

# Sixteenth Assembly Elections in Uttar Pradesh

A seven-phased election for 403 assembly seats in Uttar Pradesh was held on 8, 11, 15, 19, 23 and 28 of February 2012, and 3 March 2012. At 60%, the voters' turnout was the highest ever in the state, and 14 percentage points higher than the previous assembly election. The increase in voters compared to 2007 was 45%, indicating that the rise in turnout was not a mere statistical correction. The turnout of women was higher than that of men and went up by 18 percentage points compared to 2007. The number of contestants increased to 6,839, an increase of 12 percentage points over the last assembly election (Table 1A).

**Table 1A: Summary Electoral Participation: Electorate, Turnout and Number of Candidates Compared to the Assembly Election (2007)**

	Assembly Election 2012	Change from 2007 (%)
Total electorate	12,58,10,314	+10.6
Male electorate	6,92,75,608	+12.4
Female electorate	5,65,29,768	+8.8
Other electorate	4,938	-
Total voters	7,58,29,264	+45.3
Total turnout	60.3%	+14.3
Male turnout	58.8%	+9.5
Female turnout	60.3%	+18.4
Number of candidates	6,839	+12.4

For electorate, voters and candidates the change is in %, with 2007 as the base. Change in turnout is computed in percentage points, compared to turnout in 2007. Source: Figures available from the official website of the chief electoral officer, Uttar Pradesh; <http://ceouttarpradesh.nic.in/>, and Election Commission of India website <http://eci.nic.in/>; accessed on 9 March 2012; Data aggregated and recomputed by the CSDS data unit.

Most of the major parties in the state, namely, the incumbent Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP), Samajwadi Party (SP), and the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) went into the election on their own. The Indian National Congress (INC/Congress) however contested in an alliance with the Rashtriya Lok Dal (RLD). While the Congress fielded candidates in 355 seats, the RLD contested 46 seats.

The final outcome, a clear mandate for the SP and a substantial decline of the BSP, was widely seen to be a surprise. SP recorded its best-ever performance winning a total of 224 seats, 127 more than

the 2007 assembly elections, and secured 29.15% of the vote, a gain of nearly 4 percentage points since 2007 (in terms of seats, this was the best performance by any party since the Congress' victory in 1985 when it won 269 of the 425 seats of undivided Uttar Pradesh). On the other hand, its main rival, the incumbent BSP performed poorly. From the 2007 high of 206 seats, the BSP crashed to just 80 seats, a massive drop of 126. The party secured almost 26% of the vote, down 4.5 percentage points since 2007. The gap between the SP and the BSP in terms of vote share however was that of just 3

percentage points indicating a high seats-vote disproportionality in SP's favour. (Over the years, UP has seen multi-cornered contests where the leading party has benefited from the seat-vote disproportionality, as the BSP did in 2007. This time in the case of the SP it was even higher.) The BJP finished third with 47 seats and 15% of the vote, a decline of four seats and 2% votes respectively since 2007. The Congress managed to win 28 seats, a marginal increase of six seats since 2007 and garnered nearly 12% of the vote, up 3 percentage points. Its alliance partner the RLD won nine seats with 2% of the total vote, a drop of one seat and 1% vote, respectively. Among the smaller parties, the Peace Party was the best performer winning four seats (all gains, since it was contesting for the first time) and securing 2% of the vote (Table 1B).

**Table 1B: Summary Results: Seats Contested, Won and Votes Secured by Major Parties in Alliances, Compared to the Assembly Election (2007)**

	Seats Contested	Seats Won	Gain/Loss of Seats since 2007	Vote Share (%)	Vote % Per Seat Contested	Vote Swing Since 2007 (% Points)
Indian National Congress+ (INC+)	401	37	+5	13.96	14.01	+1.65
Indian National Congress (INC)	355	28	+6	11.63	13.22	+3.02
Rashtriya Lok Dal (RLD)	46	9	-1	2.33	20.01	-1.37
Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP)	398	47	-4	15	15.19	-1.97
Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP)	403	80	-126	25.91	25.91	-4.52
Samajwadi Party (SP)	401	224	+127	29.15	29.27	+3.72
Nationalist Congress Party (NCP)	127	1	+1	0.33	1.05	+0.23
Peace Party (PP)	208	4	+4	2.35	4.53	+2.35
Quami Ekta Dal (QED)	43	2	+2	0.55	5.31	+0.55
Apna Dal (AD)	76	1	+1	0.90	4.86	-0.16
Communist Party of India (CPI)	51	0	0	0.13	1.06	+0.04
Communist Party of India (Marxist) – CPI(M)	17	0	0	0.09	2.13	-0.21
All India Trinamool Congress (AITC)	145	0	0	0.36	0.99	+0.36
Janata Dal (United) (JD(U))	219	0	-1	0.36	0.66	-0.06
Lok Janshakti Party	212	0	0	0.23	0.43	+0.07
Others	2,449	1	-6	7.45	-	+1.71
Independents	1,689	6	-3	3.21	-	-3.76
Total	6,839	403	0	100	-	0

(1) "Others" in 2012 include Shiv Sena, Janata Dal Secular, Forward Bloc, Republican Party of India, Communist Party of India Marxist-Leninist (Liberation) and other parties. "Others" in 2007 included Shiv Sena, Janata Dal Secular, Forward Bloc, Republican Party of India, Communist Party of India Marxist-Leninist (Liberation), Akhil Bharatiya Lok Tantrik Congress and other parties.

(2) INC and RLD contested separately and not as an alliance in 2007, but for purposes of comparison with 2012, their vote share and seats have been added up.

Source: Detailed constituency level results downloaded from Election Commission of India website, <http://eciresults.ap.nic.in/>; accessed on 9 March 2012. Data aggregated and recomputed by CSDS data unit.

**Table 1C: Comparative Analysis of Seats Won by Different Victory Margins: Assembly Elections (2007 and 2012)**

Victory Margins (Votes)	Total Seats		Cong+RLD		BJP		BSP		SP		Others	
	2007	2012	2007	2012	2007	2012	2007	2012	2007	2012	2007	2012
Up to 1,000	27	24	2	1	5	3	9	5	10	14	1	1
1,001-5,000	122	65	7	8	15	5	55	20	38	29	7	3
5,001-10,000	115	92	6	11	16	13	64	26	25	36	4	6
10,001 and above	139	222	17	17	15	26	78	29	24	145	5	5
Total	403	403	32	37	51	47	206	80	97	224	17	15

"Others" in this table include other smaller parties and independents.

