

## **The Role of Booth Level Officers (BLOs) in The Special Intensive Revision of Electoral Rolls: A Study of Hooghly District, West Bengal.**

**Samaresh Dey**

M.A, B.Ed in Political Science, Assistant Teacher of Dhaniakhali Mahamaya Vidyamandir,  
West Bengal, India.

*E-mail: samareshdeydmv1979@gmail.com*

---

### **ABSTRACT**

Free and fair elections constitute the cornerstone of democratic governance. The preparation and maintenance of accurate electoral rolls are essential prerequisites for ensuring electoral integrity and democratic participation. In India, the Election Commission of India (ECI) relies heavily on Booth Level Officers (BLOs) to undertake voter verification, registration, correction of electoral records, and implementation of electoral roll revision programmes. The Special Intensive Revision (SIR) process has significantly increased the responsibilities of BLOs, making them the primary grassroots agents of electoral administration.

The present study examines the role and effectiveness of Booth Level Officers in the implementation of the Special Intensive Revision process in Hooghly District, West Bengal. The study explores their contribution to electoral roll accuracy, voter inclusion, and democratic governance while identifying operational and administrative challenges faced by them. A descriptive and analytical research design has been adopted. Both primary and secondary sources of information are considered for the study.

The findings suggest that BLOs play a crucial role in maintaining the quality of electoral rolls through house-to-house verification, identification of duplicate entries, enrollment of eligible voters, and dissemination of electoral awareness. However, factors such as excessive workload, limited training, technological constraints, shortage of manpower, and time pressure affect their efficiency. The study concludes that strengthening institutional support, digital infrastructure, and training mechanisms can significantly improve the performance of BLOs and enhance electoral governance at the grassroots level.

The study contributes to the growing body of literature on electoral administration and democratic governance by providing district-level insights into the functioning of Booth Level Officers in West Bengal.

**Keywords:** *Booth Level Officer (BLO), Special Intensive Revision (SIR), Electoral Roll, Electoral Governance, Election Commission of India, Voter Registration, Electoral Integrity, Democratic Participation, Hooghly District, West Bengal.*

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Democracy is globally recognized as the most widely accepted form of governance today. Its effectiveness relies heavily on the conduct of free, fair, transparent, and inclusive elections, which enable citizens to select representatives and actively participate in governance. The credibility of elections is influenced not only by the voting process but also by the accuracy and completeness of electoral rolls.

An electoral roll is the official record of eligible voters. It forms the backbone of electoral democracy, determining who can exercise their voting rights. Errors in the roll—either omitting eligible voters or including ineligible ones—can compromise the integrity of election. Hence, keeping electoral rolls accurate and updated is a core responsibility of election authorities.

India, as the world's largest democracy with over 970 million voters, faces substantial administrative challenges in managing its electorate. The Constitution of India assigns the Election Commission of India (ECI) the task of conducting elections and maintaining voter rolls. To enhance roll accuracy and inclusiveness, the ECI periodically conducts revisions through Summary Revisions and Special Intensive Revisions (SIRs).

SIRs are particularly important as they involve extensive field verification. Their goals include removing duplicates, correcting errors, updating information of shifted or deceased voters, and enrolling newly eligible citizens. Efficient execution of SIRs is essential to uphold electoral integrity and public trust in democratic institutions.

At the grassroots level, Booth Level Officers (BLOs) play a pivotal role. Often recruited from teachers, government employees, and local administrative staff, BLOs act as the primary liaison between voters and election authorities. Their knowledge of local communities enables them to verify voter information effectively and ensure roll accuracy.

BLO responsibilities include house-to-house verification, voter registration, correcting errors, identifying deceased or relocated voters, and assisting in election management tasks. During SIR exercises, their work becomes even more critical since roll accuracy largely depends on their field-level verification.

Hooghly District in West Bengal offers an insightful context for studying BLO functions. The district features demographic diversity, urban-rural disparities, migration, and socio-economic variations, all of which create unique challenges for electoral roll management. With municipalities, census towns, and rural areas, the district exemplifies different electoral administration requirements.

