महीने-1 साल	4			
1 – 1.5 years	1 - 1.5 साल	5			
1.5 yrs – 2 years	1.5 साल - 2 साल	6			
2 yrs -2.5 years	2 साल -2.5 साल	7			
2.5 yrs – 3 years	2.5 साल - 3 साल	8			
3 yrs – 4 years	3 साल - 4 साल	9			
4 yrs – 5 years	4 साल - 5 साल	10			
5 or more years	5 या ज्यादा साल	11			
Don't know/Can't Say	पता नहीं/ कह नहीं सकते	12			

QA4 How long have you lived in this city, DELHI? Please look at the screen and answer using the options shown आप इस शहर, दल्लि में कतिने समय से रहते हैं? कृपया स्क्रीन को देखें और दखाियें गए वकिल्पों के अनुसार जवाब दें। CAPI INSTRUCTION – HAVE A LOGIC CHECK FOR QUESTIONS QA3 & QA4 i.e. IF 6 IS CODED IN QA3, NO VALUE BELOW 6 CAN BE CODED FOR QA4

Less than 1 month	1 महीने से कम	1			
1-3 months	1-3 महीने	2			
3-6 months	3-6 महीने	3			
6 months – 1 year	6 महीने-1 साल	4			
1 – 1.5 years	1 - 1.5 साल	5			
1.5 yrs – 2 years	1.5 साल - 2 साल	6			
2 yrs -2.5 years	2 साल -2.5 साल	7			
2.5 yrs – 3 years	2.5 साल - 3 साल	8			
3 yrs – 4 years	3 साल - 4 साल	9			
4 yrs – 5 years	4 साल - 5 साल	10			
5 or more years	5 या ज्यादा साल	11			
Don't know/Can't Say	पता नहीं/ कह नहीं सकते	12			
QA5 Are you a tenant or the owner of this address? क्या आप इस पते के मालकि या करिायेदार है?	Tenant करिायेदार	1			

	Owner मालकि	2				
QA6 Could you please prov कृपया हमें अपना फोन नंबर	vide us with your contact दे सकते हैं?	number?				
INTERVIEWER TO RECORD CONTACT NUMBER इंटरव्यूअर फोन नंबर रकॉिर्ड करें						
Refused/ Don't know/ Can't say इनकार/ पता नहीं/ कह नहीं सकते	1					

QA 7 Please let us know if we can share your responses with Janaagraha Centre for Citizenship & Democracy for their advocacy purpose. We assure you that under no circumstance will this information be used for sales or any other commercial purpose?

कृपया हमें बताएं यद हिम आपके जवाबों को जनाग्रह सेंटर फोर सटिौजनशपि एण्ड डेमोक्रेसी के साथ उनकी समर्थन/ अवलोकन संबंधी उद्देश्यों के लएि बांट सकते हैं। हम आपको यकीन दलिाते हैं क किसीि भी परसि्थति में इस जानकारी को बक्रिरी या कसीि अन्य व्यवसायकि उद्देश्यों के लएि इस्तेमाल नहीं करेंगे?

Yes	हां	1
No	नहीं	2

END OF SURVEY - THANK YOU

9.6 Appendix 6: The citizen-centric desk research – validating claims

In the citizen-centric survey instrument, for citizens who were found omitted, there was a question which asked them whether they believed they were registered in another place outside of their polling part. They could reply with any of the below options:

- 1. Registered to vote in the same Assembly Constituency but in a different area/part/polling part
- 2. Registered to vote in the same city, some other Assembly Constituency
- 3. Registered to vote in a different city or village etc.

Since during the field work, the frame of reference used was registration in the PP a citizen lived in, as a result of which the surveyor only had access to that PP list, it was not possible to verify these claims while on the field. For the purpose of this verification, an additional desk based layer was used.