Source: As in Table 1B.

If we analyse the result in terms of victory margins, we find that the number of seats that were won by a margin of over 10,000 votes went up from 139 in the previous election to 222 this time and two-thirds of such seats were won by the SP. Moreover, SP won a majority of its seats by huge margins. Sixty-five per cent of the seats won by the SP were won by margins of over 10,000 votes. In 2007, the BSP had won only 38% of its total 206 seats by such huge margins. Both the Congress-RLD alliance and the BJP also won most of their seats this time by huge margins. Contrary to popular impression, the seats which were decided by very small margins (up to 1,000 votes) were shared in the same proportion as the rest. The SP did not benefit from smaller margins (Table 1c, p 80).

Out of the seven regions of Uttar Pradesh as classified by Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (CSDS), the SP was ahead of its rivals in five (Rohilkhand, Awadh, east, Doab and north-east) both in terms of votes and seats. It was only in west and Bundelkhand that the BSP managed to gain an upper hand, but here too the party had to suffer losses compared to 2007 and this was largely due to some impressive gains made by SP. Of the five regions where SP was ahead, the party registered its best performance in the region of Awadh winning 55 of the 73 seats on offer and accumulating a total vote share of 33%. Within Awadh, the party did particularly well in Faizabad winning all the four seats in the district. In Lucknow district the party ended up with seven of the nine seats, whereas in Unnao it won five of the six seats. In Rae Bareilly and Sultanpur, pocket-boroughs of the Nehru-Gandhi family, the SP won 12 of the 15 seats and the Congress managed to win just two. In east, the SP won 52 out of the 81 seats in the region with a vote share of 32%. SP's performance in Ambedkar Nagar where it won all five seats and in Azamgarh where it won nine of the 10 seats was particularly impressive. In north-east (southern Terai region bordering Nepal), SP won 32 of the 61 seats with a vote share of 28%. In terms of seats, the BJP finished second in this region winning 10 seats, half of which came from

**Table 2A: Region-wise and District-wise Analysis: Turnout and Performance of Major Alliances and Parties**

Regions/Districts	Total Seats	Turnout (%)	Congress+RLD		BJP		SP		BSP		Independents		Others	
			Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)
Rohilkhand	52	65.0	2	12.8	8	18.9	29	28.9	11	22.7	0	1.9	2	14.7
Bijnor	8	65.1	0	14.5	2	20.4	2	20.8	4	30.0	0	1.3	0	13.0
Moradabad	9	65.5	0	10.8	1	24.1	7	29.9	0	19.2	0	1.7	1	14.3
Rampur	5	60.7	2	23.4	0	14.9	2	30.5	1	17.0	0	1.6	0	12.6
Jyotiba Phule Nagar	4	70.4	0	10.5	0	15.7	4	33.3	0	24.3	0	1.1	0	15.1
Budaun	7	61.4	0	16.2	0	8.2	5	35.8	2	24.6	0	1.7	0	13.4
Bareilly	9	65.5	0	4.5	3	23.2	3	26.1	2	20.2	0	2.9	1	23.2
Pilibhit	4	68.6	0	13.1	1	27.7	3	25.3	0	17.6	0	2.3	0	13.9
Shahjahanpur	6	65.7	0	14.9	1	14.2	3	31.7	2	27.5	0	2.4	0	9.3
Awadh	73	61.0	4	14.4	3	10.8	55	32.9	8	25.7	2	4.7	1	11.5
Kheri	8	65.0	0	13.3	1	13.0	4	32.1	3	25.7	0	4.5	0	11.5
Sitapur	9	65.6	0	17.3	0	6.4	7	34.3	2	32.0	0	2.1	0	7.9
Hardoi	8	61.7	0	8.0	0	4.6	6	37.2	2	33.0	0	2.8	0	14.4
Unnao	6	60.3	0	10.9	0	17.4	5	33.2	1	27.3	0	4.0	0	7.1
Lucknow	9	57.9	1	16.5	1	16.7	7	29.7	0	21.4	0	1.6	0	14.1
Rae Bareilly	7	60.7	1	24.2	0	5.4	5	32.2	0	17.8	0	3.0	1	17.4
Sultanpur	8	58.4	1	14.9	0	10.0	7	35.8	0	24.3	0	5.5	0	9.6
Pratapgarh	7	54.2	1	12.5	0	10.9	4	20.5	0	23.5	2	18.9	0	13.7
Barabanki	7	65.2	0	14.6	1	12.6	6	35.2	0	24.5	0	3.4	0	9.6
Faizabad	4	60.5	0	9.1	0	13.0	4	39.4	0	24.4	0	4.9	0	9.2
East	81	57.3	4	8.1	6	10.5	52	32.4	13	27.9	3	5.0	3	16.1
Kaushambi	3	58.8	0	8.9	1	11.5	0	29.8	2	33.5	0	6.4	0	9.9
Allahabad	12	56.0	1	9.1	0	8.8	8	28.7	3	28.6	0	7.4	0	17.4
Ambedkar Nagar	5	63.0	0	5.9	0	4.3	5	46.9	0	34.2	0	2.4	0	6.4
Azamgarh	10	55.0	0	6.9	0	10.2	9	39.0	1	30.0	0	2.0	0	11.9
Mau	4	56.6	0	7.5	0	4.8	2	28.9	1	28.0	0	1.8	1	29.1
Ballia	7	54.0	0	6.6	1	15.5	5	29.3	1	23.1	0	4.0	0	21.5
Jaunpur	9	55.6	1	7.5	1	14.4	7	33.8	0	27.3	0	6.0	0	11.2
Ghazipur	7	57.6	0	3.9	0	6.0	6	36.1	0	27.6	0	2.0	1	24.4
Chandauli	4	61.4	0	3.6	0	9.2	1	28.4	1	29.8	2	16.4	0	12.7
Varanasi	8	58.2	1	18.1	3	16.1	1	20.4	2	21.1	0	2.0	1	22.5
Sant Ravidas Nagar	3	56.3	0	2.8	0	7.2	3	45.1	0	31.7	0	1.7	0	11.5
Mirzapur	5	62.4	1	13.3	0	10.9	3	32.8	1	28.1	0	2.1	0	12.8
Sonbhadra	4	58.7	0	6.5	0	12.7	2	27.6	1	26.1	1	17.3	0	9.9
West	44	62.8	8	23.7	9	17.3	10	20.5	17	29.2	0	2.8	0	6.4
Saharanpur	7	71.6	1	30.2	1	11.2	1	21.1	4	30.6	0	4.3	0	2.6
Muzaffarnagar	9	61.2	2	22.3	2	20.0	2	22.1	3	27.8	0	3.0	0	4.9
Meerut	7	65.4	0	20.2	4	24.0	3	25.0	0	23.3	0	1.8	0	5.7
Baghpat	3	58.8	1	37.3	0	3.9	0	15.5	2	35.5	0	1.2	0	6.6
Ghaziabad	8	59.7	2	22.8	0	20.0	2	18.0	4	32.3	0	2.2	0	4.7
Gautam Buddha Nagar	3	56.5	0	20.6	1	21.7	0	17.1	2	33.7	0	2.3	0	4.5
Bulandshahar	7	62.2	2	20.0	1	13.5	2	19.6	2	27.4	0	3.7	0	15.7
Doab	73	61.1	8	14.5	8	16.5	41	29.4	15	26.8	1	3.7	0	9.1
Aligarh	7	63.0	3	26.3	0	12.8	4	19.9	0	24.6	0	3.2	0	13.2
Mahamaya Nagar	3	62.2	0	14.6	0	10.2	1	33.9	2	35.4	0	2.6	0	3.2
Mathura	5	65.2	4	36.2	0	14.6	0	8.3	1	25.7	0	4.1	0	11.0
Agra	9	62.1	0	12.8	2	18.2	1	25.0	6	33.1	0	5.6	0	5.3
Firozabad	5	64.7	0	2.9	1	15.2	3	41.8	1	29.3	0	6.4	0	4.4
Etah	7	61.7	0	9.7	0	9.1	6	32.5	1	22.7	0	2.6	0	23.4
Mainpuri	4	60.0	0	9.1	0	10.7	4	42.7	0	26.7	0	2.3	0	8.5
Farrukhabad	4	58.9	0	11.2	0	17.8	3	26.4	0	14.9	1	9.8	0	20.0
Kannauj	3	58.4	0	4.3	0	22.0	3	39.5	0	26.5	0	2.6	0	5.1
Etawah	3	61.2	0	4.3	0	12.3	3	47.1	0	30.2	0	0.4	0	5.8
Auraiya	3	60.4	0	5.6	0	21.4	3	38.6	0	28.7	0	1.0	0	4.7
Kanpur Dehat	4	63.7	0	11.5	0	14.5	3	32.7	1	30.7	0	5.2	0	5.6
Kanpur Nagar	10	55.9	1	19.6	4	25.8	5	26.9	0	22.3	0	2.0	0	3.3
Fatehpur	6	60.7	0	14.9	1	19.7	2	24.5	3	26.4	0	2.7	0	11.8
Bundelkhand	19	62.8	4	18.6	3	18.9	5	25.3	7	26.2	0	4.1	0	7.0

