CHAPTER IV

POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION TO DIFFERENT AGE GROUPS

Our intention is to find out how do the rural people of West Bengal get inducted into the political culture as well as the extent of their political socialization. An enquiry from the individual or social psychological level as well as an enquiry from the social system level direct us in this respect to find out the agencies and the channels available for political socialization in the rural social soil of West Bengal, as well as the contents of political knowledge of the rural people.

West Bengal is a problem ridden state facing several types of socio-economic and political maladies like poverty, unemployment, population growth, tensions, conflicts, general disorder. Inspite of that her rich socio-politico and cultural background "has shaped the lives of the people ...".

Whatsoever, the rural agricultural society of West Bengal is not traditional but it is rather transitional. In the transitional societies there remain "usually a variety of diverging and contending notions and sentiments about the nature and purpose of politics".

The rural life is based on the hotbed of political process where the agents of political socialization are active enough for rural politicalization. "In fact the growth of political consciousness among peasant populations and their increasing political activities is one of the striking features of the life of mankind to-day."
So the study of the rural society of West Bengal is urgently necessary.

In the literature of political socialization, family, school, peers have been recognized as the universal and the primary agents of political socialization. The political socialization is a life long as well as never-ending process. Although the importance of these agents in the pre adolescence period is no doubt important the role of other socializing agents in the same period cannot be overlooked. Children belonging to educationally and economically advanced group should naturally be influenced by these primary agents of political socialization. Would it be correct to attribute the pioneering role of those agents in the case of educationally and economically backward groups also?

Niemi and Jennings have divided up the pre adults environment into three or four categories in which family and school take the first two positions although there is a considerable difference of opinion about the primacy of these two. Peer groups are given the third position. They have been placed below family and school in the order of priority. Besides this, there are 'other agents' which include mass media, secondary groups, like interests group, political parties, etc., political events and development that affect groups or individuals.  

In the rural areas of West Bengal although the first three categories are no doubt important, the importance of some other agents of the fourth category cannot be overlooked.
In our present context, the importance of the agents of political socialization is to be studied mainly according to income, education of the rural populace. Age, however, is an important variable and this also should be given a place in our study for comprehending the relative importance of socializing agents.

Robert Lane is of opinion that lower degree of political participation as well as interest among people belonging to lower socio-economic status group emerge from economic insecurity and inadequate control over political affairs and lack of time for political activity and discussion. The high income group hold political power and draw the maximum benefit from the governmental action. As a matter of fact, they have a high level of political efficacy and high civic responsibility unlike the low economic status group.

Among these three universal agents — the family, school, peer group — school as an agent exert much influence on the children because the latter spend a substantial portion of time with text books, curriculum, teachers and class mate. Thus there remains a scope of explicit political education in school which is much more influential than direct political socialization.

"It seems useful to conceive of political socialization as a major facet of political education which pertains to learning experiences aimed at shaping human potentialities to support the socio-cultural order."  

Thus citizenship training can be imparted through the educational institutions because the authority of every regime wants to create its members sincere and faithful to the said regime.
through such explicit education of authority - imposed norms and ideologies.

Peer group is a universal agent nodoubt and it has been given third place in order of priority.

Mass media are the most potent sources of political information and the exposition of political events through them seems to happen best for the receivers whereby the latter usually can understand the contents of either political information or political event.

Television is the most potential instrument of political socialization for the children in the Western Countries, especially in the U.S.A. New political personalities or its change or significant political events or issues are always produced to shape the political cognitions of the receivers.

However, besides these important agents, the influence of other agents assumes large importance. In our present study we have named seven such agents as rural elites, community associations, social institutions, interest groups, political parties, panchayat institutions, governmental institutions of which the last three assume great importance.
THE CASE OF WEST BENGAL

Age group 6 - 10
Primary School going and non School going children.

There is a difference between the industrialized nations and developing nations regarding the children's cognitive development. The children of the industrialized nations have the chances of rapid cognitive development for their massive media use as well as active and conscious effort on the part of the primary agents.

In the words of Stacey:

In industrialized countries children are rapidly inducted into the political system to which they are born, and at a relatively early age acquire emotional attachments to and identifications with their nation and its symbols, their ethnic group, their class and other significant in-groups.

Thus naturally it may be contended that the cognitive attitude of the rural children in West Bengal is not as developed as that of the children of the industrialized nations because of inadequate and different types of socialization provided by the agents of political socialization. From this viewpoint we can say that for the children belonging to high income group, the family is the most prominent agent of political socialization. On the contrary, for the children belonging to middle and low income groups, the school occupies the pioneering role in the process of inculcation of political values.
The reason behind this is no doubt clear. The rural poor have neither specific political knowledge nor can they impart direct political teaching with the help of the mass media to their children. As they are always running after their livelihood, they have little time to discuss politics within the family environment. However, this does not mean that the rural families are totally out of political environment because in almost all of the families belonging to middle and low income groups, discussions regarding election campaigns, party candidates rather than party ideologies, governmental performance are made at least during elections. But it is not as regular, prominent and evaluative as the socio-economically advanced families. Moreover, the people of high income and education are always in direct contact with all levels of government, may it be national, state or local. So they have the specific knowledge about politics and current events. Moreover, with the help of the mass media they can, easily as well as swiftly, get inducted into prominent political ideas of any kind which in turn are transmitted to their children by them. Thus the children belonging to high income group build up a firmer cognitive structure unlike the children belonging to middle and low income groups who get political ideas as well as systematic concept about their country from the school curriculum and teaching.

On the basis of this discussion, we can draw the following hypothesis:

(1) Children of high income group will have a firmer cognitive base for future political activities.
To test this hypothesis we selected the following questions for the interview of the rural children (HIG-125, MIG-125, LIG-250) belonging to age group 6-10 who are the students of Primary School as well as non-school goers like this:

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIG</th>
<th>MIG</th>
<th>LIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School going</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-School-going</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question: Do you know the names of:

i) Our country;
ii) The President of India;
iii) The Prime Minister of India;
iv) Or at least anyone of these names?

Yes / No.

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIG</th>
<th>MIG</th>
<th>LIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we have taken three cases to test this hypothesis.

Case I

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_M \text{ Vs. } H_1 : P_H > P_M \]
Here the null hypothesis \( H_0 \) is that the proportion of the children belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of children belonging to middle income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of children belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of the children belonging to middle income group in respect of answering the names of the country, the President and the Prime Minister of India or at least any one of these names. In this case, our test statistic is

\[
T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \hat{p}_M}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_M}\right)p_q}}
\]

and we get \( T = 5.301 \)

So we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level as our calculated value of \( T (5.301) \) is greater than the tabulated value of \( T_{0.05} (1.645) \).

Case II

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_L \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : P_H > P_L \]

Here our null hypothesis is that the proportion of children belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of children belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the children belonging to high income group is greater than the children belonging to low income group in respect of knowing the names of their country and the President and the Prime Minister of their country or at least any one of these names.
The test statistic in this case is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right)p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 7.065 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level as our calculated value of \( T (7.065) \) is greater than the tabulated value of \( T \cdot 05 (1.645) \).

Case III

\[ H_0 : p_M = p_L \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : p_M > p_L \]

In this case our null hypothesis is that the proportion of children belonging to middle income group is equal to the proportion of children belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of children belonging to middle income group is greater than the proportion of children belonging to low income group with respect to knowing the names of their country, the President and the Prime Minister of their country or at least any one of these names.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_M} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right)p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 2.054 \).
Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level as our calculated value of $T(2.054)$ is greater than the tabulated value of $T_{0.05}(1.645)$.

Thus in brief, our statistical results of the three cases are as follows:

$$P_H > P_M > P_L$$

That is the preponderance of the high income group over the middle and low income groups is clearly visible.

Hence this finding approves our hypothesis-I.

In order to know their source of learning we asked the following question:

From which of these sources (parents/school/peer group/mass media) have you come to learn the names of:

1) Our country;
2) the President of India;
3) the Prime Minister of India;
4) or at least anyone of these names?

Our collected data are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass media</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following percentages come out:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>73.17</td>
<td>30.53</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>69.47</td>
<td>93.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass media</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus from the data relating to source of learning (the names: our country, the President of India, the Prime Minister of India etc.) we see that parents play a prominent role as an agent of political socialization to the children of high income stratum. On the contrary, school plays a significant role as an agent of political socialization to the children middle and low income groups.

The high income group enjoys the better socio-economic facilities in our rural society. So the people of this economic stratum discuss political matters and express their opinion frequently regarding day-to-day performance of the political personnels of our country in their families as compared to the people belonging to other income groups. Consequently the children of this income group listen to political news from their respective families unlike the children belonging to other income groups.

On the basis of this discussion we can draw the following hypothesis:
(2) The children of high income group get the chance of political learning the most, through family as compared to the children belonging to the middle and low income groups.

To test this hypothesis we asked the following question:

Is there any regular discussion in your family regarding:

i) the Prime Minister of India;

ii) the Chief Minister of your state;

iii) or any other statesman of our country? Yes/No.

Table 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MIG</th>
<th>MIG</th>
<th>LIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following three cases are to be tested in order to test the above mentioned hypothesis.

Case I

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_M \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : P_H > P_M \]

Here the null hypothesis is that the proportion of the children belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of the children belonging to middle income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of children belonging to high income group is greater than the children belonging to middle income group.
in relation to admitting the fact that a regular discussion is held in their families regarding the Prime Minister, the Chief Minister or any other statesman of their country.

To test the null hypothesis we have the following test statistic:

\[
T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \hat{p}_M}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_M}\right)p,q}}
\]

and we get \(T = 8.982\)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level.

Case II

\(H_0: P_H = P_L\) vs. \(H_1: P_H > P_L\)

Here the proportion of the children belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of the children belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of the children belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of children belonging to low income group in respect of admitting the fact that a regular discussion takes place regarding the Prime Minister, the Chief Minister or any other statesman in their respective families.

Our test statistic is
\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_M} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right)p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 12.11 \).

Thus we reject the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level as our calculated value of \( T \) (12.11) is greater than the tabulated value of \( T_{0.05}(1.645) \).

Case III

\( H_0 : P_M = P_L \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : P_M > P_L \)

Here the null hypothesis is that the proportion of the children belonging to middle income group is equal to the proportion of children belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of the children belonging to middle income group is greater than the proportion of children belonging to low income group in relation to the fact that a regular discussion is held in their respective families regarding the Prime Minister, the Chief Minister or any other statesman.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_M} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right)p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 1.301 \).

Thus we accept the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level since our calculated value of \( T \) (1.301) is less than the tabulated value of \( T_{0.05}(1.645) \).
The following summary comes out:

\[ P_H > P_M = P_L \]

Thus with respect to having political news from the family, the children belonging to high income group obtain predominant position over the children belonging to middle and low income groups. However the proportion of children belonging to middle and low income groups is equal in respect of having political news from family.

Thus this finding approves our hypothesis-2.

However for the children who belong to poverty line and usually do not go to school in the rural areas, neither the school nor their parents are the main sources of political knowledge. On the contrary, other agents are found to be active in their case. The children of this category usually have little or no education in the rural areas of West Bengal as we have already pointed out that West Bengal is a problem ridden state as well as a poverty stricken state. To them the functional process of political parties and their election campaign of rural welfare policies and programmes are important enough to evoke their political senses although obscure in nature.

Election campaign within which usually fall party processions with their demand-oriented slogans, public meetings, wall paintings with comedy and cartoons, coloured posters, flags and festoons of different political parties, polling stations—all these attract the rural children of all income groups including the poverty stricken groups.
The rural children of all income groups are found to copy the processions and to utter demand-oriented slogans although these are held absolutely in playful manner.

The activities of the Panchayati Raj Institution regarding rural development are frequently observed by the children of the rural areas, such as, repairment of village roads, sinking wells or tube wells, etc. Moreover, easy contacts between Panchayati Raj Personnel and the children are made when the former frequently come to visit the welfare activities for the betterment of the surrounding environment of the latter. The children welfare programmes and policies and their implementation are the gateways of making contact between the two. Moreover the election process of Panchayati Raj Institution based on party system has given birth to battle field in the rural political psychology, what invariably affects children's psychology.

The rural children are conscious about their government as the latter gives them free text books and dresses and tiffin, especially in the primary school level. They know very well that materials come from the government (Sarkar in their Bengali word), although they have no clear ideas about government.

Moreover the arrival of the governmental officials including Ministers by their vehicles evokes a great interest among the rural children for the clarification of "Government" by themselves. On the contrary, the presence of Police and chowkidars in the villages stirs the curiosity of the children no doubt. On the whole, rural children belonging to all income
strata, especially, the children belonging to the abject poverty-striken families get political ideas from the surrounding political environment and political institutions.

On the basis of the above mentioned argument we can draw the following hypothesis:

(3) Children acquire political knowledge from the surrounding political world and political institutions.

To test this hypothesis we asked the following questions:

(A) Do you usually notice the meetings, processions, public activities, etc., which are held within/outside of your village?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HI G</th>
<th>MI G</th>
<th>LI G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the children belonging to all income groups responded in the positive to the above mentioned question.

