

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

THE PURSUIT OF SOCIAL WELFARE

Citizen Claim-Making in Rural India

By GABRIELLE KRUKS-WISNER

World Politics

doi: 10.1017/S0043887117000193

The replication code for this article is available at:

Kruks-Wisner, Gabrielle. 2017. "Replication Data for: "The Pursuit of Social Welfare: Citizen Claim-Making in Rural India." Harvard Dataverse, V1. doi: 10.7910/DVN/VL6E3Q.

STAGES OF RESEARCH

Stage 1. Theory building (n = 80)

Exploratory research consisted of roughly 80 interviews in Udaipur and Rajsamand districts with village leaders and groups of men and women from different caste communities, as well as state and district officials and NGO staff. This first, inductive stage of research allowed me to generate theories and hypotheses about how and why claim-making practices varied.¹ From these initial observations, I began to theorize that a person's relationship to the state and, by extension, his or her propensity to make claims on the state, was not formed on the basis of individual experience alone but rather took shape in reference to the experiences and accounts of others. The greater a person's exposure to different people and places, the more he or she would learn about ways to extract resources from the state.

Stage 2. Citizen survey (n = 2210)

To test this emergent theory, and to gain a broader, more systematic view of citizen claim-making practice, I designed a survey that was administered to a representative random sample of 2210 individuals in 105 villages across the districts of Udaipur, Kota, Jodhpur, and Ajmer. Districts were purposively selected with attention to their levels of economic development, caste and tribal composition, geography, and colonial history. Within districts, all blocks (*panchayat samitis*) were ranked by literacy rates. I then randomly selected two blocks in each district, one above and one below the mean. These include: (within Kota) Sangod and Itawa; (within Ajmer) Peesangan and Masuda; (within Udaipur) Gogunda and Bargaon; (within Jodhpur) Mandor and Shergarh. Within each block, I randomly selected five Gram Panchayats and, within those, up to three villages per panchayat. I always selected the panchayat's headquarter village and, depending on the number of villages in the panchayat, randomly selected up to two other villages. Some GPs contain only one or two large villages, and in these cases all villages were selected. Villages with fewer than fifty households were dropped from the sample, due to resource constraints.

Within each village, I drew a random sample of an average of twenty households stratified by caste category in order to ensure representative inclusion of different castes. There is no detailed census data on caste at the village level, so I employed rapid participatory mapping techniques to capture the distribution of castes within a village. Since caste communities tend to be spatially segregated in a village, I used neighborhood ("*mohalla*") boundaries as a proxy for caste. Working with village key informants, I mapped the neighborhoods and listed them by population and caste composition. In each village, the maps and population data were confirmed with at least three local sources, and were checked against census data (which, while lacking detailed caste data, does calculate the percentage of SC and ST in a village). On the basis of these maps and corresponding population estimates, I drew a sample roughly representative of the village's caste and tribal composition. (To be fully representative, a full census would have been required – something beyond the scope of my study).

The caste/tribal sample was drawn to correspond with the underlying number of SC, ST, OBC, or GC households in the village. The sample size for each caste/tribal category was drawn (in intervals of five – each of which was assigned to a different survey enumerator) according to the following parameters:

¹ These preliminary interviews were carried out in villages that did not overlap with villages subsequently included in the survey sample or later rounds of qualitative research. Rajsamand district was not included in the survey sample. Udaipur was included, but any village selected for preliminary research was excluded from subsequent rounds of qualitative and quantitative data collection, thus ensuring that the theory building and theory testing samples were distinct.

- Estimated % of village population = 0-10%: sample size = 0
- Estimated % of village population = 10.1-36.7%: sample size = 5
- Estimated % of village population = 36.8-63.4%: sample size = 10
- Estimated % of village population = 63.5-89.9%: sample size = 15
- Estimated % of village population = 90-100%: sample size = 20

Once the caste/tribal sample sizes were determined, respondents were each assigned to different sectors or neighborhoods within the village where residents from their assigned community were concentrated (based on the participatory maps). Within those neighborhoods, households were randomly selected using a systematic sampling approach. Beginning at a central neighborhood landmark, the surveyors were assigned transects by rolling dice to generate a random number and then reading off the corresponding degrees on a compass to determine the direction in which to walk. Surveyors were also assigned random start numbers by rolling dice, ensuring that houses both close to and far from the center had the same chance of being included in the sample. Surveyors were then given an interval number $K = n/N$, where n = the required number of interviews and N = the estimated number of households in the neighborhood. The surveyor interviewed every K^{th} house along his randomly assigned transect, turning right and left at every other corner, in order to ensure the inclusion of houses on and off the main roads.

Every effort was made to ensure that one-half of the sample would be female. Respondents were instructed to attempt to interview an adult female in every-other selected household. Where a woman was not present, they were encouraged to return at a different point in the day. However, because women were more likely than men to refuse interviews, the final sample was skewed and includes slightly over 40% women. This introduces a gender bias in the data that – given local gender norms and dynamics – could not be overcome. I am cognizant of this in my analysis and interpretation of the data. The sample size for women, though, remains large enough to make statistical inferences.

The citizen survey collected data on the claim-making practices reported by respondents, on their contact and experiences with local governance institutions and about their engagement with a range of non-state actors and institutions. The survey was organized into modules, each of which explored interactions with a different set of local actors or institutions. These included: the local council (the Gram Panchayat); local (block and district-level) bureaucrats, party-affiliated politicians and party workers at the state (Legislative Assembly) and national (Parliamentary) levels; neighborhood, village, and caste associations; “traditional” mixed-caste councils; NGOs, protest or social movement organizations; and a range of individual brokers described as “influential or knowledgeable people in the village who can assist others in getting work done.” For each set of actors or institutions, respondents were asked: “In your own (personal) experience, have you contacted this (person/organization) for assistance related to issue (X)?” They were then asked to consider a range of issues,² including access to a bundle of *public works and village services* (examples of which included schools, health clinics, village roads, drainage, lighting, and drinking water), and access to a bundle of *individual or household level government “schemes”* (including pensions, rations, cash transfers, subsidies for food, fuel, electricity, or education, and

² Issues included: village public works and infrastructure, government poverty alleviation and household welfare schemes, financial issues (such as access to credit and financial institutions), employment, caste or religious issues, land disputes, or “other.” In defining claim-making with regard to public service delivery, I examine responses regarding only the first two of these categories (public works and government schemes), as they specifically require state-targeted action. The questions did not specify a timeframe, but let respondents reflect over their cumulative experiences and relationship with the state over time. In pilot versions of the survey, the timeframe was restricted to one and five years. This, however, created confusion among respondents as well as problems regarding recall within a specified period.

employment on government worksites).³ If they responded in the affirmative, the survey went on to pose more detailed questions related to their experiences, including their opinions concerning the efficacy of their interaction in solving the problem at hand.

Stage 3. Qualitative interviews and village case studies (n = 250)

In roughly one-third of the survey sample villages I carried out additional qualitative work, consisting of key informant interviews with village officials, elders, and caste leaders. I also spent considerable time in informal conversation with village residents, most often in gatherings next to water sources or by health centers or schools. All in all, I carried out 90 interviews in the sample villages, concurrent with the survey administration.

I then purposively selected a sub-sample of six villages in which to ground the findings from the survey in specific local context. The villages were selected from two districts, Udaipur and Kota, representing the low and high ends of the human development index. The selected villages differ in terms of economic and human development indicators, caste composition, distance from the district seat, and other salient features. In these six villages, I carried out an additional 160 in-depth interviews with village key informants. In each village, I began by seeking out local elected officials (members of the Gram Panchayat) as well as government employees (school teachers, daycare workers, nurses, doctors, and appointed village administrators). From there I used a snowball method to develop and expand a list of “knowledgeable” and “active” people in the village representing different caste groups, neighborhoods, income levels, and men and women. These included caste leaders and elders, local party representatives, NGO staff, and members of women’s and youth groups – where present.