(Contd)

Table 2A: Continued

Regions/Districts	Total Seats	Turnout (%)	Congress+RLD		BJP		SP		BSP		Independents		Others	
			Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)
Jalaun	3	61.5	1	18.9	0	14.9	1	23.9	1	26.6	0	1.3	0	14.5
Jhansi	4	64.6	0	16.1	1	20.9	2	27.9	1	28.4	0	3.0	0	3.7
Lalitpur	2	73.6	0	12.9	0	22.5	0	24.8	2	27.5	0	6.9	0	5.3
Hamirpur	2	59.9	1	26.7	1	17.0	0	22.7	0	22.1	0	5.0	0	6.5
Mahoba	2	62.9	0	17.2	1	26.5	0	23.2	1	23.3	0	4.3	0	5.5
Banda	4	57.5	2	24.8	0	15.1	1	24.2	1	26.0	0	3.3	0	6.6
Chitrakoot	2	61.7	0	12.0	0	18.0	1	30.2	1	26.7	0	7.9	0	5.2
North-east	61	55.9	7	12.2	10	17.7	32	28.1	9	22.7	0	5.9	3	13.4
Bahraich	7	59.9	2	21.1	2	20.0	2	21.5	1	21.0	0	6.6	0	9.9
Shrawasti	2	61.7	0	17.9	0	20.2	2	33.0	0	19.5	0	5.0	0	4.5
Balrampur	4	50.1	0	12.4	0	15.5	4	31.6	0	20.1	0	5.4	0	15.0
Gonda	7	57.3	0	7.0	1	17.4	6	35.4	0	25.2	0	6.7	0	8.2
Siddharthnagar	5	53.0	0	10.1	1	17.3	3	30.9	0	21.2	0	4.7	1	15.9
Basti	5	58.3	1	17.9	0	9.0	2	30.2	2	31.5	0	2.6	0	8.7
Sant Kabir Nagar	3	54.4	0	6.5	0	19.1	2	25.0	0	22.5	0	2.8	1	24.1
Maharajganj	5	61.5	1	16.3	1	18.6	2	26.9	1	18.9	0	1.9	0	17.4
Gorakhpur	9	53.1	0	4.4	3	21.4	1	24.9	4	25.6	0	7.6	1	16.1
Kushinagar	7	57.4	2	14.6	1	15.8	3	25.0	1	20.0	0	7.6	0	17.0
Deoria	7	52.2	1	10.3	1	18.8	5	30.3	0	21.3	0	9.1	0	10.2
Total	403	60.3	37	13.9	47	15.0	224	29.2	80	25.9	6	4.1	9	11.9

"Others" in this table and in Tables 2B and 2C include other smaller parties and independents.

Source: As in Table 1B.

Table 2B: Category-wise Analysis: Turnout and Performance of Major Alliances and Parties by Reserved and General Constituencies

Category	Total Seats	Turnout (%)	Congress+RLD		BJP		SP		BSP		Independents		Others	
			Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)
Reserved (SC)	85	59.5	7	13.2	3	14.4	58	31.6	15	27.3	2	3.6	0	9.9
General	318	60.5	30	14.1	44	15.2	166	28.5	65	25.5	4	4.3	9	12.4
Total	403	60.3	37	13.9	47	15.0	224	29.2	80	25.9	6	4.1	9	11.9

Source: As in Table 1B.