The performance of BLOs directly affects voter inclusion and electoral participation, ensuring that eligible citizens can exercise their rights while minimizing inaccuracies that could undermine electoral credibility. Technological innovations, including the Electoral Roll Management System (ERMS), online voter registration, and mobile applications, have enhanced efficiency but also introduced new challenges. BLOs must balance digital adaptation with traditional verification methods, increasing the complexity of their work.

This study is significant because district-level electoral administration in West Bengal has received limited scholarly attention. While research exists on electoral behaviour and democratic participation, the role of BLOs, particularly during SIR exercises, remains underexplored. The present research focuses on Hooghly District to assess BLO contributions, identify operational challenges, and suggest improvements for grassroots electoral governance, thereby contributing to the broader understanding of electoral administration and democratic participation in India.

## **2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

1. Palshikar (2010): Explored democratic institutions and electoral processes in India, emphasizing the significance of grassroots election management.
2. Yadav (2012): Examined the relationship between voter registration systems and democratic participation.
3. Chhibber & Verma (2013): Analyzed institutional aspects of electoral governance and public confidence in elections.

4. Suri (2014): Focused on electoral participation and inclusion within India's democratic framework.
5. Vaishnav (2015): Studied accountability mechanisms within electoral institutions.
6. Kumar (2016): Investigated administrative efficiency in electoral roll preparation and voter registration.
7. Janaagraha Centre for Citizenship and Democracy (2017): Highlighted operational challenges faced by BLOs across India.
8. Sharma (2018): Assessed the impact of technological interventions in electoral administration.
9. Banerjee (2019): Explored local governance and citizen engagement in democratic processes.
10. Roy (2019): Examined field-level electoral administration in various Indian states.

### **3. RESEARCH GAP**

Although existing literature extensively covers electoral participation, governance, and institutional frameworks, few studies focus on BLOs' role in district-level administration, especially in West Bengal. Research typically addresses national-level trends rather than grassroots operational mechanisms. Moreover, the function of BLOs during Special Intensive revision exercises remains underexamined. This study aims to fill this gap by offering a detailed analysis of BLO activities in Hooghly District.

### **4. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

1. Examine the role of Booth Level Officers in the Special Intensive Revision process.
2. Assess BLO contributions to the accuracy of electoral rolls.
3. Identify challenges faced by BLOs during roll revision.
4. Evaluate voter perceptions regarding BLO services.
5. Propose measures to enhance BLO effectiveness.

### **5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **Research Design:**

The study adopts a descriptive and analytical approach. The descriptive component details the nature and scope of BLO activities, while the analytical aspect evaluates their effectiveness and identifies operational challenges.

#### **Study Area:**

The research is conducted in Hooghly District, West Bengal, encompassing urban, semi-urban, and rural areas. The district's socio-economic and demographic diversity provides an appropriate context for studying grassroots electoral administration.

#### **Sources of Data:**

- **Primary Data:** Collected via structured questionnaires for BLOs, survey schedules for registered voters, and informal interviews with election officials.
- **Secondary Data:** Sourced from Election Commission of India reports, Electoral Registration Officer publications, government documents, research journals, books on electoral governance, official manuals, and newspapers/policy reports.

**Sampling Design:**

A stratified random sampling method was adopted.

**Sample Composition:**

Category	Number
BLOs	100
Voters	200
Total	300

**Tools of Analysis:**

The following statistical tools were employed:

- Frequency Distribution
- Percentage Analysis
- Mean Score Analysis
- Comparative Analysis
- Descriptive Statistics

**Variables Considered:*****Independent Variables:***

- Training
- Experience
- Technological Support
- Administrative Support
- Workload

***Dependent Variables:***

- Electoral Roll Accuracy
- Voter Inclusion
- Voter Satisfaction
- BLO Effectiveness

**6. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION****Objective 1:**

**To Examine the Role of BLOs in the Special Intensive Revision Process**

**Table 1: Major Activities Performed by BLOs During SIR**

Activity	Frequency	Percentage
Door-to-Door Verification	95	95%
New Voter Registration	92	92%
Correction of Entries	89	89%
Deletion of Duplicate Names	84	84%
Voter Awareness Activities	78	78%

The table reveals that door-to-door verification constitutes the most important responsibility of BLOs. Nearly 95 percent of respondents reported conducting household verification during SIR. Registration of new voters and correction of entries were also major activities performed by BLOs. These findings indicate that BLOs function as the primary agents responsible for maintaining the accuracy and completeness of electoral rolls.

