KARNATAKA CRIME VICTIMISATION SURVEY 2019

Azim Premji University

Centre for
Constitutional & Legal System Reform

Background and Context

The public debate on crime, its causes and consequences, dominates the newspapers and news on the television. However, these debates rest on a thin empirical understanding of the nature and social experience of crime in India. In order for meaningful public and academic debate to be rooted in the reality of crime, we need to go beyond our current reliance on the statistics released by the National Crime Records Bureau ('**NCRB**') and replace it with new survey based crime baselines. We present the results of the first academically rigorous original empirical study of crime victimisation in Karnataka that promises to set a new standard for data collection and analysis of crime in India.

The NCRB acts as the official repository of crime related data in India and has published the *Crime in India* report annually since 1953. The report is a statistical compilation of "cognizable crimes as reported in police stations during the reference year". It has specific chapters on police/civilian casualties and police firing, complaints against police personnel and custodial crimes, cybercrimes, human trafficking, crimes against senior citizens, crimes against foreigners, offences against the State, environment related offences, seizures of arms & drugs by police, economic crimes, recidivism, crimes in railways, kidnapping and abduction (NCRB, 2016).

This data however, has many shortfalls primarily due to the social stigma associated with certain crimes and due to systemic inefficiencies (Ghosh, 2013; Gupta, 2014; Krishnaswamy, Finnoff, & Bail, 2016). The "dark figure" of crime (Biderman & Reiss, 1967) is the discrepancy between the amount of crime officially recorded by police as captured by the NCRB data and that which is actually experienced by victims. So, to supplement national crime statistics, a survey is required to study victimisation of people by crimes ('**CVS**').

Although there are no large, comprehensive and regular CVSs in India currently, there have been small-scale, city-based victimisation surveys. Some of the earliest attempt in crime victims survey were on victims of dacoit gangs (D. Singh & Jatar, 1980; D. R. Singh, 1978), homicide (V N Rajan & K P Krishnan, 1981) and motor vehicle accidents (M. Z. Khan & K. P. Krishna, 1981). Singh notes about his own work that the focus of the study was not as a victimisation survey but rather, the causes of victimisation and the contexts (2004, p. 96). A 1981 study of homicide in Bangalore and Delhi ('**Bangalore-Delhi survey**') consisted of a small number of respondents (57 in Bangalore and 86 in Delhi), nevertheless it provided insight into the most frequently seen homicide-related victimisation. These surveys provided the incentive for a larger scale crime victims survey in India in 1992 - the International Crime (Victim) Survey in Bombay ('**ICS Bombay**'). ICS Bombay had a representative sample of 1000 respondents and a questionnaire was administered in English and Hindi. Some of the salient results from ICS Bombay were that fear of crime was not a big concern for a majority (92.8%) of the respondents, more than half (54.3%) of burglaries occurred in hutments and burglary (with entry) and theft of bicycle was seen as "very serious" and "fairly serious" crime by 57% and 83% of the respondents respectively (D. R. Singh, 2004).

In 2001, a CVS was conducted in four cities of Tamil Nadu ('**TN Survey**')- Madurai, Coimbatore, Trichy and Chennai by Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli funded by the University Grants Commission. The results showed that most (45%) of the victims of

sexual offences among the respondents were school and college students of which only 4% of the victims reported the crime. The survey also noted that there was high incidence of non-reporting for theft (79%), burglary (48%) and robber (58%), and reporting behaviour depended on the value of loss and the perceived seriousness of offence (Chockalingam, 2003).

In 2015, a CVS was conducted by Nielsen India along with Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative in New Delhi and Bombay in 2015, called the Crime Victimisation and Safety Perception Survey ('**CVSP (2015)**'). This focused on crime incidence, crime reporting and perception of safety and found that theft was the common crime amongst respondents (Delhi 10.14%, Mumbai 12.36%) followed by sexual harassment (Delhi 2.78%, Mumbai 1.94%) and physical assault (Delhi 1.02%, Mumbai 1.62%). The survey also showed that the rate of unreported crimes was over 50% in both Delhi and Mumbai (Sarkar, Mukhopadhyay, Blake, & Prasad, 2015). National Family Health Survey ('**NFHS-3**') and the Indian Human Development Survey ('**IHDS**') included crime victimisation as a part of a larger survey. IHDS, conducted in 2004-05, was the first national survey to record crime victimisation data. The NFHS (2005-06) introduced questions on domestic violence, covering both physical and mental abuse. Most recently, in 2017, an analysis of safety perceptions and adaptive behaviour across four major Indian cities was carried out by the IDFC Institute, ('**SATARC (2017)**').

