To achieve the purpose of the present study described in the first chapter and elaborated in the subsequent chapters, the data was to be collected from samples of Hindus and Muslims using the tools that would enable us to have the measures of variables considered in the study. The sample and the tools used for the collection of data are described below:

**SAMPLE**

The sample drawn for the study comprises of 300 students of the various Faculties of Aligarh Muslim University belonging to both Muslim and Hindu communities during the session 1986-87. Both male and female subjects are included in the sample. The age of the subjects varies from 22 to 27 years. The sample mainly consists of the youth belonging to upper and middle class families. Hence the sample of both the communities is expected to be matched with respect to socio-economic status and class.

The characteristics of the sample are as follows:
### Sexwise Break-up of the Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Religionwise Break-up of the Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Age Distribution of the Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Distribution of the Subjects on the Basis of Self-allocation in Socio-economic Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEASURE OF POLITICAL ALIENATION

Alienation has been measured by the scale developed by Nandy (1975) which covers the following aspects of political alienation: (1) sense of political powerlessness, (2) political normlessness and (3) political inactivity or isolation. (see Appendix ).

Political Powerlessness - The scale consists of seven items pertaining to political potency or political efficacy. The respondents were asked supposing they had some problem to take up with the M.L.A., or village level official or district level officer, would they like to contact the official directly or through some personal connection. They were also asked how much influence they had on different political actions and policies of the government. The first three items of the scale have two response categories, and the score of 1 and 2 are assigned to the response options. The last four items have three response categories varying from 'A lot of influence' to 'Not all'. Correspondingly the scoring varied from 1 to 3.

Political Normlessness - The scale consists of seven questions relating to the extent of sanctity one attaches to political institutions and norms of his society. That is his acceptance to political norms and institutions. The respondents were asked how much the political parties and holding of elections
are useful and how useful are the M.Ps. and M.L.As. for the political system. Some of the items have two and some items have three response-categories hence, the scores varied from 1 to 3.

**Political Isolation** - The scale comprises of nine items consisting of questions regarding estrangement from organised social and political life, on the one hand, and social and political engagements on the other. The respondents were asked how much interest they had in politics and the affairs' of the nation, how much time did they devote in politics or how often they participated in political meetings or campaigns etc., and did they spare money for politics. The items have either two or three response options and thus the scores varied from a minimum of 1 to the maximum of 3.

**MEASURE OF POLICY EVALUATION**

In this measure the respondents are asked to evaluate the various policies of the government on a five point scale. The issues were chosen keeping in mind their wider implications for the people of India. Ten policies of the government were finally selected which included reservation policy, language policy, policy for Centre-State relations, defence policy, policy for the welfare of minorities and disadvantaged group, educational policy, cultural policy, policy for the rural development, policy for law and order in the society, and economic policy.
Often the Muslims demand for reservation of jobs for them as they are economically backward. They often fail to understand that while scheduled caste or scheduled tribes, even those among them who have improved their lot, continue to be benifited from reservation of vacancies in educational institutions and jobs, why their own economically backward community is not extended the same benifits as are available to others.

The language policy was chosen because it has significance for the Muslims because of the controversy regarding the status of Urdu as second language in certain states. The defence policy and the policy for Centre/State relations of the government has obvious significance for Muslims.

The cultural and educational policies of the government is often perceived by Muslims to be an attempt to undermine their social identity and to assimilate them. At the occasions of foundation laying ceremonies, inaugurations, etc., the rituals performed appears to Muslims to have Hindu tinge, as they fail to realize that social ceremonies are usually performed in accordance with the traditions of larger section of people participating in it. Muslims often complain that the Akash Vani and Doordarshan have a definite cultural bias irrespective of the fact India is a secular democratic country. The State is therefore expected not to contribute towards the promotion of any religious traditions.
The educational policy of the government is also often described to be a source of grudge for the Muslims, they complain that the choice of optional subjects at the school level is such that it is almost impossible for them to study Urdu as an optional subject because offering Urdu they would be deprived of studying such important subject, for example, English. Muslims have been voicing their concern about the distortion of history and the Hindu bias in the text books of languages and social studies.

The economic policy, the policy for rural development programme and the policy for the welfare of minorities are of great concern for the Muslims. The economic policy deals with the distribution of resources among the various segments of people. Muslims are also keen to get their due share in the national resources.

The policy for law and order in the society is of great concern for the Muslims because unless law and order is established in the society their security may be at stake.

MEASURES OF JUST DESERTS FRUSTRATION

This scale was used by Miller and Jukam in 1981. The scale measures the discontent of people due to the feeling of deprivation. Just deserts frustration as an specific form of deprivation was given by Gurr (1970). It denotes the feeling contingent upon equating the existing quality of life
with what a person considers himself to be rightfully entitled to. This scale consists of five questions which deal with different concrete situations of life like housing conditions, medical care, degree of influence one has in one's community, educational opportunities, and life in general. The respondents are asked how did they feel in respect of each of the above mentioned conditions of life and also that did they feel that conditions of their life are as good as they deserve? The respondents were asked to give their responses in 'YES' or 'NO' categories. The scoring for this scale was '0' for 'YES' and 1 for 'NO'. Those who gave 'YES' response were required to attribute the responsibility of dissatisfaction to any one of the following: self, family, community, majority community and government (see Appendix ).