Note on translation

I carried out interviews in a mixture of English and Hindi. My own Hindi is proficient enough to follow and participate in the interviews. I lack, however, the nuance to carry out in-depth conversations, and so also relied on the assistance of a team of interpreters. These interpreters were particularly important in interviews with respondents who spoke local Rajasthani dialects. Wherever possible, more than one interpreter was present for an interview. This allowed one person to take the lead in guiding the conversation, and the other to take notes, including as many direct quotations as they could capture. I did not record interviews, since this appeared to be too obtrusive a practice. Directly following an interview, I would immediately sit with the interpreters. We would all compare notes, and reconstruct the interview (again, with as many direct quotes as possible). The translations that appear in this book are the product of this collaborative effort, triangulating from the accounts and notes of all those present in an interview.

Stage 4. Rapid survey (small-n) and semi-structured interviews (n = 232)

Concurrent with the village caste studies, I designed a protocol for a semi-structured interview administered by two research assistants (part of my original survey team) among a random sample of residents in the six villages. The same was stratified to reflect the major caste communities (using the same village mapping and household sampling techniques described above). The research assistants carried out roughly 40 interviews in each village, for a total of 232 across the six research sites. The interviews posed open-ended questions following a pre-designed protocol, asking respondents about issues or problems they face in the village, whether they had approached anyone for assistance with those issues, whether they had personal contact with range of local officials, whether they had attended Gram Panchayat and Gram Sabha meetings and why, and whether they have participated in collective action or acts of protest. Interview notes and transcripts from the structured interviews were subsequently coded to

³ These bundles of goods and services capture “collective” goods that benefit an entire locality, as well as “selective” goods that benefit individuals or households. Within these categories, examples of particular services were given as prompts. The length of the survey prohibited me from asking about each service individually.

generate data on claim-making incidence and practice, as well as on the specific issues on which claim-making centered, whether claim-making was individual or collective, and the outcomes of claim-making. Because of the subjectivity of the coding process, I employed two research assistants who each worked independently, following a common protocol to ensure inter-coder reliability of the data. Where differences emerged in interpretation, we met as a team to discuss how they should be resolved and ultimately coded. These data were then merged with the rapid survey data.

At the end of each randomly sampled interview, the students also administered a rapid survey to collect basic demographic, economic, occupational, and social information for each respondent. This rapid survey also included more detailed questions on social and spatial networks, travel, migration, and exposure than those included in the initial large-n citizen survey.

TABLE A.1. CITIZEN SURVEY: INDIVIDUAL & HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

	Mean (%)	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Age (years)	40.58	13.88	18	98
Female	0.41	0.49	0	1
Scheduled Tribe	0.19	0.39	0	1
Scheduled Caste	0.19	0.39	0	1
Other Backward Class	0.41	0.49	0	1
General Caste	0.21	0.41	0	1
Land (in bhigas)	13.22	24.31	0	450
Land (quintile 1)	0.26	0.44	0	1
Land (quintile 2)	0.14	0.35	0	1
Land (quintile 3)	0.27	0.45	0	1
Land (quintile 4)	0.13	0.34	0	1
Land (quintile 5)	0.19	0.39	0	1
Wealth Index (1-13)*	5.42	2.78	0	13
Education (years)	4.31	4.82	0	32
Some Primary Education	0.17	0.38	0	1
Some Secondary Education	0.31	0.46	0	1
Some Higher Education	0.07	0.25	0	1
TV/radio usage (freq.)	0.94	1.24	0	3
Newspaper readership (freq.)	0.84	1.19	0	3
GP office (current or prior)	0.15	0.36	0	1
Member of a party (any)	0.35	0.48	0	1
Congress member (self-identified)	0.20	0.40	0	1
BJP member (self-identified)	0.15	0.36	0	1
"Social" (own neighborhood)	0.05	0.21	0	1

Source: Author's Citizen Survey in Rajasthan 2010-11 (n = 2210)

* Wealth index is a composite score of number of durable goods (mobile phone, gas cooker, refrigerator, TV, radio, car, three-wheeler, motorcycle, bicycle), whether owns livestock (1 if yes), plus whether owns house (1 if yes), material of the home (1 if "pucca" or durable), and material of roof (1 if "pucca").

TABLE A.2. CITIZEN SURVEY: VILLAGE & GRAM PANCHAYAT CHARACTERISTICS

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Village population	1664.37	1263.15	212	6265
Population density	1.87	1.43	0.41	9.38
Avg. land (bhigas)	13.14	11.21	1.17	70.92
Avg. wealth (HH index, 1-13)	3.82	1.16	1.40	6.25
Intra-Village Gini	0.25	0.07	0.10	0.40
Literacy rate	0.44	0.12	0.18	0.73
Village pop. % SC	0.15	0.12	0	0.67
Village pop. % ST	0.19	0.28	0	0.99
Caste fractionalization (0 -1)*	0.59	0.24	0.01	0.90
Distance to town (km)	32.71	20.63	6	101
Hamlet (not main village)	0.14	0.35	0	1
Post-Office in village	0.42	0.49	0	1
Bus stop in village	0.55	0.50	0	1
Improved NH access road	0.44	0.50	0	1
Paved village access road	0.67	0.47	0	1
GP headquarter village	0.42	0.49	0	1
GP population	4748.93	1441.65	2782	8945
ST reserved panchayat	0.28	0.45	0	1
SC reserved panchayat	0.18	0.38	0	1
Female reserved panchayat	0.52	0.50	0	1

Source: Citizen Survey 2010-11 (n = 2210)

* Caste fractionalization is calculated as $1 - \sum (\text{caste}_i)^2$, where i is a given caste and caste_i is the proportion of the village population comprised of that caste

TABLE A.3. CLAIM-MAKING PRACTICES, COLLECTIVE vs. SELECTIVE SERVICES

Claim-making	Collective goods Mean (%)	Selective benefits Mean (%)	Diff. in Means (%)
<i>Direct channels</i>	60 (0.010)	56 (0.011)	4 ***
Gram Panchayat	57 (0.011)	53 (0.011)	4 ***
Bureaucrats	20 (0.008)	14 (0.007)	6 ***
Politicians/parties	21 (0.009)	15 (0.008)	6 ***
<i>Mediated channels</i>	51 (0.011)	39 (0.010)	12 ***
Caste body	22 (0.009)	17 (0.008)	6 ***
Inter-caste body	13 (0.007)	10 (0.006)	3 ***
Individual brokers	14 (0.007)	12 (0.007)	2 **
N.H. association	21 (0.009)	15 (0.008)	6 ***
Village association	15 (0.008)	11 (0.007)	3 ***
NGO	3 (0.003)	1 (0.002)	1 ***
Social movement	8 (0.006)	3 (0.003)	6 ***
<i>Claim-making Incidence</i>	72 (0.010)	64 (0.010)	8 ***

Source: Citizen Survey (2210), n = 2210

Notes: Difference in means are from two-sample tests of proportion. Standard errors are shown in parentheses. Standard levels of significance apply, where * = p-value < 0.10; ** = p-value < 0.05; *** = p-value < 0.01.

TABLE A.4. PERCEPTION OF CLAIM-MAKING EFFICACY, BY PRACTICE

<i>Perceived effectiveness of claim-making practice</i>	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.
A. Full sample			
Gram Panchayat	2210	0.56	0.50
Bureaucrat	2210	0.30	0.46
Political party	2210	0.20	0.40
N.H. association	2210	0.23	0.42
Village association	2210	0.19	0.39
Caste body	2210	0.54	0.50
Inter-caste body	2210	0.20	0.40
Civil society org.	2210	0.12	0.33
B. Given claim-making			
Gram Panchayat	1375	0.67	0.47
Bureaucrat	459	0.57	0.50
Political party	480	0.40	0.49
N.H. association	479	0.83	0.38
Village association	338	0.84	0.36
Caste body	519	0.76	0.43
Inter-caste body	303	0.83	0.38
Civil society org.	239	0.79	0.41

Note: A channel was code as "effective" if a respondent reported that it was either “somewhat” or “very” effective in problem solving. Part A reports the responses of the full sample, while Part B is restricted to those who report engaging in claim-making through the channel in question. “Civil society organization” includes both NGOs and social movement organizations. Because of an oversight in survey design, data on the perceived effectiveness of contacting brokers” cannot be calculated.