This layer used key information captured in the citizen-centric questionnaire to try and locate them on the national electoral database as well as Delhi's electoral database^{A2}. In order to be able to find a person on the above mentioned databases, certain key pieces of information were required:

- 1. Elector's name
- 2. Name of elector's father/mother/husband
- 3. Elector's age and gender
- 4. Assembly Constituency name

The above mentioned parameters, except for point number 3, were a must to be able to find citizens on Delhi's electoral database but the national electoral database allowed for more flexibility, in terms of the AC, Age and Relative names not being mandatory while searching for an elector. While the name of the elector, their age, gender and the AC were readily collected during the survey, working out the relative's name which would be listed with the citizen's on the electoral role posed quite a challenge. This part of the research was not planned prior to going into the field so the survey did not include a question asking citizens specifically which of their relatives were listed with them on the electoral role. However, during the survey process, as part of the sampling of the citizen in the household, a list of all relatives and ages was made. This list was used along with assumptions about which relatives may be listed along with the citizen, to verify their claims. It must be noted however that due to the data being collected on a tab (which makes typing harder) and skills of the surveyors, data for fields such as the citizen's name and the name of their family members were prone to errors of spelling and of missing surnames, initials etc.

Depending on where a citizen had claimed to be registered, slightly different search methodologies were adopted to find and confirm their presence on that particular list but the basic guidelines to arrive at the correct citizen name and the relative's name, while searching, remained similar for all:

- CITIZEN'S NAME The citizen's name as given in the Excel may not have been the right spelling. For each citizen, possible 'correct' and 'variant' spellings were listed and used in the search. For e.g. if a citizen was listed as 'Nazeer', the name could actually have been Nazir, Nasir or Nazer etc. (a similar procedure was undertaken for names of relatives).
- 2. CHOOSING RELATIVE'S NAME 'Father's/Mother's/Husband's Name' -

a. The first option used in the search was the eldest male member in the household. Father/Husband was usually an older male member - when compared to the CITIZEN who we were searching for in the national database

b. If the eldest male member did not show results, other male members' names were used

c. If there was no elder male member when compared to the citizen, the name of the eldest FEMALE

^{1.} CEO, Delhi's elector search page - http://164.100.112.153/electorsearchtest.aspx and

^{2.} Election Commission of India's NVSP (National voter's services portal) - http://electoralsearch.in/

member older than the citizen was used - this was likely the mother

d. If there was only one other member in the household of the CITIZEN and was a younger female, the search was to begin by looking for this younger member instead of the CITIZEN (with the citizen's name in the Relative's name field)

As mentioned earlier, searches for most type of 'registered elsewhere' claims were quite similar. However, before classifying a citizen as found, certain checks were made to be sure that the citizen zeroed in on, using this process, was the one actually interviewed on ground. These checks included matching the age, to as close as possible, to that which the citizen had stated as well as looking for the citizen's family members on the PP List that had been identified. A broad flow of how searches were conducted for citizens claiming to be registered in another PP within the same AC can be seen in Figure A1.



Figure A1 – Search Flow for people claiming to be registered in another PP within the same AC

TO BE ABLE TO CHECK FOR A CITIZEN, AT LEAST ONE OTHER RELATIVE NEEDS TO BE PRESENT. IF NOT, TRY USING THEIR SURNAME IN THE FIELD TITLED 'Father's/Mother's/Husband's Name'

CITIZEN'S NAME - The citizen's name as given in the excel may not be the right spelling. For each Citizen, follow the entire procedure with the possible 'correct' and 'variant' spellings. For E.g. if a citizen is mentioned as Nazeer, the name could be Nazir, Nasir or Nazer etc and so, we need to try all these variations (in cases where we search for their relatives, even their names should be tested similarly i.e. with variant spellings)