The Bangalore-Delhi survey, although one of the first such studies, had a small sample size. ICS Bombay was more thorough, however it focused only on Mumbai, primarily due to high crime rates in the city. The TN survey, similarly, focused on the urban centres of Tamil Nadu and had 4030 respondents but the respondents were pooled for analysis. CVSP (2015) had a large number of respondents (4950 households in Delhi, 5850 in Mumbai), SATARC (2017) had 20,957 households in Delhi, Mumbai, Chennai and Bengaluru. However, similar to other CVSs, only the metropolitan regions of India were studied. A common shortcoming of the CVSs has been the focus on the urban centres in India and, when multiple areas are targeted, the sample size of the survey. Nevertheless, the importance of CVSs is evident from the results these surveys have provided.

In 2017, Azim Premji University, with the assistance of field investigators from Sigma Research and Consulting Pvt Ltd ('**Sigma**'), undertook a crime victimisation survey in Karnataka ('**KCVS**') to understand the scope and nature of crime in the state and analyse the extent to which NCRB records capture the rate of crime in the state. The objectives of KCVS were to:

- understand the rates of crime victimisation along various socio-economic categories,
- estimate the rate of under reporting of crimes in the official crime data released by the NCRB,
- understand who the victims are, the spread of crime, the circumstances in which victimisation takes place, and
- understand why victims of crime engage or disengage with the criminal justice system.

Research Methodology

I.   Research Instrument:

The KCVS questionnaire was designed by a team of students and faculty after studying questionnaires used in National Crime Victimisation Survey ('**NCVS'**), Crime in England and Wales ('**CSEW'**), International Crime Victimisation Survey ('**ICVS'**) and CVSP (2015). Furthermore, we held a consultation meeting on questionnaire design with Professor Rajiv Sethi (Professor of Economics, Barnard College, Columbia University) in October 2016. During the consultative meeting, Professor Sethi, who has worked extensively on crime and justice in the United States, provided valuable suggestions on strategies for asking sensitive questions and improving design of questionnaire. He spoke of the need for clarity between burglary, theft and robbery in the questionnaire and advised us that a question phrased as 'Do you know anyone who has faced sexual harassment?' is more likely to receive a response than 'Have you faced sexual harassment?'

Our questionnaire has three sections: safety, crime victimisation (with incident reports) and demographic information. The section on demographic information recorded information such as age, education, occupation and caste of the respondents. Such socio-economic and demographic information is essential to analyse the trends in crime and the social identity of the victims. The crime victimisation section of the questionnaire has a two-part format where first, the respondent is asked whether they have experienced victimisation and then, for every instance of victimisation, a form of details on the crime is filled.

While designing the questionnaire, predetermined response categories were added to the questions to ensure that data can be systematically recorded. The questionnaire was also designed to fit diverse experiences of the respondents in Karnataka. We methodically reviewed and edited the questionnaire to ensure simplicity of language. Finally, the questionnaire was translated into Kannada by Sigma and then reviewed by an in-house translator at Azim Premji University. Conversational Kannada was used to make the interviews as comfortable as possible without losing the fundamental nature of the questions.

1. Perceptions of Safety

While victimisation by different types of crimes forms the crux of any victimisation survey, it is the citizens' perception of neighbourhood safety that provides a more holistic understanding of policing, crime and safety. Almost all recent surveys related to crime and victimisation include a section on perceptions of neighbourhood safety. For instance, in the 6th wave of the World Values Survey (2010-2014), 2 of the 4 questions on crime victimisation, pertained to safety perceptions and security measures.[1] This points to the relevance of safety perceptions in victimisation studies. Through this section of the questionnaire, we explored different aspects of safety and awareness of policing.

---

[1] 'Could you tell me how secure do you feel these days in your neighbourhood?' and 'Which of the following things have you done for reasons of security?'. World Values Survey, 'WVS 6 Questionnaire' (World Values Survey, June 2012), 13, http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSDocumentationWV6.jsp.

