CHAPTER - III

METHODOLOGY
The following main hypotheses are formulated and the study is designed to verify them objectively.

1. The in-group perception of the Christians is significantly more positive than their perception of the out-group, Hindus.

2. The in-group perception of the Christians is significantly more positive than their perception of the out-group, the Muslims.

3. The Christian’s perception of the Hindus is significantly different from the Christian’s perception of the Muslims.

4. In the Christian’s perception, the Hindu’s perception of the Christians is significantly different from their perception of the in-group, Christians.

5. In the Christian’s perception, the Muslim’s perception of the Christians is significantly different from their perception of the in-group, Christians.

6. In the Christian’s perception, the Hindu’s perception of the Christians is significantly different from the Christian’s perception of the Muslim’s perception of the Christians.

7. The in-group perception of the Hindus is significantly more positive than their perception of the out-group, Christians.

8. The in-group perception of the Hindus is significantly more positive than their perception of the out-group, Muslims.

9. The Hindu’s perception of the Christians is significantly different from the Hindu’s perception of the Muslims.

10. In the Hindu’s perception, the Christian’s perception of the Hindus is significantly different from their perception of the in-group, Hindus.
11. In the Hindu's perception, the Muslim's perception of Hindus is significantly different from their perception of the in-group, Hindus.

12. In the Hindu's perception, the Christian's perception of the Hindus is significantly different from the Hindu's perception of the Muslim's perception of the Hindus.

13. The in-group perception of the Muslims is significantly more positive than their perception of the out-group, Christians.

14. The in-group perception of the Muslims is significantly more positive than their perception of the out-group, Hindus.

15. The Christian's perception of the Muslims is significantly different from the Christian's perception of the Hindus.

16. In the Muslim's perception, the Christian's perception of the Muslims is significantly different from their perception of the in-group, Muslims.

17. In the Muslim's perception, the Hindu's perception of the Muslims is significantly different from their perception of the in-group, Muslims.

18. In the Muslim's perception, the Christian's perception of the Muslims is significantly different from the Muslim's perception of the Hindus perception of the Muslims.

19. There are significant differences in the perceptions of these groups income- and sex-wise as also on the nature of occupation of mother.

THE SETTING

India is a union of 28 states and 5 union territories. Karnataka is one of the major states situated in the Deccan plateau. The present Karnataka State was carved into existence on linguistic basis on 1st November 1956 as recommended by the States Re-organization Commission appointed by the Government of India in 1953. It consists of the regions known as Bombay
Karnataka comprising the districts of Belgaum, Bijapur, Dharwad and Uttar Kannada (Karwar), the Hyderabad Karnataka comprising the districts of Raichur, Gulbarga and Bidar, and Madras Karnataka comprising Bellary district and Dakshina Kannada (Mangalore) excluding Kasargod. It also includes Kodagu (formerly known as Coorg), which was earlier under a chief commissioner. The State was named as ‘Karnataka’ on 1st November 1973.

The federal form of the Government of India as well as the Karnataka State provides decentralized administration through local self-governing institutions. Karnataka is divided into 27 districts and 175 taluks. Urban local bodies in Karnataka and also all over India are broadly classified into

1. Municipal Corporation
2. Municipalities
3. Cantonment boards, and
4. Notified area committees.

Presently Karnataka has 151 Municipalities, 6 Municipal Corporations, 12 Notified Areas, and 3 Cantonment Boards. Hubli and Dharwad is a Municipal Corporation.

The fieldwork for the present study was conducted in Hubli-Dharwad Corporation area of Karnataka state. Hubli-Dharwad was selected for the study because it has witnessed regular outbursts of communal violence, which has claimed many lives and destroyed property worth lakhs of rupees. These riots cause loss of human lives, damage to property and create an atmosphere of tension and insecurity. Certain pockets of the cities are marked out as sensitive areas, which are more prone to riots.
Table 2: Statement of communal incidents since 1996-2004 with Number of Civilians and Government Officials killed and injured.

| Sl. No | Year | No. of cases | No. of Civilians | | | | | No. of Govt. Officials |
|-------|------|--------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|       |      |              | Killed           | Injured          | Hindu Killed | Muslim Killed | Hindu Injured | Muslim Injured |
| 1     | 1996 | --           | --               | --               | --            | --            | --            | --            |
| 2     | 1997 | 01           | --               | --               | --            | --            | --            | --            |
| 3     | 1998 | 07           | --               | --               | 02            | 03            | --            | 77            |
| 4     | 1999 | 01           | --               | --               | --            | --            | --            | --            |
| 5     | 2000 | 02           | --               | --               | --            | --            | --            | --            |
| 6     | 2001 | 50           | 01               | --               | 11            | 02            | --            | 10            |
| 7     | 2002 | 12           | 01               | --               | --            | 01            | --            | 06            |
| 8     | 2003 | --           | --               | --               | --            | --            | --            | --            |
| 9     | 2004 | --           | --               | --               | --            | --            | --            | --            |