Source: Citizen survey 2010-11 (n = 2210).

TABLE A.5. CLAIM-MAKING PRACTICE: DIFFERENCES IN MEANS (PANEL A)

	INCIDENCE			REPERTOIRE			Gram Panchayat			Bureaucrats			Politicians/Parties			Brokers		
	Mean	Diff.		Mean	Diff.		Mean	Diff.		Mean	Diff.		Mean	Diff.		Mean	Diff.	
<i>Landownership</i>																		
Quintile 1	0.714	-0.059	***	1.700	-0.417	***	0.583	-5.701	**	0.164	-0.062	***	0.177	-0.055	***	0.141	-0.034	*
	(0.019)			(0.068)			(0.021)			(0.016)			(0.016)			(0.015)		
Quintile 2	0.751	-0.008		2.026	0.021		0.626	0.001		0.160	-0.058	**	0.211	-0.007		0.208	0.048	**
	(0.024)			(0.097)			(0.027)			(0.021)			(0.023)			(0.023)		
Quintile 3	0.763	0.007		2.013	0.008		0.625	-0.001		0.222	0.017		0.205	-0.016		0.158	-0.011	
	(0.017)			(0.070)			(0.020)			(0.017)			(0.017)			(0.015)		
Quintile 4	0.844	0.099	***	2.397	0.448	***	0.702	0.088	***	0.227	0.020		0.273	0.064	**	0.199	0.037	
	(0.022)			(0.105)			(0.027)			(0.025)			(0.027)			(0.024)		
Quintile 5	0.756	-0.002		2.143	0.166	*	0.630	0.007		0.280	0.087	***	0.256	0.048	**	0.159	-0.009	
	(0.021)			(0.091)			(0.024)			(0.022)			(0.021)			(0.018)		
Q1 - Q5		-0.042			-0.443	***		-0.047			-0.116	***		-0.079	***		-0.018	
<i>Caste category</i>																		
ST	0.763	0.010		1.827	-0.212	**	0.598	-0.030		0.141	-0.081	***	0.195	-0.027		0.188	0.024	
	(0.021)			(0.079)			(0.024)			(0.017)			(0.020)			(0.019)		
SC	0.785	0.036		1.921	-0.096		0.641	0.023		0.175	-0.041	*	0.213	-0.005		0.151	-0.021	
	(0.020)			(0.078)			(0.023)			(0.019)			(0.020)			(0.017)		
OBC	0.730	-0.045	**	1.992	-0.012		0.609	-0.023		0.213	0.008		0.209	-0.013		0.157	-0.019	
	(0.015)			(0.059)			(0.016)			(0.014)			(0.013)			(0.012)		
GC	0.773	0.022		2.240	0.304	***	0.652	0.038		0.287	0.101	***	0.257	0.050	**	0.188	0.025	
	(0.019)			(0.086)			(0.022)			(0.021)			(0.020)			(0.018)		
ST - GC		-0.010			-0.413	***		-0.055			-0.146	***		-0.062	**		0.000	
SC - GC		0.011			-0.319	***		-0.011			-0.113	***		-0.044			-0.037	
<i>Gender</i>																		
Men	0.872			2.535			0.753			0.287			0.307			0.218		
	(0.009)			(0.048)			(0.012)			(0.013)			(0.013)			(0.011)		
Women	0.592	-0.279	***	1.243	-1.292	***	0.437	-0.316	***	0.096	-0.191	***	0.091	-0.217	***	0.097	-0.121	***
	(0.016)			(0.047)			(0.016)			(0.010)			(0.009)			(0.010)		

TABLE A.5. CLAIM-MAKING PRACTICE: DIFFERENCES IN MEANS (PANEL B)

	N.H. Assoc.			Village Assoc.			Caste Assoc.			Inter-caste Assoc.			NGO		Soc. Mov't	
	Mean (%)	Diff.		Mean (%)	Diff.		Mean (%)	Diff.		Mean (%)	Diff.		Mean (%)	Diff.	Mean (%)	Diff.
<i>Landownership</i>																
Q1 - Q5		-4.230 *			-0.063 ***			-0.059 **			-0.051 **			0.024 **		-0.032 **
Q1	0.168 (0.016)	-6.983 ***		0.106 (0.013)	-0.066 ***		0.194 (0.017)	-0.055 ***		0.111 (0.013)	-0.036 **		0.039 (0.008)	0.016 **	0.055 (0.010)	-0.043 ***
Q2	0.236 (0.024)	1.983		0.147 (0.020)	-0.009		0.256 (0.025)	0.024		0.128 (0.019)	-0.012		0.035 (0.010)	0.010	0.077 (0.015)	-0.012
Q3	0.242 (0.018)	3.163		0.157 (0.015)	0.003		0.239 (0.017)	0.005		0.135 (0.014)	-0.004		0.022 (0.006)	-0.007	0.098 (0.012)	0.015
Q4	0.270 (0.026)	5.753 **		0.234 (0.025)	0.091 ***		0.259 (0.026)	0.027		0.174 (0.023)	0.041 *		0.021 (0.009)	-0.006	0.138 (0.021)	0.059 ***
Q5	0.210 (0.020)	-1.151		0.169 (0.018)	0.018		0.254 (0.021)	0.023		0.162 (0.018)	0.030		0.014 (0.006)	-0.015 *	0.087 (0.014)	0.000
<i>Caste category</i>																
ST - GC		0.338			-0.005			-0.061 **			-0.035			0.023 *		-0.047 **
SC - GC		8.127 ***			-0.041 *			-0.022			-0.056 **			-0.023 ***		-0.029
ST	0.180 (0.019)	-4.451 **		0.149 (0.018)	-0.005		0.202 (0.020)	-0.040 *		0.132 (0.017)	-0.007		0.051 (0.011)	0.030 ***	0.063 (0.012)	-0.027 *
SC	0.258 (0.021)	5.134 **		0.112 (0.015)	-0.050 **		0.242 (0.021)	0.008		0.110 (0.015)	-0.033 *		0.005 (0.003)	-0.027 ***	0.081 (0.013)	-0.005
OBC	0.234 (0.014)	3.028 *		0.173 (0.013)	0.035 **		0.232 (0.014)	-0.004		0.137 (0.011)	0.001		0.025 (0.005)	-0.003	0.085 (0.009)	-0.001
GC	0.177 0.0	-5.014 **		0.153 0.0	0.001		0.263 0.0	0.036 *		0.166 0.0	0.037 **		0.028 0.0	0.002	0.110 0.0	0.031 **
<i>Gender</i>																
Men	0.268 (0.012)			0.197 (0.011)			0.278 (0.012)			0.192 (0.011)			0.035 (0.005)		0.097 (0.008)	
Women	0.144 (0.012)	-0.124 ***		0.091 (0.009)	-0.107 ***		0.174 (0.013)	-0.103 ***		0.060 (0.008)	-0.132 ***		0.015 (0.004)	-0.020 ***	0.069 (0.008)	-0.029 **