Safety may be understood through multiple facets; two of which are temporal and spatial. Intuitively, perceptions of safety are a combination of temporal and spatial features. CVSP (2015) and SATARC (2017) explored the temporal nature of safety through questions such as 'After what time in the evening, would you worry about safety while walking around alone in your neighbourhood?' and 'After what time in the evening, would you worry about an adult female member of your household who may be outside home unaccompanied?'. In a similar manner, KCVS explores temporality through feeling of safety at certain hours in the evening while pursuing quotidian activities such as withdrawing cash, walking around the neighbourhood and using public transport. Additionally, KCVS also looked into the trend in concern for male and female family members at different hour of the evening.

Questions on spatial safety may relate to how safe a location is ('How safe do you feel your neighbourhood is?' in SATARC 2017) or to the prevalence of crime in the area ('How much of a problem is crime in your area?' in CVSP 2015). In KCVS, we explored both aspects of spatial safety. While we studied at neighbourhood safety, leaving the house for a considerably duration and the use of public transport, we also investigated the citizens' perception on the magnitude of crime in their locality and their perception of the most prevalent crime in their neighbourhood.

The response categories for questions on safety are generally ordinal or binary categories. For example, questions such as 'Do you feel safe leaving your home locked for many days?' or 'Do you feel safe walking alone in your neighbourhood during the day?' seen in CVSP (2015) and SATARC (2017), have binary response categories ('Yes' 'No'). On the other hand, for questions such as 'How much of a problem do you think crime is in your local area?' or 'How serious is the problem of crime is in your local area?' seen in both CVSP (2015) and SATARC (2017), use ordinal response categories. Additionally, for questions pertaining to temporality of safety, there is, generally, a range of responses corresponding to different hours of the evening; for example, from 'After 7 pm' to 'After midnight' and an additional 'Always feel safe'. In KCVS, we have followed a similar design for response categories for questions pertaining to perceptions of safety.

2. Crime Victimisation

The crux of any crime victimisation survey is the recording of victimisation by different types of crimes. Based on the relevant sections of the Indian Penal Code,1860 ('**IPC**'), we have identified four categories of crime: property and economic offences, offences against body, law and order offences and offences by government officials. The specific crimes that come within each of the four categories are shown in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Crimes identified for KCVS

Property and Economic Offences	•Robbery •Criminal trespass/ burglary •Theft •Criminal breach of trust •Cheating • Forgery

Offences against the body	•Murder
	•Attempt to murder
	•Culpable homicide not amounting to death
	•Attempt to commit culpable homicide
	•Kidnapping and abduction
	•Grievous hurt
	Dowry deaths
	• Assault on women with intent to outrage her modesty
	• Insult to modesty of women
	• Causing of death through negligence
	• Extortion
	• Causing injuries through rash driving
Law and order offences	• Unlawful assembly
	• Riots
	• Arson
Offences by government officials	• Bribes
	• Assault

The crimes that were studied in this survey were selected based on the nature of the crime and the scope of survey protocols. A survey tool can effectively study crimes that have a significant incident rate and those that can be explored without infringing on the privacy and security of the subjects. Thus, certain crimes of very sensitive nature, particularly crimes of sexual nature, could not be covered by KCVS. This survey does not cover sexual assault, dowry related crimes and crimes against children but does study certain other crimes against women, such as eve teasing, molestation and stalking. Pan-India victimisation studies on domestic abuse and assault already exist as a part of the NFHS, which is conducted regularly and stringent follows survey protocols that pertain to questions of sensitive nature. We felt that the protocols for data collection in this survey did not permit for such kind of interviews.

Additionally, KCVS does not cover crimes against children, dacoity, human trafficking, illegal arms, narcotics, copyright violations, cybercrime, smuggling, crimes by foreigners, bonded labour and some crimes covered by special & local laws. Given the length of the questionnaire and incidence of these crimes, we focused our effort on understanding more prevalent crimes in the society.