Therefore the rural children belonging to all income groups get chance of securing political knowledge from the surrounding political world and institutions. This is invariably applicable specially to those children who are illiterate, poverty-striken and do not belong to the socio-economically advanced or politicized families.
Do you know the names of some of the political parties of our country? Yes/No

Table 3.4B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three cases are to be tested:

Case I

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_M \text{ Vs. } H_1 : P_H > P_M \]

That is the null hypothesis is that the proportion of children belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of children belonging to middle income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of children of high income group is greater than the proportion of children of middle income group with respect to knowing the names of some of the political parties of our country.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_H - \hat{P}_M}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_M}\right) \bar{p} \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 1.008 \).
Thus we accept the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level.

Case II

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_L \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : P_H > P_L \]

That is, the null hypothesis is that the proportion of children of high income group is equal to the proportion of children belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of children of high income group is greater than the proportion of children belonging to low income group in respect of knowing the names of some of the political parties of our country.

Our test statistic is

\[
T = \frac{\hat{P}_H - \hat{P}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right) p \cdot q}}
\]

and we get \( T = .355 \)

Thus we accept the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level.

Case III

\[ H_0 : P_M = P_L \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : P_M < P_L \]

Here the null hypothesis is that the proportion of children belonging to middle income group is equal to the proportion of children belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of children belonging to middle
income group is less than the proportion of children belonging to low income group in respect of knowing the names of some of the political parties of our country.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_M} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right)p_0q}} \]

and we get \( T = -0.873 \)

In this case we accept the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level.

Thus we can draw the following summary:

\[ P_H = P_M = P_L \]

Thus the children of all income groups acquire political knowledge from the political parties and institutions of their surrounding areas.

So on the basis of the results of two questions we can undoubtedly forward our argument that the children of all income groups usually acquire political knowledge from the surrounding political world and political institutions.

Thus this finding approves our hypothesis - 3.
Although peer group ordinarily occupies third place in order of priority, its real contribution in the rural areas of West Bengal is much debatable. Peer groups in our rural society cannot influence at all the children. That's why we have not got any datum regarding it in the question relating to the source of learning.

Mass media, which are the most valuable sources of information in the developed countries (especially television), play an insignificant role in the process of inculcation of political values into the minds of the rural children. In our rural society, the role of television is almost nil. However, radio is available to all the families of high income group unlike the families belonging to middle and low income groups. On the other hand, in the rural areas newspapers are available to some people belonging to the well-to-do families only.

Thus the children belonging to the low income group have no chance of getting news from the newspaper. Similarly, they have no chance to hear news broadcast by radio. On the contrary, the mass media have failed to attract the children belonging to high and middle income groups. In other words, the mass media play an insignificant role in the process of political socialization to the children of the rural areas, although cinema is found to play some role.

On the basis of the above argument we asked the following questions on mass media to the rural children.
Table 3.5

(i) Do you read newspaper regularly? Yes/No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Do you listen to news broadcasting regularly? Yes/No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) Do you see cinema occasionally? Yes/No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) Do you observe T.V. shows occasionally? Yes/No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following percentages come out from table 3.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News paper (yes)</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News broadcasting (yes)</td>
<td>28 %</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema (yes)</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.V. (yes)</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that only 12.8% and 9.6% children of high and middle income groups respectively read newspapers in the rural areas of West Bengal. However, in respect of listening broadcasting the percentages of high income group (28%) and middle income group (14.4%) are a little better than the newspaper reading. Here only cinema is in a better position in comparison with other media. But the role of T.V. is also insignificant as the children of M I G and L I G remains totally out of the purview of such a powerful medium of political socialization, although, however, 7.2% children of high income group enjoy T.V.

This table shows that except cinema (12%) no other media facility is available to the children of low income group.

Thus we can say that the mass media play the least important role in the process of political socialization to the children of the rural areas of West Bengal.

From the aforesaid discussion we can say that the children of all economic strata (high, middle, low) of the rural areas of West Bengal are not out of any scope of political socialization.
children have no tabula rasa about the political world and at the age of six (before they join primary school), their political mind is likely to open towards their surrounding political environment. But their cognitive development does not take its proper shape at this stage whereas Easton and Hess contend that "every piece of evidence indicates that the child's political world begins to take shape well before he enters elementary school". The contention is not applicable to the children of our rural society.

The case of Pre-adults (11-18) : Secondary and Higher Secondary School goers and non-school goers

In our Indian society the preadults belong to this age group (11-18) and this age group usually the students of secondary and higher secondary schools from class V to X (11-16) and XI-XII (16-18).

The picture of education of the respondents (HIG-125, MIG-125 and LIG-250) of this age group in the rural areas is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIG</th>
<th>MIG</th>
<th>LIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School-goers</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-school-goers</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The picture of education (both secondary and higher secondary) reveals that a significant percentage of middle and low income groups do not receive such education facilities. However, it is noted that the non-goers include both illiterate and others who have failed to continue their studies due to their financial crisis or some other reasons.

In the case of this age group (11-18), the role of the family is important in respect of political socialization to the preadults of high income group only. The reasons may be said to be the same in this case as we pointed out in the case of children group (6-10). To this age group, school also plays an important role. A large percentage of this age group belonging to high economic stratum attend both secondary and higher secondary schools. On the contrary, since these preadults of this high income stratum belong to politically sensitive families unlike the preadults of middle and low income groups, they usually enter into these educational institutions with some specific political knowledge, beliefs, ideas which are again reinforced by the school curriculum. Thus to the preadults of high income group both family and school are the important agents. On the contrary, to the preadults of middle and low income groups, the importance of the family is not so visible as that of the school. In other words, the school or the educational institution is more important than the family to the preadults of middle and low income groups. However both the teachers and the fellow-students are important for this age group irrespective of income strata. They discuss current political events with each other and in order to understand
the complicated political problems, they take the help of their teachers. The school going preadults try to understand the surrounding political situation since their political minds begin to mature gradually in this age period.

On the basis of this argument we have taken two hypotheses 1 (a and b) and 2:

1(a) The family and the educational institutions are the two important agents of political socialization for the preadults of high income group,

(b) on the contrary, the role of the educational institution is comparatively more important for the children of the middle and the low income groups than the family,

(2) The teachers and the fellow-students are the important agents of socialization to politics to the school-going adults of all income groups.

To test the hypothesis-1(a) and (b) we asked the following questions (A) and (B) to the preadults of the rural areas of Nadia district.

(A) Do your parents or any other family member discuss current politics? Yes/No.

Table 4.1A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(B) Do you come to know about the past and the present history of our country from the school curriculum? Yes/No.

Table 4.1B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIG</th>
<th>MIG</th>
<th>LIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the hypothesis-2 we asked the following question:

Do you usually discuss politics in school with your fellow-students/teachers? Yes/No.

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIG</th>
<th>MIG</th>
<th>LIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test the hypothesis-1(a) in relation to the role of the family in the case of preadults belonging to high income group, the data we collect are as follows:

High income group
(The role of family)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following case is to be tested.

\[ H_0 : \quad p = \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : \quad p > \frac{1}{2} \]

Here, our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadult belonging to high income group is equal to \( \frac{1}{2} \) against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadult belonging to high income group is greater than \( \frac{1}{2} \) in respect of confessing that the current political discussions are made by their parents or any other member of their family.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \frac{1}{2}}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_H} \cdot p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 6.529 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level since our calculated value of \( T (6.529) \) is greater than the tabulated value of \( T_{0.05} (1.645) \), consequently we accept the alternative hypothesis \( (p > \frac{1}{2}) \). This statistical finding leads us to assume that more than 50% preadults of high income group get political news from their respective families.

Thus family plays an important role for the socialization of the preadults belonging to high income group.

Let us examine the role of the educational institutions with respect to this high income group.
High income group

(The role of educational institutions)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following case is to be tested.

\[ H_0 : \ p = \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : \ p > \frac{1}{2} \]

That is our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults belonging to high income group is equal to \( \frac{1}{2} \) against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults belonging to high income group is greater than \( \frac{1}{2} \) in respect of acknowledging that they come to know about the past and the present history of their country from the school curriculum.

Our test statistic is

\[
T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \frac{1}{2}}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_H} \cdot p \cdot q}}
\]

and we get \( T = 9.034 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level. On the contrary we accept the alternative hypothesis \((p > \frac{1}{2})\). This leads us to admit that more than 50% preadults belonging to high income group come to learn their country's past and present political process from the educational institutions.
The summary stands thus:

\[ P_H > \frac{1}{2} \] in respect of family

\[ P_H > \frac{1}{2} \] in respect of school

Thus both school and family are the important agents of political socialization for the preadults of high income group.

This finding approves our hypothesis-1(a).

For the hypothesis-1(b) our collected data are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle income group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus for the middle income group the following case is to be tested,

\[ H_0 : P_S = P_F \quad \text{vs.} \quad H_1 : P_S > P_F \]

That means, our null hypothesis is that the proportion of contribution of school is equal to the proportion of family against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of contribution of school is greater than the proportion of contribution of family in respect of supplying with the political news to the preadults of the middle income group.
Our test statistic is

\[
T = \frac{\hat{P}_S - \hat{P}_F}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_S} + \frac{1}{n_F}\right) \cdot p \cdot q}}
\]

and we get \( T = 2.54 \).

Therefore we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level. Consequently we accept the alternative hypothesis \((P_S > P_F)\).

The following case is to be tested for the preadults of low income group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low income group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( H_0 : P_S = P_F \) Vs. \( H_1 : P_S > P_F \)

Here, our null hypothesis is that the proportion of contribution of school is equal to the proportion of contribution of family against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of contribution of school is greater than the proportion of contribution of family in relation to the supplying with political news to the preadults of low income group.

Our test statistic is

\[
T = \frac{\hat{P}_S - \hat{P}_F}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_S} + \frac{1}{n_F}\right) \cdot p \cdot q}}
\]

and we get \( T = 5.766 \).
Thus the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level and we accept the alternative hypothesis \( P_S > P_F \).

The summary:

For the middle income group \( P_S > P_F \)

For the low income group \( P_S > P_F \)

Thus in both cases of middle and low income groups school plays more important role than family in respect of political socialization in the rural areas.

This finding approves our hypothesis-1(b).

For the hypothesis-2 three following cases are to be tested:

Case I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High income group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ H_0 : \pi_H = .5 \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : \pi_H > .5 \]

Here our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults belonging to high income group is equal to .5 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults belonging to high income group is greater than .5 in respect of discussing political matters with their fellow students and teachers.
Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - .5}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_M} \cdot p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 7.066 \).

Thus we reject the null hypothesis \( (p_H = .5) \) at 5% level. Here we can say that more than 50% preadults belonging to high income group admit that they discuss political matters with their class-fellows and teachers.

Case II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle income group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( H_0 : p_M = .5 \) Vs. \( H_1 : p_M > .5 \)

Our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults of middle income group is equal to .5 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults belonging to middle income group is greater than .5 in respect of admitting that they discuss political matters with the fellow-students and teachers.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - .5}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_M} \cdot p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 1.878 \).
Therefore we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level. This leads us to assume that more than 50% preadults of middle income group discuss political matters with their class fellows and teachers.

Case III

Low income group

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ H_0: p_L = 0.5 \text{ vs. } H_1: p_L > 0.5 \]

That is the proportion of preadults belonging to low income group is equal to 0.5 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults belonging to low income group is greater than 0.5 in respect of discussing political matters with their class fellows and teachers.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_L - 0.5}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_L} \cdot p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 1.771 \).

So the null hypothesis \( p_L = 0.5 \) is rejected at 5% level. That is, we can argue that more than 50% preadults admit that they discuss political matters with their fellows and teachers.
Summary:

\[ P_1 > .5 \]
\[ P_M > .5 \]
\[ P_L > .5 \]

This finding approves our hypothesis-2.

Mass Media

Mass media are not in a position to influence the preadults significantly. Newspaper and radio, much less T.V., are available to the least extent in the rural families belonging to middle and low income groups. However, there is a tendency to read newspaper in this age group. So they usually attend the club or any other social organisation, go to the village market to read newspaper. Besides this, in the educational institution they read newspaper. However, most of the preadults of these middle and low income groups do not read newspaper or hear news broadcasting regularly, although most of them visit cinema shows.

On the contrary, a large number of preadults of high income group enjoy mass media news facilities (especially, from radio and newspaper) because of their availability at their homes. Besides this, most of them enjoy news reels in the cinema. The frequency of observing cinema ranks first in their case because of their sound financial position.
The role of T.V. is almost nil in the rural areas of West Bengal. Above all mass media do not play any significant role for the preadults of rural areas.

However in respect of enjoying mass media facilities, the preadults of high income group rank first position and the preadults of middle income group are in a little better position than the preadults of low income group and the latter group is to be placed in the third position.

Some times other secondary mass media, such as, motion pictures, popular music and songs, art, comic and cartoons, etc., exert influence on this age group. These may contain political perceptions and their influence is to be taken into account as well. However, in the rural areas of West Bengal, among these elements of popular culture, protest songs containing political demands may arouse the people’s political instincts very easily, e.g., Gambhira songs of Malda district. The preadults who have little or no education at all are usually influenced by such manifestations of popular culture (Lok Sanskriti).

However we have drawn the following hypothesis on mass media.

(3) The mass media facilities are enjoyed mostly by the preadults of high income group.

To test this hypothesis we asked the following question:

(a) Do you read newspaper daily? Yes/No.
(B) Do you listen to news broadcasting regularly? Yes/No.

(C) Do you go to see cinema? Yes/No.

