GAON CONNECTION RURAL SURVEY ANALYSED BY LOKNITI-CSDS

METHODOLOGY

Two months into the Coronavirus-induced lockdown, Gaon Connection in consultation with the Lokniti programme of the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies conducted a sample survey among rural households located in all zones of India to find out how lives and livelihoods in villages had coped during the lockdown. The survey was conducted in **179** districts spread across **20** States and **3** Union Territories. The States where the survey was conducted are Rajasthan, Punjab, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand, West Bengal, Sikkim, Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura, Odisha, Kerala, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh. The surveyed Union Territories are Jammu and Kashmir, Ladakh and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. A total of **25,371** respondents were interviewed between **May 30 and July 16, 2020** during the exercise. All respondents interviewed were main earners of their households, and thus primarily Men.

In addition to the interview with the main earner in every household, a supplementary interview was also conducted in those households where a household member had returned from a city or a town during the lockdown. This interview was taken after the completion of the main earner's interview. A total of **963** supplementary interviews of such migrants were completed. The aim of interviewing migrants was to find out their experience and struggle in the city/town at the time of the lockdown and their experience/ordeal in travelling back home during the lockdown.

The sampling method adopted was purposive, as districts chosen for the survey were those that had a presence of the Gaon Connection team in them. Because of this limitation and given the extraordinary situation of the epidemic/lockdown and the movement restrictions that came along with it, the sampled districts (and the villages surveyed within them) in some States are not necessarily spread out evenly. For instance in some states, some of the districts chosen for the survey were geographically contiguous or located close to each other. Moreover, the number of surveyed districts varies from State to State - some big States have relatively fewer districts in the sample and some smaller States have relatively more districts. This also meant that some big States with fewer districts in the sample had a more clustered sample as they saw many more interviews being conducted within a district in order to meet the sample target.

A total of 25,000 interviews were targeted across the country at the outset of the exercise. The sample target for the each of the States and UTs where the survey was to be conducted was first determined on the basis of the proportion of their rural population in the overall rural universe (the total rural population of States and UTs combined) and then adjusted/boosted in some of the smaller States to achieve a good enough sample that would allow for robust State-

based claims. The achieved sample in some of the states fell short of the target due to Covid-related restrictions/limitations. It must be stressed here that while making overall claims for the country as a whole, the data reported in this report has been weighted by the State/UT proportion – i.e., each surveyed State's and UT's share in the total sample is the same as the share of their rural population in the total rural population of all the surveyed States and UTs combined. However, while making any specific State-centric claims unweighted data has been relied on as it ensures inferences based on robust/larger samples for the smaller States.

State and UT-wise sample - Weighted and Unweighted

	No. of districts covered	Unweighted Sample	Weighted Sample*
States			
Arunachal Pradesh	4	351	39
Assam	1	897	976
Bihar	12	2249	3363
Chhattisgarh	8	908	714
Gujarat	8	1027	1263
Haryana	3	232	601
Himachal Pradesh	5	763	225
Jharkhand	11	1747	912
Kerala	11	1203	636
Madhya Pradesh	11	1731	1914
Maharashtra	9	1112	2242
Manipur	1	34	74
Odisha	7	1367	1273
Punjab	3	854	632
Rajasthan	3	1645	1875
Sikkim	3	134	17
Tripura	7	528	99
Uttar Pradesh	41	4823	5656
Uttarakhand	6	538	256
West Bengal	12	1488	2264
Union Territories			
Andaman and Nicobar Islands	1	82	9
Jammu and Kashmir	10	1608	324
Ladakh	2	50	8
Total	**179**	**25371**	**25371**

*Based on State/UT's rural share in total rural population of all surveyed States/UTs

Profile of sample in terms of key socio-demographics

	% of Unweighted Sample	% of Weighted Sample
Male	79.6	80.8
Female	20.1	18.9
Others	0.3	0.3
Scheduled Caste	17.3	18.4
Scheduled Tribe	12.8	10.5
Other Backward Class	39.7	41.8
General	30.2	29.3
Hindu	79.1	84.9
Muslim	13.6	9.6
Christian	1.8	1.1
Sikh	3.0	2.4
Other	2.5	2.0
15-25 years old	12.6	12.7
26-35 years old	27.3	28.9
36-45 years old	26.4	26.2
46-55 years old	18.4	17.5
56 years and above	15.3	14.7
Non-literate	18.6	17.9
Below primary	14.5	13.7
Class 5 pass	11.1	11.0
Class 8 pass	12.0	12.4
Class 10 pass	15.7	16.4
Class 12 pass	13.1	13.4
Graduate and above	15.0	15.2
Poor	43.0	42.8
Lower Class	24.9	26.2
Middle Class	25.8	25.0
Rich	6.3	6.0

The fieldwork for the survey was conducted by Gaon Connection's members in each district. All interviews were conducted face-to-face at/outside with residence of the interviewee. During the interview the interviewers from Gaon Connection made sure that they were wearing a

mask and maintained a distance of 1 meter between themselves and the interviewee while asking the questions.

