CHAPTER-IV

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND MASS MEDIA USER PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS (COMMON PEOPLE)

4. Analysis based on the Opinion of Common People

An empirical survey was conducted to understand the perception of the common peopleand accordingly, interpretations have been made as follows:-

Table 4.1: Distribution of Common People according to Residence

Sl.no	Residence	Frequency	Percentage
1	Urban	213	53
2	Rural	187	47
	Total	400	100

The residence of an individual indicates the kind facilities he/she is getting and influence of it on the mindsets of the people. The table shows that53% of the respondents turns out to be urban residence whereas only 47% are belongs to rural area. Hence, it is being observed that almost equal participation of respondents from urban as well as rural areas in the present study.

Table 4.2: Distribution of Common People accordingto Age

Sl.no	Age(years)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	18-28	58	14
2	23-27	35	9
3	28-32	42	10
4	33-37	37	9
5	38-42	42	11
6	43-47	38	10
7	48-52	37	9
8	53-57	32	8
9	58-62	0	0
10	63-67	25	6
11	68-72	26	7
12	73-77	28	7
	Total	400	100

Age of a person determines the physical and mental maturity. It affects the attitude and reflects the mobility and acceptability of individuals. The table shows that maximum respondents (14%) belong to 18-22 years of age while minimum respondents (6%) are from 63-67 years of age. Hence, it is inferred that majority of the respondents are youths and minority of them are in higher age group.

Table 4.3: Distribution of Common People according to Gender

Sl.no	Gender	Frequency	Percentage
1	Male	202	51
2	Female	198	50
	Total	400	100

Gender determines the status of an individual in the society. It reflects the thinking and acceptability besides bearing on the media access and use of an individual. The table shows that 51 % of the respondents are male while 50% belongs to female. Hence, it is observed that the current study have equal participation of the both the gender.

Table 4.4: Distribution of Common People accordingto Mother Tongue

Sl.no	Mother Tongue	Frequency	Percentage
1	Manipuri	269	67
2	English	0	0
3	Hindi	0	0
4	Others	131	33
	Total	400	100

Mother tongue of an individual shows the community of an individual. It reflects social behaviour of the particular community. The table shows that maximum respondents (67 %) are belong to Manipuri (Meitie and Meitei pangal) while only 33% of the respondents are belongs to other community. No representation from English and Hindi speaking community.Hence, it is being inferred that Manipuri community are the maximum participants of the present survey.

Table 4.5: Distribution of Common People according to Caste

Sl.no	**Caste**	Frequency	Percentage
1	General	178	44
2	OBC	131	33
3	SC	91	23
4	ST	0	0
	Total	400	100

Caste determines the socio-economic status of an individual in the society. The study reveals that maximum respondents belong to general caste (44%) and minimum respondents arefrom SC (91%). But, OBC respondents have the share of 33%.No representation from ST (scheduled tribes).Hence, it is being observed that the present study is conducted among Manipuri Community.

Table 4.6: Distribution of Common People according to marital status

Sl.no	Marital status	Frequency	Percentage
1	Married	220	55
2	Unmarried	180	45
	Total	400	100

Marriage is a societal institution and reflects the individual's ability to take up familial responsibility. The table shows that nearly 55% of the respondents are married people while 45% are unmarried people. Hence, it is observed that the maximum participation of the current survey belong to married people suggesting matured and responsible individuals.

Table 4.7: Distribution of Common People according to Languages(known)

Sl.no	Languages (known)	Frequency	Percentage
1	Manipuri	167	41
2	English	107	27
3	Hindi	91	23
4	Others	35	9
	Total	400	100

A language not only integrates individuals emotionally but also a need for survival. It is an important means of communication. Having the knowledge of other languages reflects the individual exposure and potential for accessibility to various language media. Language affects the media use patternof an individual. The table shows that maximum respondents know Manipuri (41%) whilerespondents having knowledge of English and Hindi are 27% and23% respectively. Only 9% of the respondents know other languages besides Manipuri, English and Hindi. Hence, it has been inferred that majority of the respondents know Manipuri language.

Table 4.8: Distribution of Common People accordingto Educational Qualification

Sl.no	Educational Qualification	Frequency	Percentage
1	No education	47	12
2	High school	72	18
3	Higher secondary	72	18
4	Graduate	97	24
5	PG	61	15
6	Others	51	13
	Total	400	100

Education helps in acquiring knowledge by an individual. It shapes the individual and brings about development in the society. Education reflects the level of individual awareness. Maximum respondents (24%) are graduates while minimum respondents (12%) are without any kind of formal education. The data shows equal representation of respondents having high school and higher secondary qualifications with 18% each. Hence, it is being observed that majority of the respondents are graduates and very few of them are without any formal educational qualification.

Table 4.9: Distribution of Common People according to Status of employment

Sl.no	Status of employment	Frequency	Percentage
1	Self Employed	96	24
2	Unemployed	75	19
3	Employed	103	26
4	Farmer	61	15
5	Others	65	16
	Total	400	100

Employment is a determining factor for an individual income source. Maximum respondents are having employment with 26% while 19% of the respondents are unemployed. While the rshares of self-employed, farmer and others are 24%, 15% and 16% respectively. Hence, majority of the respondents are having regular income source.

Table 4.10: Distribution of Common People accordingto Type of Employment

Sl.no	Type of Employment	Frequency	Percentage
1	Government:		
2	Class 1	21	21
3	Class 2	27	26
4	Class 3	27	26
5	Class 4	0	0
6	Private	28	27
7	Unorganised	0	0
	Total	103	100

Type of employment reflects the status of the job where an individual is serving. Maximum respondents are from private sector (27%) and no respondent belongs to unorganized sector as well as Class 4 employment. The respective share of Class1 and Class2 sectors are 21% and 26% each. Hence, it is being inferred that majority of the respondents are working in private sector.