Table 2C: Locality-wise Analysis: Turnout and Performance of Major Alliances and Parties by Rural-Urban Nature of Constituency

Locality	Total Seats	Turnout (%)	Congress+RLD		BJP		SP		BSP		Independents		Others	
			Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)
Rural	308	61.0	28	13.7	21	12.3	183	30.3	64	26.6	5	4.5	7	12.7
Semi-urban	60	59.8	5	13.2	6	19.3	32	26.9	14	26.1	1	3.6	2	10.8
Urban	35	55.0	4	18.2	20	32.4	9	22.8	2	19.3	0	1.6	0	5.6
Total	403	60.3	37	13.9	47	15.0	224	29.2	80	25.9	6	4.1	9	11.9

Rural constituencies are those constituencies where less than 25% electors live in urban areas. Semi Urban constituencies are those constituencies where 25% and more but less than 75% of electors live in urban areas. Urban constituencies are those constituencies where 75% or more electors live in urban areas. The classification of constituencies is based on Census 2001 and description of constituency boundary provided by the Delimitation Commission 2002 read with the urban/rural location indicated on the top sheet of electoral rolls for each Polling Booth Area. Computation and classification has been done by the CSDS data unit.

Source: As in Table 1B.

Table 2D: Muslim Concentrated Seats-wise Analysis: Turnout and Performance of Major Alliances and Parties

Seats with Muslim Population	Total Seats	Turnout (%)	Congress+RLD		BJP		SP		BSP		'Muslim Parties'		Independents and Others	
			Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)	Won	Vote (%)
Up to 10%	121	60.3	11	12.4	8	12.5	66	31.0	33	27.5	0	1.4	3	15.1
10.1% to 20.0%	139	59.1	12	12.8	13	14.3	86	29.8	21	26.8	2	3.4	5	13.1
20.1% to 30.0%	70	59.8	8	15.6	9	15.4	37	28.1	13	24.0	3	6.1	0	10.7
30.1% and above	73	62.9	6	17.3	17	20.1	35	25.8	13	23.4	2	4.0	0	9.5
Total	403	60.3	37	13.9	47	15.0	224	29.2	80	25.9	7	3.4	8	12.6

(1) "Muslim parties" in the Table include Peace Party, Quami Ekta Dal, Ittehad-e-Milat Council and Rashtriya Ulama Council.

(2) Independents and Others in the Table include Independents and other smaller parties.

(3) The classification of constituencies by religious groups is based on Census 2001 and description of constituency boundary provided by the Delimitation Commission 2002. However, it may be noted that Census does not provide information on religion below Tehsil/Taluka/Block level and that a constituency often cuts across these administrative units. So, in order to arrive at constituency level estimates of religious groups, the "principle of proportionality" was used to aggregate and disaggregate population below these administrative units.

Source: As in Table 1B.

Gorakhpur and Bahraich districts. In Doab, with 73 seats, the main contest was between the SP and the BSP with the former emerging ahead with 41 seats. Within this region, the SP swept the districts of Etawah, Kannauj, Etah, Mainpuri, Farrukhabad, Auraiya and Kanpur Dehat. The BSP performed best in Agra, and in Mathura district it was the RLD-Congress alliance which emerged on top. In Rohilkhand with 52 seats, the main contest was between the SP, BSP and the BJP. Here the SP won 29 seats giving its best performance in the districts of Moradabad, Budaun and Pilibhit. In west where the BSP finished ahead of the rest, the party won most of its seats in the districts of Saharanpur, Baghpat, Gautam Buddha Nagar and Ghaziabad. The BJP did well in the district of Meerut winning four of the seven seats, the rest going to SP. For the Congress-RLD alliance which was expected to do well in this region, the victories were few and far between. In fact the only region where the Congress seems to have put up a good fight is Bundelkhand, where the party won four of the 19 seats on offer and finished third behind the BSP and the SP (Table 2A, p 81). Of all the 70 districts in the State, Lalitpur district in Bundelkhand recorded the highest voter turnout at 74%. If we compare the turnout across regions, it was the highest in Rohilkhand at 65% and lowest in north-east at 56%.

The electoral trend in favour of SP was quite strong and pushed the BSP to the margins in the reserved scheduled caste (SC) constituencies (which tend to only marginally have a higher proportion of SCs). SP won 58 of the 85 SC seats on offer, leaving the BSP, which is considered to have an advantage in such seats, with only 15. This is a significant turnaround considering that in 2007 (pre-delimitation), the BSP had won 61 of 89 reserved SC seats and the SP had managed to win just 13 (Table 2B). If we analyse in terms of locality, then it was in the rural and semi-urban areas where the SP performed the best. The party won 183 of the 308 almost entirely rural seats (59%) and 32 of the 60 semi-urban seats (53%). However in almost entirely urban areas of Uttar Pradesh, it was the BJP that retained its dominance winning 20

of the total 35 seats. The Congress-RLD alliance too did reasonably well here in terms of votes (Table 2c, p 82).

An analysis of the results by proportion of Muslim population in constituencies reveals that contrary to popular impression, the SP's performance in terms of votes was much better in constituencies without any significant Muslim population than in constituencies where Muslims are present in high numbers. For instance, while the SP secured around 31% of the total vote in the 260 seats where Muslims constitute below 20% of the population, it could manage lesser votes in seats with a larger concentration of Muslims. In constituencies where Muslims are over 20% of the total population, the SP faced some stiff competition in terms of votes from the BSP, the BJP and other parties like the Peace Party and the Quami Ekta Dal. But here too it ended up winning many more seats (Table 2d, p 82).