The survey was conducted using a structured and standardized interview schedule that was administered via a specially designed mobile phone application. The interview schedule was designed by researchers at CSDS for the Gaon Connection. The main interview took about 30-35 minutes to complete on average whereas the supplementary interview took about 15-20 minutes.

The survey data was analysed by researchers at Lokniti, CSDS for Gaon Connection.

Given that the sampled locations were not spread out evenly in most States/UTs and were selected by non-probability sampling methods owing to logistical and Covid-related issues, we are not in a position to provide reliable estimates of sampling error.

While analyzing the data 2 Classifications and 3 indices were used to make sense of the data. Their details are given below.

Classifications

Here's how the 2 classifications have been defined.

1. **Party ruling States Classification**

- BJP-ruled States - Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura, Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh
- BJP-ally ruled States - Bihar and Sikkim
- Congress-ruled States - Punjab, Rajasthan and Chhattisgarh
- Congress-ally ruled States - Maharashtra and Jharkhand
- Other party-ruled States - West Bengal, Odisha and Kerala
- Union Territory - Jammu and Kashmir, Ladakh, Andaman and Nicobar Islands

2. **District Classification**

- Districts where the survey took place have been classified as Green-Orange and Red Zone districts based on the Government of India list released on May 1, 2020. Out of the total 179 districts surveyed, 67 are Green districts (those least affected by the Coronavirus and having no active cases at the time of 'Lockdown 3' on May 1), 37 Red districts (the worst affected) and 75 are Orange districts (neither too badly affected and nor unscathed). While their color coding may have changed when the fieldwork was eventually conducted, a classification of sampled districts helps in an analysis of the certain questions. District classification-wise analysis presented in the report is unweighted.

Indices

Here's how the 3 indices were constructed

1. Economic Class Index

The Economic Class Index and the resultant class categorizations have been arrived at on the basis of whether certain select were assets owned by the respondent's household. A scoring system was used to construct the index. If a respondent's household owned a car/jeep/van, an air conditioner, a computer/laptop or an I-pad, a tractor and had a fixed line internet connection, then they were given a score/marking of 4 for each. Households with a washing machine and a pumping set were given a score of 3 for each item. Those with a scooter/mo-bike, a fridge and a toilet inside the house were given 2 points for each. Finally those who had a fan/cooler, a television set and an LPG gas connection were given 1 point for each. Those who did not own any particular item were scored 0. The scores of all 13 asset related questions were summed up. The resulting summated scores for each respondent ranged from 0 to 35. The summated scores were distributed across four categories that indicated economic classes. Respondents/households with summated scores ranging from 0 to 5 were categorized as being 'Poor'. Those with summated scores that ranged from 6 to 9 were categorized as being from the 'Lower Class. Respondents with summated scores ranging from 10 to 20 were labeled as being 'Middle Class'. Finally respondents with scores ranging from 21 to 35 were considered as being 'Rich'.

2. Income change Index

The Income Change index was based on respondent answers to two questions in the survey – one that asked them about their total monthly household income a month before the lockdown and a question soon after that sought to find out their total monthly household income during the lockdown months. A respondent who reported a lower (or no) income in the second question compared to the previous question was categorized as a respondent whose 'Household income decreased during the lockdown'. On the other hand a respondent who reported the same income or greater income in the second question was categorized as someone who's 'Household income stayed same or even increased during the lockdown'. There were around 5,300 respondents that refused to divulge their income details in both the questions. Such respondents were excluded from the index/analysis.

3. Index of whether money was received from the government during the lockdown

The Index of whether money was received from the government during the lockdown has been constructed using three questions - one that sought to know from Kisaan Samman Nidhi scheme beneficiary households if they had continued receiving money in their bank accounts under the scheme during the lockdown, another that sought to know whether any woman member of the household had benefitted from the lockdown scheme of the Central government to deposit Rs 500 in every women Jan Dhan account holder's account for three months, and a third that sought to know generally whether a household member had received any amount from the government in their bank account during the lockdown. Respondents who answered in the affirmative to any of these three questions were considered as having 'received money in the bank account from the government' and those who answered in the negative to all three questions were considered as having 'received no money from the government'.