(D) Do you observe T.V. regularly? Yes/No.

Let us test one by one:

**Newspaper**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIG</th>
<th>MIG</th>
<th>LIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For newspaper we have taken the three following cases:

Case I

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_M \text{ Vs. } H_1 : P_H > P_M \]

That means, our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of preadults belonging to middle income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults of high income group is greater than the proportion of preadults of middle income group in relation to reading newspaper daily.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \hat{p}_M}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_M}\right) p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 6.067 \).

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level.
Case II

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_L \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : P_H > P_L \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults belonging to middle income group is equal to the proportion of preadults of low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults of middle income group is greater than the proportion of preadults of low income group in respect of reading newspaper.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_M - \hat{P}_L}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_M} + \frac{1}{n_L}}} \]

and we get \( T = 2.216 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level.

Case III

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_L \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : P_H > P_L \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of preadults belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults of high income group is greater than the proportion of preadults of low income group in respect of reading newspaper.
Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_H - \hat{P}_L}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L}}} \sqrt{P \cdot q} \]

and we get \( T = 9.168 \).

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level.

The summary is as follows:

\[ P_H > P_M > P_L \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broadcasting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 4.3B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIG</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In respect of listening to news-broadcasting: following three cases are to be tested.

Case I

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_M \text{ Vs. } H_1 : P_H > P_M \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of preadults belonging to middle income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults of high income group is greater than the proportion of preadults of middle income group in relation to hearing news-broadcasting.
Our test statistic is
\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \hat{p}_M}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_M}\right)p_0q}} \]

and we get \( T = 6.831 \).

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis.

Case II

\[ H_0 : \; P_M = P_L \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : \; P_M > P_L \]

That is, our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults belonging to middle income group is equal to the preadults of low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults of middle income group is greater than the proportion of preadults of low income group in respect of hearing news broadcasting.

Our test statistic is
\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_M} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right)p_0q}} \]

and we get \( T = 2.044 \).

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis \( (P_M > P_L) \) mentioned above.
Case III

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_L \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : P_H > P_L \]

Here our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of preadults of low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults of high income group is greater than the proportion of low income group in respect of hearing news broadcasting.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{\phi}_H - \hat{\phi}_L}{\sqrt{\left( \frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L} \right) P \cdot Q}} \]

and we get \( T = 9.677 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level.

Summary:

\[ P_H > P_M > P_L \]

Cinema

Table 4.3C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIG</th>
<th>MIG</th>
<th>LIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following three cases are to be tested.

Case I

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_M \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : P_H > P_M \]

That is, our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults belonging to high income groups is equal to the proportion of preadults belonging to middle income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of preadults belonging to middle income group with regard to seeing cinema.

Here our test statistic is

\[
T = \frac{\hat{P}_H - \hat{P}_M}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_M}\right) P \cdot Q}}
\]

and we get \( T = 2.459 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis \((P_H > P_M)\).

Case II

\[ H_0 : P_M = P_L \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : P_M > P_L \]

That is, our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults belonging to middle income group is equal to the proportion of preadults belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults of middle income group is greater than the proportion of preadults of low income group with respect to seeing cinema.
Here our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L} \cdot p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 2.354 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis.

Case III

\[ H_0 : \; P_H = P_L \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : \; P_H > P_L \]

Here null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of preadults belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults of high income group is greater than the proportion of preadults of low income group in respect of seeing cinema.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L} \cdot p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 4.932 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level.

The summary comes out in the following:

\[ P_H > P_M > P_L \]
Thus in each case the predominance of the high income group over the middle and low income groups is clearly visible.

Thus the preadults of high income group are concerned with the newspaper, news broadcasting, cinema, the most. But the scope of T.V. facilities is not at all satisfactory, which is completely nil to the preadults of middle and low income groups. This will reveal in the following data.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{T.V.} \\
\hline
\text{Table 4.3D} \\
\hline
 \text{H I G} & \text{M I G} & \text{L I G} \\
\text{Yes} & 09 & 0 & 0 \\
\text{No} & 116 & 125 & 250 \\
\text{TOTAL} & 125 & 125 & 250 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Percentage} \\
\hline
\text{H I G. M I G. L I G} \\
\text{Yes} & 7.2\% & 0\% & 0\% \\
\end{array}
\]

Thus only 7.2% preadults of high income group observe T.V. regularly.

This finding approves our hypothesis on mass media facilities.
In the rural areas of West Bengal, although the peer groups have some influence on the school-going preadults (since the fellow student discuss current political events with each other), these exert the least influence on the non school-going preadults. Because in this preadult group (11-18), a remarkable percentage of middle income group and low income group discontinue their studies mainly due to financial crisis or some other reasons. Thus these preadults who have little or no education lack real political knowledge. Thus they cannot influence each other inspite of their discussion. But governmental activities as well as welfare programmes, political parties, party cadres, rural elites, local governmental institutions, organisations, electoral process surrounding political environment, including conflictual political situation, etc., exert influence on the significantly and consequently impart political knowledge though not sound enough. However, these elements exert their influences on the school-going preadults too.

Moreover it is interesting to note that, at present, even the preadults are found to take part in the party procession and to party slogans, either consciously or unconsciously. Although they do not know the ideologies of the right and left political parties, at least they know the difference between the slogans of parties of such nature. The teenagers are attracted to their party affiliations in accordance with their economic condition. With the growth of their political personalities their real attachment to the political parties begins and that matures when they reach adulthood. They are found to take part with cadres in door-to-door party campaigns during election period
although they are not voters. The rural leaders and party networks influence them much in this respect.

In the village areas the adults and preadults are found to sit together and hear the evaluation of the functional efficiency of their Panchayat representatives usually through gossips in the evening and form public opinion as such.

This public opinion may either involve moral appreciation for or strong sanctions against their representatives. Thus gossip is rather a social control process which is educative for the preadults about the initiation and implementation of the developmental projects for their surroundings or the availability of agricultural as well as cottage industry inputs and other kinds of advantages and market price as well. Usually the panchayat personnel, rural elites, party activities, etc., initiate the discussion in the evening gossipings. Just after their mental and manual labour of the day they come to village markets or the notable chatting centres like club or any organisation only to relax themselves where they play cards or read newspaper or hear news broadcasting and explain the summary of these news and pass comments from their respective party angles. However, little debate and discussion on the matters of socio-economic and political importance are found to take place on the basis of such comments and the preadults hear these comments, and discussions. Sometimes the preadults are found to ask something on those socio-economic and political matters and seek their opinion.
In the interior villages, the ignorant masses usually chat together in the evening in the grocery shops where they usually come to purchase essential commodities and to relax themselves after the prolonged hardship of the day. Newspapers are read by some persons who can read and write at least and others stand by their side to hear the news and comments come from several sides on various issues, especially on price hike, unemployment problem, etc. The village people of all age groups including the preadults usually come to these grocery shops for their essential commodities.

However, there are interior-most villages, where newspapers are not available regularly because of regular disruption in the communication system, where electrification programme, too, still stands beyond imagination. In that rural atmosphere, the rural people belonging to all income groups are completely dependent on radio to have the current news daily.

In such place, too, evaluations are made regarding public works, especially, the panchayat's activities and village development. So naturally comments are made from various angles and these are heard by the non-school-going preadults who have no work in the evening.

On the basis of all these political information sources discussed above, they try to evaluate the country's political situation and express their opinion as well as consolidate their political ideas. However, some comparatively consolidated political ideas are found among the preadults belonging to high income group who are the maximum school goers and who get the political ideas
early in their childhood from family, and which are again 
strengthened by the school curriculum, teachers and the fellow 
students. Moreover, from the surrounding political environment 
they acquire political knowledge.

But for the preadults of middle and low income groups (who 
are the school goers), the educational institutions and the surround­
ding political environment are important.

However only the surrounding political environment imparts 
political knowledge to those preadults who have no education or 
little education.

The political environment as well as political institutions 
can influence the preadults of the rural areas irrespective of 
their economic status and academic attainment.

On the basis of this discussion we have drawn the following 
hypotheses for the preadults of the rural areas.

(4) The rural political elites, public personnel's, political 
parties, election process, above all the surrounding political 
environment, etc., are the important agents of political socializa­
tion for the preadults of all income groups.

(5) Most of the preadults of all income groups at least know 
the difference between the slogans of right and left political 
parties.

We asked the following six consecutive questions for the 
hypothesis-4 (mentioned above).
1. Do you hear the discussions on matters of socio-economic and political importance in your surrounding area which are held by panchayat personnel/rural elites/political activists? Yes/No.

Table 4.4A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Did you ever receive any aid from the government?

Table 4.4B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Have you ever seen any political unrest in your village? Yes/No

Table 4.4C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Are you interested in taking part in processions, meetings or protest songs etc. of any political party held in your village? Yes/No

Table 4.4D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIG</th>
<th>MIG</th>
<th>LIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Have you ever seen/or taken part in any political campaign, voting centres during election period? Yes/No

Table 4.4E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIG</th>
<th>MIG</th>
<th>LIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Have you ever noticed any government official performing developmental services in your locality? Yes/No

Table 4.4F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIG</th>
<th>MIG</th>
<th>LIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We asked the following question for the hypothesis-5.

Do you know the names of the political parties which propagate the following slogans ————

Bandemataram

and

Inquilab Zindabad?

Yes/No

If yes: mention.

Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first six consecutive questions were projected for the hypothesis-4 and the last one was prepared for the hypothesis-5.

For the first question we have taken three cases.

Case I

High income group

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H_0 : \( p_H = \frac{1}{2} \) vs. \( H_1 : p_H > \frac{1}{2} \)

The null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults belonging to high income group is equal to \( \frac{1}{2} \) against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults belonging to high income group is greater than \( \frac{1}{2} \). In respect of hearing discussions on matters of socio-economic and political importance which are held by panchayat personnel/other rural elites, etc., in their surrounding area.

Our test statistic is

\[
T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \frac{1}{2}}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_H} \cdot \hat{p} \cdot \hat{q}}}
\]

and we get \( T = 6.35 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis \((p_H > \frac{1}{2})\).

Case II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Middle income group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ H_0 : p_H = \frac{1}{2} \text{ vs. } H_1 : p_H > \frac{1}{2} \]

Here our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults of middle income group is equal to \( \frac{1}{2} \) against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults belonging to middle income group is greater than \( \frac{1}{2} \) with respect to hearing discussions.
of socio-economic and political importance which are held by the panchayat personnel and other rural elites or political activists.

Our test statistic is

$$ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - \frac{1}{2}}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_M} \cdot p \cdot q}} $$

and we get $T = 5.277$

Thus we reject the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis $(p_M > \frac{1}{2})$.

Case III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low income group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>201</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$H_0 : p_L = \frac{1}{2}$ Vs. $H_1 : p_L > \frac{1}{2}$

Here our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults belonging to low income group is equal to $\frac{1}{2}$ against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults belonging low income group is greater than $\frac{1}{2}$ in respect of hearing discussions of socio-economic and political importance which are held by the panchayat personnel or rural elites or political activists.

Our test statistic is
Thus we reject the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis ($p_L > \frac{1}{2}$).

The summary of the three cases is as follows:

$$P_H > \frac{1}{2}$$
$$P_M > \frac{1}{2}$$
$$P_L > \frac{1}{2}$$

This leads us to assume that more than 50% preadults of all income groups (high, middle, and low) hear the discussions of socio-economic and political importance which are held by the panchayat personnel, rural elites or political activists.

For the second question we take three cases for test.

Case I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High income group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$H_0 : P_H = \frac{1}{2} \text{ vs. } H_1 : P_H > \frac{1}{2}$$

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults of high income group is equal to $\frac{1}{2}$ against the alternative
hypothesis that the proportion of preadults of high income group is
greater than \( \frac{1}{2} \) in relation to receiving any aid from the government.

Our test statistic is

\[
T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \frac{1}{2}}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_H} \cdot p \cdot q}}
\]

and we get \( T = 8.855 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis \( (p_H = \frac{1}{2}) \) at 5% level.

Case II

Middle income group

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( H_0 : p_M = \frac{1}{2} \) Vs. \( H_1 : p_M > \frac{1}{2} \)

That is our null hypothesis is that the proportion of
preadults belonging to middle income group is equal to \( \frac{1}{2} \) against
the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults belong­ing
to middle income group is greater than \( \frac{1}{2} \) in respect of recei­
v ing any aid from the government.

Our test statistic is

\[
T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - \frac{1}{2}}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_M} \cdot p \cdot q}}
\]

and we get \( T = 6.35 \)
Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis \( p_M > \frac{1}{2} \).

Case III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low income group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults belonging to low income group is equal to \( \frac{1}{2} \) against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults belonging to low income group is greater than \( \frac{1}{2} \) in respect of receiving any aid from the government.

Our test statistic is

\[
T = \frac{\hat{p}_L - \frac{1}{2}}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_L} \cdot p \cdot q}}
\]

and we get \( T = 3.795 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level.

The summary is as follows:

- \( p_M > \frac{1}{2} \)
- \( p_M > \frac{1}{2} \)
- \( p_L > \frac{1}{2} \)
Therefore we can say that more than 50% preadults of all income groups (high, middle and low) admitted that they had received aid of any kind from the government.

Three cases have been taken for the third question.