Table 4.11: Distribution of Common People accordingto possession of Pet animal

Sl.no	Possession of Pet animal	Frequency	Percentage
1	Yes	226	56
2	No	174	44
	Total	400	100

Possession of pet animal reflects the affection and relationship of individual with other living beings. Nearly 56 % of the respondents are having pet animal while only 44% of the respondents do not possess pet animal. Hence, it is being observed that more than half of the respondents have affection and conscious of other living beings around them.

Table 4.12: Distribution of Common People according to Identity of the pet animal

Sl.no	Identity of the pet animal	Frequency	Percentage
1	Cat	75	19
2	Dog	85	21
3	Cow	47	12
4	Goat	37	9
5	Pig	42	10
6	Hen	75	19
7	Others	39	10
	Total	400	100

Identifying individual pet animal reflect those animals which are domesticated by the particular community in the area. Maximum pet animal belongs to dog (21%) while minimum pet animal turns out to be goat (9%). While the respective share of Hen(19%), Cat(19%),Cow(12%), Pig (10%) and other (10%) each. Hence, it has been inferred that dog is most domesticated animal in the study area whereas pig and other undisclosed animals are the least domesticated animals.

Table 4.13: Distribution of Common People according to Food Preference

Sl.no	Food Preference	Frequency	Percentage
1	Rice grown with urea	137	34
2	Rice grown with cow dung	263	66
	Total	400	100

Eating preference reflects the individual awareness of fertilisers having organic and chemical source. The study reveals that about 66% of the respondents preferred food with organic manure .While only 34% of the respondents choose food with chemical fertiliser. Hence, it has been observed that majority of the respondents have high level of awareness of organic food.

Table 4.14: Distribution of Common People according toDrinking water source

Sl.no	Drinking water source	Frequency	Percentage
1	Domestic supply	146	36
2	Pond	76	19
3	River	55	14
4	Lake	40	10
5	Well	40	10
6	Others	43	11
	Total	400	100

Source of drinking water is an important criterion for leading a hygienic life. The study shows that maximum respondents (36%) rely on domestic water supply whereas minimum respondents depend on lake and well with their respective share of 10% each. While the share of respondents having water sources from pond, river and other sources are 19%, 14% and 11% respectively. Hence, it has been inferred that major source of drinking water is domestic supply in study area.The decreasing order of drinking water sources are domestic supply, pond, river, others (undisclosed source), lake and well.

Table 4.15: Distribution of Common People according to possession of radio

Sl.no	Possession of radio	Frequency	Percentage
1	Yes	360	90
2	No	40	10
	Total	400	100

The study claims that 90% of the respondents possess radio while 10% of the respondents are not having radio. Hence, it is being inferred that majority of the respondents have accessibility to radio while very low number of respondents do not have any access to radio.

Table 4.16: Distribution of Common People according to Frequency of Listening

Sl.no	Frequency of Listening	Frequency	Percentage
1	Regularly	220	55
2	Irregularly	180	45
	Total	400	100

Listening frequency reflects the accessibility of individual to radio. More access to radio means more exposure. The study finds that 55% of the respondent's regular listeners 45% of the respondents are irregular listeners. Hence, it has been observed that Maximum of the respondents are regularly access to radio but minority of the respondents are irregular listeners to radio.

Table 4.17: Distribution of Common People according to Listening Hours

Sl.no	Listening hours	Frequency	Percentage
1	0-15 mins	90	22.5
2	15-30 mins	130	32.5
3	30-1 hr.	130	32.5
4	Above 1 hr.	50	12.5
	Total	400	100

Listening hours reflects the individual exposure to radio in a day. The study reveals that maximum respondents (32.5%) are listening to radiofrom 15 minutes to 1 hour per day. While minimum of the respondents (12.5%) are listening to radio above 1 hour in a day. Nearly, 22.5 % of the respondents are listening to radio about 15 minutes in a day. Hence, it has been observed that majority of the respondents listening to radio from 15 minutes to 1 hours per day.

Table4.18: Distribution of Common People according toRecalling Environmentalissue

Sl.no	Recalling Environmental issue	Frequency	Percentage
1	Yes	185	46
2	No	215	54
	Total	400	100

Recalling ability reflects the level of awareness an individual is having with the particular information or message. It affects the individual perception about the information or message being conveyed. The study shows that maximum respondents (54%)

areunable to recall the information while only 46% respondents are able to recall the information or message. Hence, it is being observed that majority of the respondents have low level of awareness about the particular message or information.

Table 4.19: Distribution of Common People accordingtoSpecifying the Issue

Sl.no	Specifying the issue	Frequency	Percentage
1	Able to specify	212	53
2	Unable to specify	188	47
	Total	400	100

Specifying a particular information or message reflects the level or degree of understanding an individual is having with it. The study found out that more than half of the respondents (53%) are able to specify the information whereas nearly 47% of the respondents are unable to specify it. Hence, it has been inferred that most of the respondents are able to digest the message or information being conveyed.

Table 4.20: Distribution of Common People according to RecallingtheSlogan

Sl.no	Recalling the slogan	Frequency	Percentage
1	Yes	175	44
2	No	225	56
	Total	400	100

Recalling ability indicates the attention associated with the particular slogan. It has been reflected at the perception level of an individual. The table shows that maximum respondents (56%) are unable to recall the slogan while the remaining 44% of the respondents are able to recall the slogan. Hence, it has been inferred that majority of the respondents are inattentive of the particular slogan and less than half of the respondents give proper attention to the slogan being conveyed.