There are two parts to any victimisation survey: general questions and incident report. The following sections will explain these elements and our rationale in framing many of the questions.

a) General Questions
Drawing from the questionnaire design of NCVS, this survey does not directly ask the respondent whether he or she has experienced a certain crime. Instead, the survey asks whether the respondent has experienced a crime through smaller details and draws a conclusion as to the nature of the crime. The general questions determine whether subject has experienced victimisation. For instance, Q16 in the questionnaire asks:

*During the last one year, has anything been stolen or attempted to be stolen
from your possession or from the possession of any member of your family?
(house/ vehicles/ phones/household appliances/ goods/ jewellery)*

This question does not ask the respondent whether he or she is a victim of burglary or theft. Instead, we proceed to incident report which enquires about the location of the crime, the use of force, the identity of the perpetrator and based on the details we would then match the incident to the corresponding category of crime.

b) Incident reports

While the general questions ascertain whether a respondent has experienced crime of a certain nature, the incident reports – the second part of victimisation survey – provide a comprehensive understanding of victimisation. An incident report was filled only if the respondent answered in the affirmative to any of the questions in the general questions. The interviewer was asked to skip to the appropriate part of the incident report (corresponding to the question number of the general question) and record the details of the incident. The incident report records various details about the incident and about reporting the incident to the police. For instance, if a respondent replied in affirmative to Q17 in the questionnaire:

*During the last one year, has anyone damaged or tried to cause damage to
your property (house/ vehicles/phones/household appliances/
goods/jewellery)?*

The incident report, which records the details of the crime, will enquire about the time of occurrence of the crime, what type of property was stolen, the value of the property, the location of the incident, whether the perpetrator was known, whether the crime was reported to the police, the action taken by the police and satisfaction with police behaviour. This provides a thorough understanding of the nature of crime and experience with the legal system.

Other than the basic details on time, frequency and location of the incident it records specific details relating to particular crimes. For instance, if the respondent replies in the affirmative that an item was stolen or attempted to be stolen from his or her possession, the incident report would attempt to ascertain whether it is a case of burglary, theft or robbery by recording details on the location of the crime, the use of force and identity of the perpetrator. Similarly, separate incident reports were designed for only 11 out of the 13 questions on the general list.

The remaining questions enquired about offences committed by government officials. We did not create any incident reports for these questions, given the sensitivity of the information pertaining to these crimes.

II. Sampling and Interviews

1. Sampling

Police zones are a common administrative delimitation used to organise the police force across the state, as well as in major cities. These act as significant markers of institutional capacity and regional disparity. Sampling through police zones is a standard practise in conducting victimisation surveys, especially in India. CVSP (2015) and SATARC (2017) mention that the cities where they conducted the interview were first segmented into respective police zones

before sampling the population.[2] Thus, in the first stage of sampling, we divided the state of Karnataka into police zones or ranges.

Karnataka has 30 administrative districts which are organised into 7 police ranges - Central, Northern, North-Eastern, Bellary, Eastern, Southern and Western - consisting of 3 to 6 districts each and headed by Inspectors General of Police (**IGP**s).[3] Table 2.2 provides the list of police ranges and the districts that fall within them. Since Bellary range was created only after completion of the survey, we have used the original North-Eastern range for all sampling and data reporting purposes. Furthermore, the police force in five major cities of Karnataka - Bangalore, Mysore, Hubbali-Dharwad, Mangalore and Belagavi - are headed by commissioners and organised into commissionarates. However, for to simplify the analysis, the data from the commissionarates were considered as part of the respective geographical police range. For instance, as Bangalore city falls within the administrative districts of Bangalore Urban and Bangalore Rural, victimisation data from Bangalore were combined with that of Central range.

Table 2.2: Districts and Police Ranges

Sl. No.	Range	Districts	Sl. No.	Range	Districts
1.	Central	Bangalore Urban	4.	North-Eastern	Bellary
		Bangalore Rural			Bidar
		Chikballapur			Kalaburagi (Gulbarga)
		Kolar			Koppal
		Ramanagara			Raichur
		Tumakuru			Yadgir
2.	Northern	Vijayapura (Bijapur)	5.	Southern	Chamarajanagar
		Belagavi			Hassan
		Bagalkot			Kodagu
		Dharwad			Mandya
		Gadag			Mysore
3.	Eastern	Chitradurga	6.	Western	Chikkamagaluru
		Davanagere			Dakshina Kannada
		Haveri			Udupi
		Shivamogga			Uttara Kannada

KCVS uses systematic stratified sampling to capture the perceptions and experiences of residents of Karnataka over the age of 18 years. The sample size of 2000 respondents for the entire state was calculated on the basis of the population of Karnataka, taken from Census 2011. Using the sample of 2000 respondents, data was collected at the household level. The method of stratification and sample size allocation is shown in Table 2.3.