Case I

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High income group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults belonging to high income group is equal to .5 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults of high income group is greater than .5 in respect of seeing political unrest in their villages.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - .5}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_H} \cdot p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 5.098 \)

Therefore we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis \( (p_H > .5) \).
Case II

Middle income group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ H_0 : p_M = 0.5 \ vs. \ H_1 : p_M > 0.5 \]

Here our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults belonging to middle income group is equal to 0.5 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults of middle income group is greater than 0.5 in relation to seeing political unrest in their respective villages.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - 0.5}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_M} \cdot p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 2.236 \)

Hence we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level.

Case III

Low income group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>177</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ H_0 : p_L = 0.5 \ vs. \ H_1 : p_L > 0.5 \]
That is our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults of low income group is equal to 0.5 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults of low income group is greater than 0.5 in respect of seeing political unrest in their respective villages.

Our test statistic is

$$T = \frac{\hat{p}_L - 0.5}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_L} \cdot p \cdot q}}$$

and we get $T = 6.578$

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level.

The summary stands thus:

- $p_H > 0.5$
- $p_M > 0.5$
- $p_L > 0.5$

So we can put forward our argument that 50% preadults of each income group have seen political unrest in their respective villages.

The collected data relating to question 4 exhibit that all the preadults of each income group (HIG-125, MIG-125, LIG-250) have offered positive answer. So statistical calculation is not required here.

Similarly question 5 and question 6 expose that all the respondents of each income group have responded in the positive. So no statistical calculation is required for these questions.
The summary is as follows with respect to six consecutive questions:

question - 1 \( P_H > \frac{1}{2} \)
\( P_M > \frac{1}{2} \)
\( P_L > \frac{1}{2} \)

question - 2 \( P_H > \frac{1}{2} \)
\( P_M > \frac{1}{2} \)
\( P_L > \frac{1}{2} \)

question - 3 \( P_H > .5 \)
\( P_M > .5 \)
\( P_L > .5 \)

Questions 4, 5 and 6 show that all answers are positive in nature.

Henceforth all these findings approve our hypothesis-4.

With respect to hypothesis-5 the following two cases are to be tested because the data relating to high income group require no statistical calculation since all the answers are positive in nature.

Case I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Middle income group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here our null hypothesis is that the proportion of the preadults of middle income group is equal to .5 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults of middle income group is greater than .5 in relation to knowing the names of some political parties which propagate the slogans like Bandemataram and Inquillab Zindabad.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_M - .5}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_M} \cdot \hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p})}} \]

and we get \( T = 9.57 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level.

Case II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low income group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of the preadults belonging to low income group is equal to .5 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults of low income group is greater than .5 with respect to knowing
the names of some political parties which propagate the slogans like Bandemataram and Inquilab Zindabad.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - .5}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_M} \cdot .5 \cdot .5}} \]

and we get \( T = 13.029 \).

Hence we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level.

Thus the summary is as follows:

In the case of high income group all the preadults have answered in the positive;

In the case of middle income group \( p_M > .5 \).

In the case of low income group \( p_L > .5 \).

That means we can say that more than 50% preadults of both middle and low income group know the names of some political parties which propagate the slogans like Bandemataram and Inquilab Zindabad.

Therefore this finding approves our hypothesis-5.

The preadults are found to evaluate the functional process and efficiency of the government. The preadults of middle and low income groups are more interested in news and views of the state and local governments than the central government as the former are deemed to solve the acute problems of localities as well as of villages more quickly than the central government which is more concerned with national problems. The state and local government
personnel are more susceptible to rural society than the national
government personnel.

On the contrary, the preadults of high income group are more interested in taking news and views of the central government as they are more fortunate to have the greater mass media facilities and they belong to politically sensitive families. Moreover, they attend the educational institutions, the most. So the cognitive development on the part of them has helped them to build up a higher conceptual framework regarding the central government and the national political system. This will reveal in the following question. For this purpose we asked the following question:

Which of the following governmental activities, news and views do you want most? Central/State/Local

Table 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage distribution of these data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table shows that the preadults of high income group are more interested in getting news and views of the central government (48%) than the state (32.8%) and local government (19.2%). On the contrary, the preadults of middle and low income groups are more concerned with the news and views of the state and local governments and the reasons of these findings have been mentioned above.

Due to higher conceptual framework of the political system and political process, the preadults of the high income group build up an ideological framework in which they usually persist from the beginning. But both the middle and low income groups usually do not persist in early political opinion and attitudes since these do not take shape so prominently unlike the early political opinions and attitudes of the preadults of high income group. This does not mean that all the preadults of high income group have broader ideological framework in which all of them persist from the beginning up to death.

On the basis of this argument we have drawn the following hypothesis:

(6) The preadults of high income group are more persistent in their early political opinion and attitudes than the preadults of middle and low income groups.

For this hypothesis we asked the following question:

Do you hold the same political opinion and attitudes from your childhood till now? Yes/No.
Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test the above mentioned hypothesis we have taken three cases:

Case I: High income group

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults of high income group is equal to .5 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults belonging to high income group is greater than .5 in relation to holding the same political opinion and attitudes from their childhood till now.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - .5}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_H} \cdot p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 5.993 \)
Thus we reject the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis \( p_H > .5 \) mentioned above.

Case II

Middle income group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( H_0 : p_M = .5 \) vs. \( H_1 : p_M < .5 \)

Here our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults belonging to middle income group is equal to .5 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults belonging to middle income group is less than .5 in respect of holding the same political opinion and attitudes from their childhood till now?

We have the test statistic

\[
T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - .5}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_M} \cdot p \cdot q}}
\]

and we get \( T = -2.415 \)

So we reject the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis \( p_M < .5 \).
Case III

Low income group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ H_0 : \hat{p}_L = .5 \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : \hat{p}_L < .5 \]

Here our null hypothesis is that the proportion of preadults belonging to low income group is equal to .5 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of preadults belonging to low income group is less than .5 in respect of holding the same political opinion and attitudes from their childhood till now.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_L - .5}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_L} \cdot p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \[ T = -4.301 \]

So we reject the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis \( (\hat{p}_L < .5) \) mentioned above.

The summary stands thus:

\[ p_H > .5 \]
\[ p_M < .5 \]
\[ p_L < .5 \]
That means, more than 50% preadults belonging to high income group persist in their early political attitude and opinions whereas less than 50% preadults of each middle as well as low income group persist in the same from their childhood up till now.

Thus the finding approves our hypothesis - 6.

The case of Adults (19-24)

In the first place the picture of higher education of the respondents of this age group is provided.

The respondents of this age group (19-24) include both (i) college and university going and outgoing students as well as (ii) those who are not the students of such educational institutions (i.e., who have dropped their studies in such institutions or who have discontinued their studies at school level (Primary or Secondary)) or who are totally illiterate.

So in response to question "Are you a college or university student?", the answer "yes" includes the former group and "no" comprises the latter group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The percentage distribution of the above data relating to higher education of the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the adults of high income group get the higher education the most (38.4%) but it is not at all satisfactory. The position of adults of middle and low income groups are poor and meagre respectively. The reasons are that higher education is not available to the poor class in rural areas as they are financially handicapped.

Secondly, due to severe unemployment in West Bengal the adults of middle and low income groups are reluctant to take higher education. They deem fit to earn something through business or agricultural work etc.

In the rural areas of West Bengal only the adults belonging to high economic status group take the college and university education to a maximum extent. They find appropriate time to verify their theoretical political knowledge already learned. They get to learn more and more adult politics. As they usually stay in the urban areas they enjoy the mass media facilities. Thus observation of the day-to-day political happenings within the political system through the mass media is possible in their case. They
filter their political knowledge, ideas, values, beliefs and attitudes of their childhood (6-10), and pre-adolescence (11-18) periods. After the all-round filteration of their early attitudes —— renewed perception which they acquire at this period, is likely to exist throughout the life cycle. In the rural areas of West Bengal, the phase of unrefined or coarse attitude formation lies in between 6-18. The uneducated section has some gross ideas about politics. Specific political knowledge is found only among the educated section in the rural areas. However the students of Political Science are found to have more specific political knowledge as Bay says: "As with all education political science education must aim at liberating the student from the blinders of the conventional wisdom, from political totems and tabbos, so that he may make the basic choice of how to live and of political ideals as an independent person with optimal critical powers".

However this educated section helps to filter the political knowledge of the rural people and spreads political ideas, and imparts political knowledge to the rural people and acts as the rural elites in the political socialization process. This educated section belonging to high income group discusses the political affairs at their homes, the most and think about politics or discuss politics, the most. They belong to the brain trust section of the rural society. They prefer to conduct the activities of their respective political parties rather than performing the work of the rank and file members.
For, as for example, such functions as postering, wall painting etc. of the political parties are done by the adults of middle and low income groups. Thus the latter get political ideas from such activities of their respective political parties.

On the basis of this argument we have set up the following hypotheses:

1. The adults of high income group are more concerned with politics as compared to the other income groups.

2. The adults of high income group, although more concerned with politics, are not the manual activists of their respective political parties to a large extent unlike the adults of middle and low income groups.

To test these hypotheses, we asked the following questions to the adults of the rural areas of Nadia district.

For the hypothesis-1 we have asked the two questions A and B in the following:

A) Do you discuss political events with the members of your family? Yes/No

Table 5.1A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have taken three cases in the following.
Case I

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_M \quad vs. \quad H_1 : P_H > P_M \]

That is, here our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group in respect of discussing political events with the members of their families.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_H - \hat{P}_M}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{\hat{n}_H} + \frac{1}{\hat{n}_M}\right) p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 3.973 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis \((P_H > P_M)\) mentioned above.

Case II

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_L \quad vs. \quad H_1 : P_H > P_L \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of adults belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to low income group.
in respect of discussing political events with the members of their families.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right)p_q}} \]

and we get \( T = 8.99 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance and accept the alternative hypothesis \( (P_H > P_L) \).

Case III

\[ H_0 : \hat{p}_M = \hat{p}_L \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : \hat{p}_M > \hat{p}_L \]

Here our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group is equal to the proportion of adults belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to low income group in relation to discussing political matters with members of their families.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_M} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right)p_q}} \]

and we get \( T = 4.84 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance and accept the alternative hypothesis \( (P_M > P_L) \).
Summary

\[ P_H > P_M > P_L \]

B) Do you think about or discuss politics regularly? Yes/No

Table 5.1B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have taken three cases in the following:

Case I

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_M \ vs. \ H_1 : P_H > P_M \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group in respect of thinking about or discussing politics regularly.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_H - \hat{P}_M}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_M}\right)p_q}} \]

and we get \( T = 1.823 \)
Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance and accept the alternative hypothesis \((P_H > P_M)\).

Case II

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_L \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : P_H > P_L \]

Here our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of adults belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to low income group with respect to thinking or discussing politics regularly.

Our test statistic is

\[
T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right) p \cdot q}}
\]

and we get \(T = 6.654\)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance and accept the alternative hypothesis \((P_H > P_L)\).

Case III

\[ H_0 : P_M = P_L \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : P_M > P_L \]

Here our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group is equal to the proportion of adults belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group is greater.
than the proportion of adults belonging to low income group with regard to thinking or discussing politics regularly.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_M} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right) p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 4.748 \)

So we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance and accept the alternative hypothesis \( (P_M > P_L) \).

Summary

\[ P_H > P_M > P_L \]

Thus we get the following summaries from questions:

(A) \( P_H > P_M > P_L \)

(B) \( P_H > P_M > P_L \)

Thus the preponderance of the high income group over the middle and low income groups is clearly indicated by these findings. The reason is that the adults of high income group live in an advanced socio-economic atmosphere. So they have enough time at their disposal to discuss political matters. Moreover they are comparatively more educated than the adults of other income groups. Lastly, they are more exposed to mass media than the adults of other income groups.
Hence these findings approve our hypothesis - 1.

However for the hypothesis-2 we asked the following question:

Are you a manual worker of any political party? Yes/No

Table 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following three cases are to be tested.

Case I

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_M \text{ vs. } H_1 : P_H < P_M \]

Here our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults of high income group is equal to the proportion of adults of middle income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults of high income group is less than the proportion of adults of middle income group in respect of being manual worker of any political party.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_H - \hat{P}_M}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_M}}} \]

and we get \[ T = -1.814 \]
Since our calculated value of $T (-1.814)$ is less than the tabulated value of $-T_{0.05} (-1.645)$, so we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis ($P_H < P_M$).

Case II

$H_0 : P_H = P_L$ vs. $H_1 : P_H < P_L$

That is our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults of high income group is equal to the proportion of adults belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is less than the proportion of adults belonging to low income group in respect of being manual worker of any political party.

Our test statistic is

$$T = \frac{\hat{P}_H - \hat{P}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right) P \cdot Q}}$$

and we get $T = -3.08$

Thus we reject null hypothesis at 5% level of significance as our calculated value of $T (-3.08)$ is less than the tabulated value of $-T_{0.05} (-1.645)$.

Case III

$H_0 : P_M = P_L$ vs. $H_1 : P_M < P_L$

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group is equal to the proportion
of adults belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group is less than the proportion of adults belonging to low income group in relation to being manual worker in any political party.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_M} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right) \hat{p} \cdot \hat{q}}} \]

and we get \( T = -9.53 \)

Since our calculated value of \( T (\approx 9.53) \) is greater than the tabulated value of \( -1.645 \) at 5% level of significance, so we accept the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance.