MEASURE OF SUBJECTIVE RANK DISEQUILIBRIUM

The scale was also used by Miller and Jukam (1981) to measure the discontent of people. The term subjective rank disequilibrium was first given by Galtung (1964). It takes into consideration the disparity in the status and rank which an individual achieves in certain areas of life but fails to achieve in the other areas. Rank disequilibrium is a condition of imbalance or inconsistency between individual's placement on different dimensions of social stratification. For example, rank disequilibrium is experienced by people whose occupational status is significantly less than that for which they are qualified by education. This scale consists of three questions dealing with comparison of one's education with that of one's
income, occupational prestige and status, and the amount of
say in various matters. The respondents are asked that
considering their level of education do they feel that their
income level, occupational status, etc., would be as good
as they deserve? They had to respond in 'Yes' or 'No' cate-
gories. If their response to any item is in 'No' category
they are again asked to specify the degree of disparity on a
three point scale varying from 'somewhat worse' to 'very much
worse'. If the response is in 'Yes' category a score of 0
is assigned to it. If it is in 'No' category, then a score
of 1 is assigned to 'somewhat worse' and a score of 2 to
'much worse' and a score of 3 is assigned to the response
in 'very much' category. (see Appendix ).

MEASURE OF TREATMENT EVALUATION

The respondents were asked to evaluate the various
agencies of the government with which they come in contact
in their day-to-day life. The agencies that were included,
are the police, the railway staff, the electricity department
and the municipal authorities. The respondents are asked to
give their response as to how they feel toward these agencies
in various situations of life. The respondents' feelings
towards each agencies are assessed with a set of four state-
ments asking the respondents to indicate whether they
themselves and other members of their community are given
hard time and their problems are not looked into. The scale
had five response categories. The response options varied from 'Strongly Disagree' to 'Strongly Agree'. Correspondingly, the scoring varied from -2 to +2.

MEASURE OF SYSTEM AFFECT

The measure of system affect was introduced by Almond and Verba (1964), who defined system affect as a generalized attitude towards the system and its virtues and accomplishments as a whole. The respondents are asked to indicate their attitude towards the system vis-a-vis their fundamental rights, representation in the government, support for the system and to what extent they feel proud to live under the system. This scale is sort of a measure of one's patriotic feelings towards the country. It consists of six items, covering the above mentioned items. The respondents are required to give their responses on a five point scale varying from 'Not at all' to 'To a great extent'. The scores varied from -2 to +2.

DATA COLLECTION

The scales were administered to the subjects in small groups. They were instructed to read the items carefully and to put a tick mark in one of the provided spaces according to their agreement/disagreement and opinions to the items. The subjects were also requested to give the responses honestly.
according to their genuine feelings and opinion regarding the issue. They were given ample time to read the questionnaire and respond. There was no time limit fixed for filling up the questionnaire. However, they were asked not to take unnecessarily long time. They were first asked to fill in the biographical details like name, age, sex, religion, income group and area of living, thereafter that they were asked to proceed with the items. In case of any difficulty they could seek clarification from the investigator. The English version of the scales were used. Thus the data were collected from 300 subjects belonging to two major communities.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Since the purpose of the study is to know causal relationship of the variables to different forms of political alienation, the main method of analysis of data is to be the path analysis. This statistical method can be traced back to Wright (1934) who developed the method as a means of study of direct and indirect effects of the variables. Path analysis has to begin with the specification of certain variables as exogenous and other variables as indogenous. Thus, theoretical orientation and the insight of the investigator plays an important role in developing a causal model which is analysed with the help of multiple-regression equations. There is one important difference between multiple regression analysis and
regression analysis and causal analysis. In ordinary regression a dependent variable is regressed on all the predictors under consideration. In path analysis more than one regression analysis are undertaken. Path analysis consists of a number of stages at each stage a variable taken as effect is regressed on its causes. Thus, the variables which are considered as critaria at one level of analysis are treated as predictors at another level of analysis.

The path coefficient $P_{ij}$ denotes the path from $j$ to $i$. $i$ is the criterion and $j$ is the predictor. Path coefficients are equivalent to standard regression weights (Dillon and Goldstein, 1986); they indicate the contribution of a predictor in the prediction of the criterion. Such a path coefficient $P_{ij}$ can be defined as ratio of two quantities (Blalock, 1967), in the denominator and standard deviation of the criterion $S_{ij}$ is in the numerator. Path coefficient can be interpreted in terms of the expected change in the dependent variable as a function of the unit change in the predictor $x_j$ (Mukerjee, 1977).

While direct influence of one variable on the other can be determined by taking standard regression weights as equivalent to the path coefficient, the indirect effect, i.e., the effect mediated through an intervening variable can be ascertained with the help of the product of respective path coefficients.
It may be noted that in spite of the combination of the predictors some variance in the criterion remains unanalysed. The unanalysed variance or the residual can be estimated with the formula \( \sqrt{1-R^2_{Y_i.jkl \ldots p}} \), where \( R^2_{Y_i.jkl \ldots p} \) is the squared multiple correlation of the endogenous variable \( Y_i \) with all those variables (both exogenous and endogenous) that affect it.

Testing of causal model, that is the fit between the data and hypothesized causal structure, can be done with the help of \( W \) which for large sample approximates Chi-square with proper degree of freedom. \( W \) can be calculated according to the formula (Dillon and Goldstein, 1986; 12.3-5 p.449). \( W \) can be calculated as follows:

\[
W = -(N-d) \ln Q \frac{1-R^2_m}{1-M}
\]

where \( Q \) is

\[
R^2_m = 1-(1-R^2_1) (1-R^2_2) \ldots (1-R^2_p)
\]

\[
M = 1-(1-R^2_1) (1-R^2_2) \ldots (1-R^2_p)
\]

Means and standard deviations of all the variables for the two groups are also calculated so as to enable us for intergroup comparison whenever needed. Percentages were taken out where frequencies were to be analysed.

The outcome of the statistical analysis is presented in the next chapter.