First, district-wise population data from Census 2011 was used to proportionally allocate the number of respondents that needed to be interviewed in each of the six ranges (Columns 3 and

---

[2] Abhijit Sarkar et al., 'Crime Victimisation and Safety Perception: A Public Survey of Delhi and Mumbai' (New Delhi: Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, 2015), 3; Avanti Durani et al., 'Safety Trends and Reporting of Crime' (IDFC, 2017), 3.

[3] 'Organisation', Karnataka State Police, 9 April 2018, https://www.ksp.gov.in/Page.aspx?page=Organisation.

4 in the table). The sample size within each range was then distributed among rural and urban areas based on the appropriate Census information on urban-rural populations in range (Columns 5, 6, 7 and 8).

Table 2.3: Population and Sampling

Police Range	Population (Pop.) 2011 census	% Pop.	Total Sample size allocate	% Rural pop.	Rural sample size	% Urban pop.	Urban sample Size	No of villages to select	No wards to select
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Central	16174743	26.9	538	36	193	64	345	10	17
Northern	11758337	19.6	391	68	267	32	124	13	6
Eastern	6955374	11.6	231	72	167	28	64	8	3
North Eastern	11215224	18.7	373	72	269	28	104	13	5
Southern	8158627	13.6	271	73	199	27	73	10	4
Western	5842140	9.7	194	66	128	34	66	6	3
Karnataka	**60104445**	**100**	**1998**		**1223**		**777**	**61**	**39**

The number of rural villages and urban wards to be interviewed was calculated based on the sample allocated to rural and urban areas, and estimating a sample of 20 households within each Primary Sampling Unit (**PSU**), in this case, the police ranges (Columns 9 and 10). The villages and wards within every range were organised in ascending order of population and the required number of villages and wards were selected through PPS (Probability Proportional to Size) method. The selected wards and villages in every range was divided into four geographical segments of equal population. Five households were selected from each of the 4 segments using left hand rule of field movement starting from centre of the segment for a total of 20 households in each segment.

3. Training

In preparation for the fieldwork, a one-day training workshop was organised at Azim Premji University for the Field Investigators (**FI**s) from Sigma, our survey partner. The aim of the project, the design of the questionnaire and the categories of crimes were explained and discussed with the FIs. The field investigation coordinators explained techniques of interviewing respondents and communication protocols that must be followed during interviews. The FIs also practised face-to-face interviews with the questionnaire and pointed out errors in translation which were corrected before the commencement of fieldwork. The FIs then conducted a one-day pilot test with the translated questionnaire at Hennur. The field investigation coordinators from Sigma and KCVS team at Azim Premji University held a post-pilot discussion to finalise the details of the fieldwork.

4. Fieldwork

The FIs were organised into six teams and each police range was covered by 3 to 4 teams depending on the number of districts in the range. The fieldwork took place between 24 April 2017 and 11 May 2017. As mentioned earlier, the respondents were randomly selected based on left hand rule of field movement and skipping appropriate number of households to cover the segment of the ward thoroughly. Once a household was selected and the respondent was confirmed to be above the age of 18 years, the FIs first established their identity, explained the purpose of the interview and assured the respondent of the confidentiality of their data.

After receiving the approval of the respondent, the statement of informed consent was read out and the consent of the respondent was requested to continue with the interview. Being a household survey, the interviews were conducted at the residence of the respondent. The FIs did not record any personal information that could lead to later identification of the respondents. The FIs, often accompanied by a coordinator from Sigma, ensured that standard interview protocols were practised and that all information collected in the course of the field work was kept strictly confidential.

Prior to the commencement of fieldwork, the offices of IGPs of every police range were informed of the KCVS project and the administering of the survey. Furthermore, the FIs were provided with an authorisation letter from Azim Premji University and an identification document by Sigma for the duration of the fieldwork.

Crime is both a sensitive topic and a political issue in many areas. In these cases, questions on victimisation and crime are likely to be received with suspicion and rejection. While the field investigation coordinators noted many interesting incidents, there was one particular instance of FIs being harassed. After local thugs in a certain ward grew suspicious of the field investigation team, the FIs were harassed by local thugs and taken to the police station where they were held till evening. Although the team was released after the police recorded their details, the incident highlighted how even relevant documentation might not help in certain areas.