The summary stands thus:

Case I: \( p_H < p_M \)
Case II: \( p_H < p_L \)
Case III: \( p_M = p_L \)

Thus we can say that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is less than the proportion of adults of middle and low income group with regard to being manual worker of their respective political parties.

This finding approves our hypothesis-2.

However all the adults belonging to all income groups take part in the decision-making process in their families. Besides
family, the lowest unit of all social organisations, there are several other organisations and institutions in society where the adults get chance to take part in decision-making process.

Participation in the para-political institutions evokes the chance to take part in the decision-making and this creates political interest. Social participation, we know, has an impact on attitudes involving overt political behaviour. The rural adults and the pre-adults are found to take part in the social organisations and institutions like village library, club, sports association, free dispensary, human service organisation etc. Not only that they also take part in the functional process of such para-political institutions and gain experience regarding functional similarity in the decision-making process of government. However, the dominance of the preadults of high economic stratum in such decision-making is found to be clearly manifested.

On the basis of this argument we have prepared the following hypotheses:

(3) Adults of all income groups are concerned with the decision making process of their respective families.

(4) Adults of high income group are more concerned with the influencing of the decision-making process of any organisation as compared to other income groups.

For the hypothesis-3 we asked the following question:
Do you influence decision-making process in your family? Yes/No

Table 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIG</th>
<th>MIG</th>
<th>LIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to this question the data show that all the respondents responded in the positive. Therefore, no statistical test is required here.

This finding approves our hypothesis-3.

For the hypothesis-4 we asked the following question:

Do you influence the decision making process of any organisation? Yes/No

Table 5.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIG</th>
<th>MIG</th>
<th>LIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following three cases are to be tested.

Case I

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_M \text{ vs. } H_1 : P_H > P_M \]
That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group in respect of influencing the decision-making process of any organisation.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\widehat{p}_H - \widehat{p}_M}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_M}\right)p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 2.558 \)

Here our calculated value is greater than the tabulated value. So we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance and accept the alternative hypothesis \( (P_H > P_M) \).

Case II

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_L \text{ vs. } H_1 : P_H > P_L \]

That is null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of adults belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to low income group in relation to influencing the decision making process of any organisation.
Our test statistic is
\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right)p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 5.249 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5\% level of significance and accept the alternative hypothesis \((P_H > P_L)\).

Case III

\[ H_0 : P_M = P_L \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : P_M > P_L \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group is equal to the proportion of adults belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to low income group with respect to influencing the decision-making process of any organisation.

Our test statistic is
\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_M} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right)p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 2.504 \)

So we reject our null hypothesis at 5\% level of significance and accept the alternative hypothesis \((P_M > P_L)\).
Summary

\[ P_H > P_M > P_L \]

The predominance of high income group is clearly manifested.

Thus finding approves our hypothesis-4.

Mass media facilities to this adult age group are as insufficient as we found in the case of the children and the preadult groups. In this respect we can say that communication structure is insufficient to our rural society. Television which is the most effective weapon of communication remains almost out of place in our rural society.

However, in this age group, too, the adults of high income group enjoy the media facilities (except T.V.) the most. But to the majority adults belonging to middle income group and low income group mass media facilities are not available.

Due to paucity of mass media and the lack of scope of its availability, it has failed to produce itself as a prominent agent of political socialization in our rural society.

We have projected the following hypothesis on the basis of the above statement.

(5) The adults belonging to high income group enjoy the media facilities, the most.

To prove this hypothesis we asked the following questions:

A) Do you read newspaper regularly? Yes/No
B) Do you listen to news broadcasting regularly? Yes/No
C) Do you go to see cinema regularly? Yes/No
D) Do you observe T.V. regularly? Yes/No

Let us test the hypothesis on the basis of the collected data on mass media

A) Newspaper

Table 5.5A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have taken three cases for test.

Case I

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_M \text{ vs. } H_1 : P_H > P_M \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults of high income group is equal to proportion of adults of middle income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group with respect to reading newspaper regularly.
Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \hat{p}_M}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_M}\right) p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 5.187 \)

So we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance and accept the alternative hypothesis \( (P_H > P_M) \).

Case II

\( H_0 : P_H = P_L \) vs. \( H_1 : P_H > P_L \)

Here our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of adults belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults of high income group is greater than the proportion of adults of low income group in respect of reading newspaper daily.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right) p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 6.667 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis \( (P_H > P_L) \).
Case III

\[ H_0 : \hat{P}_M = \hat{P}_L \text{ vs. } H_1 : \hat{P}_M > \hat{P}_L \]

That means our null hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group is equal to the proportion of adults belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to low income group in respect of reading newspaper daily.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_M - \hat{P}_L}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_M} + \frac{1}{n_L}}} \]

and we get \( T = .634 \)

Thus we accept our null hypothesis \( (\hat{P}_M = \hat{P}_L) \) at 5% level as our calculated value of \( T (0.634) \) is less than the tabulated value of \( \chi^2_{0.05}(1, 645) \).

Summary:

\[ P_H > P_M \quad \text{and} \quad P_M = P_L \]

That means, in case of reading newspaper in the rural areas of West Bengal, the proportion of adults of high income group is greater than the proportion of adults of other two income groups, middle and low, whereas the proportion of adults of both these income groups is same in this respect.
B) News broadcasting

Table 5.5B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIG</th>
<th>MIG</th>
<th>LIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three cases are to be tested in the following:

Case I

\[
H_0 : P_H = P_M \text{ vs. } H_1 : P_H > P_M
\]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of adults of middle income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of adults of middle income group in respect of listening to news broadcasting.

Our test statistic is

\[
T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - p_M}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_M}\right) p \cdot q}}
\]

and we get \(T = 4.067\)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance and accept the alternative hypothesis \((P_H > P_M)\) mentioned above.
Case II

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_L \text{ Vs. } H_1 : P_H > P_L \]

i.e. our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of adults belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults of high income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to low income group in respect of listening to news broadcasting.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_H - \hat{P}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right) \hat{p} \hat{q}}} \]

and we get \( T = 5.932 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis \((P_H > P_L)\) mentioned above.

Case III

\[ H_0 : P_M = P_L \text{ Vs. } H_1 : P_M > P_L \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults of middle income group is equal to the proportion of adults of low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults of middle income group is greater than the proportion of adults of low income group with respect to listening to news broadcasting.
Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_M - \hat{P}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_M} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right) \hat{p} \cdot \hat{q}}} \]

and we get \( T = 1.461 \).

Thus we accept our null hypothesis at 5\% level as our calculated value of \( T (1.461) \) is less than the tabulated value of \( T_{0.05} (1.645) \).

Summary:

\[ P_H > P_M \quad \text{and} \quad P_M = P_L \]

Therefore we can argue that in respect of listening to news broadcasting, the proportion of adults of high income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to middle and low income groups whereas the proportion of adults of both latter income groups is same in respect of listening to news broadcasting.

C) Cinema

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following three cases are to be tested.
Case I

\[ H_0 : \hat{P}_H = \hat{P}_M \text{ Vs. } H_1 : \hat{P}_H > \hat{P}_M \]

i.e. our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group in respect of seeing cinema regularly.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_H - \hat{P}_M}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_M}\right)p_\text{q}}} \]

and we get \( T = 2.475 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis \( (P_H > P_M) \).

Case II

\[ H_0 : \hat{P}_H = \hat{P}_L \text{ Vs. } H_1 : \hat{P}_H > \hat{P}_L \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults of high income group is equal to the proportion of adults of low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to low income group in respect of seeing cinema regularly.
Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_H - \hat{P}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right) \cdot p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 4.834 \)

So we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis \((P_H > P_L)\).

Case III

\[ H_0 : P_M = P_L \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : P_M > P_L \]

Here our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults of middle income group is equal to the proportion of adults of low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to low income group in respect of seeing cinema regularly.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_M - \hat{P}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_M} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right) \cdot p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 2.127 \)

Here we find that our calculated value of \( T (2.127) \) is greater than the tabulated value of \( T_{0.05} (1.645) \).
So we reject our null hypothesis at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis ($P_M > P_j$).

Summary

$P_H > P_M > P_L$

Therefore we can say that the proportion of adults of high income group is greater than the proportion of adults of middle and low income groups. Again the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group is greater than the proportion of adults of low income group in respect of seeing cinema.

D) Television

Table 5.5D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the data show that only 8% adults of high income group observe T.V. regularly but no respondent of both middle and low income group answered in the positive in respect of observing the same.
The summary on mass media stands thus:

(A) Newspaper

\[ P_H > P_M \quad \text{and} \quad P_M = P_L \]

\[ P_H > P_L \]

(B) News broadcasting

\[ P_H > P_M \quad \text{and} \quad P_M = P_L \]

\[ P_H > P_L \]

(C) Cinema

\[ P_H > P_M > P_L \]

(D) Television

\[ \text{HIG} \quad \text{MIG} \quad \text{LIG} \]

8% 0% 0%

Thus in every case the predominance of the adults of high income group over the adults of middle and low income group is clearly visible. But in the case of television the percentage is not satisfactory while it is nil in the case of middle and low income groups.

Thus this finding approves our hypothesis-5.

This finding suggests that the adults of middle and low income group get less mass media facilities as compared to the adults of high income group. So, naturally, the adults belonging to the former groups are mainly dependent on interpersonal communications for political news, views and information.

Most of the social institutions are the evening gossip centres of the adults in the rural areas of West Bengal where governmental performances are evaluated, the actions and the views
of the Gram Panchayat are discussed, comments are passed, newspapers are read, party activities are evaluated, political events of critical periods are discussed with frequent comments from many sides, political environment is studied. However, after all, opinions are created which influence the peers of same age groups or at least new political ideas are received by the adults.

However the educated adults take part in such evening gossipings to communicate interesting news to others who are not concerned with day-to-day national and international happenings. Our data show that the higher education in our rural society (except of the high income group) is poor and meagre to middle and low income groups. So, naturally, in such discussions the adults of high income group play the pioneering role.

Besides the educated rural adults, the rural elites, panchayat personnel, party activists, etc., take part in such discussion. Debates and discussions are held on the total political set up. The burning and soul-stirring national and regional problems are discussed in a very friendly atmosphere by those well informed persons from whom the uneducated adults and preadults come to know all these, as they have less contact with media and are all-day-long busy with their household works and for their livelihood earning. They come to such evening gossip centres (market place or a specific shop or club or any social organisation, etc.) only to relax after the prolonged physical work throughout the day. When the issues like unemployment, extreme poverty, separatism, terrorism, high prices, corruption, hoarding, etc., are discussed,
the adults of low income group are found to express their opinion in favour of authoritarian regime instead of the present liberal democratic government which can, in their opinion, solve these problems with iron hand. But the adults belonging to high income group are found to express opinion in favour of the liberal democratic set up which is at present exercising power in centre. The preadults of middle income group as they are the same type of sufferers as the preadults of low income group, usually hold attitude in favour of authoritarianism regarding the nature of government like the preadults of low income group.

On the contrary, when the country's total progress is considered, the preadults of the middle income group and the low income group are found to express lukewarm interest in acknowledging the steady national progress unlike the adults of high income group. In their opinion India may develop much in science and technology or occupy an honorable place in world political society but she has not still solved the acute rural problems like food, cloth, shelter, drinking water, primary education, health, communication, rural electrification, etc., from which they are badly suffering and want them to be quickly solved.

Whatsoever their opinion regarding the nature of national government or national progress, one thing, which is no doubt interesting, is to be noted that the adults of all income groups express their opinion without any hesitation, although all of them are not able to receive higher education or media contact. This indicates their evaluative capacity in politics.
The day-to-day practical hardships of life have made the rural poor adults to regard an authoritarian regime as an alternative although they do not know the exact nature of such government. However they think that if government exercises its heavy hand on the anti-socials, blackmarketeers, profit makers, separatists and anti-national forces destroying national resources and property and follow an authoritarian planned economy, then an economic upliftment may take place from which they might get benefit.

On the basis of this discussion we have taken the following hypotheses:

(6) The adults of high income group have greater faith in the present liberal democratic set up than the adults of middle and low income groups.

(7) The adults of high income group express greater satisfaction regarding the country's general progress as compared to the adults of middle and low income groups.

We asked the following question to the adults to test the hypothesis-6.

Do you think that the present liberal democratic set up will be able to solve the existing burning problems in India? Yes/No.

Table 5.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three cases are to be tested.
Case I

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_M \hspace{1em} \text{Vs.} \hspace{1em} H_1 : P_H > P_M \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group in respect of expressing faith in the present democratic governmental set up.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_H - \hat{P}_M}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_M}\right) P \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 1.16 \)

Thus we accept the null hypothesis at 5% level as our calculated value of \( T \) (1.16) is less than the tabulated value of \( T_{0.05} \) (1.645).

Case II

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_L \hspace{1em} \text{Vs.} \hspace{1em} H_1 : P_H > P_L \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of adults belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to low
income group in respect of expressing faith in the present
democratic governmental set up.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_H - \hat{P}_L}{\sqrt{(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L}) p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 7.496 \)

Thus we reject our null hypothesis at 5% level and accept
the alternative hypothesis \((P_H > P_L)\).