Table 4.21: Distribution of Common People according to Specifying the Slogan

Sl.no	Specifying the Slogan	Frequency	Percentage
1	Able to specify	211	53
2	Unable to specify	189	47
	Total	400	100

Specifying ability reflects the understanding of an individual associated with the particular slogan. The study reveals that 53% of the respondents (53%) are able to specify the slogan whereas only 47% of the respondents are fail to specify the slogan. Therefore, it has been observed that majority of the respondents are able to digest the slogan while minority of the respondens are unable to do so.

Table 4.22: Distribution of Common People according to Possession of Telivision

Sl.no	Possession of Television	Frequency	Percentage
1	Yes	251	63
2	No	149	37
	Total	400	100

Possession of television reflects the easy availability of the medium. The study claim that 63% of the respondents possess television sets. While 37% of the respondents are not having television sets. Hence, it is being inferred that majority of the respondents have accessibility to television while less than half of the respondents do not have any access to television.

Table 4.23: Distribution of Common People according to Identifying the Brand name

Sl.no	Identifying the Brand name	Frequency	Percentage
1	Able to specify	226	56
2	Unable to specify	174	44
	Total	400	100

Ability to specify the brand name reflects the consciousness of individual for the brand company. The finding reveals that more than half of the respondents i.e. 56% are able to specify the brand name while 44% of the respondents are unable to specify the brand name. Hence, it is being observed that majority of the respondents are aware of the brand name while minority of the respondents are are aware of the brand name.

Table 4.24: Distribution of Common People according to Number of T.V Sets

Sl.no	Number of T.V Sets	Frequency	Percentage
1	1	89	22
2	2	104	25
3	Above 2	93	23
4	No response	124	30
	Total	400	100

Possession of T.V sets reflects the easy accessibility of the medium. The study claims that 25% of the respondents have two TV sets while 23% of the respondents claim to have more than two TV sets. Only

22% of the respondents are having one TV set. Nearly, 30% of the respondents are not expressing their opinion. Hence, it is being observed that majority of the respondents have TV sets which varies from one set to more than two sets. Respondents not expressing their views appear to be unaware of television.

Table 4.25: Distribution of Common People accordingto Type of Connection

Sl.no	Type of Connection	Frequency	Percentage
1	DD only	128	32
2	DTH	91	23
3	Cable TV	103	26
4	Any other	78	19
	Total	400	100

Type of connection reflects the individual access to various programmes by innumerable local and satellite channels. The study reveals that 32% of the respondents have received doordarshan channel only. While 26% of the respondents claim to have cable connection and another 23% of the respondent have DTH connection. Only 19% of the respondents are having other connections. Hence, it is being observed that majority of the respondents have DD only(receiving doordarshan's free to air channels through Yagi Antenna-ladder like antenna). The decreasing order of connections as claimed by the respondents is DD only, cable TV, DTH and any other connections.

Table 4.26: Distribution of Common People according to T.V viewing frequency

Sl.no	T.V viewing frequency	Frequency	Percentage
1	Regularly	183	46
2	Irregularly	217	54
	Total	400	100

Viewing frequency reflects the accessibility of individual to television. More access to television means more exposure. The study finds that 54% of the respondents irregular viewers while 46% of the respondents are regular viewers. Hence, it has been observed that more than half of the respondents are not regularly access to television although little less than half of the respondents do have regular access to television.

Table 4.27: Distribution of Common People according to weekly Viewing frequency

Sl.no	WeeklyViewing frequency	Frequency	Percentage
1	Daily	116	29
2	5-6 days	86	21
3	3-4 days	94	24
4	2-1 day	104	26
	Total	400	100

The study reveals that maximum of the respondents (29%) are daily viewers of television while minimum respondents (21%) are viewing television on 5-6 days per week. While the respective share of respondents having 3-4 days and 2-1day's viewing television are 24%

and 26% each.Hence, all the respondents are viewing television with variation in viewing days.

Table 4.28: Distribution of Common People according to Daily viewing frequency

Sl.no	Daily viewing frequency	Frequency	Percentage
1	0-15 mins	79	20
2	15-30 mins	104	26
3	30-1 hr.	112	28
4	Above 1 hr.	105	26
	Total	400	100

Daily viewing frequencyreflects the individual exposure to television in a day. The study finds that maximum respondents (28%) are viewing television about 1 hour per day. While minimum of the respondents (20%) are viewing television about 15 minutes in a day. Respondents viewing television for 15-30 minutes and above 1 hour have the equal share of 26% each. Hence, it has been observed that maximum viewing time period lies from 30 minutes to 1 hour while the minimum viewing time period lies between 0 minutes to 15 minutes.

Table 4.29: Distribution of Common People according to Viewed DD channels

Sl.no	Viewed DD channels	Frequency	Percentage
1	DD-1	142	35
2	DD-2	87	22
3	DD-1+ DD-2	46	11
4	DD-13	0	0
5	Others	54	14
6	No response	71	18
	Total	400	100

Doordarshan channels are the only channel of mainstream media that reaches every nook and corner of India.The study reveals that maximum of the respondents (35%) are viewing DD-1 only while the minimum of the respondents (11%) are viewing both DD-1 and DD-2. No respondents are not viewing DD-13. The respective share of respondents viewing DD-2 and other channels are 22% and 14% each. Interestingly, 18% of the respondents do not express their opinion. Hence, it is being observed that DD-1 or DD-national is the only channel most viewed by the respondents. Some of the respondents reflect their neutrality of opinion about the doordarshan channels.

