
**IMPACT OF PSYCHO-SOCIAL FACTORS ON ATTITUDE TOWARD ETHNICITY
AND MODERNITY AMONG HINDU- MUSLIM GRADUATE STUDENTS:**

*Priya**

In the present study an attempt has been made to probe into the attitudes of Hindu – Muslim graduate students towards Ethnicity and Modernity in relation to some of the psycho – social factors. In this study the dependent variable were Ethnicity and Modernity and independent variables were different castes and communities (Social factors and psychological factors like – conservatism). The prime objective of the study was to ascertain if the sample had positive attitude towards these phenomenon. As we know that Ethnicity is part and parcel of our social life, so obviously we cannot change our traditional society into modern one with one stroke. Change will come very slowly and gradually by creating a certain synthesis with traditional value i.e. broadening social base and deepening popular support.

KEY WORDS: Ethnicity, Modernity, Psycho-Social factors [Psychological factors like “Conservatism”, and Social factors like “Different castes and communities”.]

The genesis of the word Ethnicity reveals the fact that it owes its origin to the Greek word “Ethos and Demos”, denoting the fundamental differences in the nature of social cohesion. Both meant biologically defined groupings which are later on applied to human beings. The main social psychological features of ethnic group are following:

- a. The sense of unique group origin
- b. Sharing of common past history and aspiration of our future
- c. The sense of collective solidarity
- d. Multidimensional group cultural behavior.

Ethnic divisions have existed in society from time immemorial. Ethnic minorities did not pose problem so much as they do in present time. They assert their claim within greater impunity because of the world economy and polity. The new ethnic revival has posed greater danger to

** (Research scholar, Department of Psychology) (B. R. A. Bihar University, Muzaffarpur)*

humanity. Welfare states often to ethnic demands and make concession but such concessional tactics prove insufficient if majority ethnic groups becomes intolerant. This causes communal upsurges and leads to revivalisms of religions.

How far the Modernity is concerned, a living society always tries to adopt itself to the changing norms in order to cope with the needs and demand of the time. This attitude of society to adopt itself to the new value criterions is generally called Modernity. Adopting to new values of life is considered to be a sign of modernization. The aspirations for higher standard of life, freedom of action, social security and justice are some of the accepted goals or index of modernity. In India, modernity prevails in the same spirit. Our country has a rich cultural traditions which is oriental in spirit. The Indian people are proud of their ancient culture, but they have developed a pro-attitude towards scientific culture. Though, Indian society are more or less conservation but this does not mean that it is adverse to scientific and technological changes and innovations. But, still certain communities and areas of the country still hold the thought that the old and new traditions cannot co-exist. Modernization in any field is closely related to economic aspects, which is the central and determinant force in the process of modernization. In the same way, education is an effective instrument of Social transformation. Time perspective is another important aspect of modernization. The popular image of modernity today may not be considered modern tomorrow and then the attitude towards modernity is time related. In today's world popular images of modernization which are mostly, based on western model have a global relevance. This is perhaps due to transcultural nature of human psyche (Smith and Inkele, 1966).

The performance for Science to religion openness to new experiences, time punctuality, family planning, roles and right of women, social equality and justice, political involvement are considered as most popular images of modernity.

How far conservatism is concerned, it is a sort of rightness in believes and understanding which does not easily accept new values and interpretations and remains attached with old values and modes of life. This psychological attitude cannot be called negative attitude but it does not mean lack of scientific attitude. Conservatism denotes lack of flexibility and presence of rigidity. Conservatism has also close links with parental attitude and child rearing practices.

Jaensch observed that “Conservatism” and “Authoritarianism” constitute the prominent fabrics of parental attitude in primary group societies.