TABLE A.6. COMBINATIONS OF DIRECT & MEDIATED CLAIM-MAKING PRACTICES

Claim-making practice	Contact		
	Mean	Obs.	Std. Dev.
Multiple channels	0.54	2210	0.50
Direct & mediated	0.43	2210	0.50
Direct only	0.22	2210	0.41
Mediated only	0.10	2210	0.31
Among those who contact the Gram Panchyat			
GP only	0.20	1375	0.4
Plus political party	0.32	1375	0.47
Plus bureaucrat	0.31	1375	0.46
Plus intermediary	0.67	1375	0.47
Plus broker	0.22	1375	0.41
Plus N.H. assoc.	0.29	1375	0.45
Plus village assoc.	0.21	1375	0.41
Plus caste body	0.30	1375	0.46
Plus inter-caste body	0.19	1375	0.39
Plus NGO	0.03	1375	0.18
Plus social movement	0.10	1375	0.31
Among those who contact Politicians/parties			
Politicians/parties only	0.04	480	0.20
Plus GP	0.91	480	0.29
Plus bureaucrat	0.47	480	0.50
Plus intermediary	0.74	480	0.44
Plus broker	0.28	480	0.45
Plus N.H. assoc.	0.29	480	0.45
Plus village assoc.	0.24	480	0.43
Plus caste body	0.35	480	0.48
Plus inter-caste body	0.25	480	0.44
Plus NGO	0.04	480	0.20
Plus social movement	0.14	480	0.35

Source: Citizen Survey (2010), n = 2210

TABLE A.7. MEDIATED PRACTICES, CONDITIONAL ON PRESENCE OF CHANNEL

State-targeted pursuit of social welfare services	Presence reported by		Contact
	Full sample	> 50% village	Where present *
Caste body	0.66	0.79	0.25
Inter-caste body	0.28	0.20	0.25
Individual brokers	0.32	0.14	0.34
N.H. association	0.32	0.18	0.43
Village association	0.25	0.12	0.37
NGO	0.06	0.04	0.36
Social movement	0.11	0.03	0.33

Source: Citizen Survey (2010), n = 2210

* Mediated channel is "present" where reported by > 50 % of respondents in a village

Appendix III – Correlates of Claim-making

Empirical models, where claim-making is the outcome:

$$y_{ipd} = \alpha + \beta EXP_{ipd} + \gamma IND_{ipd} + \lambda HH_{ipd} + \theta PLACE_{pd} + \Omega DFE_d + \varepsilon_{ipd}$$

y is the claim-making outcome of interest (overall incidence, specific practice, or repertoire of practices) for individual i in place (village and panchayat) p and district d . The unit of observation is the individual, with one observation per household. For dichotomous outcomes, including the overall incidence of claim-making or of a given practice, I employ maximum likelihood estimation using probit models (reporting marginal effects, dF/dx). For the index of practices (claim-making repertoire), I use OLS (reporting the coefficients).

β estimates the effects on claim-making associated with different measures of social and spatial exposure (EXP): socializing across neighborhood lines measured first as an index of frequency, and second (in a separate model) in binary terms; participation in a mixed-caste cultural group (binary); participation in a mixed-caste workplace (binary); migration (binary; coded 1 if a household member lives outside the village for more than 30 days per year); and a composite index of exposure including all of these indicators (each assessed in binary terms; the index ranges from 0 – 4). The land-to-labor ratio (hectares of cultivable land relative to the agriculture workforce in a village) is employed as a village-level proxy for exposure.

IND represents a vector of individual-level controls, including: identity (gender, age, age-squared, caste-category (ST, SC, and OBC – each compared to GC) and caste-gender interaction effects (ST, SC, and OBC women – each compared to GC women); media exposure (frequency of newspaper readership, frequency of TV or radio usage); level of education (primary, secondary, or higher – compared to those with none; in separate models, education is assessed after dropping newspaper readership); political connections (whether shares caste or gender with the GP *sarpanch* (e.g. SC in SC-reserved village), and whether holds or held local panchayat office); partisanship (whether self identifies as Congress or BJP member; identification with *any* party is separately assessed); and level of social activity within one's *own* neighborhood.

HH represents household controls including family size and the number of children & elderly; socioeconomic status (quintile of landownership; wealth, assessed as an index of assets and durable households goods including material of the home; and wealth-squared); occupation (farming own land, farm labor on others' land, non-farm labor, and salaried employment; in a separate set of models assessing the effects of a mixed-caste workplace and the village land-to-labor ratio, NREGS employment is added along with salaried employment to control for public sector employment, while dropping the other occupational controls); and household use of private services (in education, health, drinking water).

PLACE represents village and panchayat controls, including village population size and density, whether the interview was conducted in a hamlet (versus the main village); distance to a town, village literacy rate, average landownership, average asset-ownership; caste fractionalization; whether a majority in the village supports Congress or BJP; the reported frequency of politician visits to the village; and the number of type of local association in a village (including neighborhood or village associations, caste or inter-caste associations, or NGOs); in a different model, each type of local association is separately assessed. Panchayat-related controls include GP population, whether the village is the GP headquarters, whether the village is home to the *sarpanch*, whether the village caste composition matches the GP caste composition, and whether the seat of *sarpanch* is reserved for SC, ST, or OBC caste members or women.

All models include district fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the village level.

Notes for Tables A.8 - A.11: Correlates of claim-making

Tables report estimations with claim-making as the outcome variable. Sample means for each outcome is shown in parentheses at the top of each column. “**Incidence**” is a binary variable equal to 1 if the household engaged in any manner of claim-making. Practices include contacting the GP, block or district bureaucrats, political parties, associations (neighborhood or village), caste associations, mixed-caste associations, NGOs, social movements, or fixers. Each practice is assessed in binary terms equal to 1 if the respondent reported engaging in that activity. Results for binary outcomes are the marginal effects associated with each independent variable, estimated using probit models. “**Repertoire**” is an index (0-10) comprised of all practices employed, where results are the coefficients associated with each independent variable using OLS.

Independent variables for **Table A.8** are village or panchayat-level characteristics, as noted in the model above. Village population, population density, the proportion of village population that is SC or ST, village literacy rates, and distance to an urban center are drawn from the 2001 Census. Panchayat caste and gender reservations are drawn from the Rajasthan Election Commission. All other indicators are village means extracted from the citizen survey.

Independent variables for **Table A.9** are individual and household characteristics, as noted above, drawn from the citizen survey. Land quintiles 1-4 are each compared to the fifth quintile. Women are compared to men. ST, SC, OBC are each compared to GC. SC, ST, and OBC women are compared to GC women. Levels of education are compared to those with zero education.

In Tables A.8 and A.9, the effects of the independent variables are jointly assessed in models that also include the index of socio-spatial exposure, along with the full set of controls described in the empirical model above.

Independent variables for **Table A.10** are indicators of "exposure," each assessed in binary terms (equal to 1 if yes) and assessed in a separate model alongside the full controls. The indicators include: social engagement beyond the neighborhood; participation in a mixed-caste cultural group; participation in a mixed-caste workplace; and migration (when a member of the household migrates for more than 30 days per year). The index of socio-spatial exposure is the composite of the binary measures of all four indicators of exposure). The land-to-labor ratio is hectares of cultivable land in the village relative to the village agricultural workforce (data from the 2001 Census Primary Abstract and Village Directory). All estimations also include full the individual, household, village and panchayat-level controls, as noted above. For “mixed-caste workplace” and for “land-to-labor ratio,” an additional control for NREGS employment is included along with salaried employment after dropping the other occupational controls.

All estimations (A.8 - A.10) include district fixed effects (comparing Kota, Jodhpur, and Udaipur, to Ajmer), and standard errors are clustered at the village level. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

Standard levels of significance apply, where * = p-value < 0.10; ** = p-value < 0.05; *** = p-value < 0.01.

