CHAPTER VI
PROFILE OF THE SAMPLE

INTRODUCTION

The sample, of which a profile is presented in this chapter, consists of 314 students randomly selected out of a universe of students studying for the Master's Degree in Calcutta University in the session 1986-1988.

SOCIAL BACKGROUND

ORIGIN

A convenient way of classifying people is according to their place of origin. A person may either be a ruralite or an urbanite. Rural and urban communities do not merely depict geographical location. They are two distinct modes of community life.¹

81 students (25.8%) in the sample come from rural areas and 233 students (74.2%) come from urban areas. Thus the sample is overwhelmingly urban in its composition. This finding agrees with that of B.V. Shah.²

Again, from the data we find that while 25.8% of the students come from rural area, 50.6% come from Calcutta, 0.6% from other state capitals and 22.9% from other urban centres. Thus Calcuttans form the major chunk of the clientele of Calcutta University. (See Fig.1)
Since Calcutta University is located in the state of West Bengal, it is natural to expect that the vast majority of the students will be from West Bengal. In fact, of the 314 students in the sample, 305 students (97.13%) are residents of West Bengal. 9 students (2.95%) come from states outside West Bengal. At the time of the survey (1988-89), Tripura had no university of its own. It was under Calcutta University. Hence it is natural to find students from Tripura in Calcutta University. In fact 4 out of the 9 students (44.44%) who had come from outside the state were from Tripura. Of the rest, one student came from Uttar Pradesh, two from Bihar, one from Kerala and one from Delhi.

**SEX**

A convenient means of classifying people is the gender-wise division into males and females.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No.2</th>
<th>Distribution of male and female students from rural and urban areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 41.543, \text{ df } = 1, \text{ P } = 0.0000 \]
In the present sample 133 (42.4%) are males while 181 (57.6%) are females. Thus females outnumber males. Of the rural respondents the males are in a majority. 59 rural students, i.e., 72.8% of the rural students, are males. (See Table No.2). In contrast, in the urban areas, it is the females who are in the majority. 159 urban students (68.2% of the urban respondents) are females. There is, thus, a significant variation in the ecological origins of male and female students in Calcutta University.

A plausible explanation for this variation may be found in the data in Table 2. We know that 74.2% of the sample is urban while 25.8% is rural. This indicates that rural areas lag behind the urban areas so far as higher education is concerned. In the rural areas too, it is the girls who are mostly discriminated against as far as education is concerned. This is evident from the fact that 73% of the rural studentry are boys. Thus it is the males in the family who are generally allowed to take advantage of higher education.

In urban areas, however, there is less discrimination against females. The boys, moreover, are less likely to be interested in higher education because they are compelled by economic reasons to search for employment or study technical or professional courses which increase their employment prospects. It is also not unusual for urban male students to drop out of the University if they manage to secure a job while
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studying. Females in urban areas, in contrast to their male counterparts, are less burdened with the compulsion of seeking employment immediately after graduation. Most of the girls who can afford it therefore go for higher studies for improving their marital and job prospects. That accounts for their preponderance in the urban sample (68.2% urban students are females in contrast to 31.8% males).

AGE

The age of the respondents varies from 21 years to 40 years. 284 students (90.4%) are aged between 21-25 years. 14 students (4.5%) are between 26-30 years. 9 (2.9%) are aged between 31-35 years. 7 (2.2%) are aged between 36-40 years. We also find that 97.8% of the respondents are aged within 35 years. Thus the overwhelming majority of the students are youths, according to the definition of S.S. Saraswati, who, in her *Youth in India* (1988) defined youth demographically as being between 15 and 34 years.

Sexwise, there is a significant difference in the ages of males and females, \( \chi^2 = 17.656, \text{ df} = 3, P = 0.0005 \). Compared to 82.7% of the boys who are between 21-25 years of age, 96.1% of the girls are in this age group. 6.8% of the males and 2.8% of the females are aged between 26-30 years, 6% of the males and 0.6% of the females are aged between 31-35 years, 4.5% of the males and 0.6% of the females are aged between 36-40 years. Thus the girls are younger than the boys. A greater percentage of the girls (99.5%) are youths in contrast to the boys (95.5%). My findings agree with the findings of Krishna Chakraborty. In her *The University Student: Background Profile and Stance* (1985), she also found that in Calcutta University, girls are younger than boys.
RELIGION

Like age, sex and place of origin, religion is also an important social attribute. From the data we find that out of 314 students, 300 (95.5%) are Hindus, 12 (3.8%) are Muslims, 2 (0.6%) belong to other religions (Of these two, one is a Jain while the other is a Buddhist). We find that there is no significant association between either sex and religion or place of origin and religion.

CASTE

Caste is an important indicator of social status in Hindu society, its peculiarity being that it is confined to Hindu society. Ghurye defined caste as a social grouping characterised by 1) segmental division of society; 2) hierarchy; 3) restrictions on feeding and social intercourse; 4) civil and religious privileges and disabilities of different sections; 5) lack of unrestricted choice of occupation and 6) restrictions on marriage. Hindu society is divided into a multitude of castes and sub-castes. For operational convenience, I have made a five-fold classification of castes. These are Brahmins, Non-Brahmin High Castes, Non-Brahmin Low Castes, Scheduled Castes and Casteless religions. For the purpose of analysis I have deliberately excluded the last category and also those who refused to state their caste.
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Brahmins are socially the highest in social status among the Hindu castes and at one time held virtual monopoly not only of the priestly functions but also of all traditional learning. Even today they have the sole right of priesthood and presiding over religious ceremonies. In our sample of 293 Hindus, 97 (33.10%) are Brahmins. Next in importance in the caste hierarchy are the literate and warrior non-Brahmin High castes like Vaidya, Kayasthas, Rajputs, etc. 114 (38.9%) come from these castes. Near the bottom of the hierarchy are the agricultural, trading and toiling castes who have been classified under non-Brahmin low castes. Trading castes like Mahishya, and other castes pursuing service and artisan trades like barbers (Napit), potters (Kumars), Smith (Kamar) etc. belong to this group. 66 students, comprising 22.52% of the sample, belong to this group. At the bottom of the hierarchy are the Scheduled Castes who are regarded as beyond the pale of Hindu society. Gandhi called them Harijans. The list of Scheduled Castes is specified for each state. The Constitution makes it obligatory to reserve 22½% of the total seats in a government-aided educational institution for Scheduled Castes.