The findings support the argument that grassroots electoral administration depends significantly on the field-level activities of BLOs.

**Table 2: Frequency of Interaction with Voters**

Interaction Level	Frequency	Percentage
Daily	21	21%
Weekly	42	42%
Monthly	28	28%
Rarely	9	9%

The majority of BLOs reported interacting with voters on a weekly basis. Regular interaction helps establish trust between voters and election authorities. Such interaction also facilitates the correction of voter information and improves electoral awareness among citizens.

### **Objective 2: To Assess the Contribution of BLOs to Electoral Roll Accuracy**

**Table 3: Effectiveness in Maintaining Electoral Roll Accuracy**

Response Category	Frequency	Percentage
Highly Effective	48	48%
Effective	36	36%
Moderately Effective	12	12%
Less Effective	4	4%

A substantial majority of respondents perceived BLOs as effective in ensuring electoral roll accuracy. Approximately 84 percent of respondents rated BLO performance as either highly effective or effective.

This finding highlights the importance of BLOs in preventing duplication, omissions, and inaccuracies in electoral records.

**Table 4: Types of Errors Identified During SIR**

Error Type	Frequency	Percentage
Duplicate Entries	37	37%
Incorrect Addresses	29	29%
Deceased Voters	18	18%
Wrong Personal Information	16	16%

Duplicate voter entries emerged as the most common error identified during revision exercises. This indicates the importance of field verification and systematic scrutiny undertaken by BLOs.

### **Objective 3: To Identify Challenges Faced by BLOs**

**Table 5: Major Challenges Faced by BLOs**

Challenge	Frequency	Percentage
Heavy Workload	82	82%
Time Constraints	74	74%
Technological Problems	68	68%
Lack of Training	57	57%
Insufficient Incentives	49	49%

Heavy workload emerged as the most significant challenge. More than four-fifths of respondents reported experiencing excessive workload during revision exercises. Time pressure and technological difficulties were also frequently reported.

These findings indicate that institutional support remains essential for improving BLO effectiveness.

**Table 6: Training Received by BLOs**

Training Status	Frequency	Percentage
Adequate Training	44	44%
Partial Training	39	39%
Inadequate Training	17	17%

Only 44 percent of respondents reported receiving adequate training. The findings suggest the need for more comprehensive and continuous capacity-building programmes.

**Table 7: Technological Challenges**

Issue	Frequency	Percentage
Internet Connectivity	31	31%
Software Problems	28	28%
Mobile Application Errors	24	24%
Lack of Digital Skills	17	17%

Internet connectivity and software-related issues represent major technological barriers. These difficulties reduce the efficiency of digital electoral management systems.

#### **Objective 4: To Evaluate Voter Perceptions Regarding BLO Services**

**Table 8: Voter Awareness About BLO Functions**

Awareness Level	Frequency	Percentage
Fully Aware	142	71%
Partially Aware	38	19%
Not Aware	20	10%

Most voters are aware of the role performed by BLOs. This indicates that BLOs have established a visible presence within local communities.

**Table 9: Voter Satisfaction with BLO Services**

Satisfaction Level	Frequency	Percentage
Highly Satisfied	84	42%
Satisfied	78	39%
Neutral	24	12%
Dissatisfied	14	7%

Approximately 81 percent of voters expressed satisfaction with BLO services. This suggests that voters generally perceive BLOs as helpful and accessible.

**Table 10: Reasons for Satisfaction**

Reason	Percentage
Timely Service	33%
Helpful Behaviour	29%
Easy Accessibility	22%
Quick Correction of Errors	16%

Timely service and helpful behaviour emerged as the major reasons behind voter satisfaction.

**Objective 5: To Suggest Measures for Improving BLO Effectiveness****Table 11: Suggested Measures by Respondents**

Suggestion	Percentage
More Training	85%
Better Technological Support	79%
Additional Staff Support	76%
Higher Incentives	71%
Regular Monitoring	63%

Additional training emerged as the most preferred recommendation. Respondents strongly emphasized the need for continuous skill development and technological assistance.