	For Male CITIZEN (Use all males and females with age at least 15 years more than the CITIZEN)	For Female CITIZEN (Use all males aged more than the CITIZEN and females with age at least 15 years more than the CITIZEN)		CHOOSING 'Father Name' • This usually is the E	C's/Mother's/Husband's
Relative-1	Male member of the highest age			If the eldest male me	mber does not show results,
Relative-2	Male member with second highest	age		use other male memb	ers
Relative-3	Male member with third highest ag	je and so on		Father/Husband is us	ually an older male member
Relative-4	Female member of the highest age			searching for in the na	ational database
Relative-5	Female member of the second high	nest age and so on		• If there is no elder m	ale member when compared
STEP A Try STEP A from the E been exha	1 A with a different relative's nar xcel sheet till all names have usted	me		 to the citizen, use the older than the citize mother If there is only one other the CITIZEN and it is a for the younger female the filed titled Father's 	name of a FEMALE member in - this is likely to be the er member in the household of younger female, try searching e using the CITIZEN's name in s/Mother's/Husband's Name
CITI	ZEN NOT FOUND	Take their names from	the excel.	STEP C	
Ref Ent loo Ent	fer to basic search guidelines of ter the selected member's name king for) ter the relative's name (anothe	on how to select relative ne (not the CITIZEN we r member of the family	es are ' based on	TRYING TO LOOK FO THEN ZONING IN ON CITIZEN	R A RELATIVE AND I TO THE REQUIRED
rela S RELAT	ative guidelines mentioned) TEP D IVE FOUND	STEP E SEVERAL FOUND	STE	P F	IF COMBINATIONS OF FAMILY MEMBER + RELATIVE LEFT
Look on h insti Reco go te	<pre>< for names of the Relative simil ow close the names are, the PP nct) ord this relative's info as display o step D</pre>	ar to step B (based number and on ed on the site and	Try Ste Mother Name'. of Vote Name t found,	p C entering a different n 's/Husband's Name' tab If this is unsuccessful, ch r's Name and Father's/M cill all possibilities are exh classify CITIZEN as NOT	ame in the 'Father's/ for the same 'Voter's ange the combination other's/Husband's nausted. If still not FOUND
CITI Possibl minor o	ZEN FOUND CITI e to find them with changes in spelling	ZEN NOT FOUND			
Dov Che Onc rela	vnload the PP List from Delhi (ck for the relative on the list e found, search for the CITIZEI tive's position	CEO's site			
					STEP G

Go to STEP C and try other combinations of Family Members. If all possibilities have been exhausted, classify CITIZEN AS NOT FOUND

The output:

Nine hundred and four respondents who could not be located on their Polling Part lists, while undertaking the survey, claimed to be registered elsewhere in Delhi. The methodology above was used to try to verify their claims.

Due to the manner in which Delhi's publicly available electoral database is structured, searching for the largest segment, i.e. people claiming to be registered in a different PP within the same Assembly Constituency (AC) was undertaken. Twenty-two out of the aforementioned category chose to not disclose their name and age, details without which validation could not be done; because of this, the effective number of respondents that were searched reduced to 816. Results from this stage are as in Table A9 below.

AC Name	Names to be validated (n)	Names found (n)	% Names found
Gandhi Nagar	98	65	66.3%
Gokalpur	124	96	77.4%
Okhla	184	91	49.5%
Palam	60	35	58.3%
R K Puram	87	62	71.3%
Rohini	59	36	61.0%
Sangam Vihar	183	97	53.0%
Trinagar	21	16	76.2%
Total	816	498	61.0%

Table A9: Validation of names – People claiming to be in same AC, different PP (n=816)

As described above, in order to find a citizen on the Delhi electoral database, the basics needed were:

- 1. Citizen's Name along with surname
- 2. Relative's Name (father/husband/mother etc.)
- 3. AC Name

If these parameters were not available, finding a citizen or finding the right citizen was not guaranteed. Out of the 816 citizens that were looked for, a total of 601 entries either had no surname or any other family member or were the eldest among all in their family, effectively negating the use of any family member's name as the relative's name to be entered on the voter search portal^{A3}. Moreover, several of the names that were recorded during the survey had spelling mistakes and other minor errors that proved to be an additional hindrance. Despite all of these factors, the desk based stage was able to find 61% of all citizens who claimed to have been registered elsewhere in Delhi. In light of these, there is sufficient evidence to indicate that a large proportion of people, perhaps close to 90%, who 'claim' to be registered elsewhere in Delhi are present on the list.

9.7 Appendix 7: Quality assurance procedures

10.7.1 Surveys

The survey agency undertook a range of quality assurance procedures while the surveys were in the field:

- 10-15% of each of the surveyor trips were accompanied by a supervisor.
- 30% of the surveys were back-checked upon completion.
- 10% of surveyed citizens received a call-back to check survey procedures and completion.
- When a surveyor deemed an address not findable, a supervisor went onto the field to check whether an address could be found.

The research team also undertook quality assurance checks to ensure the surveys were being executed as planned. A member of the team went on the field on three different days during the list-centric field-work, and monitored 2 surveyors' work (undertaking eight surveys). During the citizen-centric, a member of the team went on the field on one day and monitored one surveyor undertaking three surveys. Detailed feedback was given to the survey agency following the observations.