SOURCE: Hubli-Dharwad Police Commissionarate

Hubli-Dharwad – Geographic setting:

Dharwad district lies in the northwest region of Karnataka state. The district lies between the latitudinal parallels of 14° 17’N and 15° 15’N and the longitudinal parallel of 74° 48’E. Dharwad district comprises of 5 talukas, namely, Hubli, Dharwad, Kundagol, Kalghatagi and Navalgund. The twin cities of Hubli and Dharwad together form the largest of the district covering an area of 190,94 sq. kms. It is well connected by road, rail and air. It is located on the Western Ghats at a height of 2580 feet above sea level and records an average rainfall of 32 inches. Dharwad was made the district headquarters of
collectorate for the area of southern Maratha country in 1930. For the first time a civic body was established in 1856 and later it became the city municipality in 1883 and a municipal borough in 1926. The Hubli-Dharwad Municipal Corporation was created by merging the separate Municipalities of Hubli and Dharwad on 1st March 1962. This corporation is the largest city corporation in Karnataka after Bangalore.

**Table 3: Distribution of population in India, Karnataka state and Dharwad district.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>INDIA</td>
<td>531,272,078</td>
<td>495,738,169</td>
<td>1,027,015,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>KARNATAKA</td>
<td>26,856,343</td>
<td>25,877,615</td>
<td>52,733,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DHARWAD DIST</td>
<td>8,23,416</td>
<td>7,80,379</td>
<td>16,03,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DHARWAD CITY</td>
<td>1,12,252</td>
<td>1,06,551</td>
<td>2,18,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>DHARWAD RURAL</td>
<td>1,03,962</td>
<td>98,555</td>
<td>2,02,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>HUBLI CITY</td>
<td>65,952</td>
<td>62,363</td>
<td>1,28,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>HUBLI RURAL</td>
<td>65,952</td>
<td>62,363</td>
<td>1,28,315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The distribution of population in the district is similar to the population distribution of Karnataka state as a whole.
Interestingly, when Hubli city was introduced to the adult franchise system in 1925, the city was divided into 7 non-Muslim and 3 Muslim constituencies. In 1948, the municipal council was reorganized the government dissolved the separate electorates.

Objectives of the study:

1. To know the perception of different religio-cultural groups in the Indian context.
2. To study the perception by each of the different religio-cultural groups of the other religio-cultural groups.

SELECTION OF SAMPLE

The sample, aged between 18 and 28 years mainly consisted of students from various colleges in Hubli and Dharwad. These colleges were randomly selected. These colleges were requested to lend a copy of the list of students enrolled in their institution. From this list, students were randomly selected. These students were assembled and administered the Bogardus Social Distance Scale and the newly developed Inter-religious Perception Scale. To ensure candor, care was taken to appoint a trained experimenter who was known to the subjects and was also from the same religious background as the students, i.e., Christians were administered the test by Christian experimenter, Hindus by Hindu experimenter and Muslims by Muslim experimenter (Varshney, 2002). For example, in one of the colleges, one of the lecturers was requested to administer the test to her students. She was explained all the nuances of the scale and armed with a list of the meanings of items on the scale. This way the subjects were expected to drop their inhibitions to some extent and respond to the very
sensitive items on the scale more freely. The subjects were requested to be truthful and honest. To enhance the validity of the responses of the subjects, a procedure known as the 'bogus pipeline technique' (Aguinis, Pierce, and Quigley, 1993, 1995) was used, whereby the subjects were told that the scale was fitted with an inbuilt lie scale.

The total sample of 600 subjects, which included 200 each of the three different religious groups, was contacted personally and administered the tests.

**Distribution of Sample:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CHRISTIANS</th>
<th>HINDUS</th>
<th>MUSLIMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 600

**Research design:**

The perceptions of each of the three religio-cultural groups, Christians, Hindus and Muslims are measured on Semantic Differential Scale in the following frameworks:

1. Perceptions of the in-group.
2. Perception of the out-group.
3. In the perception of a given group, how is it perceived by an out-group.
TOOLS

Personal Data Questionnaire:

Personal Data Questionnaire was used to collect the basic information about the subjects. It consisted of 20 questions, like name, age, date of birth, sex, marital status, education, occupation, background during childhood, religion, father’s religion, mother’s religion, father’s occupation, mother’s occupation, parent’s income (monthly), number of siblings, exposure to various modes of mass media like newspaper/magazine, radio, television and internet, and lastly their relation with other religious groups.