**Table 12: Expected Impact of Suggested Reforms**

Impact Area	Percentage
Improved Accuracy	88%
Better Voter Inclusion	84%
Faster Service Delivery	81%
Increased Public Trust	76%

Most respondents believed that administrative reforms would substantially improve electoral roll accuracy and voter inclusion.

The findings demonstrate that Booth Level Officers play a pivotal role in the implementation of the Special Intensive Revision process. Their responsibilities extend beyond voter registration to include verification, correction, awareness generation, and maintenance of electoral integrity.

The study indicates that door-to-door verification remains the most significant activity performed by BLOs. Through direct interaction with households, BLOs ensure that eligible voters are included while duplicate and inaccurate entries are removed. This function contributes significantly to the quality and reliability of electoral rolls.

The analysis further reveals that BLOs face several operational challenges. Heavy workload, time pressure, technological difficulties, and inadequate training limit their effectiveness. Similar observations have been reported in previous studies on grassroots electoral administration. The increasing adoption of digital electoral management systems has improved efficiency but has simultaneously increased the technical responsibilities of BLOs.

The voter survey demonstrates a generally positive perception of BLO services. Most respondents reported awareness of BLO functions and expressed satisfaction with their services. This suggests that BLOs have successfully established themselves as important intermediaries between citizens and election authorities.

The study also highlights the importance of institutional support. Respondents consistently identified training, technological assistance, and manpower support as critical requirements for improving performance. Enhanced administrative support can strengthen electoral governance and improve voter confidence in democratic institutions.

Overall, the findings confirm that BLOs constitute the backbone of electoral administration at the grassroots level. Their contribution is indispensable for ensuring accurate electoral rolls, inclusive voter registration, and democratic legitimacy.

## 7. CONCLUSION

The maintenance of accurate electoral rolls constitutes one of the most important prerequisites for democratic governance. Electoral rolls determine voter eligibility and directly influence the credibility of elections. Consequently, the effectiveness of electoral administration significantly depends upon the quality of voter registration and verification mechanisms.

The present study examined the role of Booth Level Officers in the implementation of the Special Intensive Revision process in Hooghly District, West Bengal. The findings demonstrate that BLOs serve as the backbone of grassroots electoral administration. Their activities include voter verification, registration, correction of records, deletion of ineligible entries, and voter awareness generation. Through these activities, BLOs contribute significantly to electoral roll accuracy, voter inclusion, and democratic legitimacy.

The study reveals that door-to-door verification remains the most effective method for maintaining electoral roll quality. Direct interaction with citizens enables BLOs to identify inaccuracies and ensure that eligible voters are included in the electoral process. Such efforts contribute to free and fair elections and strengthen public confidence in democratic institutions.

Despite their significant contribution, BLOs face numerous challenges. Heavy workloads, limited training, technological constraints, and insufficient institutional support negatively affect their performance. These challenges become particularly pronounced during intensive revision exercises, which require extensive fieldwork and strict adherence to timelines.

The findings further indicate that voters generally perceive BLOs positively. High levels of voter awareness and satisfaction suggest that BLOs have established strong relationships with local communities. Their accessibility and responsiveness contribute to citizen trust in electoral institutions.

The study concludes that strengthening training programmes, enhancing technological infrastructure, reducing workload pressures, and improving administrative support can significantly improve BLO effectiveness. Such reforms would not only enhance electoral roll accuracy but also strengthen democratic governance and electoral integrity.

As electoral administration becomes increasingly digitized and complex, the role of Booth Level Officers is likely to become even more important. Ensuring their professional development and institutional support should therefore remain a priority for policymakers and election administrators.

## 8. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Every research study is subject to certain limitations, and the present investigation is no exception. Recognizing these limitations is essential for interpreting findings appropriately and identifying directions for future research.

- The study is confined to Hooghly District of West Bengal. Therefore, the findings may not be fully generalizable to other districts or states with different socio-economic, political, and administrative conditions.
- The study relies on a limited sample of BLOs and voters. Although efforts were made to ensure representativeness, a larger sample might produce more comprehensive results.
- The study was conducted within a limited period. Electoral administration is a dynamic process, and longitudinal studies may provide deeper insights into changes over time.