Survey-based estimates of vote by social background reveal that while both the SP and the BSP continue to get an overwhelming proportion of their total votes from Yadavs and Jatavs, respectively (their core voters), they were unable to retain their 2007 dominance among these sections. While the SP saw a 6 percentage point vote drop among Yadavs and Muslims, the BSP's decline among Jatavs was even bigger. The extraordinary polarisation of Jatav votes that was witnessed in favour of BSP in 2007 came down this time, with 62% of Jatavs voting for Mayawati's party, a drop of 24 percentage points. While these figures may surprise many, it must be pointed out that this is a trend which was already noticed by a CSDS survey conducted in Uttar Pradesh in July 2011 when 66% of Jatavs had said they will vote for the BSP in the event of an immediate election. Among other dalit categories too (except the Pasis) the BSP lost votes this time compared to 2007.

The party's votes declined by 29 percentage points among Balmikis, and 19 percentage points among Dhobis. The BSP's loss of votes among dalits seems to have benefited SP the most. In fact, SP's gains were most impressive among communities that are not considered as its

**Table 3: Social Basis of Voting: Survey-based Estimates of Vote for Major Alliances/Parties by Gender, Age, Education, Locality, Class and Caste/Community in Assembly Elections (2007 and 2012)**

	Congress		BJP		BSP		SP		RLD		Others		N for 2012
	2007	2012	2007	2012	2007	2012	2007	2012	2007	2012	2007	2012	
<b>Age groups</b>													
Up to 25 years	10	15	19	15	28	23	27	30	4	1	13	16	1,167
26-35 years	8	11	19	16	30	26	26	29	4	3	13	14	1,879
36-45 years	8	11	18	13	32	29	24	27	3	2	14	18	1,661
46-55 years	8	11	18	16	31	24	25	30	5	2	13	17	844
56 years and above	9	11	18	15	30	26	24	31	3	3	15	15	1,061
<b>Gender</b>													
Men	9	11	19	16	30	27	25	28	4	3	13	16	3,940
Women	8	12	18	14	32	25	26	31	3	2	13	16	2,673
<b>Level of education</b>													
Non-literate	7	10	13	10	37	33	25	30	4	2	15	16	2,217
Up to primary	9	10	17	15	30	26	27	34	4	2	13	13	1,025
Up to matric	9	10	20	16	28	26	27	28	4	3	12	18	1,665
College and above	11	17	27	21	22	17	23	27	4	3	12	15	1,693
<b>Locality</b>													
Rural	8	10	18	14	32	27	26	29	4	3	13	16	5,438
Urban	16	18	21	18	21	20	23	29	2	1	18	14	1,174
<b>Class</b>													
Upper	12	16	30	17	14	21	25	27	6	5	14	15	1,487
Middle	10	9	24	15	24	26	28	33	5	1	10	16	2,086
Lower	10	12	15	15	33	26	25	28	2	2	15	18	1,916
Poor	5	10	12	12	41	33	23	28	4	2	15	15	1,123
<b>Caste community</b>													
Brahmin	19	13	44	38	16	19	10	19	3	1	8	11	522
Rajput	9	13	46	29	12	14	20	26	5	2	9	16	565
Vaishya	10	21	52	42	14	15	12	12	0	0	12	10	67*
Other Upper Caste	12	13	41	17	15	17	17	15	1	4	14	34	450
Jats	2	11	18	7	10	16	8	7	61	45	2	15	132
Yadav	4	4	5	9	7	11	72	66	1	1	10	10	657
Kurmi/Koeri	6	13	42	20	16	19	17	35	4	1	16	12	389
Other OBC	9	12	17	17	30	19	20	26	6	3	19	23	768
Jatav	2	5	3	5	86	62	4	15	1	2	4	12	817
Balmiki	4	12	11	3	71	42	2	9	4	0	9	34	59*
Pasi/Pano	7	7	12	4	53	57	16	24	0	0	11	9	178
Other SC	4	17	9	11	58	45	16	18	1	1	13	8	344
Muslim	14	18	3	7	17	20	45	39	8	1	13	15	1,105
Others	12	9	14	16	30	23	23	31	3	0	18	21	559

(1) All figures except 'N' are in % and rounded off.

(2) 'N' stands for sample size for the relevant row. In some cases the sample size is too small and figures indicated with \* need to be read with caution.

(3) Educational categories: are defined as follows. Non-literate: A person who can neither read nor write in any language. Up to Primary: It includes the persons who received formal schooling; either completed the whole primary cycle (I-V) or completed one or other grades of it. Up to Matric: It includes persons ranging from those who received schooling beyond the primary cycle to those who actually completed the 10th standard. College and above: It includes persons who went to college but could not receive a degree and those who completed five years of education in college and persons who received education beyond graduation either in general education or in specialised streams/courses.

(4) The class scheme used here takes into account two elements of material wealth – durable household assets and monthly household income. Upper are those who had a car/jeep/tractor or colour TV, scooter, telephone, fridge, air conditioner, pumping sets (rural) and LPG (rural), or whose monthly household income was above Rs 20,000. Middle class respondents are those who had any three out of four assets such as telephone, colour TV, scooter/motorcycle and fridge in their households or whose monthly household income was above Rs 5,000 and up to Rs 20,000. Lower class respondents are those who had any three out of four assets such as B/W TV, electric fan, bicycle and LPG in their households or whose monthly household income was above Rs 2,000 and up to Rs 5,000. Poor are those who had no more than two out of the household assets or whose monthly household income was Rs 2,000 and less.

(5) Since the analysis uses data-file weighted by actual vote shares, it holds on the assumption that any discrepancy between the reported vote in the post-poll survey and the actual vote share is evenly distributed across, all the social groups.

(6) "Others" in this Table (column) include other smaller parties and Independents.

(7) Special care should be taken in reading these figures as in Uttar Pradesh there was an unusually large gap between reported and actual vote share for the two major parties (the survey raw data overestimated the lead for the SP by seven percentage points). The figures presented here have been weighed by actual vote shares on the assumption that over-reporting for SP was spread evenly across all social categories. The pattern reported here may not hold if over-reporting for SP was substantially higher among some social groups.

Source: All figures are based on a post-poll surveys carried out by CSDS in 2007 and 2012. Total sample size in 2007 was 11,331. Total sample size in 2012 was 7,291; In these surveys the respondents were asked to indicate who they voted for by using a ballot paper that carried the list of candidates their party names and symbols as on the EVM in their constituency. Figures reported here are for respondents who said they voted. The investigators checked if these respondents carried a mark on their finger. Those without a finger mark have been excluded from this analysis. The raw survey figures were weighed by actual vote share obtained by major alliances/parties in the final results.