Case III

\[ H_0 : P_M = P_L \text{ Vs. } H_1 : P_M > P_L \]

i.e. our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults
belonging to middle income group is equal to the proportion of
adults belonging to low income group against the alternative
hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to middle in-
come group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to
low income group in respect of expressing faith on present democ-

cratic governmental set up in India.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_M - \hat{P}_L}{\sqrt{(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L}) p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 6.226 \)
So we reject the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis \( P_M > P_L \).

Summary

\[ P_H = P_M > P_L \]

That means the adults of high and middle income groups hold the same view that the present liberal democratic set up will be able to solve the existing burning problems in India. In this respect the adults of high and middle income groups exhibit confidence in the present democratic set up unlike the adults of low income group.

Thus the lack of confidence on the part of the low income group indicates that the adults of this income group favour an authoritarian governmental set up of stern attitude which can only solve the existing burning problems with a heavy hand.

Thus this finding partly approves our hypothesis-6.

For the hypothesis-7 we projected the following question : Do you think that the country has progressed much after independence? Yes/No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following three cases are to be tested.
Case I

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_M \text{ vs. } H_1 : P_H > P_M \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group in respect of expressing their opinion that the country has progressed much after independence.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_H - \hat{P}_M}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_M}\right)p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 3.431 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance and accept the alternative hypothesis \( (P_H > P_M) \) mentioned above.

Case II

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_L \text{ vs. } H_1 : P_H > P_L \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of adults belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to low
income group in relation to expressing their opinion that the country has progressed much after independence.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left( \frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L} \right) p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 4.393 \)

Thus we reject our null hypothesis at 5% level of significance and accept the alternative hypothesis \( (P_H > P_L) \) mentioned above.

Case III

\[ H_0: P_M = P_L \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1: P_M > P_L \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults of middle income group is equal to the proportion of adults belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group is greater than the proportion of adults belonging to low income group in respect of expressing their opinion that the country has progressed much after independence.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left( \frac{1}{n_M} + \frac{1}{n_L} \right) p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = .388 \)
Thus we accept the null hypothesis at 5% level as our calculated value of $T (388)$ is less than the tabulated value of $T_{0.05}(1.645)$.

Summary

$$P_H > P_M = P_L$$

That means the adults of high income group hold more positive view regarding country's progress since independence than the adults of middle and low income groups ($P_H > P_M$ and $P_H > P_L$).

However, the adults of middle and low income group hold same type of opinion ($P_M = P_L$) regarding the same, i.e., they hold a discouraging view in this respect.

This finding approves our hypothesis-7.

The panchayat institutions have helped the rural adults to be well acquainted with the local political system in which reflections of the national and state (provincial) political systems are clearly visible. This local self-government is the potent weapon to solve the local issues and problems and it is the source of political knowledge by getting involved into it.

The meetings which are held by panchayat personnel for wise decision and to have public support help the adults of all income groups to acquire political knowledge. Now-a-days the introduction of decentralized planning requires the involvement of the common people including the adults of this age group (19-24).
Moreover, the local problems are discussed by the party cadres or government personnel with the adults because the latter are the emerging forces for future ruling of the rural society.

Above all, the party classes of the left parties help the educationally and economically disadvantageous adult group to acquire political ideas, knowledge, and information which consequently help them to form concrete political knowledge afterwards. This age period (19-24) is the most suitable time to get their political eyes opened to the political world. This view is condensed, filtered as well as made concrete and this view persists throughout their life-cycle, subject to minor change according to political environment and needs of the political system.

However, although the political minds of all age groups of our rural society are not as developed as the political minds of all these age groups of the industrially advanced and developed political systems, it is surely to be acknowledged that the concerned rural age groups, especially belonging to poor socio-economic condition, are not totally ignorant or inert; rather they are interested and enthusiastic in politics.

Thus generally we can say that even in our backward rural society the political mind of the children (6-10) opens and in the age period, 11-18, their political mind gathers some knowledge, ideas, beliefs, and values regarding politics. In the age period between 19-24, these ideas, beliefs, values, get concrete and solid.

We have drawn the following hypothesis:
(8) Most of the adults of all income groups are interested in participating in the local political process.

Two questions (A and B) were prepared for this above mentioned hypothesis.

A) Do you discuss political matters with the important persons or party cadres in this locality? Yes/No

B) Do you take part in discussion of any problem of your area which is launched by the Panchayati Raj Institution? Yes/No

Data relating to question-A (Discussion on political matters with important persons)

Table 5.8A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have taken the following three cases.

Case I

\[ H_0: p_H = .5 \] \ Vs. \ \[ H_1: p_H > .5 \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is equal to .5 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to
high income is greater than .5 in respect of discussing political matters with important persons or party cadres in their localities.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - .5}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_H} \cdot p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 7.066 \)

So we reject null hypothesis at 5% level of significance and accept the alternative hypothesis \( (p_H > .5) \).

Case II

\( H_0 : p_M = .5 \text{ Vs. } H_1 : p_M > .5 \)

That is our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults of middle income group is equal to .5 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults of middle income group is greater than .5 in relation to discussing political matters with important persons or party cadres in their localities.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - .5}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_M} \cdot p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 6.35 \)

Thus our null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level of significance and the alternative hypothesis \( (p_M > .5) \) is accepted.
Case III

\[ H_0 : p_L = .5 \; \text{ Vs. } \; H_1 : p_L > .5 \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to low income group is equal to .5 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to low income group is greater than .5 in respect of discussing political matters with important persons or party cadres in their localities.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_L - .5}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_L} \cdot p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 9.107 \)

Thus our null hypothesis is rejected at 5\% level of significance and the alternative hypothesis \( (p_L > .5) \) is accepted.

Summary:

\[ p_H > .5 \]
\[ p_M > .5 \]
\[ p_L > .5 \]

That means more than 50\% adults of each income group are found to be interested in taking part in the political discussions with the important political personnel in their localities.
Data relating question (B) (Discussion of the problems launched by Panchayati Raj Institution)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have taken three cases in the following:

Case I

\[ H_0 : p_H = 0.5 \text{ vs. } H_1 : p_H > 0.5 \]

That is our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is equal to 0.5 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to high income group is greater than 0.5 in respect of discussion of any problem of their areas which is launched by Panchayati Raj Institution.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - 0.5}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_H} \cdot p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 7.245 \)

Thus we reject null hypothesis at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis \( (p_H > 0.5) \) mentioned above.
Case II

\[ H_0 : \hat{p}_M = .5 \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : \hat{p}_M > .5 \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group is equal to .5 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults belonging to middle income group is greater than .5 with respect to taking part in discussion regarding any problem of their areas which is launched by Panchayati Raj Institution.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - .5}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{N_M} \cdot p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 5.993 \)

Thus our null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level and the alternative hypothesis \((p_M > .5)\) is accepted.

Case III

\[ H_0 : \hat{p}_L = .5 \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : \hat{p}_L > .5 \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of adults of low income group is equal to .5 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of adults of low income group is greater than .5 with regard to taking part in discussion of any problem of their localities which is launched by the Panchayati Raj Institution.
Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_L - .5}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_L} \cdot p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 8.222 \)

Thus our null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level of significance and the alternative hypothesis \((p_L > .5)\) is accepted.

Summary

\[ p_H > .5 \]
\[ p_M > .5 \]
\[ p_L > .5 \]

That means more than 50% adults of each income group take part in the discussion of any problem of their localities which is launched by the Panchayati Raj Institution.

Summary of question (A) : \( p_H > .5 \)
\[ p_M > .5 \]
\[ p_L > .5 \]

Summary of question (B) : \( p_H > .5 \)
\[ p_M > .5 \]
\[ p_L > .5 \]

That means more than 50% adults of each income group are interested in the local political process.

Thus these findings approve our hypothesis-8.
People belonging to age group 25 and above

Although, ordinarily, there is a 'tendency to identify "Political Socialization" with the study of preadult or even of preadolescent political behaviour, the socialization process takes place throughout the entire life span. For this reason, political environment, organisation, political events, etc., can exert a great influence on the political socialization process of the adults.

For this purpose we conducted an interview for the late adults of this age group (25 and above) belonging to different income groups in the rural areas of Nadia district whose literacy rate (in per cent) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H I G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the previous chapter we have seen that the economic picture of West Bengal is not a bright one.

Inspite of this, people's political orientation is clear enough as well as a keen consciousness of political affairs may be found. The people belonging to high income group are found to express greater interest in the political process and they have specific knowledge in politics as they are educationally and
economically more privileged and are more exposed to mass media than the people belonging to middle and low income groups and above all, they belong to the politicized families.

We have drawn the following hypothesis on the basis of this discussion:

(1) The people of high income group express greater interest in politics.

To test this hypothesis we asked four questions (A, B, C, D) mentioned below. The first two questions (A and B) indicate the political background of the rural people which, in turn, has helped them to express their political interest and the remaining two questions (C and D) also help us to understand the political interest expressed by the rural people.

(A) Did you ever hear your parents or any other relative in the family talking about current events, public affairs or politics? Yes/No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of the collected data we test 3 cases in the following.
Case I

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_M \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : P_H > P_M \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of people of middle income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people of high income group is greater than the proportion of people belonging to middle income group in respect of hearing about country's events, public affairs or politics in the past from their parents, or any other relative in their families.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \hat{p}_M}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_M}\right) p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 3.708 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level of significance and accept the alternative hypothesis \((P_H > P_M)\) mentioned above.

Case II

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_L \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : P_H > P_L \]

That means the null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of people belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people belonging to high income
group is greater than that of the proportion of people belonging
to low income group in respect of hearing in the past, the country's
current events, public affairs or politics from parents, or any
other relative in their families.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L}}} \cdot p \cdot q \]

and we get \( T = 7.525 \)

So our calculated value of \( T (7.525) \) is greater than the tabulated value of \( T.05 (1.645) \).

Consequently we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance and accept the alternative hypothesis \( (p_H > p_L) \).

Case II

\( H_0 : p_M = p_L \) vs. \( H_1 : p_M > p_L \)

i.e. our null hypothesis is that the proportion of people of middle income group is equal to the proportion of people of low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people of middle income group is greater than the proportion of people of low income group in respect of hearing in the country's past current events, public affairs or politics from parents or any other relative in their families.
Our test statistic is

\[
T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_M} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right) \cdot p \cdot q}}
\]

and we get \( T = 3.489 \)

So null hypothesis is rejected on the basis of the sample at 5% level and we accept the alternative hypothesis (i.e. \( P_M > P_L \)).

Summary

\( P_H > P_M > P_L \)

So we can put forward our argument that the families belonging to high income group are the most politicized than the families of middle income group and low income group. Consequently the people belonging to high income group express greater interest in politics.

(B) Did you take part in any political movement or activity?

Yes/No

Table 6.1B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are three cases in the following:

Case I

\[ H_0 : \hat{P}_H = \hat{P}_M \text{ vs. } H_1 : \hat{P}_H > \hat{P}_M \]

That means the null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to a high income group is equal to the proportion of people belonging to a middle income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people belonging to a high income group is greater than the proportion of people belonging to a middle income group in respect of taking part in any political movement or activity in the past.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{\Delta}_H - \hat{\Delta}_M}{\sqrt{\left( \frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_M} \right) \hat{P} \cdot \hat{Q}}} \]

and we get \( T = 2.535 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis \((\hat{P}_H > \hat{P}_M)\) mentioned above.

Case II

\[ H_0 : \hat{P}_H = \hat{P}_L \text{ vs. } H_1 : \hat{P}_H > \hat{P}_L \]

That means the null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to a high income group is equal to the proportion of people belonging to a low income group against the alternative
hypothesis that the proportion of people belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of people of low income group regarding taking part in the past political movement or activity.

Our test statistic is

\[
T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right) \bar{p} \cdot \bar{q}}}
\]

and we get \( T = 4.405 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5\% level and accept the alternative hypothesis \( (P_H > P_L) \) mentioned above.

Case III

\[H_0 : \bar{p}_M = \bar{p}_L \text{ vs. } H_1 : \bar{p}_M > \bar{p}_L\]

That is the null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to middle income group is equal to the proportion of people belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people of middle income group is greater than the proportion of the people of low income group regarding taking part in the past political movement or activity.

Our test statistic is

\[
T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_M} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right) \bar{p} \cdot \bar{q}}}
\]

and we get \( T = 1.633 \)
Thus we accept the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level.

The summary comes out in the following manner.

\[ P_H > P_M = P_L \]

Thus we can say that the proportion of the people of high income group is greater than the proportion of the people of middle income group and low income group in respect of gathering experience in politics from the past political activity or movement in the rural areas of West Bengal.

However the proportion of the people of both middle and low income groups is same in this respect. This finding helps us to indicate that the people belonging to high income group express greater interest in politics.

(C) Do you talk about politics with the members of your family? Yes/No

Table 6.1C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here 3 cases are as follows:
Case I

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_M \text{ vs. } H_1 : P_H > P_M \]

i.e. the null hypothesis is that the proportion of the people belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of people belonging to middle income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people of high income group is greater than the proportion of people of middle income group regarding talking about politics with the members of their families.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_H - \hat{P}_M}{\sqrt{\left( \frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_M} \right) \hat{p} \hat{q}}} \]

and we get \( T = 4.058 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis i.e. \( P_H > P_M \).