10.7.2 Desk-based work

Each of the phases of desk-based work underwent quality assurance procedures:

- 5% of the data entry of the address parameters from the voter list were checked.
- 10% of the address quality scores were checked.
- All 838 citizens who claimed to be registered in another PP in the same AC were subject to being searched for by two people. If one person could not locate the citizen, the second person also tried. 15% of all successful and unsuccessful searches were checked by the supervisor.

9.8 Appendix 8: Housing types

In addition to a socio-economic classification grid, the study also captured data on the dwelling unit type/housing unit type of respondents approached. This, in addition with the SEC Data, was to be able to get a more accurate picture of the socio-economic class of people that these two data points in isolation may not be able to provide. To capture this data effectively, a 'Housing Type' classification grid was built into the CAPI which had a brief description of the markers of all housing types, as well as a couple of images to aid surveyors. During the field briefing, special emphasis was paid on how to effectively identify the 5 housing types, details of which are given below:

1. Upper Class Housing





- a. Independent house or apartment building
- b. Rarely has outdoor staircases
- c. Often constructed using materials in addition to concrete such as: glass, wood
- d. If house, multiple rooms, one family or joint family lives there. Generally not multiple independent units of unrelated families within one house. Can assess this by single mailbox on the outside, single address marked doorway entrance.
- e. Usually has surrounding wall with gate in front of house
- f. If apartment building will also have wall and gate with security guarding entrance
- g. Often apartment complexes/gated communities. Amenities such as a swimming pool, shopping mall, gym, will be inside of complex.
- h. Size of individual apartments will be large
- i. Multiple balconies for one apartment
- j. Large windows

2. Upper Middle Class Housing





- a. Independent house or apartment building
- b. If independent house and large (more than three BHK) often a shared dwelling between independent family units which can be indicated by multiple mailboxes and different entrances
- c. There may be a gate but usually no high-wall present around house
- d. Apartment buildings often have outdoor staircases, may have a gate entrance to building but generally not part of a complex or gated community
- e. Often mostly concrete but some have additional materials such as glass/wood/brick, etc.
- f. Apartments often have private balconies

3. Lower Middle Class Housing





- a. Apartments and houses are most often made only of concrete
- b. Windows are often smaller
- c. Houses are small often two-three rooms with concrete roofs, usually only one level
- d. Usually no gate around house, electricity meter is usually present as is piped water
- e. Often in neighbourhoods containing 2's and 1's
- f. Interspersed with commercial shops/denser neighbourhoods
- g. Apartment buildings may often be above small shops, often no gate around apartment building
- h. May often have shared balconies across units

4. One room home/Designated Slum





- a. One-room pakka row house
- b. Corrugated metal roof
- c. Densely packed
- d. Often not located on a main street, behind buildings, down gullies
- e. Often uses community-tap, often no sump storage
- f. Often in neighbourhoods containing 2s and 1s, and small one room commercial businesses
- g. Few windows, small windows, often shutters not glass
- h. One entrance

5. Self-Built Informal Slum Housing





- a. Self-built dwelling often made from: reclaimed wood, fabric, tarpaulin, corrugated metal, sack-cloth
- b. Often not located on street-fronts, often located in vacant lots, behind buildings, on sidewalk, road medians, small green spaces, large slums, under overpasses, construction sites
- c. Can be two floors or one floor
- d. Can be a family living inside of a larger vacant-abandoned/under-construction non-self-made structure, but often using self-made materials within that building (tent, etc.)
- e. Often presence of community-tap
- f. No electricity meters
- g. JNNURM social housing built for slum relocation; these buildings are often green and white with JNNURM printed on the side. Small concrete open windows/no glass, inside staircases, community bathrooms (E.g. Neelasandra JNNRUM relocation projects

9.9 Appendix 9: The SEC grid

The SEC, or Socio Economic Classification grid is a tool developed to bucket households into eight different strata based on education and occupation of the chief wage earner. The SEC grid used for this study is as given below; it uses Education and Occupation of the Chief Wage Earner (the person in the household who contributes most to expenses incurred) of a household to classify it as belonging to a certain SEC. The highest SEC is A1 and the lowest is named E2. This is a standard grid used by all MRSI (Market Research Society of India) members as well as certain Social Research organizations in India^{A4}.