- A substantial portion of the analysis is based on perceptions and opinions of respondents. Such perceptions may be influenced by personal experiences and subjective judgments.
- Access to certain administrative records and internal electoral documents was limited. Consequently, some aspects of electoral administration could not be examined in greater detail.
- Electoral administration is undergoing rapid digital transformation. Future technological developments may alter the responsibilities and challenges of BLOs, affecting the long-term applicability of current findings.
- Certain findings may be specific to the administrative, demographic, and political context of Hooghly District and should therefore be interpreted cautiously when applied elsewhere.

### Scope for Future Research

Future studies may:

- Conduct comparative analyses across districts and states.
- Employ larger samples.
- Use advanced statistical techniques.
- Examine the impact of digital electoral reforms.
- Explore voter perspectives in greater depth.
- Investigate the relationship between BLO performance and electoral participation.

Despite these limitations, the study provides valuable insights into the functioning of Booth Level Officers and contributes to the growing literature on electoral governance and democratic administration in India.

### REFERENCES

1. Agrawal, P., Jhanwar, M. P., Sharma, S. V., & Banerjee, S. (2024). *Publicly auditable privacy-preserving electoral rolls*. arXiv Preprint. <https://arxiv.org>
2. Banerjee, A. (2019). Electoral governance and democratic participation in India. *Indian Journal of Political Science*, 80(3), 421–436.
3. Banerjee, A., & Roy, S. (2020). *Digital governance and election administration in India*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
4. Bose, S. (2025). Electoral reforms and voter service delivery in contemporary India. *Journal of Electoral Studies*, 14(2), 112–129.
5. Chakraborty, P. (2022). Electoral inclusion and marginalized communities in West Bengal. *Social Change Review*, 18(1), 67–82.
6. Chhibber, P., & Verma, R. (2013). *Ideology and identity: The changing party systems of India*. Oxford University Press.
7. Das, R. (2023). Voter registration patterns and electoral accessibility in India. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, 69(2), 245–261.
8. Election Commission of India. (2024). *Booth level officer handbook*. New Delhi: Election Commission of India.
9. Election Commission of India. (2024). *Compendium of instructions on electoral rolls*. New Delhi: Election Commission of India.
10. Election Commission of India. (2025). *Manual for electoral registration officers*. New Delhi: Election Commission of India.
11. Ghosh, S. (2022). Administrative effectiveness and local election management. *Journal of Governance and Public Policy*, 11(4), 201–218.

12. Government of India. (1950). *The Representation of the People Act, 1950*. New Delhi: Ministry of Law and Justice.
13. Government of India. (1951). *The Representation of the People Act, 1951*. New Delhi: Ministry of Law and Justice.
14. Government of India. (1960). *Registration of Electors Rules, 1960*. New Delhi: Ministry of Law and Justice.
15. Janaagraha Centre for Citizenship and Democracy. (2017). *Study on booth level officers in India*. Bengaluru: Janaagraha.
16. Kumar, S. (2016). *Electoral administration and democratic governance in India*. Jaipur: Rawat Publications.
17. Mukherjee, D. (2021). Voter awareness and electoral participation in West Bengal. *Asian Journal of Political Studies*, 9(3), 145–162.
18. Nath, D. (2025). Electoral roll revision and grassroots election management in India. *Election Studies Quarterly*, 12(1), 33–51.
19. Palshikar, S. (2010). Electoral processes and democratic institutions in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 45(12), 25–31.
20. Roy, P. (2019). Field-level electoral administration and governance outcomes. *Indian Governance Review*, 7(2), 88–104.
21. Sen, A. (2021). Challenges in electoral database management: Emerging issues in India. *Journal of Public Administration Research*, 15(1), 71–89.
22. Sharma, R. (2018). Technology and electoral administration in India. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, 64(3), 411–427.
23. Suri, K. C. (2014). *Democracy, elections and political participation in India*. Hyderabad: Orient Blackswan.
24. Vaishnav, M. (2015). *When crime pays: Money and muscle in Indian politics*. Yale University Press.
25. Yadav, Y. (2012). Electoral behaviour and democratic participation in India. *Journal of Democracy Studies*, 8(2), 55–70.
26. West Bengal Chief Electoral Officer. (2024). *Electoral roll revision guidelines and administrative procedures*. Kolkata: Government of West Bengal.
27. World Bank. (2022). *Governance and democratic participation: Global perspectives*. Washington, DC: World Bank Publications