**TABLE A.8. CORRELATES OF CLAIM-MAKING: VILLAGE & GP CHARACTERISTICS
PANEL A. INCIDENCE, REPERTOIRE, & DIRECT PRACTICES**

Village & GP characteristics	Claim-Making INCIDENCE ($\mu= 0.756$)	Claim-Making REPertoire ($\mu= 1.999$)	Contact GP ($\mu= 0.622$)	Contact Bureaucrat ($\mu= 0.208$)	Contact Party ($\mu= 0.217$)
Population Size	3.3e-07 (.000026)	.000051 (.000099)	.00002 (.000035)	.000042** (.000019)	.000036* (.000021)
Population Density	-.018 (.012)	-.073 (.05)	-.037** (.016)	-.016* (.0084)	.0025 (.0094)
Literacy Rate	-.0057 (.19)	-.16 (.81)	.066 (.26)	.026 (.13)	.1 (.14)
Average Landownership	-.0028 (.0018)	-.0035 (.0084)	-.0028 (.0025)	-.0013 (.0013)	.0007 (.0016)
Average Wealth (index)	-.062*** (.018)	-.19** (.073)	-.095*** (.023)	-.056*** (.014)	-.042*** (.016)
Caste Fractionalization	-.054 (.083)	-.14 (.37)	-.074 (.12)	-.062 (.07)	.043 (.072)
Distance to Town	-.0012 (.00081)	-.0039 (.0035)	-.0015 (.0012)	-.0011 (.00074)	-.00077 (.00067)
Congress village (majority)	.023 (.082)	.21 (.41)	.032 (.1)	.082 (.087)	.04 (.072)
BJP village (majority)	-.066 (.069)	-.56** (.22)	-.32*** (.058)	.053 (.037)	-.054 (.082)
Politician visits (frequency)	.22*** (.07)	1** (.4)	.34*** (.082)	.18*** (.066)	.18** (.079)
Gram Panchayat Headquarter	.066 (.049)	.19 (.2)	.08 (.058)	.015 (.028)	-.023 (.036)

Gram Panchayat population	7.7e-06 (.000016)	-.000026 (.000072)	-3.8e-06 (.000021)	-.000019 (.000012)	-.000032** (.000013)
ST reserved panchayat	-.12** (.059)	-.52*** (.19)	-.19*** (.066)	-.098*** (.029)	-.074** (.033)
SC reserved panchayat	-.11 (.068)	-.14 (.27)	-.046 (.084)	-.037 (.041)	-.081** (.033)
Female reserved panchayat	-.045 (.034)	.043 (.14)	-.069* (.041)	-.018 (.024)	-.0079 (.026)

**TABLE A.8. CORRELATES OF CLAIM-MAKING: VILLAGE & GP CHARACTERISTICS
PANEL B. MEDIATED PRACTICES**

Village & GP characteristics	Contact Association ($\mu= 0.300$)	Contact Caste Assoc. ($\mu= 0.235$)	Contact Int.caste Assoc. ($\mu= 0.137$)	Contact NGO ($\mu= 0.027$)	Contact Movement ($\mu= 0.086$)	Contact Fixer ($\mu= 0.168$)
Population Size	.000027 (.00002)	-.000012 (.00003)	-3.5e-06 (.000014)	-6.5e-07 (9.1e-07)	-7.7e-06 (.000014)	7.2e-06 (.000017)
Population Density	-.0094 (.013)	-.015 (.015)	-.0089 (.0062)	.00021 (.00046)	.011* (.0066)	-.013 (.0096)
Literacy Rate	-.072 (.2)	-.31 (.2)	.021 (.1)	.02* (.01)	-.051 (.097)	.079 (.13)
Average Landownership	-.00047 (.002)	-.0029 (.0022)	.0012 (.00096)	-.0001 (.00012)	.0017** (.00085)	-.00032 (.0016)
Average Wealth (index)	-.0029 (.019)	.012 (.019)	-.0078 (.012)	-.0016 (.001)	-.02* (.011)	.021 (.015)
Caste Fractionalization	-.021 (.09)	-.11 (.088)	.036 (.055)	-.000039 (.003)	.058 (.043)	-.1* (.058)

Distance to Town	.000024 (.00088)	-.0007 (.0011)	.00042 (.00044)	-.000061 (.000044)	-.00029 (.0005)	.00039 (.00066)
Congress village (majority)	-.019 (.093)	-.031 (.084)	-.024 (.032)		.14** (.066)	-.04 (.062)
BJP village (majority)	-.014 (.06)	-.19*** (.038)	-.049 (.038)	.056 (.047)	-.043*** (.013)	.028 (.094)
Politician visits (frequency)	.11* (.063)	.16* (.096)	.018 (.037)	.0022 (.002)	-.063 (.04)	.095* (.057)
Gram Panchayat Headquarter	-.0053 (.047)	.042 (.053)	-.0025 (.022)	-.00047 (.0017)	.069** (.03)	-.019 (.037)
Gramp Panchayat population	-1.9e-06 (.000017)	-3.3e-06 (.000022)	6.8e-06 (.000011)	1.0e-06 (8.4e-07)	-3.4e-06 (9.6e-06)	.00001 (.000011)
ST reserved panchayat	-.056 (.047)	-.034 (.064)	-.047** (.024)	-.0012 (.0018)	.02 (.031)	-.039 (.033)
SC reserved panchayat	.053 (.063)	-.051 (.062)	.0059 (.032)	-.00074 (.002)	.015 (.032)	.015 (.045)
Female reserved panchayat	.0084 (.034)	.02 (.038)	.026 (.018)	-.0012 (.0016)	-.0034 (.019)	.034 (.024)

**TABLE A.9. CORRELATES OF CLAIM-MAKING: INDIVIDUAL & HH CHARACTERISTICS
PANEL A. INCIDENCE, REPERTOIRE, & DIRECT PRACTICES**

Individual & HH characteristics	Claim-Making INCIDENCE ($\mu= 0.756$)	Claim-Making REPertoire ($\mu= 1.999$)	Contact GP ($\mu= 0.622$)	Contact Bureaucrat ($\mu= 0.208$)	Contact Party ($\mu= 0.217$)
Land ownership (Q1 compared to Q5)	.011 (.035)	-.06 (.12)	.041 (.044)	-.023 (.033)	-.038 (.03)
Land ownership (Q2 compared to Q5)	.015 (.036)	.16 (.13)	.058 (.047)	-.042 (.031)	-.039 (.031)
Land ownership (Q3 compared to Q5)	.014 (.032)	.015 (.11)	.019 (.042)	-.0073 (.026)	-.032 (.029)
Land ownership (Q4 compared to Q5)	.077** (.032)	.2 (.14)	.058 (.046)	-.036 (.03)	.0035 (.033)
Wealth index (household)	.029** (.014)	.05 (.067)	.027 (.019)	.024 (.016)	.013 (.015)
Wealth index - Squared (household)	-.0033*** (.0013)	-.005 (.0059)	-.0031* (.0016)	-.0023* (.0012)	-.00034 (.0012)
Female (compared to male)	-.22*** (.064)	-1.1*** (.21)	-.27*** (.059)	-.22*** (.059)	-.14*** (.05)
Scheduled Tribe (compared to GC)	-.065 (.073)	-.57** (.26)	-.22*** (.081)	-.15*** (.036)	-.084* (.047)
Scheduled Caste (compared to GC)	-.065 (.059)	-.44** (.19)	-.17*** (.059)	-.1*** (.028)	-.0055 (.043)
Other Backward Class (compared to GC)	-.049 (.051)	-.25 (.19)	-.052 (.059)	-.056 (.04)	.026 (.043)
ST woman (compared to GC women)	.088* (.047)	.66** (.28)	.12 (.075)	.25* (.13)	-.013 (.07)