SEC GRID	DCUCATION	literate	chool: upto 4 years	chool: 5-9 years	sc/Hsc	ome college but not raduate	raduate/ Post raduate general	raduate / ost graduate rofessional
1 Unskilled Worke	ш r	= F2	F2	S F1	N N			
2. Skilled worker	1	E2	E1	D	C	C	B2	B2
3. Petty trader		E2	D	D	C	С	B2	B2
4. Shop owner		D	D	С	B2	B1	A2	A2
Businessmen/ Inc	lustrialists	with no.	of employe	es				
5. None		D	С	B2	B1	A2	A2	A1
6.1-9		С	B2	B2	B1	A2	A1	A1
7.10+		B1	B1	A2	A2	A1	A1	A1
8. Self-employed Professional		D	D	D	B2	B1	A2	A1
9. Clerical / Salesr	nan	D	D	D	С	B2	B1	B1
A. Supervisory leve	el	D	D	С	С	B2	B1	A2
B. Officers/Executi Junior	ves-	С	С	С	B2	B1	A2	A2
C. Officers/Execut middle / senior	ives	B1	B1	B1	B1	A2	A1	A1

9.10 Appendix 10: Methodological updates

Following a review of all earlier work on measuring the hygiene of urban voter lists, the subsequent points of note were flagged as revisions to the methodology and conceptualization of Quality of Voter List (QoL) surveys for the current study. Full documentation of the revised methodology follows but these were the key recommended changes from earlier work in this area:

- 1. For voter-list-centric surveys, accurately measure and conceptualise the issue of 'address not found'; introduce a new layer of verification/quality checking of the address instead of simply accepting these instances as errors of deletion.
- 2. Record errors with registration details separately for each kind of error (both survey types)
- 3. Errors with photos can only be established for those citizens with a voting card as pictures are not printed on the publically available PDF versions of the voter lists. Questions about accuracy/presence of photo should therefore be done by way of questions in the survey (and only for those with a voter card).
- Allow multiple errors with registrations to be recorded per citizen [record as one count per citizen with regard to ability to vote however repetitions should not be included here and should be considered separately, see below]
 (both survey types)
- 5. Repeated entries on the voter list should be considered as errors of deletion (both survey types)
- 6. Number of repeated entries should be recorded and the rate of errors of deletion should reflect the number of repetitions (both survey types)
- 7. Use the same questions and methods to collect errors with registrations for both survey types where appropriate.
- 8. Errors on the list could potentially lead to being unable to vote; explore this concept further (both survey types)
- 9. The reference point for error measurement should be clearly defined preferably as the PP. The PP level is the smallest reference unit and also the unit at which voting occurs. Therefore, in the citizen-centric surveys, incidents where the citizen is not registered in the PP in question, should be considered as an outright error of inclusion rather than as an only an error with the registration. In the list-centric survey it should be an error of deletion. In the latter in fact, the reference point more specifically is the exact address and if the person is not found there is an error of deletion. The proportion of citizens who are not at the specific address but still within the correct PP, would be picked up from the citizen-centric survey and cross-calibrated to validly calculate errors relative to the PP.
- 10. Ensure that errors of deletion/inclusion etc. are calculated on the basis of fact rather than self-report basis (both survey types)
- 11. For citizens who self-report registration but are not on the list, explore when citizens last tried to register on the list to mitigate for recent registration requests which have not yet made it onto the list and understand other issues around this.

In terms of application of the data:

• Make net calculations of additions and deletions on basis of new parameters (as above for how to conceptualise additions/deletions etc.) for calculating potential voter turn-out and making other commentary on the data (i.e. consider and analyse the citizen-centric and list-centric data together).

In terms of sampling:

- For list-centric surveys, do not have a variable cap on substitutes. This is very hard to implement on the field. Take the maximum number of respondents as per desirable from the capping model and take a response/try to approach all of these.
- For the list-centric surveys, following from above point, pre-select all citizen names from the list and consider these the sample basis.
- For the list-centric surveys, clearly distinguish between 'address not found' and 'person not found'.
- Both survey types: Link all data on different papers/tablets with identifiers so clear back trail of work.



4th Floor, UNI Building, Thimmaiah Road, Vasanthnagar, Bangalore - 560052 Tel: +91-80-4079-0400 Fax: +91-80-4127-7104 www.janaagraha.org | www.ichangemycity.com | www.ipaidabribe.com