Table 4.30: Distribution of Common People according to Recalling Slogan

Sl.no	Recalling Slogan	Frequency	Percentage
1	Yes	147	37
2	No	150	37
3	No response	103	26
	Total	400	100

Recalling ability indicates the attentiveness shown by individual with the particular slogan. It affects at the individual perception level. The study finds an equal representation of respondents having recalling (37%) and not recalling (37%). Only 26% of the respondents are not expressing their opinion. Hence, it has been inferred that an equal proportion of respondents are attentiveand inattentive of the particular slogan. Minimum of the respondents are unaware about the slogan.

Table 4.31: Distribution of Common People according to Shown Programme

Sl.no	Shown Programme	Frequency	Percentage
1	News	99	25
2	Advertisement	50	12
3	Documentary	82	21
4	Serial	69	17
5	Others	0	0
6	No response	100	25
	Total	400	100

Broadcasting or showing particular programme reflects the policy of the broadcaster or the cable operator. The finding shows that 25% of the respondents claim to be shown news by the cable operator while another 25% of the respondents do not express their views at all. Nearly 21% of the respondents claim to be shown documentary while 17% of the respondents claim to be shown serials. Only 12% of the respondents claim to be shown advertisement. None of the respondents claim to be shown other programmes. Hence, it is being observed that decreasing order of programmes shown by cable operator are news, documentary, serial and advertisement. News programme turnout to be the most broadcasted programme.

Table4.32: Distribution of Common People according to Frequency of Environmental Coverage

Sl.no	Frequency of Environmental Coverage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Occasionally	119	30
2	Rarely	43	11
3	Weekly	55	13
4	Monthly	45	11
5	Yearly	39	10
6	Not shown	39	10
7	No response	61	15
	Total	400	100

Showing (broadcasting) frequency reflects the interest and social responsibility kept in mind by the authority of the media houses. The study shows that 30% of the respondents claim to be shown environmental programmes occasionally. While 15% of the respondents do not express their opinion and 13% of the respondents claim to be shown weekly. Only 11% of the respondents claim to be shown rarely and another 11% of the respondents claim to be shown monthly. Nearly 10% of the respondents claim not to be shown environmental programmes at all. Hence, it is being inferred that maximum number of respondents claims to be shown environmental programmes with variation in time period. Few of the respondents are unaware of the environmental programmes while some of the respondents felt not shown the environmental programmes.

Table 4.33: Distribution of Common People according to Preference for watching films

Sl.no	Preference for watching films	Frequency	Percentage
1	Yes	266	66
2	No	134	34
	Total	400	100

Watching preference reflects individual interest of the medium. The finding shows that 66% of the respondents prefer to watch movies while only 34% do not prefer to watch films.Hence , it is being observed that majoirity of the respondents like to watch films.

Table 4.34: Distribution of Common People according to Place of Watching Film

Sl.no	Place of Watching Film	Frequency	Percentage
1	Home	162	40
2	Neighbour’s house	65	16
3	Relative’s house	54	14
4	Friend’s house	56	14
5	Others	63	16
	Total	400	100

Place of watching films reflect the individual preferred place for watching movies. The study reveals that 40% of the respondents watch movies at home. Nearly 14% of the respondents watch films at relative’s house and another 14% of the respondents watch at friend’s house. While each 16% share of the respondents watch films at neighbour’s house and other places respectively. Hence, it is being observed that majority of the respondents preferred home as place for watching films. The decreasing order of preference of place for watching films by the respondents are home, neighbour’s house, others(undisclosed), relative’s house and friend’s house.

Table 4.35: Distribution of Common People according to Way of Watching Film

Sl.no	Way of Watching Film	Frequency	Percentage
1	Television	178	44
2	Computer	75	19
3	Mobile	65	16
4	At theatres	82	21
	Total	400	100

Way of watching films reflects the individual preference of the medium for watching films. The study discloses that 44% of the respondents watch films through television while 21% of the respondents watch films at theatres. Only 19% of the respondents watch through computer and another 16% of the respondents watch through mobile. Hence, it is being inferred that majority of the respondents prefer television as medium for watching films. The ascending order of individual preference of medium for watching films is mobile, computer, theatres and television.

Table 4.36: Distribution of Common People according to Frequency of watching films (last 6 months)

Sl.no	Frequency of watching films (last 6 months)	Frequency	Percentage
1	1-5	136	34
2	5-10	124	31
3	Above 10	140	35
4	Zero	0	0
	Total	400	100

Number of movies being watched by the respondents reflects the frequency of exposure having by an individual. The study shows that 35% of the respondents watch more than 10 movies. Nearly,34% of the respondents claim watching 1-5 movies while 31% of the respondents have watched 5-10 movies. Hence, it is being observed that all the respondents have gone for movies in the last six months suggesting their high exposure to movies.

Table 4.37: Distribution of Common People according to Watched environmental films

Sl.no	Watched environmental films	Frequency	Percentage
1	Yes	189	47
2	No	211	53
	Total	400	100

Watching reflects the degree of interest and participation of an individual. The finding discloses that about 53% of the respondents claim to watch environmental films while only 47% of the respondents claim not watching environmental films. Hence, it is being observed that majority of the respondents have interest and attended environmental films while minority of the respondents are not having interest for environmental films.

Table 4.38: Distribution of Common People according to Specifying the environmental films

Sl.no	Specifying the environmental films	Frequency	Percentage
1	Able to specify	210	52
2	Unable to specify	190	48
	Total	400	100

Specifying reflects the degree of attentiveness and understanding of an individual. The finding shows that more than half of the respondents i.e. 52% are able to specify the film and another 48 % of the respondents are unable to specify the films. Hence, it is being inferred that majority of the respondents are attentive to environmental films.