However, the Scheduled Castes (comprising castes like shoemaker (Muchi), undertaker (Dom), etc. who are mainly engaged in polluting occupations are only meagrely represented in the sample. Only 16 students, i.e. 5.46% come from this category. That only 5.46% of the sample are Scheduled Castes still lag far behind the rest of society in education. Our finding, that the majority of the students (72%) come from high
castes (i.e., Brahmin and non-Brahmin High Castes, supports the findings of a number of scholars like Rajendra Pandey and B.V. Shah, H.D. Lakhshminarayana, K.D. Gangrade and A.B. Shinde.

MOTHER TONGUE

The overwhelming majority of the respondents are Bengalis. Thus 294 students, comprising 93.63% of the sample are Bengalis. 20 respondents (6.37%) do not speak Bengali. We find that Hindi, Urdu, Nepali and Malayalam are the major languages which are represented in the sample.

FAMILY TYPE

A family is "a group defined by sex relationship sufficiently precise and enduring for the procreation and upbringing of children." The family is the most important primary group in society. As Goode pointed out, it is the only social institution other than religion which is formally developed in all societies. It is the fundamental institutional foundation of the larger social structure, in which all other institutions depend on its contributions.

Families may be divided into two basic types: nuclear and joint. A nuclear family may be operationally defined as a social unit consisting of a man and a woman united by marriage and their unmarried offspring. A joint family may be defined as a social unit in which two or more generations live under one roof, share a common hearth and have undivided property."
From our data we find that 201 students come from nuclear families and 113 come from joint families. In percentage terms 64% are from nuclear families and 36% are from joint families. Further investigations revealed that there is a close association between family and place of origin.

Table No.3 Distribution of family types in rural and urban areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(54.3%)</td>
<td>(67.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(45.7%)</td>
<td>(32.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 4.451, \quad df = 1, \quad P = 0.0349$

From Table No.3 it is evident that there is a difference in the distribution of nuclear and joint families in the rural and urban areas. It is found that in the rural areas, 44 (54.3%) students come from nuclear families whereas 37 (45.7%) students are from joint families. In contrast 157 (67.4%) urban families are nuclear while 76 (32.6%) urban families are joint. Thus there is a significant difference in the distribution of joint families. There are more joint families in the countryside than in urban areas though in both cases the joint families are in a minority. 45.7% of the families in rural areas are joint in contrast to 32.6% in the urban areas.
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The greater percentage of joint families in rural areas may be due to several reasons. In the rural areas living jointly is more socially and economically feasible than in urban areas. There is the need for manpower for agriculture. The bigger the family, the greater is the internal resources of the family that can be utilised. As K.M. Kapadia rightly pointed out:

The Indian farmer used to be producer, seller, labourer and investor combined. Each of these functions can be performed efficiently and to the advantage of the family if the family is a joint one. Attendance to social calls ... is facilitated by the joint family.12

In urban areas, there are more nuclear families than in rural areas. This is possibly because shortage of living space, different occupational opportunities that arise in the urban environment and the unwillingness of the younger generation to live within the joint family set up, lead to the splitting up of the joint family and the founding of nuclear families.13

FAMILY SIZE

It is interesting to note the size of the families of the respondents. 158 families, comprising 48.7% of the sample, were small families having up to 5 members, 13 families (41.4%) were medium sized, having up to 10 members, 23 families (7.3%)...
were large families, having up to 15 members and the rest, 7 families (2.2%) were very large families, having more than 15 members.

PREFERENCE FOR FAMILY TYPES

The students were asked what type of family they preferred to live in. 10 respondents (3.2%) were undecided. 149 (47.5%) preferred nuclear families and 155 (49.4%) preferred joint families. From the data it appears that the students are more or less equally divided in their family preferences. In this respect our findings differ significantly from B.V. Shah, who in his Social Change and College Student of Gujarat (1964) found that only a minority of students (16%) were against the joint family (p.38).

Table No.4 Rural-urban differences in preferences for family types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Family preferences</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2 (2.5%)</td>
<td>28 (34.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>8 (3.4%)</td>
<td>121 (51.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 8.084, \quad df = 1, \quad P = 0.0176 \]

If we make a deeper analysis of the responses we will find that there is considerable difference of opinion among respondents. From Table 4 we find that the nuclear
family was liked by 28, i.e. 34.6%, of the rural respondents, in contrast to 121, or 51.9%, of the urban respondents. Again, 51, i.e., 65% of the rural respondents, liked the joint family in contrast to 104, or 44%, of the urban respondents. Thus, there is an interesting variation in the preference for family types among rural and urban students. A greater percentage of the rural students (65%) prefer the joint family in contrast to the urban students, a greater percentage of whom (51.9%) prefer the nuclear family.

The reason for this difference lies in the economic and cultural differences between the two types of communities. The rural order is agrarian and stable. As mentioned earlier, the character of rural occupations is such that it requires the labour of the whole family. That apart, the cultural conditions of the rural areas favour the joint family at the expense of the nuclear family. The rural folk are much more attached to their natal families than the urbanites. The desire for separate families is therefore less than in the urban areas.