SC woman (compared to GC women)	.058 (.057)	.54*** (.2)	.12* (.07)	.17* (.088)	-.014 (.059)
OBC woman (compared to GC women)	.0032 (.054)	.14 (.18)	-.047 (.066)	.053 (.069)	-.003 (.055)
SC in SC reserved panchayat	.1** (.043)	.72** (.33)	.19*** (.059)	.14 (.092)	.054 (.072)
ST in ST reserved panchayat	.069 (.055)	.37 (.28)	.14** (.068)	.11 (.09)	.16* (.092)
Female in fem. reserved panchayat	.0087 (.042)	-.063 (.15)	.012 (.047)	.054 (.054)	.017 (.042)
Primary education (compared to none)	.023 (.027)	.12 (.11)	.016 (.039)	.063* (.034)	.06* (.031)
Secondary education (compared to none)	.031 (.034)	.084 (.13)	.014 (.044)	.055* (.029)	.048 (.032)
Higher education (compared to none)	.0091 (.052)	.28 (.24)	.03 (.059)	.14** (.067)	.14** (.065)
TV/radio usage (frequency)	.017 (.012)	.036 (.038)	-.013 (.015)	.015 (.0099)	-.0007 (.0091)
Newspaper readership (frequency)	.033*** (.012)	.18*** (.047)	.032** (.014)	.017 (.012)	.019* (.0099)
GP office-bearer (current or previous)	.054** (.027)	.41*** (.11)	.087*** (.03)	.029 (.028)	.059** (.025)
Congress supporter (self-identified)	.0072 (.031)	.25** (.12)	.055 (.037)	-.026 (.027)	.083*** (.031)
BJP supporter (self-identified)	-.049 (.031)	.24** (.12)	.025 (.037)	-.019 (.024)	.059** (.027)
"Social" (in own NH)	-.0016 (.043)	.076 (.18)	.031 (.056)	-.047 (.057)	-.091** (.035)

**TABLE A.9. CORRELATES OF CLAIM-MAKING: INDIVIDUAL & HH CHARACTERISTICS
PANEL B. MEDIATED PRACTICES**

Individual & HH characteristics	Contact Association ($\mu= 0.300$)	Contact Caste Assoc. ($\mu= 0.235$)	Contact Int.caste. ($\mu= 0.137$)	Contact NGO ($\mu= 0.027$)	Contact Movement ($\mu= 0.086$)	Contact Fixer ($\mu= 0.168$)
Land ownership (Q1 compared to Q5)	.01 (.047)	-.1*** (.035)	-.019 (.019)	.0041 (.0041)	.028 (.027)	.026 (.028)
Land ownership (Q2 compared to Q5)	.13** (.058)	-.042 (.036)	-.013 (.02)	.00026 (.0026)	.062* (.036)	.067* (.035)
Land ownership (Q3 compared to Q5)	.035 (.04)	-.064** (.028)	-.0041 (.015)	.001 (.0021)	.051** (.022)	.0053 (.02)
Land ownership (Q4 compared to Q5)	.1** (.044)	-.04 (.031)	.014 (.023)	.00092 (.0029)	.069** (.03)	.034 (.03)
Wealth index (household)	-.041** (.017)	.017 (.02)	-.011 (.011)	.00053 (.00076)	.01 (.0073)	.0083 (.013)
Wealth index - Squared (household)	.0029** (.0015)	-.0016 (.0017)	.00087 (.00086)	-.000051 (.000058)	-.00045 (.0006)	-.00092 (.001)
Female (compared to male)	-.2*** (.064)	-.17*** (.041)	-.11*** (.035)	-.0015 (.0025)	.053* (.032)	-.15*** (.043)
Scheduled Tribe (compared to GC)	.0013 (.074)	-.074 (.069)	-.056** (.028)	.019 (.018)	-.015 (.046)	-.031 (.044)
Scheduled Caste (compared to GC)	-.015 (.055)	-.026 (.055)	-.034 (.029)	-.0038* (.002)	-.00096 (.025)	-.046 (.034)
Other Backward Class (compared to GC)	-.0086 (.049)	-.068 (.053)	-.017 (.031)	.0036 (.003)	-.017 (.025)	-.038 (.037)
ST woman (compared to GC women)	.16* (.084)	.15* (.079)	.064 (.067)	-.0017 (.0014)	-.035 (.024)	.2** (.094)

SC woman (compared to GC women)	.037 (.079)	.11* (.061)	.0095 (.05)	.0019 (.0068)	-.014 (.029)	.2** (.08)
OBC woman (compared to GC women)	.02 (.07)	.028 (.05)	.037 (.047)	-.0022 (.0018)	-.041** (.018)	.12* (.064)
SC in SC reserved panchayat	.2 (.12)	.13 (.12)	.11 (.081)	.034 (.046)	-.033 (.022)	.026 (.069)
ST in ST reserved panchayat	.042 (.094)	-.026 (.095)	.11 (.075)	-.0023 (.0014)	.046 (.079)	.0083 (.062)
Female in fem. reserved panchayat	.051 (.058)	-.014 (.036)	.0029 (.033)	.0033 (.004)	-.029* (.018)	-.0015 (.032)
Primary education (compared to none)	.0031 (.034)	-.072** (.029)	.055** (.025)	-.00086 (.00091)	.007 (.018)	.03 (.027)
Secondary education (compared to none)	-.037 (.038)	-.052 (.032)	.02 (.025)	-.00094 (.0017)	.0085 (.023)	.035 (.034)
Higher education (compared to none)	-.045 (.061)	-.096*** (.036)	.017 (.038)	.00045 (.0028)	.031 (.042)	.062 (.052)
TV/radio usage (frequency)	.017 (.013)	.018 (.012)	-.0079 (.0065)	-.00053 (.00063)	.016** (.0067)	-.01 (.0086)
Newspaper readership (frequency)	.03** (.014)	.012 (.013)	.016** (.0077)	.0012** (.00049)	.0081 (.0078)	.023** (.01)
GP office-bearer (current or previous)	.074** (.034)	.019 (.029)	.037* (.022)	.0025 (.0026)	.03 (.019)	.057** (.028)
Congress supporter (self-identified)	.053 (.035)	-.061** (.029)	.085*** (.023)	-.00048 (.0016)	.025 (.022)	.045 (.028)
BJP supporter (self-identified)	.025 (.042)	-.046 (.03)	.048** (.024)	-.0011 (.001)	.03 (.02)	.081*** (.032)
"Social" (in own NH)	.11** (.055)	-.052 (.034)	.11** (.053)	-.00059 (.0024)	-.029 (.022)	.062 (.045)

**TABLE A.10. CORRELATES OF CLAIM-MAKING: SOCIAL AND SPATIAL EXPOSURE
PANEL A. INCIDENCE, REPERTOIRE, & DIRECT PRACTICES**

<i>Indicators of exposure</i>	Claim-Making INCIDENCE ($\mu= 0.756$)	Claim-Making REPERTOIRE ($\mu= 1.999$)	Contact GP ($\mu= 0.622$)	Contact Bureaucrat ($\mu= 0.208$)	Contact Party ($\mu= 0.217$)
Social engagement beyond neighborhood	.12*** (.025)	.55*** (.094)	.2*** (.029)	.055** (.024)	.047** (.022)
Participation in mixed-caste cultural group	.086*** (.027)	.4*** (.13)	.054 (.036)	-.033 (.026)	-.024 (.026)
Engagement in mixed-caste workplace	.12*** (.032)	.33*** (.096)	.13*** (.038)	.014 (.025)	.073*** (.027)
Migration beyond village (household)	.015 (.022)	.083 (.092)	.032 (.028)	-.015 (.024)	.048** (.024)
Index of socio-spatial exposure	.075*** (.012)	.31*** (.047)	.099*** (.016)	.01 (.014)	.034*** (.012)
<i>Village-level proxy for exposure</i>					
Land-to-labor ratio	-.062*** (.015)	-.15*** (.051)	-.08*** (.02)	-.014 (.011)	-.013 (.016)