**Table 4A: Level of Satisfaction with the Incumbent Government (2007 and 2012)**

Satisfaction with Incumbent Government	SP Govt	BSP Govt	N in
	2007	2012	2012
Satisfied with performance	49	49	3,576
Dissatisfied with performance	35	39	2,860
No opinion	16	12	855

(1) All figures except 'N' in % and rounded off.  
 (2) 'N' stands for sample size for the relevant row.  
 (3) Question asked in the surveys – What is your assessment of the work done by the government in during the last four/ five years? Would you say that you are satisfied or dissatisfied with it? (Probe further whether “fully” or “somewhat” satisfied or dissatisfied). Categories of “Fully satisfied” and “Somewhat satisfied” have been merged together as ‘Satisfied’; categories of “Fully dissatisfied” and “Somewhat dissatisfied” have been merged together as “Dissatisfied”.

Source: All figures are based on post-poll/pre-poll surveys carried out by CSDS. Data sets weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances. Total sample in 2007 was 4,988.

**Table 4B: Citizen's Assessment of the Work Done by Governments during Their Tenure for Various Public Goods and Services**

Assessment of Governance Issues...	BSP Government 2012			SP Government 2007		
	Improved	Remained Same	Deteriorated	Improved	Remained Same	Deteriorated
Development of UP	32	43	11	39	26	18
Control of corruption	22	49	15	20	30	31
Electricity supply	24	46	15	26	32	27
Hospital facilities	27	45	14	30	34	20
School/college facilities	31	41	12	34	28	18
Condition of roads	20	49	16	42	27	19
Security of common man's life/property	26	45	14	19	29	31
Hindu Muslim brotherhood	25	45	14	22	29	23

(1) All figures in % and rounded off; rows do not add up to 100 as those who said “Don't know” have not been reported here.  
 (2) Question asked in surveys – Now I will ask you about the assessment of the work done by the government in the state in the last four/five years. Do you think the condition of the following has improved, deteriorated or remained same?  
 Source: All figures are based on a post-poll/pre-poll surveys carried out by CSDS. Data sets weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances. Sample size in 2007 pre-poll survey: 4,988.

**Table 4C: Popularity of Incumbent Governments in Assembly Elections (2007 and 2012)**

Should the Government Get Another Chance?	SP Government	BSP Government	N in
	2007	2012	2012
Yes	37	27	1,968
No	47	48	3,514
Can't say/No opinion	17	25	1,808

(1) All figures except 'N' in % and rounded off.  
 (2) 'N' stands for sample size for the relevant row.  
 (3) Question asked in the survey: Should the current BSP government in Uttar Pradesh get another chance?

Source: All figures are based on a post-poll/pre-poll surveys carried out by CSDS. Data sets weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances. Sample size in 2007: 4,988

**Table 4D: Comparison of BSP Government (2007-12) and SP Government (2003-07)**

Comparing Governments	All
BSP government better than previous SP government	25
Previous SP government better than BSP government	46
Both equally good/bad	13

(1) All figures are in % and rounded off. Rest of the respondents had no opinion.  
 (2) Question asked in the survey: If we compare the previous SP government (2003-07) with the present BSP government (2007-12), then which government according to you had been better?  
 Source: Figures are based on a post-poll survey carried out by CSDS. Data set weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances.

core supporters. Among brahmins for instance the SP secured 19% of the votes, up 9 percentage points since 2007. Among Rajputs its vote share went up by 6% and among Kurmi and Koeris its votes more than doubled. Not just that, SP gained across categories of age, education, gender, class and locality. Among men, women, poor, rich, rural and urban voters, SP's gains were in the range of 3 to 5 percentage points since 2007. While the BSP lost a significant chunk of its core, it seems to have held on to some of its gains among upper castes and Muslims in 2007. However among lower OBCs who had also given BSP an advantage in 2007,

the party lost 11% votes. It's not just the BSP, but the BJP too which lost its grip over its traditional voters, namely, the brahmins, Rajputs and other upper castes. While the party came down 6 percentage points among brahmins, the losses among Rajputs and other upper castes were much bigger at 17 and 24 percentage points, respectively. Economically well off voters and college educated voters, core supporters of the BJP for a long time, also seem to have moved away from the party. In urban areas however, where the BJP has done well in the past, the party suffered only marginal losses. As for the Congress, while its performance was way below expectation, it did improve its performance among some

**Table 4G: Most Important Election Issue in Uttar Pradesh**

Price rise	36
Condition of roads	26
Farmers' problems	14
Unemployment	7
Corruption	7
Electricity, water, etc	3
Development of state	2
Law and order	1

(1) All figures are in % and rounded off; rest of the respondents had no opinion  
 (2) Question asked in the survey: Now I will read out certain issues. Please tell me how important were they to you while voting – very much, somewhat or not at all? Once the respondent had given an answer to each of the issues put before him/her, a follow up question was asked to the respondent where only those answer categories where the respondent had said “very much” in the first question were read out again, and the respondent was asked to choose from among them the single most important election issue. The follow up question was not applicable to those who did not say “very much” for any of the issues that we put before him/her.

Source: Figures are based on a post-poll survey carried out by CSDS; Data set weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances.

**Table 4H: Citizens' Opinion on Division of Uttar Pradesh**

Opinion on Division of UP in...	Support Division		Oppose Division	
	2011	2012	2011	2012
Overall	29	37	32	35
Poorvanchal	28	36	30	38
Awadh	29	31	36	45
Bundelkhand	20	32	22	27
Paschim	32	42	36	30

(1) All figures are in % and rounded off; rest of the respondents had no opinion.  
 (2) Question asked in the surveys: I will read out a statement to you. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with it (Probe further whether fully or somewhat agree or disagree) – Uttar Pradesh should be divided into smaller states. Categories of “Fully agree” and “Somewhat agree” have been merged together as “Agree”; categories of “Fully disagree” and “Somewhat disagree” have been merged together as “Disagree”.  
 Source: Figures are based on a post-poll/special survey carried out by CSDS; Data set for 2012 weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances. Sample size in 2011: 2,502.