III.   Final Sample

After completion of the interviews, all the questionnaires were collected and screened. As the questionnaires had been pre-coded, these were used to create a dataset and to check for errors. As Table 2.4 shows, the final sample for KCVS consisted of 2002 respondents from 6 police ranges of Karnataka. The proportion of the respondents in the sample from each police range proportional to the population in Census 2011 with a standard deviation of ~1%. Table 2.5 shows the demographic proportions of the population.

Table 2.4: Final Sample: Census v/s Sample

Police Zones	Number of Respondents	Percent of Sample	State Population	State Percentage
Central	541	27	17165595	28
Northern	379	19	11758337	19

North East	360	18	10040953	16
Southern	283	14	8158627	13
Western	219	11	5842140	10
Eastern	229	11	6955374	11
Total	**2002**	**100**	**61095297**	**100**

Table 2.5: Sample Demographics

Categories		Percentage
Gender	Male	50
	Female	50
Class	Upper Class	26
	Middle Class	40
	Lower Class	33
Urban/Rural	Town/City/Metro	32
	Village	68
Caste category	General	45
	Scheduled Caste	17
	Scheduled Tribe	6
	OBC	18
	Don't know / Can't Say	13
Religion	Hindu	83
	Muslim	13
	Christian	3
	Jain	0
	No religion	0

SCOPE OF KCVS

The KCVS survey is the first of its kind due to its comprehensive treatment of the subject based on views of respondents residing in both urban and rural areas of Karnataka. We do not make causal connections using our observations or propose measures for institutional reform. Based on the survey results, we discover that there is a high proportion of victimisation in Karnataka, at 30% of all survey respondents in the state, as identified by the victims themselves. We understand that despite this, victims do not report crime to the police, for reasons of social stigma, distrust in legal mechanisms or fear of retaliation. This is further complicated by the systematic non-recording of crimes by police.

In our survey, we looked into the following issues:

I.   Perceptions of Safety:

We asked people about their perceptions of fear, safety and security under certain spatial and temporal conditions - in the home, the neighbourhood and on modes of transport used by them.

II.   Crime Victimisation:

We analysed victimisation under four categories of crime - property and economic crimes, crimes against the body, law & order crimes and crimes by government officials and discovered that the actual experiences of crime victimisation reported to us is three times higher than the official victimisation rate recorded by the NCRB. We observed significant variation in the experience of victimisation across demographic markers like gender, caste religion and economic class for the four crime categories we identified.

III.   Reporting Crimes:

We focussed on the survey reporting rate to assess why crimes are reported to the police, which crimes are reported and whether the nature of the offence or a victim's caste, class, religion, gender and geographical location shapes their decision to report. We also examined the modes employed to report such crimes.

IV.   Policing:

We reviewed the police response to reporting of crimes and people's perceptions about the efficacy of criminal justice agencies. We focussed on the citizen experience of policing in response to their complaints, their knowledge of police infrastructure and their levels of satisfaction with policing, and whether they found the police approachable and effective.

V.   Way forward:

Crime victimisation surveys like the KCVS provide more accurate data on crime from the perspective of households and the victims, explore public perceptions of the activities of the police in the prevention of crime and victimisation by crime. In our survey, we note that despite the overall perceptions of security that people feel in their neighbourhood, they are highly

victimised. Official records do not capture this victimisation. Through annual household surveys like the KCVS, we can also check levels of satisfaction and reasons for dissatisfaction of victims with the police and recommend effective measures to remedy these.

As a pan - region crime victimisation survey, KCVS provides a different basis for the understanding of crime in society. It provides supplementary data on the level of crime within the state to support the statistics published annually by local police. The focus is on the views of the public regarding their access to, and effectiveness of the police service. However, as is the case with other indices of crime measurement, KCVS has its limitations too in that it is not as effective in providing a good indication of changes in low volume crimes or in determination of emerging trends of crime in the state. This can be remedied in part by ensuring that similar comprehensive CVSs are regularly conducted on a state wide basis for all Indian states as well as covering the entire country.

The KCVS report will be released at the end of August 2019.

_____