Inspite of assuring the subjects that the data will be used only for research purposes, due to the extremely sensitive nature of the items some subjects were hesitant about writing their names, so filling out the name was made optional and left to the discretion of the subject.

Inter-religious Perception Scale:

A questionnaire of 50 items was developed on the basis of Osgood’s Semantic Differential method. This method was preferred over the other prevalent methods because it is the best method to study religious and cultural issues (Osgood et al, 1957).

The semantic differential is a method of observing and measuring the psychological meaning of concepts. The semantic differential scale or S.D. scale was developed by Charles E. Osgood, G.J.Suci and P.H.Tannenbaum to measure the psychological meanings of an object to an individual. This scale is
based on the presumption that an object can have different dimensions of connotative meaning, which can be located in multidimensional property space, or what can be called the semantic space in the context of SD scale. An actual SD scale consists of a number of scales, each of which is a bipolar adjective pair, chosen from a large number of such scales for a particular research purpose. The bipolar adjectives can be used on a three, five, seven or even nine point scales. Each concept to be measured appears on a separate sheet with the same set of scales. The items are classified into different dimensions, namely evaluative, potency and activity. These are the basic dimensions, added to these there are a few other dimensions like aggressive, stability etc, but these dimensions cause a lot of overlapping.

CONSTRUCTION OF SCALE

For construction of the semantic differential scale for this study the book titled “The measurement of meaning” by Osgood et al was consulted. This book explains the steps to be taken to develop an SD scale. The book also lists out the bipolar items for which factor analysis was worked out by the authors. From this list, though not exhaustive, 60 items were chosen. This list of 60 items was given to 6 experts to pick out the relevant items to construct the scale. These experts were given the leeway to suggest new bipolar items with relevance to the topic. The experts unanimously selected 48 items from the list and suggested the use of 2 pairs of new bipolar adjectives, which were not part of the list by Osgood et al. These items were classified into the different
dimensions, evaluative, potency and activity. These 50 items were used for validation in the pilot study.

**Research design:**

The perceptions of each of the three religio-cultural groups, Christians, Hindus and Muslims are measured on Semantic Differential Scale in the following frameworks:

1. Perceptions of the in-group.
2. Perception of the out-group.
3. In the perception of a given group, how is it perceived by an out-group.

**PILOT STUDY**

Soon after the selection of the 50 items, a pilot study was conducted. The sample consisted of 90 subjects, which included 30 Christians, 30 Hindus and 30 Muslims.

**Distribution of Sample:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Christians</th>
<th>Hindus</th>
<th>Muslims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 90

The subjects were presented the 50 selected items five times on five different sheets of paper. The five concepts were presented on different sheets.
1. On the first sheet they had to rate their own religious group, i.e., Christians rated Christians, Hindus rated Hindus and Muslims rated Muslims.

2. On the second sheet each subject rated the first out-group, whereby Christians rated Hindus, Hindus rated Christians and Muslims rated Christians.

3. On the third sheet, each subject rated the second out-group, whereby Christians rated Muslims, Hindus rated Muslims and Muslims rated Hindus.

4. On the fourth sheet, each subject rated how their self-group was probably perceived by the first out group, i.e., Christians rated how Hindus perceived Christians, Hindus rated how Christians perceived Hindus and Muslims rated how Christians perceived Muslims.

5. On the fifth sheet, each subject rated how their self-group was probably perceived by the second out-group, i.e., Christians rated how Muslims perceived Christians, Hindus rated how Muslims perceived Hindus and Muslims rated how Hindus perceived Muslims.

These concepts were clearly explained to the subjects in the instructions printed on the sheet after the PDQ. The subjects were requested to write down any suggestions to improve the test. The instructions were explained to the subjects before administering the test. There is no time limit for the test. After completion of the test the responses were collected and scored.

**SCORING**

For scoring the items the positive items were scored as 5,4,3,2 and 1 while the negative items were scored as 1,2,3,4 and 5. When the 50 items were classified into the three dimensions, 33 items came under evaluative, 13 items
under potency and 4 items under activity. After scoring the items, the scores for each dimension were added up and finally these dimension scores were added up to arrive at a grand total.

The responses of the 90 subjects were scored. The results were statistically analysed and found satisfactory. Validity was established through the process of construct validation. Reliability was established through the split half method. Both were satisfactory.

The same 50 items were used for the main study. Certain suggestions made by the subjects in the pilot study were incorporated like,

1. The subjects requested that the concepts be printed not only in the instructions section but also on each sheet.
2. Due to the sensitivity of the topic many subjects requested that the option to fill in their name in the PDQ be left to their discretion.
3. The subjects found, answering 50 items five times (i.e., 250 items) quite laborious. For this, in the main study, before administering the test, the subjects were mentally prepared by explaining to them about the test being repetitive, laborious and time consuming.