In urban areas, the joint family has more or less outlived its economic utility. The younger generation does not show any predisposition to live in the natal family. The desire for independence from the control of elders is very strong among urban youth and the spirit of accommodation and adjustment is lacking. The shortage of living space means that one must of necessity live in small flats and this has a deleterious impact on the joint family. Nevertheless, it is also true that the feeling of jointness lives on among members
of erstwhile joint family members who have been compelled to set up separate households for some reason or other.

Table No. 5 Male-Female differences in preference for family types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Family preference</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>Joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35.3%)</td>
<td>(60.9%)</td>
<td>(3.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(68.5%)</td>
<td>(40.9%)</td>
<td>(2.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 7.023, \quad df = 1, \quad p = 0.0080$

Males and females also significantly differ in their family preferences (See Table 5). 47 males (or 35.3% of the male respondents) prefer to live in nuclear families in contrast to 102 females (or 68.5% of the females). 81 males (60.9%) prefer joint families in contrast to 74 (40.9%) females. Thus there is a marked divergence among the sexes with regard to their family preferences. It is found that boys are more interested in living in joint families than girls who prefer living in nuclear families. Such a significant divergence of opinion about the family among the sexes has been noticed by other researchers also. In Merchant's inquiry of 277 students, it was found that the girl students in general disfavoured the joint-family. Kapadia has given a plausible explanation for this.
The relations between a wife and her mother-in-law are not usually cordial. Not only has the woman to put up with indignities arising from this inimical relationship but her life with her husband becomes strained by the impact of an unfriendly, and at times even hostile, attitude of her elders. Women also find the family atmosphere suffocating on account of inhibitions introduced by conventional etiquette surrounding sex and age. It was the knowledge of these emotional stresses and strains that provoked the girl students to express discontent against the joint family. 14

Kapadia's explanation, I think, holds good for the present sample also.

MARITAL STATUS

265 students (84.4%) in the sample reported that they were single and 49 students (15.6%) were married. Thus the overwhelming majority of the respondents were unmarried. Sexwise, 117 (88%) of the males and 148 (81.8%) of the females were single. 16 (12%) males and 33 (18.2%) females were married. In terms of rural-urban origin, it was found that 71 rural students and 194 urban students were single. In percentage terms, 87.7% of the rural and 83.3% of the urban students were single. 12.3% of the rural students and 16.7% of the urban students were married.
Shelter is an essential requirement of man along with food and clothing. The kind of accommodation one gets reflects his and his family's status and lifestyle. 30 students (9.6%) lived in hostels but lived in brickbuilt houses at home. 20 students (6.4%) lived in hostels but lived in mud houses in their native place. Thus 50 students (15.92%) lived in hostels. 7 students (2.23%) lived in rented mud huts while 54 (17.2%) lived in rented brickbuilt houses. 48 (15.3%) were commuters who had their own brick houses in their native place. 8 (2.55%) were commuters who had mud huts in their native place. 100 students (31.85%) lived in their family's own house/flat in Calcutta. 12 (3.82%) resided in official quarters. 35 (11.15%) cases proved to be difficult to analyse. These did not fit any of the above mentioned categories. These respondents lived in various types of houses - built of wood and tin, partly built of brick with tiled or corrugated tin roofs, etc., such as those which are found in urban slums.

On further analysis it was found that 38 (46.91%) students from rural areas resided in hostels in contrast to 12 (5.15%) students from urban areas. 6 rural students (7.41%) lived in rented huts and houses, compared to 55 (23.61%) urban students. 25 rural students (30.86%) were commuters in contrast to 31 (13.30%) urban students.

From the above data we find that
1) More rural students lived in hostels compared to urban students. In percentage terms, 36.91% students from rural areas lived in hostels compared to 5.15% urban students. This may be mainly due to the fact that many rural areas are located deep in the interiors. Communications with Calcutta are very poor. The lucky few who eventually succeed in gaining admission to the university are compelled to stay in hostels for the prosecution of their studies since commuting from home is impossible for them.

2) More rural students (30.86%) commute from home than urban students (13.30%). This may be explained by the fact that a large chunk of the urban students either own houses in Calcutta or stay in rented quarters in Calcutta. Thus they do not find the necessity to commute to and from Calcutta by train. Students of rural areas which are close to the railway line find it more convenient to commute to Calcutta than stay in the city.

**ECONOMIC BACKGROUND**

One way of determining the economic status of a person is to have a look at his income.

**FAMILY INCOME**

The family income gives us a rough and ready measure of the economic status of the respondents.
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In the sample we find that the family income of the respondents ranges from Rs. 100/- per month to Rs. 30,000/- per month.

Among the respondents, 58 (18.5%) have a family income of upto Rs.1000/- per month, 78 (24.8%) come from families that have incomes of Rs.1001-2000, 80 (25.5%) are in the range between Rs.2001 and 3000/-, 45 (14.3%) come from families with monthly incomes from Rs.3001 upto Rs.4000/-, 25 (8%) are in the range of Rs.4001-5000, 5 (1.6%) come from families with an income of Rs.5001-Rs.6000/-, 4 (1.3%) come from families with an income from Rs.6001-9000/-, 5 (1.6%) have an income from Rs.7001 to Rs.8000, 3 (1%) have a monthly income from Rs.8001-9000 and 11 (3.5%) have an income of Rs.9001 and above. The median income of the group is Rs.2,263/- per month. (See Fig 5).

For analytical purposes these income categories among the students have been merged into three broad income groups as follows -

a) Upto Rs.3000/- per month - Lower Income Group (LIG).

b) Rs.3001-6000 per month - Middle Income Group (MIG).

c) Rs.6001/- and above - Higher Income Group (HIG).