Case II

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_L \text{ vs. } H_1 : P_H > P_L \]

i.e. the null hypothesis is that the proportion of the people of high income group is equal to the proportion of the people of low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of people belonging to low income group in relation to talking about politics with the members of their families.
Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right) \hat{p} \cdot \hat{q}}} \]

and we get \( T = 7.691 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis i.e. \( P_H > P_L \).

Case III

\[ H_0 : P_M = P_L \text{ Vs. } H_1 : P_M > P_L \]

i.e. the null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to middle income group is equal to the proportion of people belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people of middle income group is greater than the proportion of people belonging to low income group in relation to talking about politics with the members of their families.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_M} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right) \hat{p} \cdot \hat{q}}} \]

and we get \( T = 3.506 \)

So we reject the null hypothesis on the basis of sample at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis i.e. \( P_M > P_L \).
Summary:

\[ P_H > P_M > P_L \]

This indicates that the proportion of the people belonging to the high income group is greater than the proportion of people of middle and low income groups talking about politics in their families. Again the proportion of people of middle income group is also greater than the proportion of people of low income group in this respect.

Whatsoever the high income group ranks first position because of their advanced socio-economic position. The people belonging to this income group are educationally advanced too. They usually get more mass media facilities. On the contrary most of the people of low income group in the rural areas have no time to discuss politics at home due to their severe economic crisis. They are always in search of food and shelter, although their ignorance is responsible to some extent in this respect. However the people of middle income group are in a better position than the people of low income group in relation to this aspect of talking politics in family. But this group cannot supersede the rank of the high income group in this respect in the rural areas of West Bengal.

(D) Do you know the ideologies of the political parties of the Centre and the State which are at present in power?

Yes/No
Table 6.1D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIG</th>
<th>MIG</th>
<th>LIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three cases are to be tested.

Case I

\[ H_0: \hat{P}_H = \hat{P}_M \text{ Vs. } H_1: \hat{P}_H > \hat{P}_M \]

That means the null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of people belonging to middle income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people belonging to high income group is greater than the people belonging to middle income group regarding acquaintance with the ideologies of the political parties in centre and state which are at present in power.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_H - \hat{P}_M}{\sqrt{(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_M}) \hat{P} \cdot \hat{Q}}} \]

and we get \( T = 9.842 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level as our calculated value of \( T \) (9.842) is greater than the tabulated value of \( T_{0.05} \) (1.645).

So we accept the alternative hypothesis i.e. \( P_H > P_M \).
Case II

\[ H_0 : P_H = P_L \text{ Vs. } H_1 : P_H > P_L \]

i.e. the null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to high income group is equal to the proportion of people belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people belonging to high income group is greater than the proportion of people of low income group in relation to the acquaintance of ideologies of the political parties in centre and state which are at present in power.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - \hat{p}_L}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_H} + \frac{1}{n_L}\right)p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 12.72 \)

Thus we reject the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level and accept the alternative hypothesis i.e. \( P_H > P_L \).

Case III

\[ H_0 : P_M = P_L \text{ Vs. } H_1 : P_M > P_L \]

i.e. our null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to middle income group is equal to the proportion of people belonging to low income group against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people belonging to middle income
group is greater than the proportion of people belonging to low income group in relation to the acquaintance of ideologies of political parties in centre and state which are at present in power.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_M - \hat{P}_L}{\sqrt{\left( \frac{1}{n_M} + \frac{1}{n_L} \right) p \cdot q}} \]

and we get \( T = 1.597 \)

Here our calculated value of \( T (1.597) \) is less than the tabulated value of \( T_{0.05} (1.645) \). So we accept the null hypothesis \( (P_H = P_L) \) at 5% level.

We get the summary of each question respectively.

(A) \( P_H > P_M > P_L \)
(B) \( P_H > P_M = P_L \)
(C) \( P_H > P_M > P_L \)
(D) \( P_H > P_M = P_L \)

We see that in every case high income group occupies the highest position. So we can say that the people of high income group express interest in politics, the most, in comparison with the other two groups and these findings approve our hypothesis-1.

In respect of having mass media facilities, the people of high income group assume highest position, this will be revealed in the following:
Thus 68.8% people belonging to high income group read newspaper, 92.2% people of this income group listen to news broadcasting and 50.4% people see cinema but only 7.2% people of this group observe T.V. Thus the T.V. is not available significantly in the rural areas and the people belonging to middle and low income group remain completely out of the perview of T.V. facilities. However, in the case of having other media news this table shows that the people of middle income group is in a little better position than the people belonging to low income group.

Inspite of the lack of specific political knowledge i.e. ideological non-acquaintance on the part of the middle and low income groups as compared to the people belonging to high income group, the people belonging to these strata are not totally unaware of the governmental/political activity. They are well acquainted with the governmental socio-economic programmes,
especially of the local self-government like Panchayati Raj Institutions. They at least know the names of political parties in power both in centre and in state and the names of the country and the state in which they live in.

On the basis of this discussion we have drawn the following hypothesis.

(2) Basic political knowledge of middle and low income groups is not discouraging.

To test this hypothesis we selected this question for the rural populace of Nadia district.

Do you know the names of the country and of the state you live in and parties in power? Yes/No

Table 6.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the respondents of high income group know the names of the country and of the State they live in and parties in power. Therefore, no statistical test is required. However two other cases are to be tested in the following.

Case I

\[ H_0 : P_M = .9 \] Vs. \[ H_1 : P_M > .9 \]
The null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to middle income group is equal to .9 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people belonging to middle income group is greater than .9 in respect of knowing the names of the country and of the state they live in and party in power.

Our test statistic is

$$T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - p_M}{\sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}_M(1 - \hat{p}_M)}{n_M}}}$$

and we get $T = .745$

Here our calculated value of $T (.745)$ is less than the tabulated value of $T_{.05} (1.645)$. So we accept the null hypothesis ($p_M = .9$) at 5% level of significance.

Case II

$H_0: p_L = .7$ Vs. $H_1: p_L > .7$

That is our null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to low income group is equal to .7 against the alternative hypothesis that the people belonging to low income group is greater than .7 in relation to knowing the names of the country and of the state they live in and party in power.

Our test statistic is
and we get $T = .69$

Here our calculated value of $T (.69)$ is less than the tabulated value of $T_{0.05}(1.645)$. Hence forth we accept null hypothesis ($p_L = .7$) at 5% level of significance.

Summary:

100 percent people of high income group answered in the positive

Case - I $p_M = .9$
Case - II $p_L = .7$

Thus we can say that a significant portion of respondents of middle income group (90%) and low income group (70%) responded to this question inspite of their meagre opportunities for gathering political knowledge and illiteracy.

This indicates that the basic political knowledge is not at all discouraging on the part of the middle and low income groups.

So this finding approves our hypothesis-2.

The rural people of West Bengal have the capacity to express opinion about country's development and progress either in the negative or in the positive, although, the people of low income group are found to express the least positive opinion in
this respect. Everyone responds spontaneously. Thus, they are not inert or totally ignorant about politics.

We have taken the following hypothesis in this respect.

(3) The rural people of all income groups do not hesitate to answer questions regarding national progress, although the people of low income group hold the least positive attitude regarding this.

To test this hypothesis we asked the following question.

Do you think that our country has made much progress since independence? Yes/No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIG</th>
<th>MIG</th>
<th>LIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question contains 3 cases as follows:

Case I

\[ H_0 : \pi_H = .75 \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : \pi_H > .75 \]

i.e. the null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to high income group is equal to .75 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people belonging to high
income group is greater than .75 in relation to the opinion that our country has made much progress after independence.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - p_H}{\sqrt{\frac{p_H(1 - p_H)}{n_H}}} \]

and we get \( T = .465 \)

Thus we accept the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level as our calculated value of \( T (.465) \) is less than the tabulated value of \( T_{.05} (1.645) \).

Case II

\[ H_0: p_M = .65 \quad \text{vs.} \quad H_1: p_M > .65 \]

That means our null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to middle income group is equal to .65 against the alternative hypothesis that the people of middle income group is greater than .65 in relation to the opinion that our country has made much progress after independence.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - p_M}{\sqrt{\frac{p_M(1 - p_M)}{n_M}}} \]

and we get \( T = .891 \)

Therefore we accept the null hypothesis \( (p_M = .65) \) at 5% level as our calculated value of \( T (.891) \) is less than the tabulated value of \( T_{.05} (1.645) \).
Case III

\[ H_0 : P_L = 0.35 \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : P_L > 0.35 \]

That is our null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to low income group is equal to 0.35 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people belonging to low income group is greater than 0.35 regarding the opinion that our country has made much progress after independence.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_L - P_L}{\sqrt{\frac{P_L(1-P_L)}{n_L}}} \]

and we get \( T = 1.127 \).

Since here the calculated value of \( T \) (1.127) is less than the tabulated value of \( T_{.05} \) (1.645), so we accept the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance.

The summary stands thus:

- \( P_H = 0.75 \)
- \( P_M = 0.65 \)
- \( P_L = 0.35 \)

These statistical findings show us that a large proportion of people of low income group and a considerable proportion of middle income group do not hold positive attitude regarding country's progress, after independence, as they have been deprived of the output of the country's progress. In practice after
independence the high income group has been benefitted the most
in the rural areas of West Bengal. Whereas a significant portion
of rural people still lives below the poverty line although
several welfare schemes have been undertaken to ameliorate the
condition of their living standards. The people belonging to
middle income group are gradually improving their living patterns
although in a slow rate of growth. But the living standards of
the people of low income group still remain far from satisfactory.

But one thing is clear that the rural people, especially
the people belonging to middle income group and low income group,
are not politically inert. So they have expressed their opinion
in respect of country's progress without any hesitation.

However the proportion of people belonging to low income
group constitutes the worst sufferers. So they express their deep
concern and hold the least positive attitude regarding national
progress since independence in comparison with the respective pro-
portions of people belonging to both high income group and middle
income group.

Thus this finding approves our hypothesis-3.

People are also interested in local politics. Almond and
Verba through their cross national studies in the U.S.A., the
U.K., Germany, Italy, and Mexico have found that the people
are more interested as well as competent in local politics
"because there is a substantially higher level of subjective
competence in relation to the local Government in all countries."
"Local politics, like national politics, is concerned with government and is thus more likely to resemble national politics than is political activity in, say, trade union or a sailing club... (is) concerned in particular with the nature of political power as it emerges in the local context."

In rural West Bengal, the local politics revolves round the Panchayati Raj Institution—the local self government. This local political process has its own legal aspect. Moreover, it is important because, most of the political issues are, at first, raised at the local level what are usually either resolved or magnified at local level. The allocation and distribution of public resources and the control of means of production either influence or are influenced by local politics. The decision-making process is based on the principle of 'authoritative allocation of values'.

Within the periphery of local politics of rural West Bengal local branches and leaders of the political parties are also likely to play an important role because in the rural areas of West Bengal, local factional-in-fightings are frequently seen, and the responsibility of their settlement falls on the Panchayati Raj Institution. Moreover, most of the state government's policies and programmes regarding rural welfare are directly executed through the Gram Panchayat. In rural West Bengal the people are found to take part in the planning process which has been made to be decentralized. Thus planning, execution, monitoring, and evaluation are done by the people themselves through the Panchayati Raj Institution.
Thus Panchayati Raj Institution as a unit of government is the sharpest weapon to keep a close contact with the rural populace on the part of the state government in West Bengal which has made the rural people of all socio-economic status groups more politicized as the three tiers (Gram Panchayat, Panchayat Samiti, Zila Parishad) are based on party system.

The rural people irrespective of their economic status are always aware of the functional process of the Panchayati Raj Institution. They are the main critics also of the functional efficiency of the Panchayati Raj Institution as the representatives of this rural power structure are in close contact with the rural people.

Thus we can say that the Panchayat process is a value acquisition process on the part of the village people including the young ones. "The process of political socialisation consists in acquisition of political value not only by the panchayat status winners but also by voters, deviants and children". 13

We have prepared the following hypothesis on Panchayati Raj Institutions.

(4) Rural people of all income groups are aware of the functional process and efficiency of the local governmental machinery in the rural areas.

To test this hypothesis we asked the following question to the rural people of Nadia district.
Do you think that the Panchayati Raj Institutions are solving many of the problems of your area? Yes/No

Table 6.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following 3 cases are to be tested.

Case 1

\[ H_0 : p_H = .9 \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : p_H > .9 \]

i.e. the null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to high income group is equal to .9 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people belonging to high income group is greater than .9 in respect of the proposition that the Panchayati Raj Institutions are solving many of the problems of their areas.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - p_H}{\sqrt{\frac{p_H(1 - p_H)}{n_H}}} \]

and we get \( T = .745 \)

Thus we accept the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance because our calculated value of \( T (.745) \) is less than the tabulated value of \( T_{0.05} (1.645) \).
Case II

\[ H_0 : p_M = .9 \ \text{vs.} \ \ H_1 : p_M > .9 \]

That means the null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to middle income group is equal to .9 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people belonging to middle income group is greater than .9 in relation to the statement that Panchayati Raj institutions are solving many of the problems of their areas.

Our test statistic is

\[
T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - p_M}{\sqrt{\frac{p_M(1-p_M)}{n_M}}}
\]

and we get \( T = .745 \)

Therefore we accept the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance.