**TABLE A.10. CORRELATES OF CLAIM-MAKING: SOCIAL AND SPATIAL EXPOSURE
PANEL B. MEDIATED PRACTICES**

<i>Indicators of exposure</i>	Contact Association ($\mu= 0.300$)	Contact Caste Assoc. ($\mu= 0.235$)	Contact Int.caste Assoc. ($\mu= 0.137$)	Contact NGO ($\mu= 0.027$)	Contact Movement ($\mu= 0.086$)	Contact Fixer ($\mu= 0.168$)
Social engagement beyond neighborhood	.18*** (.026)	.053** (.024)	.07*** (.014)	.0015 (.0014)	.013 (.013)	-.025 (.023)
Participation in mixed-caste cultural group	.095** (.039)	.011 (.035)	.076*** (.027)	.014 (.0087)	.047* (.025)	.093*** (.034)
Engagement in mixed-caste workplace	.046 (.035)	.0089 (.031)	.061*** (.016)	.0011 (.0016)	-.0045 (.017)	.059*** (.021)
Migration beyond village (household)	.051* (.029)	-.039* (.023)	.0053 (.019)	-.000049 (.0016)	-.0041 (.011)	.039* (.021)
Index of socio-spatial exposure	.096*** (.014)	.012 (.013)	.046*** (.0085)	.0019* (.0011)	.0095 (.0061)	.032*** (.0098)
<i>Village-level proxy for exposure</i>						
Land-to-labor ratio	-.024* (.013)	-.038** (.017)	-.011 (.0076)	-.00033 (.00066)	.008 (.0056)	-.012 (.011)

Appendix IV – Correlates of Social & Spatial Exposure

Empirical models, where claim-making is the outcome:

$$y_{ipd} = \alpha + \gamma IND_{ipd} + \lambda HH_{ipd} + \theta PLACE_{pd} + \Omega DFE_d + \varepsilon_{ipd}$$

y is an outcome related to socio-spatial exposure for individual i in place (village and panchayat) p and district d . The unit of observation is the individual, with one observation per household. The indicators of social and spatial exposure are cross-neighborhood social engagement; participation in a mixed-caste cultural group; participation in a mixed-caste workplace; migration (if a household member lives outside the village for more than 30 days per year) – all assessed in binary terms. For these dichotomous outcomes, I employ maximum likelihood estimation using probit models (reporting marginal effects, dF/dx). A composite index of the degree of exposure includes all of these indicators (each assessed in binary terms; the index ranges from 0 – 4). The land-to-labor ratio, which measures hectares of cultivable land relative to the agriculture workforce in a village is, in a separate set of models, employed as a proxy for exposure. For these non-dichotomous outcomes, I use OLS (reporting the coefficients).

IND represents a vector of individual-level controls, including: identity (gender, age, age-squared, caste-category (ST, SC, and OBC – each compared to GC) and caste-gender interaction effects (ST, SC, and OBC women – each compared to GC women); media exposure (frequency of newspaper readership, frequency of TV or radio usage); level of education (primary, secondary, or higher – compared to those with none; in separate models, education is assessed after dropping newspaper readership); political connections (whether shares caste or gender with the GP *sarpanch* (e.g. SC in SC-reserved village), and whether holds or held local panchayat office); partisanship (whether self identifies as Congress or BJP member; identification with *any* party is separately assessed); and level of social activity within one's *own* neighborhood.

HH represents household controls including family size and the number of children & elderly; socioeconomic status (quintile of landownership; wealth, assessed as an index of assets and durable households goods including material of the home; and wealth-squared); occupation (farming own land, farm labor on others' land, non-farm labor, and salaried employment; in a separate set of models assessing the effects of a mixed-caste workplace and the village land-to-labor ratio, NREGS employment is added along with salaried employment to control for public sector employment, while dropping the other occupational controls); and household use of private services (in education, health, drinking water).

PLACE represents village and panchayat controls, including village population size and density, whether the interview was conducted in a hamlet (versus the main village); distance to a town, village literacy rate, average landownership, average asset-ownership; caste fractionalization; whether a majority in the village supports Congress or BJP; the reported frequency of politician visits to the village; and the number of type of local association in a village (including neighborhood or village associations, caste or inter-caste associations, or NGOs); in a different model, each type of local association is separately assessed. Panchayat-related controls include GP population, whether the village is the GP headquarters, whether the village is home to the *sarpanch*, whether the village caste composition matches the GP caste composition, and whether the seat of *sarpanch* is reserved for SC, ST, or OBC caste members or women.

All models include district fixed effects. (Additional models, not shown, include block, GP, and village fixed effects.) In all models, standard errors are clustered at the village level.

Notes for Tables A.11. – A.12: correlates of exposure

Tables report estimations with the following socio-spatial exposure variables as the outcomes: social engagement beyond the neighborhood (binary, equal to 1 if yes); participation in a mixed-caste cultural group (binary, equal to 1 if yes); participation in a mixed-caste workplace (binary, equal to 1 if yes); and migration (equal to 1 if a member of the household migrates for more than 30 days per year); an index of socio-spatial exposure (0 - 4, consisting of binary measures of all other indicators of exposure); and the land-to-labor ratio (cultivable land in hectares relative to the village to the agricultural workforce). Sample means for each outcome is shown in parentheses at the top of each column. Results for dichotomous outcomes are the marginal effects associated with each independent variable, estimated using probit models. Results for non-dichotomous outcomes are the coefficients associated with each independent variable using OLS. Sample means for each outcome is shown in parentheses.

Independent variables for **Table A.11** are village or panchayat-level characteristics. Village population, population density, the proportion of village population that is SC or ST, village literacy rates, and distance to a urban center are drawn from the 2001 Census. Panchayat caste and gender reservations are drawn from the Rajasthan Election Commission. All other indicators are village means extracted from the citizen survey.

Independent variables for **Table A.12** are individual and household characteristics drawn from the citizen survey. Land quintiles 1-4 are compared to the fifth quintile. Women are compared to men. ST, SC, OBC are each compared to GC. SC and ST women are compared to GC women. Levels of education are compared to those with zero education.

In both tables, the effects of the independent variables are jointly assessed in models that include the full set of controls described in the empirical model, above. The village land-to-labor ratio is also included as an additional control for models assessing the correlates of the individual-level indicators of exposure and the index of exposure. For “mixed-caste workplace” and for “land-to-labor ratio,” an additional control for NREGS employment is included along with salaried employment after dropping the other occupational controls.

All estimations include district fixed effects (comparing Kota, Jodhpur, and Udaipur, to Ajmer), and standard errors are clustered at the village level. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

Standard levels of significance apply, where * = p-value < 0.10; ** = p-value < 0.05; *** = p-value < 0.01.