Using this threefold classification, we find that 216 students (68.8%) come from the lower income group, 75 students (23.9%) from the middle income group, and only 23 students (7.3%) come from the higher income group.
There is a significant difference between the economic status of rural and urban students. From the data we find that out of 81 rural students, 75 students; i.e., 92.6% of the rural students, came from the lower income group. In contrast, out of 233 urban students, 141, or 60.5% of the urban students, came from the lower income group. Only 3 rural students, or 3.7% of the rural students, came from the Middle Income Group. By contrast, 72 urban students (30.9%) came from the Middle Income Group. 3 rural students (3.7%) came from the Higher Income Group, in contrast to 20 urban students (8.6%). From the above figures it is clear that students of rural areas are poorer than students of urban areas. B.V. Shah, in his Social Change and College Students of Gujarat (1964) (p.34), comes to similar conclusions. He showed that a greater percentage of students from upper income groups come from the cities while a greater percentage of rural students come from lower income groups. He also established a correlation between economic status and educational status.

MAIN EARNER

The students were asked who was the main earner in the family. 192 (61.15%) respondents reported that the father was the main earner, 8 (2.5%) the mother. 42 (13.4%) reported that their brothers were main earners, and 5 (1.6%) their sisters. 17 married women (5.4%) reported that their husbands were main earners. Eleven (3.5%) reported no main earners. This may mean either that no one was earning at present or
it was a family business in which everyone participated.
14 respondents (4.5%) reported that they were the main earners in their families. 19 (6.1%) reported a combination of relatives, e.g. father and brother, or father and uncle etc. as the main earners. 6 students (1.6%) reported that grandfathers, uncles, etc. were the main earners.

**OCCUPATION OF MAIN EARNER**

The students were asked about the occupation of the main earner. 17 (5.4%) were agriculturists. 54 (17.2%) were in business or industry. 42 (13.4%) were in the teaching profession. 60 (19.1%) were professionals. 24 (7.6%) were civil servants. 18 (5.7%) were business executives. 39 (12.4%) were White Collar employees like typists and stenographers. 17 (5.4%) were pensioners. In case of 19 respondents (6.1%) the main earners pursued a combination of professions. 24 respondents (7.6%) reported other occupations like industrial worker, orderlies, gatekeepers, etc.

Thus it is found that 58.2% of the main earners were engaged in white collar occupations. 45.8% of them were engaged in high status occupations like teaching, civil and administration, business administration, etc. My findings are similar to those of B.V. Shah (1964) who found that students coming for higher education have fathers in high status occupations. 
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EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

The respondents were asked details about their educational background. The responses may be classified into two categories: educational background of parents and educational background of the respondents.

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF PARENTS

The educational background of parents may be divided into two categories: education of father and education of mother.

EDUCATION OF FATHER

On the education of father, it was found that 4 respondents (1.3%) did not respond. Hence, in these four cases the educational status of the father could not be determined. Four fathers (1.3%) were illiterate, five (1.6%) had studied up to the primary level (K.G. - Class V), 17 (5.4%) were non-matric, i.e., they had read up to Class VIII and beyond but not passed the Matriculation or School Leaving Examination, 63 fathers (20.1%) were matriculates, 16 (5.1%) passed the Intermediate Examination which is taken before entering the degree course, 86 (27.4%) were graduates, i.e., they had taken the Bachelor's Degree, 34 (10.8%) had taken the Masters' Degree, \( \text{and} \) 39 (12.4%) had taken professional degrees like law (L.I.B.), Management (M.B.A.), Physical (M.B.B.S. M.S.,) etc. One father (0.3%) had a Doctorate (Ph.D.) degree. 35 fathers had taken a combination of degrees. For example, a Master's Degree holder may also take a degree in teaching (B.Ed.). 10 fathers had taken certificates or diplomas.
which do not fall within the present classification. Instances of acquiring post-matric technical or vocational qualifications like a certificate course at an Industrial Training Institute, a certificate in Hotel Management and Catering, a diploma in Foreign Trade, etc. are not rare. These fathers may have taken one of these certificates or diplomas. (See Fig 6.)

EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS OF MOTHERS

The educational qualifications of the mothers is lower than that of the fathers. 7 students (2.2%) did not respond to this question while one (0.3%) did not know mother's educational qualifications. Compared to 4 illiterate fathers (1.3%) we find 13 illiterate mothers (4.1%). Compared to 5 fathers (1.6%) who studied up to the primary level, we find that there are 24 (7.6%) primary level mothers. Compared to 63 (20.1%) matriculate fathers there are 91 (29.0%) matriculate mothers. There are 62 (19.75%) graduate mothers compared to 86 (27.4%) graduate fathers. Compared to 34 Masters Degree holder fathers (10.8%) there were 17 (5.4%) Masters Degree holders among mothers. Compared to 39 fathers (12.4%) having professional qualifications, there were only 2 mothers (0.6%) having such qualifications. 35 fathers held a combination of degrees (11.1%) compared to 11 mothers (3.5%). Other qualifications like post-matric technical qualifications were held by 10 (3.2%) fathers, compared to 2 (0.6%) mothers. (See Fig 6)

The lower educational qualifications of mothers may be
due to the fact that women's education has all along been neglected. And the educational opportunities for women some twenty or thirty years ago were even less than those at present.

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF STUDENTS

The school is the institution that initiates the child into the world of learning. The child's performance in school largely determines his future educational prospects. On the basis of location, Schools may be divided into three types: Rural schools, Calcutta schools and other urban schools.

From the data it is found that 70 students (22.3%) studied in rural schools, 155 (49.4%) studied in Calcutta schools and 89 (28.3%) in urban schools outside Calcutta.

MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION

Schools in India may be divided, on the basis of the medium of instruction, into two main types - Schools which impart instruction solely through English and schools which impart instruction through an Indian language. In English medium schools, English is the sole language of instruction. That apart, the atmosphere of these schools has a distinctly western flavour. Their steep fees ensure that only the rich or well-to-do can afford them. The rich, the *nouveau riche*, and those sections of the middle class who aspire their children to join the ranks of the elite prefer to send their wards to English medium schools. 65 respondents i.e., 20.7% come from English medium schools.
In contrast to English medium schools, there are schools in which the Indian languages like Bengali or Hindi are the medium of instruction. It would be more appropriate to call them vernacular schools. Here instruction is imparted through the mother tongue. They are subsidised by the government. In some states like West Bengal, education up to the Higher Secondary level has been made totally free. These schools, which are generally affiliated to the West Bengal Board of Secondary Education, place education within the reach of all classes of people, especially the poor. 249 students, i.e., 79.3% of the sample, come from these schools.