Table 4.39: Distribution of Common People according to Computer Operability

Sl.no	Computer Operability	Frequency	Percentage
1	Yes	207	52
2	No	193	48
	Total	400	100

Operability indicates the potential to access computer. The finding reveals that 52% of the respondents are able to operate computer while 48% of the respondents do not know how to operate computer. Hence, it is being inferred that majority of the respondents have the potential to access to computer.

Table 4.40: Distribution of Common People according to Internet User

Sl.no	Internet User	Frequency	Percentage
1	Yes	199	50
2	No	201	50
	Total	400	100

The finding discloses that 50% of the respondents have used internet while another 50% of the respondents have not used internet. Hence, it is being observed that an equal proportion of respondents of user and non-user.

Table 4.41: Distribution of Common People according to the Purpose of Internet used

Sl.no	Purpose of Internet Used	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Chatting	57	14
2	Official communication	58	15
3	Games	54	14
4	Social networking	57	14
5	Information	58	15
6	Educational	57	14
7	Above all	59	15
	Total	400	100

Purpose of using internet reflects the user pattern for the medium. The study shows that 15% of the respondents use internet for official communication and another 15% of the respondents use internet for information. Only 15% of the respondents claim using internet for various purposes. The share of respondents for chatting, games, social networking, and educational users are 14%, 14%, 14% and 14% each respectively. Hence, it is being observed that majority of the respondents use internet for official communication and information.

Table 4.42: Distribution of Common People according to Weekly using frequency

Sl.no	Weekly using frequency	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Daily	201	50
2	5-6 days	199	50
3	3-4 days	0	0
4	2-1 days	0	0
5	Don’t use	0	0
	Total	400	100

Using frequencyreflects how often the person has been exposed to the particular medium. The study discloses that 50% of the respondents are daily user of internet and another 50% of the respondents are the 5-6 days users. None of the respondents found to be 3-4 days and 2-1day users. None user are not found among the respondents. Hence, it is being observed that all the respondents are user of internet and thus exposed to the medium with variation in time period.

Table4.43: Distribution of Common People according toDaily using frequency

Sl.no	Hourly using frequency	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	0-15 mins	99	25
2	15-30 mins	99	25
3	30 mins-1 hr.	99	25
4	Above 1hr.	103	26
	Total	400	100

User frequency reflects how often the person has been exposed to the particular medium. The finding discloses that 26% of the respondents are above 1 hour user of internet. Each share of users fall into the category of 0-15 minutes, 15-30 minutes and 30mintues -1 hour are 25%, 25% and 25% respectively Hence, it is being inferred that all the respondents are user of internet and got exposure to the medium with variation in duration from1 minutes to above 1hour.

Table 4.44: Distribution of Common People according to receivingEnvironmental Mails

Sl.no	Receiving environmental mails	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Yes	0	0
2	No	400	100
	Total	400	100

Getting mail reflects the degree of exposure to the environmental issues. The study discloses that none of the respondents are getting any environmental mails. Hence, it is being observed that all the respondents are not intimidated and inspire through internet for environmental activities.

Table 4.45: Distribution of Common People according to Accessed Environment websites

Sl.no	Accessed Environment websites	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	www.wwf.org/india	0	0
2	www.kolkatabird.com	0	0
3	www.fsi.org.in	0	0
4	www.envis.nic.in	0	0
5	www.greenpeace.org	0	0
6	www.iucn.org/india	0	0
7	www.aaranyak.org	0	0
8	www.kaziranga.com	0	0
9	www.indiantiger.org	0	0
10	http://envfor.nic.in	0	0
11	www.bhopal.net	0	0
	Total	0	0

Accessing particular websites reflect the concerned and awareness of particular websites by an individual. The study shows that none of the respondents have ever been accessed to anyenvironmental websites. Hence, it is being inferred that none of the respondents have been exposed to environmental websites.

Table 4.46: Distribution of Common People according to Reading newspaper

Sl.no	Reading newspaper	Frequency	Percentage
1	Yes	360	90
2	No	40	10
	Total	400	100

The study shows that 90% of the respondents readnewspaper while only 10% of the respondents do not read newspaper. Hence, majority of the respondents 90% read newspaper.

Table 4.47: Distribution of Common People according to Weekly Reading Frequency(newspaper)

Sl.no	Weekly Reading Frequency	Frequency	Percentage
1	1-2	80	20
2	2-3	120	30
3	4-6		
4	Daily	200	50
5	Do not read	0	0
	Total	400	100

The study discloses that 50% of the respondents are daily reader of newspaper. Nearly, 30% of the respondents read 2-3 days in a week while only 20% of the respondents 1-2 days in a week. Hence, majority of the respondents are daily reader of newspaper.

Table 4.48: Distribution of Common People according to Daily Reading Frequency (newspaper)

Sl.no	Daily Reading Frequency	Frequency	Percentage
1	0-15	40	10
2	15-30	160	40
3	30-1hr.	80	20
4	Above 1hr.	80	20
5	Do not read	40	10
	Total	400	100

The finding reveals that 40% of the respondents read 15-30 minutes per day while another 20% each of the respondents read from 30mins - above1 hours daily.Nearly 10% each of the respondents spent either without reading or read from 0-15 mins daily. Hence, majority of the respondents read nearly half hour dialy.