Case III

\[ H_0 : p_L = .9 \ \text{vs.} \ \ H_1 : p_L > .9 \]

That is our null hypothesis is that the proportion of people of low income group is equal to .9 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people belonging to low income group is greater than .9 in respect of the view that the Panchayati Raj institutions are solving many of the problems of their areas.
Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_L - p_L}{\sqrt{\frac{p_L (1 - p_L)}{n_L}}} \]

and we get \( T = .422 \)

So we accept the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance since our calculated value of \( T (.422) \) is less than the tabulated value of \( T_{.05} (1.645) \).

Summary:

\[ p_H = .9 \]
\[ p_M = .9 \]
\[ p_L = .9 \]

That means 90% people of each income group hold positive attitude about the functional process and efficiency of the Panchayati Raj Institutions in the rural areas of West Bengal. It also indicates that most of the people of every income group have been benefitted by the introduction of such politico-administrative institutions in the rural areas of West Bengal. For this reason positive and spontaneous results have been found.

Thus this finding approves our hypothesis-4.

In every democratic regime competition among the political parties to gain political power is found most commonly. In such political struggle, naturally the support of the common people is of utmost importance. The competition among the parties to have
public support is made through meetings, processions, demonstrations rather in order to articulate their demands unitedly irrespective of their religion, race, caste, sex, place of birth, etc. Moreover, the introduction of universal adult franchise and Parliamentary democracy have broken down the narrow caste, ethnic and religious barriers. So there is no scope for narrow communal/ethnic and religious trend in the rural politics of West Bengal. The people belonging to all income groups are free from the vices of narrow party politics.

On the basis of this argument we have drawn the following hypothesis.

(5) There is no scope of socialization into communal politics in the rural areas of West Bengal.

To test this hypothesis we asked the following question.

Do you believe that ethnic as well as religious problems can only be solved by the political parties of those ethnic and religious groups?

Table 6.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following 3 cases have been taken.
Case I

\[ H_0 : P_H = .35 \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : P_H > .35 \]

That means the null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to high income group is equal to .35 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people belonging to high income group is greater than .35 regarding their belief that ethnic as well as religious problems can only be solved by the political parties of those ethnic and religious groups.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_H - p_H}{\sqrt{\frac{p_H(1 - p_H)}{n_H}}} \]

and we get \( T = .422 \)

Thus here we accept the null hypothesis at 5\% level of significance as our calculated value of \( T (.422) \) is less than the tabulated value of \( T_{.05} (1.645) \).

So we can argue that 35\% people belonging to high income group express their belief on the issue that ethnic as well as religious problems can only be solved by the political parties of those ethnic or religious groups.

Case II

\[ H_0 : P_M = .2 \quad \text{Vs.} \quad H_1 : P_M > .2 \]

That is the null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to middle income group is equal to .2 against
the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people belonging to middle income group is greater than .2 in relation to expressing their belief that ethnic as well as religious problems can only be solved by the political parties of those ethnic and religious groups.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{p}_M - P_M}{\sqrt{\frac{P_M (1 - P_M)}{n_M}}} \]

and we get \( T = .447 \)

Thus we accept the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance as our calculated value of \( T (0.447) \) is less than the tabulated value of \( T_{05} (1.645) \).

So we can say that only 20% people of middle income group express their faith on this sensitive issue that the ethnic and religious problems would be solved by the political parties of those ethnic and religious groups.

Case III

\[ H_0 : P_L = .18 \text{ vs. } H_1 : P_L > .18 \]

That means the null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to low income group is equal to .18 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people belonging to low income group is greater than .18 in respect of expressing their belief that the ethnic and religious problems can only be solved by the political parties of those ethnic and religious groups.
Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_L - P_L}{\sqrt{\frac{P_L(1 - P_L)}{n_L}}} \]

and we get \( T = .658 \)

Thus we accept the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance as our calculated value of \( T (.658) \) is less than the tabulated value of \( T_{0.05} (1.645) \).

Hence we can say that only 18% people belonging to low income group express their faith that the ethnic and religious problem can only be solved by the political parties of these ethnic and religious groups.

Summary:

\[ P_H = .35 \]
\[ P_M = .2 \]
\[ P_L = .18 \]

From this statistical analysis, we can say that the trace of communalism in the rural areas of West Bengal, is gradually visible. Although it has not assumed a violent turn, still, there is a probability of taking a serious dimension if not careful step is taken by the authority. Thus an unhealthy process of socialization towards communal politics which is going on in the rural areas of West Bengal should be stopped with an iron hand by the administrative authority. The wealthy section of every communal group are the most active to mobilize the support of the poor rural
masses. Both the Hindu and the Muslim elites are gradually
becoming active to inculcate the communal seeds into the minds of
the rural masses. Besides the Hindus and the Muslims, the
Gorkhas, the Jharkhand communities are well advanced in this
respect. This has been reflected in the rural minds.

So this finding does not approve our hypothesis-5.

During elections, socio-economic issues, inter alia,
become the mainspring around which various classes, castes,
interest and minority groups revolve. However, in that
period various political parties disclose before the rural popu-
lace various socio-economic objectives and their ideologies to
attract them, although "party allegiance or affinity is the main
immediate determinant of voting choice except for those who decide
in the last days before an election. Party allegiance or affi-
nity, in turn, depends on factors, such as, class, occupation,
race, religion, class self-designation, parental characteristics,
education, initial party preference and significant political
events". 14

However, in the rural areas of West Bengal, different
income groups are the supporters of different political parties.
Usually the left political parties are supported by the people of
low income group whereas the right political parties are supported
by the people of high income group. On the contrary, the middle
income group remains in between the two, although, at present,
they support the left political parties more than the right poli-
tical parties. This can be shown in the following way on the
basis of the question "Are you a supporter of right/left political party? Yes/No.

Table 6.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High (H)</th>
<th>Middle (M)</th>
<th>Low (L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>109 (87.2%)</td>
<td>58 (46.4%)</td>
<td>30 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>16 (12.8%)</td>
<td>67 (53.6%)</td>
<td>220 (88%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that the people of high income group choose right political parties to such extent as the people of low income group prefer left political parties whereas the people belonging to middle income group remain in between the two, although they have leftist trend.

In the rural West Bengal, rigid party orientation is found among the people belonging to high and low income groups. But the people of low income group are not as rigid as the people of high income group in this respect. But this does not mean that people of high income group never change their party orientation. But the contention which we should prove is this that the people belonging to middle income group are apt to change their party orientation, the most.

From the aforesaid discussion we can produce the following hypothesis:
(6) People belonging to middle income group are apt to change their party affiliation the most than the people belonging to high income group and low income group.

To test this hypothesis we selected the following question:

Do you change party affiliation from time to time? Yes/No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H I G</th>
<th>M I G</th>
<th>L I G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following 3 cases are to be tested.

Case I

\[ H_0 : \hat{\theta}_H = .15 \] Vs. \[ H_1 : \hat{\theta}_H > .15 \]

That means the null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to high income group is .15 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people belonging to high income group is greater than .15 in respect of confessing that they change party affiliation from time to time.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{\theta}_H - \theta_H}{\sqrt{\frac{\theta_H (1 - \hat{\theta}_H)}{n_H}}} \]

and we get \( T = .814 \)
Thus we accept the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level as our calculated value of $T (.314)$ is less than the tabulated value of $T_{0.05} (1.645)$.

That means we can argue that 15% people belonging to high income group in the rural areas of West Bengal admit that they change party affiliation from time to time.

Case II

$H_0 : P_M = .75$ Vs. $H_1 : P_M > .75$

That means the null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to middle income group is equal to .75 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people belonging to middle income group is greater than .75 in relation to expressing the view that they change party affiliation from time to time.

Our test statistic is

$$T = \frac{\hat{P}_M - P_M}{\sqrt{\frac{P_M (1 - P_M)}{N}} P_M}$$

and we get $T = .671$

Therefore we accept the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance as our calculated value of $T (.671)$ is less than the tabulated value of $T_{0.05} (1.645)$.

So we can say that 75% people belonging to middle income group admit that they change party affiliation from time to time.
That is our null hypothesis is that the proportion of people belonging to low income group is equal to 0.6 against the alternative hypothesis that the proportion of people belonging to low income group is greater than 0.6 in relation to the confession of the fact that they change party affiliation from time to time.

Our test statistic is

\[ T = \frac{\hat{P}_L - P_L}{\sqrt{\frac{P_L (1 - P_L)}{n_L}}} \]

and we get \( T = 1.42 \).

Thus we accept the null hypothesis on the basis of the sample at 5% level as our calculated value of \( T \) (1.42) is less than the tabulated value of \( T_{0.05} \) (1.645).

Hence we can say that in the rural areas of West Bengal 60% people belonging to low income group admit the fact that they change party affiliation from time to time.

From these statistical findings we find that the people belonging to middle income group is apt to change their party affiliation, the most, in comparison with the other two income groups. However one interesting point is to be noted here that the people of low income group follow the middle income
group in this respect significantly but the people belonging to the high income group are least interested in changing the same.

However, this finding approves our hypothesis-6.

From the previous discussion we have come to know that the process of party-politics in the rural areas has become an institution for imparting political knowledge to the rural masses.

Thus we can say that the rural people of all income groups, at present, have turned to party system more prominently because it gives them the opportunities to ventilate their dreams, wishes, aspirations and needs of all kind. Thereby they follow the methods of petitioning, protesting, voting, demonstrations and marches, passive resistance, spontaneous movements, meetings, wall paintings, posterings, etc., and these are keenly observed by all including the young ones in our rural areas. Thus all age groups of people are exposed to the functional process of the political parties.

Several party networks, youth organisations of parties are found to help the rural people of all categories to understand their party objectives and ideologies especially during elections — national, state, local self-government or in the election process of the para political institutions. In every two years the election of either the state or the union government is held in the soil of West Bengal.
Consequently a great significance lies in the spontaneous participation of the rural people in the election process based on party system. Thus "the entry of the rural millions in the orbit of active politics as a result of the grant of universal suffrage and elections is veritable new point of departure in the history of rural society pregnant with incalculable possibilities". This is also invariably true in the case of West Bengal.

Thus the role of the political parties in the process of political socialization is of great significance as they serve as mechanism to moderate various societal groups to make such general policies which are of great significance for system persistence. Sigmund Neumann thinks political parties as the representatives of social interest groups bridging the distance between the individual and the great community.

In the rural areas, local politics revolving through Panchayati Raj Institutions, the grass-roots of democracy, is imparting much political knowledge to the rural masses. This local politics is not narrow or rather parochial. On the contrary, it is true that its scope is not broad.

Although we have seen that the mass media have the least impact in the rural areas of West Bengal, the rural populace get political news from other sources. They usually go to urban areas for business purpose or for work, when they return to their
rural areas, they bring political news for their fellow villagers. Now-a-days, the market places in the rural or urban areas and especially the evening gossiping centres in the rural areas are the central places of exchanging political views regarding the efficiency of government and its functional process, particularly when they discuss the question of market price. The rural people usually have political messages regarding hartals, strikes, demonstrations, etc. in the market places from the loud speakers and these are spread by them in the villages.

By rural elite we particularly mean rural political elites who play a great part in the process of political socialization. These elites usually belong to the economically and educationally advanced stratum and are politically more advanced group than the common masses. They take part either in the existing decision making process of local politics or have past experience in such process. The rural poor and the ignorant masses come to know from them clear cut explanation of critical political issues and gain advice in this respect, especially during elections of the local bodies like the managing committee of school, the executive board of village co-operatives, rural banks etc. These elites belonging to different political parties support their respective party candidates. In this field too, political parties are found to introduce both political programme and candidates to the rural electorate. In this respect, the rural political elites are found to be much more active in the election campaigns encouraging the village voters. During general elections, too, they become active in the rural areas.
In the rural areas of West Bengal interest groups are of great importance, especially various party sponsored Kisan Sabhas. At present, in the rural society of West Bengal the interactions of Kisan Sabhas are found regarding their articulation of interests like fair price of produced commodities, supplying them with seeds, fertilizers and loans, the protection of peasants' rights over the already distributed lands to the peasants, and the demand for vested land for the landless etc. These are of great significance to spread political ideas, especially to the rural peasants.

The rural artisans, fishermen, weavers etc. are also found to articulate their demands and channelize the latter to the proper authorities. Specially they are found to create pressure on panchayat authority.

Besides these, various community associations which have their associational interests also are found to be active to have their demand fulfilled in the rural areas. The tribal community groups are of great importance in this respect. These communities bear political significance especially during elections.

In this connection the question may be raised how far the early learning of the rural people are stable. In western countries, 'early learning affects later learning' although the children do not come to know the real significance of political institutions, ideologies and values. The childhood and preadult learnings are filtered gradually through mature ideas, intelligence and political experiences.
If this is true in respect of western countries it is natural that in the case of West Bengal, specially in the rural areas of it though early learning and corresponding attitudes and orientations are important for later role learning these are invariably subject to change during adolescence.

However the children of the high income group acquire greater political knowledge as they live in more politicized family environment as compared to the children of middle and low income strata. The preadults of high income group possess greater specific knowledge and comparatively more persistent in their attitudes and opinions. To the members of middle and low income group, later political learning becomes more significant as they gather knowledge more from the outside environment than from the family.

This does not mean, however, that the early learning of the preadults of high income group is quite stable. It is also subject to change although to a lesser extent as compared to the two other groups.
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