**COLLEGE**

Colleges are the institutions where the Bachelor's Degree Courses are taught. All the students had to pass through college prior to entering the university. They were asked which college they studied in. These were grouped into three categories - Rural Colleges, Calcutta Colleges and Other Urban Colleges.

It was found that 14 students came from rural colleges. That is, 4.5% of the students came from rural colleges. This indicates that higher education is slowly spreading to rural areas, as colleges are being established there. 221 students (70.4%) studied in colleges in Calcutta. This indicates that Calcutta colleges continue to draw students from the districts. Apart from 159 Calcutta students, 62 students from the districts have studied in colleges in Calcutta. 79 students (25.2%) come from urban colleges outside Calcutta.
COURSE STUDIED

The different types of courses attract different types of students. Students in our sample come from various disciplines. These have been grouped into five streams - Science, Social Science, Humanities, Commerce and Professional Courses. We find that there is a marked variation among male and female students in the choice of courses.

Table No. 6 Sexwise distribution of courses studied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22.6%)</td>
<td>(10.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15.0%)</td>
<td>(49.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15.8%)</td>
<td>(27.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21.8%)</td>
<td>(3.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24.8%)</td>
<td>(9.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 71.201, \quad df = 4, \quad P = 0.00 \]

From Table 6 we find that sex and course are closely associated. Among both males and females we find a distinct pattern of enrolment in the different types of courses.

Male students have a distinct pattern of preferences for
the various types of courses. We find that career aspects of a course have been given top priority. That is why professional courses have attracted the highest percentage of male students (24.8%) followed by Science (22.6%), Commerce (21.8%), Humanities (15.8%) and Social Sciences (15%).

Females, on the other hand, seem more interested in the intellectual aspects of the courses. Social Sciences attract the highest percentage of girls (49.2%) followed by Humanities (27.1%), Science (10.5%), Professional (9%), and Commerce (3.3%).

From the above data we find that while males are attracted most to what Metta Spencer 17 termed 'Professional' courses (including Commerce), females are attracted more to the 'Intellectual' courses (including Humanities and Social Sciences). Krishna Chakraborty, 18 who studied Calcutta University students also finds that girls are overwhelmingly represented in what she calls the 'Arts' disciplines, namely Humanities and Social Sciences.

WHY HIGHER EDUCATION?

Researchers on student youth have often asked students the purpose of coming for higher education. Rajendra Pandey 19 (1975), for example, inquired into the educational values of college youth. In present study also the respondents were asked why they had come for higher education. 2 students (0.6%) did not reply and have been excluded for the purpose of analysis.
Of 312 students, 148 students (47.43%) claimed that the prospect of securing better jobs lured them to higher education. Two respondents (0.6%) stated that they desired to achieve higher social status through higher education. 70 (22.44%) students claimed that they had come for love of knowledge, 13 (4.2%) liked the subject they studied, 31 (9.94%) gave a combination of reasons. 12 (3.85%) students said that they had come for higher studies because they had failed to secure jobs after graduation. 20 respondents (6.4%) had no clear aim in mind. 16 (5.13%) came for some other reasons which could not be included in any of the above categories. Within this category fall various reasons. Some respondents claimed that they studied because their parents wanted them to study. Others came simply to pass the time. This was especially in the case of girls about to be married.

A cursory glance at the figures reveals that the majority of the respondents (47.1%) were more interested in the future employment prospects of the course, while 22.3% were more interested in the knowledge content of the course and 4.1% in the subject itself. 3.8% of the respondents preferred to study than stay idle but from their responses it is obvious that they would leave their studies the moment they got a job. Thus, it would appear that the majority of the respondents were willing to use higher education only as an instrument for securing employment than in the knowledge aspects of the course. My findings significantly differ from Rajendra Pandey who found that the desire for knowledge, social service and development of skill and ability
were the three topmost preferences, while the desire for earning money is rated a poor fourth.20

The students were also asked whether they would have gone for higher education if jobs had been available. 2 respondents (0.6%) did not reply. The majority of the respondents, i.e., 236 students (75.2%) indicated that they were interested in higher education even if they got jobs. 76 students (24.2%) indicated that they would not have gone for higher education if a job had been available. Thus it seems that the overwhelming majority of the respondents were in favour of going for higher education irrespective of whether they got jobs in the meantime.

CAREER ASPIRATIONS

Studenthood is the time for career planning. It is in this period that young people prepare for specific vocations. A number of studies have thrown light on adolescent aspirations.21

CAREER PLANS

The students in my study were also questioned on their career plans. 39 students, comprising 12.4% of the sample, were undecided on their future career. 202 students (64.3%) were interested in an academic career. By an academic career is meant going in for jobs involving teaching, research and further studies in the subject. 14 respondents (4.5%) favoured administrative positions in the government. 12 (3.8%) aspired to be
Business Executives. 27 (8.6%) wanted to enter professional
careers. By 'professional' careers I mean those which involve
preparation for entering specific professions like Law,
Medicine, School Teaching etc. 5 (1.6%) intended to open
their own business. One student (0.3%) wanted to enter agri-
culture or allied occupations like animal husbandry. 9 (2.9%)
wanted to enter white collar jobs like clerks, steno-typist,
telephone operator etc. 2 (0.6%) aspired to a political career.
3 (1.0%) preferred other occupations like carpentry or technical trades. (See 7)

No statistically significant difference existed among
the sexes with regard to choice of careers. No statistically
significant differences also existed among rural and urban
students in their choice of careers.

