Appendix D
India Voters' Survey

Our voters' survey in the Indian states of Karnataka, Bihar, and Rajasthan took place in the context of a study of the effect of caste-based quotas in local village councils (see Dunning 2010, Dunning and Nilekani 2012).[1] To select our study group of councils (called *gram panchayats*), we first purposively sampled six districts in Karnataka, which vary in terms of strength of different parties and locally dominant castes. We took advantage of the procedure by which quotas rotate across councils in different electoral terms to construct a regression-discontinuity (RD) design, in which the assignment to caste-based quotas was either truly randomized or as good a randomly assigned (see Dunning 2009). Using this RD design, we constructed a study group of 200 village council constituencies, 100 of which had their presidencies reserved for Scheduled Caste or Scheduled Tribe presidents in 2007 and 100 of which were unreserved or reserved for Backward Classes. Although council constituencies were selected according to the RD design, rather than by a probability sampling scheme, and although the six included districts were purposively sampled, means on a variety of covariates are quite similar in our selected councils and in a statewide dataset, suggesting that our sample may be quite representative of the state of Karnataka. Indeed, as the final column of Table Appendix D.1 shows, the data are consistent with a simple random sample from the underlying population of village councils.

We selected citizens at random, using an interval sampling method, in each of the 200 councils in our study group. Our sampling design called for a stratified random sample of 10 citizens drawn from the headquarter village of each council. Because we oversampled Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe citizens by design, in some analyses we use sampling weights to recover parameter

---

[1] The surveys were approved by the Yale Human Subjects Expedited Review Committee under 1RB Protocols #0812004564 and #1106008688.

TABLE D.1. *Representativeness of the RD Study Group (Karnataka)*

	Average of Councils in Study Group (SD)	Average of Councils in Karnataka (SD)	Difference of Means (SE)
Population	5869.7	6132.1	−262.4
	(1912.03)	(2287.1)	(135.2)
Scheduled Caste population	1116.7	1129.7	−13.0
	(805.7)	(760.2)	(57.0)
Scheduled Tribe population	475.2	512.5	−37.3
	(506.5)	(715.8)	(35.8)
Number of literates	3196.1	3122.7	73.4
	(1133.4)	(1326.7)	(80.1)
Number of employed workers	2938.9	3005.9	−67.0
	(979.3)	(1092.5)	(69.2)
Number of councils	200	5760	

The unit of analysis is the village council; data are from the 2001 census. The first column gives the sample means and standard deviations (SD) for our Karnataka study group. The second column gives the population means and standard deviations, as measured by the census. The final column gives the difference between the first and second columns. The standard error (SE) in the final column is the standard deviation in the first column, divided by the square root of 200. Here, p values will give the probability of observing a sample mean as far in absolute value from the population mean as the observed value, if the N = 200 study group is a simple random sample from the population. * $p < 0.05$.

estimates that are valid for the population in our study group of councils. Citizens were asked a range of questions about benefit receipt and party affiliation and also participated in an experiment designed to assess the role of caste in shaping voting preferences. In each village, we also surveyed the council president, council secretary, and two council members. Fieldwork was undertaken in January–February 2009, over a year after the election of the council president in September 2007; the survey instruments and other materials are available online.[2]

---

[2] See http://www.thaddunning.com/research/all-research.