AIM:

The study was conducted to measure the impact of psycho-social factors on attitude towards Ethnicity and Modernity among Hindu-Muslim graduate students:

HYPOTHESES:

Considering the aim of the research following hypotheses were formulated:

- 1) The sample belonging to Hindu community would be found to be high in their attitude towards ethnicity and moderate in modernity.
- 2) The sample drawn from Muslim community would be found to be high in Ethnicity and low in Modernity.
- 3) The upper caste sample (Bhumihar, Rajput, Kayastha, Brahmin, Seikh, Saiyad and Sunni) would be found to be more conservative than their lower caste counterpart (Yadav, Baniya, Koeri, Julahas, Dhuniya, and Kabari).
- 4) The upper caste sample would be found to be ethnic in their attitude than their lower caste counterparts.
- 5) The upper caste sample would show more favorable attitude to modernity than their than their lower caste counterparts.
- 6) Ethnicity and conservatism would found to have a positive and significant association.
- 7) Modernity and Conservatism would be found to have a negative but significant dissociation.

SAMPLE:

The sample consisted of 200 graduate college students studying in different colleges of district Sitamarhi(Bihar), belonging to Hindu and Muslim communities by applying random stratified sampling method.

TOOLS USED:

- 1) For the measurement of Ethnicity, Mohsin's Ethnic check list (MECAL) has been used.
- 2) For the measurement of Modernity, Singh, Tripathi and Lal (1979), Modernity scale has been used.
- 3) For the measurement Conservatism, Mohsin's C-Scale has been used.

PROCEDURE:

After, selecting the sample, the test for study were administered to them in groups and individually in some cases, in their leisure hours of their classes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS:

The results came from the study were recorded in the table given below:

TABLE 1:

Showing grade of the Hindu sample in different attitude area:

ATTITUDE AREA	N	X	GRADE
Ethnicity	100	17.15	High
Modernity	100	52.5	Average

The result is upto our expectations. The mean value of Ethnicity is $X = 17.15$, which shows Hindu students are found to be high in Ethnicity. The caste system in the Hindu families in this belt of Sitamarhi is still very much in practice; and children are socialized as per ethical norms of the family in particular and the society in general. It shows the strict adherence to caste ethos among Hindu students. And the mean value of Modernity is $X = 52.5$; which is moderate because of less access to modern innovations. Thus, the hypotheses has been retained.

TABLE 2:

Showing grade of the sample drawn from Muslim community in different area:

ATTITUDE AREA	N	X	GRADE
Ethnicity	100	38.49	High
Modernity	100	97.70	Average

The results quite up to our assumptions. The mean value of Ethnicity is $X = 38.49$, is higher than the mean score of Hindu students, this result supported the earlier finding of Kalikar, 1955, Hassan, 1981. And, that of the mean value of Modernity is $X = 97.70$, which is a bit higher than that of our assumption. This shows their inclinations towards Modernity, Thus, the sample drawn from Muslim community would be found to be high in Ethnicity is substantiated but the sample found to be low in Modernity is rejected.

And that of the mean value of Modernity is $X = 97.70$, which is bit higher than our assumption, this shows their inclination towards Modernity. Thus, the sample drawn from Muslim community would be found to be high. High in Religiosity is accepted, but the sample found to be low in modernity is rejected.

TABLE 3:

Showing t-matrix in Conservatism between upper and lower castes of Hindu and Muslim students:

SAMPLE	N	MEAN	S. D.	S. E.	S. E. DIFF	t*
Upper caste	100	122.35	13.35	1.34	1.77	4.55
Lower caste	100	114.29	11.55	1.16		

*t is significant beyond 0.01 level

Here, the upper caste (Bhumihar, Rajput, Kayastha, Brahmin, Seikh, Saiyad and Sunni) and lower caste (Yadav, Kurmi, Baniya, Julahas, and Dhobi).

The result is in tune with our expectations. The mean value of Upper caste is $X = 122.35$ and of that of the lower caste is $X=114.29$.

The difference between the two means, has been found significant ($t = 4.55$, and $P < 0.01$). The high score of the upper caste is perhaps due to their belief in the origin of Varnas, as referred to in their religious scriptures, which gives them sense of superiority forces them consciously and unconsciously to stick to old values of life and strict adherence to social cultural and religious ethics. On the contrary, the lower caste students, a group are in spirit of revolt and try to break older traditions, and social norms forced upon them by castes of superiors, and that's why, perhaps, they have lower conservatism score. Thus, the hypotheses hasbeen retained.