RELEVANCE OF SUBJECT FOR CAREER

The respondents were asked whether the subject they
were studying was relevant for their careers. 3 students (1%)did not answer the question. 225 (81.2%) thought that the
subjects they were studying were relevant for their future
careers. 56 (17.8%) held that the subjects they were studying
were not relevant for their careers. No significant differ-
ences in the perceptions of the male and female students with
regard to their careers could be found.

Those who thought that the subjects they were studying
were not relevant for their career were further asked why they
were studying these subjects. 255 students had already answered that the subjects were relevant for their career. 3 did not answer that previous question. Hence this question did not apply to these 258 students.

Only the 56 students who did not consider the subjects they studied to be relevant for their career were included for the purpose of analysis.

Of these 56 students, 10, i.e. 17.86% explained that they were studying solely for the sake of knowledge. One (1.79%) thought that studying would be a good means of passing the time while waiting for employment. They are not interested in the subject per se. 12 (21.43%) liked the subject they were studying. 5 (8.93%) did not get a chance to study the subject they liked and opted to study the present subject. For example, a student may have liked to study Physics but he did not get a chance there and had to be content to study Botany. One respondent (1.79%) was himself not aware why he was studying the present subject. 20 students (35.71%) gave a variety of reasons which have not been classified here. For example, some students of Geology realised that they had made a mistake in studying this subject, having overestimated its potential for securing jobs. Some cited family pressure to pursue studies and were not intrinsically interested in the subject they were studying.
OPTIMISM ABOUT JOB

The respondents were asked whether they were optimistic about getting jobs after completing higher education. 3 (1%) did not answer the question. 218 (69.4%) were optimistic, 69 (22%) were pessimistic, 4 (1.3%) were uncertain, 15 (4.8%) were already employed and 5 (1.6%) intended to do business. Thus the majority of the students (69.4%) were optimistic that they would get a job after completing their education. But as the data indicate a substantial minority (22%) are worried about their job prospects. Given the alarming unemployment situation in India, it is natural that many youths are not optimistic about getting suitable jobs.22

READING HABITS

The students were questioned on their reading habits.
The information on this account may be grouped under two headings : books and newspapers.

BOOKS

The students were asked what type of books they preferred to read, other than textbooks. 7 students (2.2%) did not respond to the question. 60 students (19.1%) preferred to read novels, 4 (1.3%) poetry, 17 (5.4%) thrillers, 2 (0.6%) scientific fiction, 8 (2.5%) short stories, 2 (0.6%) religious books, 2 (0.6%) political literature, 173 (55.1%) a combination of items previously mentioned and 39 (12.4%) preferred other types of books like essays, professional books, etc. No
significant association exists between reading habits and gender, and reading habits and rural-urban background.

**NEWSPAPERS**

Students were asked whether they read newspapers. 283 students (90.1%) answered that they did, and 31 students (9.9%) that they did not.

There is a significant difference among the sexes with respect to newspaper reading habits (Chi $\chi^2 = 9.078$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.0026$). 112 males and 171 females read newspapers. 21 males and 10 females do not read newspapers. In percentage terms, 84.2% of the boys and 94.5% of the girls read newspapers. 18.8% of the boys and 5.5% of the girls do not read newspapers. Thus more girls read newspapers compared to the boys.

Students from rural and urban areas also differ in their newspaper reading (Chi $\chi^2 = 6.739$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.0094$). 67 ruralites and 217 urbanites read newspapers, while 14 ruralites and 17 urbanites do not read. 82.7% ruralites and 92.7% urbanites read newspapers. 17.3% ruralites and 7.3% urbanites do not read newspapers. Thus more urban students read newspapers. Obviously urban students have greater access to newspapers than ruralites.

**POLITICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE**

A number of questions were asked to determine the political characteristics of the respondents.
POLITICAL BACKGROUND

The first question concerned the political background of the students. They were asked whether their father was in active politics. 1 respondent (0.3%) did not answer the question. 22 (7%) answered that their father was in active politics. 6 (1.9%) replied that their father was not in active politics but their mother, brothers or other relatives were actively engaged in politics. 285 students (90.8%) responded that they have no family background in politics. Thus the majority of the students do not have a political background.

There is an interesting divergence in the political background of the sexes. 16 males or 12% of the males come from families where the father is active in politics in contrast to 6 females (3.3%). 2 males (1.5%) and 4 females (2.2%) have other relatives in politics. Thus 13.5% of the boys and 5.5% of the girls come from politically active families.

POLITICAL AFFILIATION OF FAMILIES

The respondents were questioned about the political affiliation of the families which were in politics. In 286 cases it was not applicable. Among those for whom it was applicable, 2 did not respond. Among those who responded, 8 (2.5%) stated that their families were active in the Congress(I) and 18 (5.7%) were active in the parties comprising the Left Front in West Bengal. The Left Front is a combination of a number of parties, chief of which are the Communist Party of
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India (Marxist), the Communist Party of India, The Revolutionary Socialist Party, the Forward Bloc, etc.

VOTING IN STUDENT UNION ELECTIONS

The respondents were asked whether they had voted in the Students' Union elections of Calcutta University. 4 (1.3%) did not respond to the question 124 (39.5%) stated that they had voted in union elections, 175 (55.7%) stated that they had not voted. 11 (3.5%) did not have any occasion to vote. Thus the majority of the students did not vote.

A greater percentage of males than of females voted in the union elections. 62 boys comprising 46.6% of the males students, and 62 girls, comprising 34.3% of the female students, voted in the union elections. 60 boys, comprising 45.1% of the male students, and 115 girls, comprising 63.5% of the female students, did not vote in the union elections.