Table 4.49: Distribution of Common People according to recalling Environmental Issue

Sl.no	Recalling Environmental Issue	Frequency	Percentage
1	Able to recall	40	10
2	Unable to recall	360	90
	Total	400	100

The finding shows that 90% of the respondents are unable to recall the environmental issue published in newspepar while only 10% of the respondents are able to recall the published environmental issue in newspapers. Hence, majority of the respondents are inattentive about the environmental issue being published in newspaper.

Table 4.50: Distribution of Common People according to Reading frequency (magazine/journal)

Sl.no	Variable	Frequency	Percentage
1	Daily	92	23
2	Weekly	99	25
3	Monthly	115	29
4	Quarterly	0	0
5	Yearly	94	23
	Total	400	100

Reading frequency reflects the frequency of exposure to the magazine/journal by an individual. The finding shows that 29% of the respondents are monthly reader while none of them turn out to be quarterly reader. About 23% of the respondents are daily reader while another 23% of the respondents are yearly reader. Only 25% of the respondents are weekly reader. Hence, it is being observed that maximum of the respondents are monthly reader suggesting low exposure while the decreasing order of exposure is weekly reader, daily reader and yearly reader (having equal exposure for daily and yearly reader).

Table 4.51: Distribution of Common People according to Daily reading

Sl.no	Daily reading	Frequency	Percentage
1	0-15 min	93	23
2	15-30 min	106	26
3	30mins-1hr.	102	26
4	Above 1 hr.	99	25
	Total	400	100

Spending hour reflects the time consumed by an individual while reading the magazine. The finding reveals of equal sharing of 26% each of the respondents with 15-30 minutes and 30mins -1 hours reading . Nearly 25% of the respondent spent above 1 hours and another 23 % of the respondents spent about 0-15 minutes by reading. Therefore, it is being inferred that majority of the respondents spent maximum of 15 minutes to 1 hour by reading the magazine.

Table 4.52: Distribution of Common People according to Recalling Environmental Issues (magazine/journal)

Sl.no	Recalling Environmental Issues	Frequency	Percentage

1	Yes	190	47
2	No	210	53
	Total	400	100

Recalling ability reflects the degree of attention of an individual. The study discloses that 53% of the respondents are unable to recall while only 47% of the respondents are able to recall. Hence, it is being observed that majority of the respondents are inattentive while minority of the respondents are attentive.

Table 4.53: Distribution of Common People according to Specifying the theme

Sl.no	Specifying theme	Frequency	Percentage
1	Able to specify	201	50
2	Unable to specify	199	50
	Total	400	100

Specifying the title/theme reflects the degree of attentiveness and understanding of an individual. The finding reveals that half of the respondents i.e. 50% is able to specify the title and another half i.e. 50% of the respondents are unable to specify the title. Hence, it is being observed that half of the respondents are with proper attention and understanding while another half of the respondents are inattentive and without any understanding.

Table 4.54: Distribution of Common People according to AttendedFolk Media

Sl.no	Attended Folk Media	Frequency	Percentage

1	Shumangleela	112	28
2	Mime play	22	5
3	Meeting	26	6
4	Drama	42	11
5	Fair	70	18
6	Festival	44	11
7	Puppet show	13	3
8	Speeches	19	5
9	Street play	25	6
10	Other	7	2
11	No response	20	5
	Total	400	100

Attendance reflects the individual interest and participation. The finding reveals that maximum respondents (28%) attended shumangleela while only 3% of the respondents attended puppet show and another 2% of the respondents have attended other folk media. The respective share of each respondents are fair(18%), drama (11%), festival (11%), street play(6%), meeting(6%),speeches(5%) and mime play(5%). Nearly, 5% of the respondents have not given any response. Hence, it is being inferred that shumangleela is the most preferred form of folk media while the decreasing order of preference are fair, drama, festival, play, meeting, speeches, mime play, puppet show and other folk forms. None response of some of the respondents reflects their neutral attitude and unaware of the folk media.

Table 4.55: Distribution of Common People according to recalling title/theme(Folk media)

Sl.no	Recalling title	Frequency	Percentage
1	Yes	205	51
2	No	195	49

	Total	400	100

Recalling ability reflects the level of attention of an individual. The finding shows that 51% of the respondents are able to recall the title while only 49% of the respondents are unable to recall the title. Hence, it is being observed that majority of the respondents have proper attention of attention of the title while minority of the respondents are inattentive of the title.

Table 4.56: Distribution of Common People according to specify title/theme(Folk media)

Sl.no	Specifying the title	Frequency	Percentage
1	Able to specify	214	53
2	Unable to specify	186	47
	Total	400	100

Specifying the title/theme reflects the level of attention and understanding of an individual. The present study reveals that 53% of the respondents are able to specify the title while only 47% of the respondents are unable to specify the title. Hence, it is being inferred that majority of the respondents have given proper attention and understanding of the folk media attended while only less than half of the respondents are inattentive and improper understanding of the folk media attended.

Table 4.57: Distribution of Common People according to Exposure to Displayed Environmental Messages (outdoor media)

Sl.no	**Exposure to Displayed Environmental Messages(outdoor media)**	Frequency	Percentage
1	Yes	231	58
2	No	169	42
	Total	400	100

Seeing the environmental message reflects individual exposure to the message. The finding shows that 58% of the respondents claim to be seen the environmental messages while only 42% of the respondents claim not to be seen the messages. Hence, it is being observed that more than half of the respondents got exposure to the environmental messages and only few respondents are not getting exposure of the environmental messages.