**Table 4E: Trend in Popularity of Major Political Leaders as Most Preferred CM (2002-12)**

Chief Minister Choices	2002	2004	2007	2009	2012
Mulayam Singh Yadav	27	33	28	25	33
Mayawati	19	23	30	26	24
Rajnath Singh	21	7	2	10	8
Rahul Gandhi	NA	1	7	4	7
Akhilesh Yadav	NA	0	1	1	2

(1) All figures are in % and rounded off; Respondents who said “Don't know” or gave other choices have been excluded; Responses above are to an open ended question.  
 (2) Question asked in the surveys – After this election, who would you prefer as the next chief minister of Uttar Pradesh? (No names were offered to those being interviewed; all responses are spontaneous and were post-coded).  
 (3) NA: Not applicable.

Source: All figures are based on post-poll/pre poll surveys carried out by CSDS. Data sets weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances. Sample size in 2002 was 2,552; Sample size in 2004 was 1,760; Sample size in 2007 was 11,334; Sample size in 2009 was 2,841; Sample size in 2012 was 7,291.

**Table 4F: Citizens' Choice for Chief Minister if Samajwadi Party Wins**

Who Should Be Chief Minister If SP Wins?	All	SP Voters
Mulayam Singh	48	65
Akhilesh Yadav	20	16

(1) All figures are in % and rounded off; rest of the respondents either opted for Azam Khan or said someone else or had no opinion.  
 (2) Question asked in the survey: If the SP wins this Assembly elections, then who according to you should become chief minister – Mulayam Singh Yadav, Akhilesh Yadav, Azam Khan or someone else?  
 Source: Figures are based on a post-poll survey carried out by CSDS; Data set weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances.

**Table 4I: Citizens' Opinion on Statues Built by BSP Government**

Statements	All		Dalits	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
EC was right in covering statues of Mayawati and elephants during elections	48	16	37	23
BSP government has wasted money on building statues and parks	51	25	45	28

(1) All figures are in % and rounded off; These were two separate questions, rest of the respondents had no opinion  
 (2) Question asked in the survey: I will read out a statement to you. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with it (Probe further whether fully or somewhat agree or disagree) – (a) EC was right in covering statues of Mayawati and Elephants during elections. (b) BSP government has wasted money on building statues and parks. Categories of "Fully agree" and "Somewhat agree" have been merged together as "Agree"; categories of "Fully disagree" and "Somewhat disagree" have been merged together as "Disagree".  
 Source: Figures are based on a post-poll survey carried out by CSDS; Data set weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances.

sections. The party made gains among dalits, Kurmis and Koeris, Muslims, Poor, Young (18-25 years) and the college educated compared to 2007. That said, it had done much better among these sections in the 2009 Lok Sabha elections and was simply unable to retain that same level of support. While age was not much of a factor this time, Gender certainly was with the BSP losing the edge it had among women in 2007. While 32% of the women had voted for BSP in 2007, this time only 25% voted for the party. In terms of locality, most of BSP's losses came among rural voters. The SP, on the other hand, gained among both rural and urban voters in equal measure. In terms of class, the BSP improved in the upper and middle sections but lost substantially among the lower sections and the poor. The SP gained across classes, whereas the BJP saw its support drop among the

upper and middle classes. The Congress which did well mostly among the upper class in 2007, made some gains among the lower economic sections this time (Table 3, p 83).

The CSDS post poll survey findings show that the satisfaction of people with the BSP government was exactly the same as the satisfaction expressed by voters with the SP government in 2007 when a similar survey was conducted (Table 4A, p 84). Even on issues of governance, there was very little difference on how people assessed the performance of the BSP government and the SP government in 2007. While on the issue of controlling corruption and maintaining peace and security, the BSP government was rated better than what the SP government had been rated in 2007, but it was seen to have performed much worse as far as the condition of roads was concerned (Table 4B, p 84).

The Mayawati-led BSP government it seems was also as unpopular as the previous SP government led by Mulayam Singh Yadav. When voters were asked whether the government should get another chance to rule, nearly half of them (48%) said no and only 27% were willing to give it another chance. When the same question was asked during a similar survey in 2007, 47% had wanted the then Mulayam Singh government to go and 37% had said it should get another chance (Table 4C, p 84). However when

respondents were specifically asked to compare the two governments in the post-poll survey this time, nearly half of them (46%) said that the previous SP government had been better and only 25% said the BSP government was better (Table 4D, p 84).

The survey reveals that the most popular leader in Uttar Pradesh at present is Mulayam Singh Yadav and by a wide margin. While 33% wanted him to be the next chief minister of the state, 24% wanted Mayawati to continue as chief minister. Rajnath Singh and Rahul Gandhi were the choice of 8% and 7% voters respectively. Akhilesh Yadav was the choice of 2% of the respondents (Table 4E, p 84). When respondents were asked who they would prefer as chief minister if the SP came to power, Mulayam Singh or his son Akhilesh, nearly half of them opted for father. Among SP voters, two-thirds preferred Mulayam Singh (Table 4F, p 84).

The survey revealed that price rise was the most important issue for voters (36%) during the election. Condition of roads emerged as the second most important issue (26%), followed by farmers' problems (14%). Corruption was an issue for 7% of the voters (Table 4G, p 84).

On the issue of dividing Uttar Pradesh into smaller states, there is greater support for division today than it was seven months ago. While 37% of the respondents agreed with the statement that "Uttar Pradesh should be divided into smaller states", a slightly lesser proportion 35% disagreed. When the same question was asked during a survey conducted by CSDS in July 2011 (before the proposal by the Mayawati government to divide Uttar Pradesh into four smaller states), those in favour of dividing UP were marginally lesser than those against it, across regions. The 2012 post-poll

**Table 4J: Citizens' Awareness and Support for 4.5% Quota for Minorities within OBC Quota**

Reservation Issue	All	Muslims
Those who have heard of 4.5% quota for minorities within OBC quota	42	51
Support 4.5% quota for minorities within OBC quota (among those who have heard)	48	60

(1) All figures are in % and rounded off; these were two back to back questions; rest of the respondents had not heard/did not support or no opinion.  
 (2) Question asked in the survey: Have you heard about the following issue – 4.5% reservation for minorities within the OBC quota? (If heard) Do you support it?  
 Source: Figures are based on a post-poll survey carried out by CSDS; Data set weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances.