The data further reveal that there is a significant divergence between students of rural and urban communities with regard to voting in union elections. 43 rural students, comprising 53.1% of the rural students, voted in the union elections, in contrast to 81 urban students, comprising 34.8% of the urban studentry. Thus a greater percentage of more rural or students voted in union elections than that of urban students.

Those who voted were asked whom they voted for. There was initial reluctance among many students to divulge this
information but on assurance that all the information would remain secret, most of them agreed to state the facts. Thus, of the 124 students who voted, information could be had about only 114 students. Of them, 16 (12.9%) voted the Chhatra Parishad, i.e., the student wing of the Congress (I) in West Bengal, 76 students (61.29%) voted for the SFI, the student wing of the CPI(M), and its allies, 6 (4.84%) for the Democratic Students Organization, the student wing of the Socialist Unity Centre (SUCI). Apart from these student organizations, there are a few other student organizations also, such as some frontal organizations of various Naxalite groups, and right-wing student organizations like the Akhil Bharatiya Vidyarthi Parishad, which is the student wing of the Bharatiya Janata Party. They, however, have very little influence on the students in Calcutta University. Only 6 students (5.2%) voted for them. Besides, 5 students (4.03%) voted for independents and 5 students (4.03%) voted for some front or alliance. (See Fig. 8, facing p. 132)

From the data it appears that among both the sexes the influence of the Leftists far exceeded that of the Rightwing organizations. 8 boys, comprising 6% of the male students voted for the Chhatra Parishad. 38 (29.6%) voted for the SFI and 5 (3.8%) voted for the DSO. Thus 32.4% of the males voted for leftist organizations (SFI & DSO are both Leftist organizations, while the Chhatra Parishad is a Rightwing organization). Among the girls 8 students (4.4%) voted for the Chhatra Parishad.
38 (21%) voted for the SFI, and one (0.6%) for the DSO.

CANDIDATES IN UNION ELECTIONS

The students were also asked whether they were candidates for elections to the Students Union. 4 respondents (1.3%) did not reply to the question. 63 students, or 20.1% of the respondents were candidates in the elections. 247 (78.7%) did not contest elections.

From the data it appears that there is a significant difference between the male and female students with regard to contesting elections. The boys were more likely to become candidates for union elections than the girls. We find that 40 boys, or 30.2% of the boys, contested union elections in contrast to 23 girls, or 12.7% of the females. Conversely, 69.2% of the males and 85.6% of the females did not contest student union elections.

POLITICAL BACKGROUND OF CANDIDATES WHO CONTESTED UNION ELECTIONS

62 students who contested union elections have given us information about the organizations they represented. 11 candidates (17.7%) represented the Chhatra Parishad, 38 candidates (61.29%) contested the elections under the banner of the SFI, 3 (4.84%) represented the DSO, 6 (9.68%), other organizations like the Naxalites, the Vidyarthi Parishad, etc. and 4 (6.45%) were independents. 16 students in the sample were serving as Class Representatives at the time of the survey. (See Fig 9).
POLITICAL WORK

The students were asked whether they were politically active in their locality, that is, whether they participated in such activities as posteriting, taking out political processions, organizing and attending political meetings of political parties, electioneering etc. 41 students (13.1%) reported active involvement in the political life of their locality, while 273 (86.9%) reported that they were not active. Thus, the majority of the students were not politically active outside the university.

SEX AND POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT

Table No.7 Political involvement among male and female students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Political Involvement</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Worker</td>
<td>Non-worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31 (23.3%)</td>
<td>102 (76.61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10 (5.52%)</td>
<td>171 (94.48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 21.357, \quad df = 1, \quad P = 0.0000$

Further analysis, sexwise, reveals a significant difference in the political involvement of the sexes (see Table 7) 31 males are politically active in contrast to 10 females. In percentage terms 23.3% of the males and 5.52% of the females are politically active. Conversely, females (94.48%) were
non-active than males (76.7%). Thus, a greater percentage of the boys are politically active. Conversely, a greater percentage of girls are not politically active. Boys, it seems, are more predisposed to political activism and have greater opportunities for political participation than girls.

COMMUNITY AND POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT

We also find that rural students are more politically active than urban students as is evident from Table 8.

Table No. 8 Political involvement among rural and urban students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Political involvement</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Worker</td>
<td>Non-political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(29.63%)</td>
<td>(70.37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.3%)</td>
<td>(92.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 26.408, \quad df = 1, \quad P = 0.0000$

There is thus a significant difference between rural and urban students in their participation in political life outside the university. From Table 8 we find that there are 24 politically active students coming from the rural areas as against 17 coming from the urban areas. In percentage terms, we find that 29.63% of the rural students are politically active in contrast to 7.3% of the urban students. Thus a greater percentage of rural students are politically active than urban students. Conversely, a greater percentage of the urban students
are not active. We find that 92.7% of the urban students were non-active in contrast to 70.37% of the rural students.

From a discussion of the political background of our students, it would be reasonable to conclude with Metta Spencer that "the norms concerning student political activity are rather conservative in India". Our analysis of voting behaviour, our data on candidates contesting union elections and political participation outside the university, i.e., in the locality, gives credence to Spencer's observation that "Indian students do not have a high level of political efficacy and thus do not engage in partisan activity to a degree that their reputations would suggest."

Some facets of student political activity which our data reveal agree with the findings of Metta Spencer. Spencer found that more males than females participate in politics. This is borne out by our data on voting behaviour, candidature in union elections and political participation outside the university. Spencer also pointed out that rural students are more politicized than urban students. Our findings on political participation of rural students also confirm this observation.

**TASTES AND PREFERENCES OF STUDENTS**

The students were asked questions about their tastes and preferences. In this connection questions were asked on their sartorial preferences, their taste with regard to music
and films, and their preferences for books. With the exception of books, which has been discussed in an earlier section, I shall discuss the preferences of the students with regard to the other aspects.