TABLE A.11. CORRELATES OF EXPOSURE: VILLAGE & GP CHARACTERISTICS

Village & GP characteristics	Cross-NH social ties ($\mu = 0.680$)	Mixed caste cult. group ($\mu = 0.138$)	Mixed caste occupation ($\mu = 0.810$)	Migration (household) ($\mu = 0.220$)	Index of exposure ($\mu = 1.848$)	Land-labor ratio ($\mu = 1.519$)
Land-labor ratio	-.013 (.0098)	.0035 (.0065)	-.0074 (.0075)	-.019*** (.0066)	-.04** (.015)	
Population Size	-6.9e-06 (.000028)	-.000012 (.000013)	5.1e-06 (.000015)	.000021 (.000014)	8.5e-06 (.000034)	-.00039* (.00023)
Population Density	-.00012 (.01)	.012** (.0056)	-.012 (.01)	-.017* (.0092)	-.021 (.018)	-.29*** (.1)
Literacy Rate	.04 (.15)	-.18** (.075)	-.048 (.11)	.021 (.13)	-.1 (.25)	-.18 (.93)
Average Landownership	-.0022 (.0016)	-.0026** (.001)	.0015 (.0012)	-.00085 (.0011)	-.0041* (.0021)	.01 (.016)
Average Wealth (index)	-.043** (.019)	.032*** (.0096)	-.013 (.013)	-.044*** (.014)	-.069** (.026)	-.069 (.11)
Caste Fractionalization	-.11 (.081)	-.016 (.045)	-.015 (.056)	.057 (.055)	-.064 (.12)	.48 (.42)
Distance to Town	.00036 (.00079)	.0006 (.00043)	.0012* (.00061)	.0007 (.00053)	.0025* (.0013)	.0068 (.0059)
Congress village (majority)	.012 (.092)	-.021 (.022)	-.12* (.074)	-.12* (.063)	-.25*** (.073)	-.79** (.38)
BJP village (majority)	-.06 (.1)	.053 (.037)	.048** (.024)	-.0072 (.044)	.033 (.09)	-.23 (.24)
Politician visits (frequency)	.12** (.054)	.0017 (.029)	.1*** (.038)	-.053 (.042)	.24*** (.089)	.37 (.33)
Gram Panchayat Headquarter	.05 (.039)	-.016 (.021)	-.029 (.028)	-.028 (.027)	-.038 (.053)	.21 (.32)
Gram Panchayat population	-.000021 (.000017)	-.000014** (6.6e-06)	8.3e-07 (.00001)	-.000015* (8.5e-06)	-.000046** (.000022)	.0001 (.00011)
ST reserved panchayat	-.022 (.053)	.049* (.028)	.025 (.037)	.011 (.036)	.04 (.079)	-.099 (.24)
SC reserved panchayat	.06 (.053)	-.055*** (.017)	-.04 (.045)	-.0052 (.03)	-.057 (.083)	.38 (.31)
Female reserved panchayat	-.043 (.035)	.0065 (.016)	.017 (.025)	.0057 (.024)	-.0045 (.051)	-.33** (.15)

TABLE A.12. CORRELATES OF EXPOSURE: INDIVIDUAL & HH CHARACTERISTICS

Individual & HH characteristics	Cross-NH social ties ($\mu = 0.680$)	Mixed caste cult. group ($\mu = 0.138$)	Mixed caste occupation ($\mu = 0.810$)	Migration (household) ($\mu = 0.220$)	Index of exposure ($\mu = 1.848$)	Land-labor ratio ($\mu = 1.519$)
Land ownership (Q1 compared to Q5)	.0045 (.049)	-.00031 (.025)	.045* (.028)	-.0081 (.035)	.056 (.079)	-.041 (.081)
Land ownership (Q2 compared to Q5)	-.061 (.052)	.036 (.03)	.028 (.029)	-.026 (.039)	-.02 (.081)	-.13 (.1)
Land ownership (Q3 compared to Q5)	.0037 (.038)	-.0075 (.019)	.048* (.026)	.019 (.03)	.056 (.062)	-.079 (.079)
Land ownership (Q4 compared to Q5)	-.074* (.045)	.0045 (.023)	.052** (.024)	.044 (.039)	.03 (.075)	-.13 (.088)
Wealth index (household)	.027 (.02)	.027** (.01)	.0045 (.012)	.026* (.015)	.063* (.034)	-.0088 (.032)
Wealth index - Squared (household)	-.0025 (.0017)	-.0014* (.00083)	.0007 (.0012)	-.00065 (.0012)	-.0022 (.003)	.0013 (.0027)
Female (compared to male)	-.34*** (.07)	-.089*** (.028)	-.18*** (.051)	-.066 (.041)	-.66*** (.11)	-.11 (.12)
Scheduled Tribe (compared to GC)	-.013 (.076)	.017 (.04)	.016 (.057)	-.037 (.047)	-.047 (.12)	.2 (.19)
Scheduled Caste (compared to GC)	-.12* (.071)	.007 (.033)	.012 (.046)	-.051 (.043)	-.16* (.095)	-.079 (.16)
Other Backward Class (compared to GC)	-.042 (.055)	.024 (.027)	.048 (.047)	-.081*** (.031)	-.074 (.089)	-.18 (.2)
ST woman (compared to GC women)	.15*** (.052)	.018 (.045)	.072* (.041)	-.028 (.049)	.26* (.14)	.063 (.1)

SC woman (compared to GC women)	.13** (.056)	.0081 (.046)	.071* (.039)	.094 (.068)	.37*** (.14)	.16 (.2)
OBC woman (compared to GC women)	.071 (.058)	.039 (.042)	.057 (.038)	.1* (.059)	.3*** (.11)	.13 (.13)
SC in SC reserved panchayat	-.0037 (.1)	.2** (.09)	.016 (.085)	.02 (.079)	.2 (.2)	.14 (.24)
ST in ST reserved panchayat	.016 (.087)	-.027 (.035)	-.04 (.071)	-.044 (.055)	-.093 (.15)	-.36* (.21)
Female in fem. reserved panchayat	.023 (.049)	.045* (.027)	-.028 (.032)	.016 (.039)	.049 (.078)	.017 (.062)
Primary education(compared to none)	.016 (.035)	-.02 (.017)	.025 (.027)	.054* (.03)	.058 (.059)	.082 (.081)
Secondary education (compared to none)	.019 (.038)	.016 (.021)	.036 (.028)	.044 (.033)	.11 (.067)	.054 (.047)
Higher education (compared to none)	.059 (.043)	.048 (.04)	-.022 (.054)	.12** (.061)	.27** (.11)	.12 (.084)
TV/radio usage (frequency)	.017* (.01)	.026*** (.0061)	.017* (.01)	.0085 (.011)	.078*** (.021)	-.046* (.025)
Newspaper readership (frequency)	.0049 (.014)	.022*** (.0076)	-.016 (.011)	-.027** (.012)	.0089 (.027)	.023 (.021)
GP office-bearer (current or previous)	-.045 (.031)	.027 (.017)	.047** (.021)	.046 (.028)	.095* (.055)	-.0091 (.037)
Congress supporter (self-identified)	.095*** (.031)	.004 (.019)	.083*** (.02)	.047* (.027)	.21*** (.059)	-.039 (.047)
BJP supporter (self-identified)	.14*** (.035)	.0091 (.016)	.077*** (.022)	.015 (.031)	.22*** (.05)	.06 (.055)
"Social" (in own NH)	.27*** (.022)	-.027 (.026)	.093*** (.03)	-.04 (.039)	.29*** (.095)	.044 (.12)

TABLE A.13. INTERACTION EFFECTS

	Claim-Making INCIDENCE ($\mu= 0.756$)	Claim-Making REPertoire ($\mu= 1.999$)
Index of Exposure	0.089** (0.035)	0.273* (0.144)
Wealth Index (household)	0.029** (0.014)	0.027 (0.067)
Wealth x Exposure	0.000 (0.004)	0.025 (0.017)
Scheduled Tribe	-0.078 (0.115)	-0.520 (0.393)
ST x Exposure	0.010 (0.040)	-0.002 (0.161)
Scheduled Caste	-0.052 (0.091)	-0.154 (0.339)
SC x Exposure	-0.005 (0.034)	-0.123 (0.128)
Other Backward Class	-0.065 (0.079)	0.062 (0.192)
OBC x Exposure	0.009 (0.027)	-0.084 (0.111)
Female	-0.167*** (0.066)	-0.871*** (0.237)
Female x Exposure	-0.030 (0.021)	-0.091 (0.078)
Observations	1966	1966
R ²	(Pseudo) 0.219	0.299

Notes. Results for claim-making incidence are from probit models, reporting marginal effects. Results for claim-making repertoire are from OLS models, reporting the coefficients. Sample means are shown in parentheses at the top the columns. Standard errors are in parentheses. All models include individual, household, village, and panchayat controls, with district fixed effects. Robust standard errors are clustered at the village level.

* = p-value < 0.10; ** = p-value < 0.05; *** = p-value < 0.01