**Table 4K: Party of Second Preference**

Party of Second Preference	%
Congress	18
SP	13
BJP	9
BSP	5

(1) All figures are in % and rounded off; rest of the respondents gave other party preferences or had no opinion.  
 (2) Question asked in the survey: Suppose you are not able to vote for your favourite party/party of first choice because of a bad/unsuitable candidate fielded by it, then in such a situation which other party would you vote for?  
 Source: Figures are based on a post-poll survey carried out by CSDS; Data set weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances.

**Table 4L: Citizens' Choice of Future Leader: Rahul Gandhi, Akhilesh Yadav, Jayant Chaudhury or Varun Gandhi**

Those Who Have Faith in...	All	Among Cong+ Voters	Among SP Voters	Among BJP Voters	Among Voters of Other Parties
Rahul Gandhi as a future leader	38	64	31	33	37
Akhilesh Yadav as a future leader	20	7	36	12	15
Jayant Chaudhury as a future leader	4	8	2	3	4
Varun Gandhi as a future leader	7	3	3	23	4

(1) All figures are in % and rounded off; rest of the respondents had no opinion.  
 (2) Question asked in the survey: Now I will ask you to compare four young leaders – Rahul Gandhi, Akhilesh Yadav, Jayant Chaudhury and Varun Gandhi. In your opinion who among them do you trust the most as a future leader?  
 Source: Figures are based on a post-poll survey carried out by CSDS; Data set weighted by actual vote share of major parties/alliances.

survey reveals that while most people in Poorvanchal and Awadh oppose the idea of division, in Bundelkhand and Paschim there are more people who are in support of the idea than those who are against it (Table 4H, p 84).

Nearly half the respondents were of the view that the Election Commission did the right thing by ordering the covering of the statues of Mayawati and the Elephant during the elections. Only 16% said it was a wrong decision. Even among dalits most felt the EC did no wrong. Majority of the respondents (51%) were also of the view that the BSP government had wasted money on building statues and parks (Table 4I, p 85).

Less than half the respondents had heard of the recent announcement by the central government of giving reservation to minorities within the OBC quota. However many of those who had heard about the move supported it (48%) (Table 4J, p 85).

The Congress Party may have performed below expectations but appears to have created some potential for itself for the future by emerging as the second preference party among voters. When

people were asked which party would they vote for if the party of their first choice put up a bad candidate, most (18%) said Congress (Table 4K, p 85).

Another reason for hope for the Congress is that more people have faith in Rahul Gandhi as a future leader compared to Akhilesh Yadav, Jayant Chaudhury and Varun Gandhi. When asked who among the four would make the best leader in the future, 38% said Rahul Gandhi and 20% opted for Akhilesh Yadav. Even among SP voters, Rahul Gandhi did rather well on this question (Table 4L, p 85).

### Survey Methodology

The findings presented here are based on a post-poll survey conducted by the CSDS, Delhi, in Uttar Pradesh. A total of 7,291 persons randomly selected from the latest electoral rolls were interviewed, from the second week of February 2012 till the first week of March (after polling but before counting of votes) in 399 locations in 101 constituencies spread across the state. The assembly constituencies and four polling booths within each sampled constituency were selected using the systematic random sampling technique. The respondents were sampled randomly (oversampling to allow for non-completion) from the updated electoral rolls of the selected polling

booths. Of the 12,768 sampled respondents, 7,291 could be interviewed within the stipulated time.

The social profile of the respondents interviewed largely matched the demographic profile of the state, except for women (Table 5). The interviews were conducted by specially trained field investigators. The respondents were interviewed in the face-to-face interview situation using a structured interview schedule in Hindi. Respondents were mostly interviewed at their home, preferably alone. The voting question was asked using a dummy ballot paper and dummy ballot box.

**Table 5: Sample Profile**

Social Background	Census 2001	Survey 2012
Women	47.3	40.4
Rural	79.2	81.8
Muslim	18.1	17.2
SC	21.2	21.1

All figures are in %.

The fieldwork of the survey in Uttar Pradesh was coordinated by A K Verma (Christ Church College, Kanpur), Mirza Asmer Beig (Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh) and Sudhir Khare (DAV Postgraduate College, Azamgarh). The survey was designed and analysed by a team of researchers at Centre for the Study of Developing Societies, Delhi which included Banasmita Bora, Dhananjai Kumar Singh, Himanshu Bhattacharya, Jyoti Mishra, K A Q A Hilal, Kanchan Malhotra, Kinjal Sampat, Rupali Warke, Shreyas Sardesai, Sohini Mookherjee, Vibha Attri, and Yogendra Yadav. Sanjay Kumar of the CSDS directed the survey.

## EPWRF's Online Data Base Services

[www.epwrfits.in](http://www.epwrfits.in)

### India Time Series

The EPW Research Foundation has introduced an online database service christened as the 'India Time Series', ([www.epwrfits.in](http://www.epwrfits.in)) as a part of the project funded by the **University Grants Commission (UGC)** and executed by the EPW-EPWRF and the Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai.

This service is particularly for the benefit of students, research scholars, professionals and the academic community, both in India and abroad.

The service envisages dissemination of data in 16 modules displaying time series on a wide range of macro-economic and financial sector variables in a manner convenient for research and analytical work.

EPWRF has so far released six modules since early 2011-12: (i) Financial Markets; (ii) Banking Statistics; (iii) Domestic Product of States of India; (iv) Price Indices; (v) Agricultural Statistics; and (vi) Power Sector.

Seven more modules will be released soon: (i) Industrial Production; (ii) Finances of Government of India; (iii) Finances of State Governments; (iv) Combined Government Finances; (v) National Accounts Statistics; (vi) Annual Survey of Industries; and (vii) External Sector.

The other three modules, (i) Education; (ii) Health; and (iii) Insurance will be added thereafter.

The demo version can be accessed by free registration. The existing members already registered with us and accessing member services at [www.epwrf.in](http://www.epwrf.in) will require no fresh registration. To gain full access, very affordable subscription rates are available on our website.

For any further details or clarifications, please contact: The Director, **EPW Research Foundation**, C-212, Akurli Industrial Estate, Akurli Road, Kandivli (East), Mumbai - 400 101 (phone: 91-22-2885 4995/4996) or mail: [epwrf@vsnl.com](mailto:epwrf@vsnl.com)