Table 4.58: Distribution of Common People according to Exposed message

Sl.no	Exposed message	Frequency	Percentage
1	Water Conservation	51	12
2	Water pollution	67	17
3	Global warming	47	12
4	Plantation of trees	38	9
5	Wildlife Protection	59	15
6	Respecting nature	31	8
7	Weather report	31	8
8	Protection of water bodies	55	14
9	Others	21	5
	Total	400	100

Kind of messages reflects the objective and target population of the issuing authority. The study discloses that maximum respondents (17%) found water pollution messages and the minimum respondents (5%) found other messages. The share of respondents for each messages of wild life protection, protection of water bodies, water conservation and global warming are 15%, 14%, 12% and 12% respectively. While the share of respondents for each messages of plantation of trees, weather report, respecting nature are 8%, 8% and 9% respectively. Hence, it is being observed that the decreasing order of message being displayed are water pollution, wild life protection, protection of water bodies, water conservation, global warming, respecting nature while plantation of trees and weather report are least displayed.

Table 4.59: Distribution of Common People according to specifying the environmental messages

Sl.no	Specifying the environmental messages	Frequency	Percentage
1	Yes	194	48
2	No	206	52
	Total	4 00	100

Specifying the environmental message reflects the individual level of understanding of the message. The finding shows that 48% of the respondents are able to specify the environmental message while 52 of the respondents are unable to specify the environmental message. Hence, it is being observed that majority of the respondents have low understanding of the messages while minority of them have high understanding of the messages.

Table 4.60: Distribution of Common People according to frequency of exposure to the environmental messages/painting

Sl.no	Frequency of exposure	Frequency	Percentage
1	1	89	22
2	2	103	26

3	3	104	26
4	Above 3	104	26
	Total	400	100

Viewing frequency reflects how often the individual has been exposed to the particular message. The finding reveals that 26% of each of the respondents has been seeing the environmental message/painting twice, thrice and above thrice. While only 22% of the respondents are seeing the environmental messages once. Hence, it is being observed that most of the respondents have high exposure of the environmental messages/painting.

Table 4.61: Distribution of Common People according to identifying displayed site

Sl.no	Identifying displayed site	Frequency	Percentage
1	Park	22	6
2	Back of vehicles	37	9
3	Wall	47	12
4	Garden	8	2
5	Traffic Island	27	7
6	Road Median	26	7
7	Near Bridges	18	5
8	Market	29	7
9	Pan Dukan	5	1
10	School	36	9
11	Colleges	15	4
12	University	11	3
13	Community hall	12	3
14	Other places	58	15
15	Toys	6	2
16	Eatable cover	13	3
17	Drinking bottle	12	3
18	T-shirt	19	5
	Total	400	100

Display site is a vital factor for displaying messages. The study shows that nearly 15% of the respondents accepted other places as display site without disclosing the exact site while 12% of the respondents agree with wall as the display site. The lowest number of respondent i.e. 1% accepted pan dukan as display site. About respective share of 9% each of the respondents agrees school and back of the vehicle as display site. Around 7% respective share of each of the respondents found traffic island, market and road median as display site. While 6% of the respondent found park as the display site . Nearly, 5% of the respective share of each of the respondents found T-shirt and near bridges as display site and 4% of the respondents found college as display site. While community hall, eatable cover, drinking bottle and university are found as display site by 3% respective share of each of the respondent and other 2% respective share of each respondent found garden and toys as display site for messages. Hence, it is being inferred that the decreasing order of preferable site for displaying messages are other places, wall, back of vehicles, school, traffic island, road median, park, near bridges-shirt, community hall, eatable cover, drinking bottle, university, garden and toys.

Table 4.62: Distribution of Common People according to opinion on role of radio

Sl.no	Opinion on role of radio	Frequency	Percentage
1	Poor	93	23
2	Good	94	24
4	Better	108	27
5	Best	104	27
6	No role	1	0.3
	Total	400	100

The above disclose that nearly 24% of the respondents felt good role of radio in bringing environmental awareness whereas 23% of the respondents felt poor role of radio. Only 0.3% of the respondents felt no role of radio. Nearly 27% of the respective share of each of the respondents felt better and best role of radio.

Hence, it is being observed that almost all the respondents felt some kind of role of the radio in bringing environmental awareness. Very insignificant number of respondents denies the role of radio.

Table 4.63: Distribution of Common People according to opinion on role of television

Sl.no	Opinion on role of television	Frequency	Percentage
1	Poor	71	18
2	Good	102	26
3	Better	79	20
4	Best	77	19
5	No role	71	18
	Total	400	100

The study shows that maximum of the respondents (26%) felt good role of television in bringing environmental awareness whereas 18% of the respondents felt poor role of television another 18% of the respondents felt no role of television. Approximately 20% and 19% of the respective share of each of the respondents felt better and best role of television. Hence, it is being inferred that majority of the respondents felt some kind of role of the television in bringing environmental awareness.

Table 4.64:Distribution of Common People according to Opinion on role ofNewspaper

Sl.no	Opinion on role of Newspaper	Frequency	Percentage

1	Poor	97	24
2	Good	109	27
3	Better	100	25
4	Best	94	24
5	No role	0	0
	Total	400	100

The above table shows that maximum of the respondents (27%) felt good role of newspaper in bringing environmental awareness whereas 24% of the respondents felt poor role of newspaper and none of the respondent felt no role of newspaper. Approximately 25% and 24% of the respective share of each of the respondents felt better and best role of newspaper. Hence, it is being inferred that all respondents felt some kind of role the newspaper in bringing environmental awareness. None of the respondents do felt the role of newspaper.