In India, students have a wide choice of dresses. They can either go for Indian or ethnic dresses or they can wear western dresses. For men, Indian dresses like dhoti and kurta, chosote or pyjama and kurta and western dresses like shirts, trousers, baggies, jeans, T-shirts etc. are available. For women, Indian dresses like sari and blouse or salwar, kameez and dupatta sets are available. They can also wear western dresses like skirts and blouses, jeans and T-shirts, or slacks.

From the data it appears that 102 students (32.5%) prefer Indian dresses of dhoti and kurta or sarees and blouses. 14 students (4.5%) prefer an alternative of chosote kurta or salwar and kameez. 82 students (26.1%) prefer western dresses of shirts and trousers or skirts and blouses. 4 (1.3%) students prefer western dresses like baggies, t-shirts, etc. 49 (15.6%) students prefer a combination of Indian dresses, while 48 (15.3%) would wear a combination of Indian and Western dresses. These students are not rigid in their tastes and are ready to wear Indian or western dress, which they find suitable for the occasion. 15 (4.8%) would wear dresses which have not been classified in this chapter. For example, these students may prefer a hotchpotch combination, an Indian kurta with American style jeans.
From the data we find that there is a significant difference among the sexes on sartorial preferences (Vide Table No. 9).

Table No. 9 Sartorial preferences of students classified by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type of dress</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Western</th>
<th>Combination</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoti and Chos te or Kurta/sa-pyjama and Trousers</td>
<td>Shirts and Baggies, Indian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurta/churida r and Blouse</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(71.7%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(1.5%) (15.8%) (7.5%) (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupatta sets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 = 195.466, df = 6, P: 0.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data we find that while male students in general prefer western style dresses, female students in general prefer ethnic Indian dresses. From Table 9 we find that 86 boys, comprising 70.7% of the male student sample, prefer western dresses. If we add those preferring both of western and Indian dresses, the percentage of preferring western dresses comes to 86.5%.

By contrast the majority of the girls prefer Indian dresses. 102 girls, comprising 56.3% of the total female
sample, prefer Indian dresses. If we add those preferring a combination of Indian dresses we find that 82.3% of the girls exclusively prefer ethnic Indian dresses like sarees, or churidars. Only 14.9% of the girls have shown a preference for western dresses, but Indian dresses have not been excluded from their preferences. If we add this category we find that 97.2% of the girls prefer Indian dresses either exclusively or in combination with western dresses.

What accounts for this difference? I think that the dress mores of our society are more orthodox towards girls. While boys are encouraged to wear western style dresses which make them look smarter and are more convenient to use in this fast moving society of the 20th century, girls, with the exception of some upper class, westernized female youth, are not generally encouraged to innovate in sartorial matters. Hence their choices remain mostly confined to ethnic dresses. With boys, however, ethnic dresses are out of fashion and are worn only on ceremonial occasions like marriages or during religious festivals.

TASTE IN MUSIC

In India there is a wide variety of musical forms which appeal to the mind. The students were questioned about their taste in music. From the data we find that 4 respondents (1.3%) either do not like music or chose not to respond to the question. 58 students, or 18.5% prefer classical music either of the Eastern or the Western variety. 53 (16.9%)
prefer Tagore's songs, 6 (1.9%) prefer music by other well-known composers who were contemporaries of Tagore, namely, Kazi Nazrul Islam, Dwijendralal Roy, and Rajanikanta Sen. One (0.3%) prefer Bengali folk songs. 20 (6.4%) like modern Bengali songs, and/or film music. 8 (2.5%) like Western music like pop, jazz and disco. 143 students (45.5%) like a combination of all these musical forms. Thus their tastes are quite cosmopolitan. 21 (6.7%) like other forms of music like patriotic songs or songs with specific political content known in Bengali as Ganasangeet. These are choral songs. (See Fig 10)

TASTE IN FILMS

Films today play a very important role in entertaining and educating the masses. They are a hot favourite among the students is well known. Panda and Kanungo found that Indian students have a very favourable attitude towards motion pictures. 27

The students in my study were asked what types of films they liked. Their responses have been given in Table No. 10. We find that seven respondents (2.2%) do not like films, 19 (6.1%) see romantic films, 12 (3.8%) see adventure or detective films. One (0.3%) like devotionals, 77 (24.5%) prefer to see 'Art' films. 'Art' films are experimental films dealing with non-traditional subjects. 22 (7%) like scientific fiction. One (0.3%) is interested in seeing the
Table No.10 Film preferences of Calcutta University Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Film</th>
<th>No. of students preferring it</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No films</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure/Detective Films</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devotionals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Films</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SScience Fiction</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives of National Heroes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Films</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Combination</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Other (Documentaries, comic strips, musicals, etc.)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>314</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lives of national heroes like Subhas Chandra Bose or Mahatma Gandhi, 21 (6.7%) like family entertainers or 'social' films based on family drama. 107 (34.1%) have expressed interest in seeing all types of films. 47 (15%) like documentaries, cartoon films, etc. These have not been classified.

Unlike Panda, Das and Kanungo's study, I have found no significant differences among boys and girls on film preferences.

INFLUENCE

The present study is basically an attitudinal study. The attitudes are formed through a long process of socialization. The influence of father, mother, and various in the process of formation of attitudes and opinions appears to be more or less important. The students were asked who influenced their opinions. 98 students (31.2%) reported that their parents influenced them; 15 (4.8%) reported the influence of siblings; 14 (4.5%) reported the influence of other relatives; 17 (5.4%) were influenced by their friends; 5 (1.6%) by their teachers; 20 (6.4%) reported the influence of political leaders like Mahatma Gandhi; 21 (6.7%) reported the influence of religious leaders like Swami Vivekananda; 15 (4.8%) were influenced by authors like Marx and Tagore; 23 (7.3%) reported a combination of influence from various quarters. 86 (27.4%) claimed that they independently formed their opinions and had not been influenced by anyone.
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