TABLE 4:

Showing t-Matrix, Ethnicity between upper and lower caste:

SAMPLE	N	MEAN	S. D.	S. E.	S. E. DIFF	t*	P value
Upper Caste	100	15.01	4.78	0.48	0.64	1.09	Not significan t >0.05
Lower Caste	100	14.31	4.21	0.42			

*t is not significant at > 0.05
level

The result quite contraryto our expectation. The children of upper caste and lower caste do not differ significantly in mean ethnicity score, because t-value of 1.09 is not significant at 0.05 level of confidence. Thus, the hypotheses is rejected.

TABLE 5:

Showing t-Matrix, between Upper caste and Lower caste sample in Modernity:

SAMPLE	N	MEAN	S. D.	S. E.	S. E. DIFF	t*
Upper Caste	100	38.86	5.21	0.52	1.01	8.43
Lower Caste	100	30.73	7.48	0.75		

* t is significant beyond 0.01 level

The result is in tune with our expectations. The mean value of Upper caste is $X = 38.86$ and of that of the lower caste is $X = 30.73$. The difference between the two means, has been found significant ($t = 8.43$, and $P < 0.01$). So, the findings are Upper caste sample gets more exposure to modern outlook than their Lower caste counterparts. Thus, the hypotheses is accepted.

TABLE 6:

Showing correlation between Ethnicity and Conservatism:

ATTITUDE AREA	PERSONALITY FACTOR	r	df	SIGNIFICANCE
Ethnicity	Conservatism	0.31	78	0.01

*Significant at 0.01 level

The result is quite in tune with the traditions of the land. The area under study where the caste system is still quite rigidly observed in traditional ethos, people of this belt can be characterized as orthodox and traditionalist with less develop mean of communications. The forces of Modernity do not have easy access to the life of this area. Thus, the hypotheses has been retained.

TABLE 7:

Showing correlation between Modernity and Conservatism:

ATTITUDE AREA	PERSONALITY FACTOR	r	df	SIGNIFICANCE
Modernity	Conservatism	-0.32	78	0.01

*Significant at 0.01 level

The result is quite contrary to our expectations. People with conservative ethos are adverse to change and modernity brings with it modern values are mostly in conflicts with conservative outlook and as such they are unacceptable to the people who stick to the older values and models of life and livings. Thus, the hypotheses is accepted.

CONCLUSIONS:

- 1) The sample still has been reservations regarding modern values of life but they are not adverse to it.
- 2) The sample has been found to be infused with the ethnicity, characteristic features of old caste and community, and social stratifications.
- 3) The sample still maintains the traditional ethos of conservatism for which the area under study has been widely known.

REFERENCES:

- 1) Lawrence J. (2014) *Reconciling the contact and threat hypotheses. Does ethnic diversity strengthen or weaken community inter-ethnic relations? Ethnic and Racial studies* 37 (8): 1328 – 1349.
- 2) McFall S, Nandi A. and Platt L., (2014); *Understanding Society; UK Household Longitudinal study; User guide to Ethnicity Research; Colchester: Institute for Social and Economic research, University of Essex.*
- 3) Cahoon, Lawrence (ed.), 2003, *From Modernism to Post Modernism: An Anthology, 2nd Edition, London: Black Well publishing Ltd.*
- 4) Anant, S. S. (1974), *Attitude towards caste system in Northern India; Indian Psychol Rev.* 11 (1). 1-9.

- 5) Cohen. A. (1974), *Urban Ethnicity*, Taxistrok Publications London.
- 6) Ehrlich, H. J. (1973), *The Social Psychological of Prejudice; A Willey Inter Science Publications*
- 7) Borde, S. (1969), *A process of Modernization*, Harvard University press, Cambridge Massachuattes.