Table 4.65: Distribution of Common People accordingto Opinion on role ofmagazine

Sl.no	Opinion on role of magazine	Frequency	Percentage
1	Poor	109	27
2	Good	113	28
3	Better	90	23
4	Best	88	22
5	No role	0	0
	Total	400	100

The finding shows that maximum of the respondents (28%) felt good role of magazine in bringing environmental awareness whereas 27% of the respondents felt poor role of magazine and none of the respondent felt no role of t magazine. About 23% and 22% of the respective share of each of the respondents felt better and best role of magazine. Hence, it is being observed that all respondents felt some role of the magazine in bringing environmental awareness.

Table 4.66: Distribution of Common People according to Opinion on role of traditional media

Sl.no	Opinion on the role of traditional media	Frequency	Percentage
1	Poor	82	21
2	Good	113	28
3	Better	73	18
4	Best	71	18
5	No role	61	15
	Total	400	100

The finding shows that maximum of the respondents (28%) felt good role of traditional media in bringing environmental awareness whereas 21% of the respondents felt poor role of traditional media and about 15% of the respondent felt no role of traditional media. Nearly 18% of the respective share of each of the respondents felt better and best role of outdoor media. Hence, it is being observed that majority of the respondents accepted the role of traditional media in bringing environmental awareness. But, minority of the respondents felt no role of traditional media.

Table 4.67: Distribution of Common People according toOpinion on role of outdoor media

Sl.no	Variable	Frequency	Percentage

1	Poor	96	24
2	Good	128	32
3	Better	88	22
4	Best	86	22
5	No role	2	1
	Total	400	100

The above table reveals that maximum of the respondents (32%) felt good role of outdoor media in bringing environmental awareness. While 24% of the respondents felt poor role of outdoor media and only 1% of the respondent felt no role of outdoor media. Nearly 22% and 22% respective share of each of the respondents felt better and best role of outdoor media. Hence, it is being observed that majority of the respondents accepted the role of outdoor media in bringing environmental awareness. Only very few of them felt no role of outdoor media.

Table 4.68: Distribution of Common People according to participation in environmental activities

Sl.no	Participation in Environmental activities	Frequency	Percentage
1	Yes	202	51
2	No	198	50
	Total	400	100

Participation reflects the involvement of an individual in the environmental actitivities. The study shows that 51% of the respondents participated in the environmental actitivities while 50% of the respondents do not participate in such activities. Hence, it has been observed that more than half the respondents are involved in the environmental activities due to their eco-conscious behaviour and the other half other respondents are not aware of the environmental activities.

Table 4.69: Distribution of Common People according to Level of participation

Sl.no	Level of participation	Frequency	Percentage
1	Volunteer	210	52
2	Organizer	0	0
3	Not disclose	190	48
	Total	400	100

Participation reflects the involvement of an individual in the environmental actitivities. The finding shows that 52% of the respondents participated in the environmental actitivities as volunteer while no respondent participated as organizer. Nearly 48% of the respondents do not disclose their participation. Hence, it has been observed that more than half the respondents are involved in the environmental activities as volunteer suggesting their eco-conscious behaviour. Nearly half of them participated but fail to rule out their level of participation.

Table 4.70: Distribution of Common People according to possession of mobile phone

Sl.no	Possession of mobile phone	Frequency	Percentage

1	Yes	252	63
2	No	148	37
	Total	400	100

Possession of mobile reflects the accessibility of individual to mobile services. The finding shows that 63% of the respondents are having mobile while 37% of the respondents do not possess mobile. Hence, it has been inferred that possession of mobile by majority respondents indicate their accessibility to the mobile services while the minority of the respondents not possessing mobile suggested their inaccessibility to the mobile services.

Table 4.71: Distribution of Common People according to number of mobile handsets

Sl.no	Number of mobile handsets	Frequency	Percentage
1	1	72	18
2	2	92	23
3	3	83	21
4	4	72	18
5	Above 4	81	20
	Total	400	100

Number of handsets of a family reflects the accessibility of mobile in the family. The study reveals that maximum of the respondents (23%) are having two handsets while 18% of the respondents are having only one handset. The respective share of the mobile handsets possessed by the respondents in decreasing order are three handsets(21%), above four handsets (20%) and four handsets (18%). Hence, it has been inferred that majority of the respondents are having two and more handsets that reflects their easy accessibility to the mobile services.

Table 4.72: Distribution ofCommon People according to Usedmobile service

Sl.no	Used mobile service	Frequency	Percentage
1	Airtel	90	22
2	Aircel	102	25
3	BSNL	46	12
4	Idea	45	11
5	Vodafone	70	18
6	Others	47	12
	Total	400	100

Identification with service provider reflects the services being rendered by that particular service provider. The study shows that maximum of the respondents (25%) are using Aircel service. While minimum of the respondents(11%) are availing of Idea service. The respective share of the respondents for other services are Airtel(22%), Vodafone(18%),BSNL(12%) and other services (12%). Hence, it is being observed that majority of the respondents are availing of Aircel services but other services are also being used by the respondents.

Table 4.73: Distribution of Common People according to Daily using fequency

Sl.no	Daily using frequency	Frequency	Percentage
1	1-2 hr	134	33
2	2-3 hr	72	18

3	4-5 hr	62	16
4	5-6 hr	63	16
5	Above 6 hr	69	17
	Total	400	100

User hour reflects the time spent by the individual in a day with the mobile. The finding shows that majority of the respondents (33%) spent 1-2 hours in using mobile. Nearly 18% of the respondent spent 2-3hours and another 17% of the respondents spent above 6 hours. While minority of the respondents 16% and 16% each spent 4-5 hours and 5-6 hours in using mobile. Therefore, it is being inferred that majority of the respondents spent maximum of 2 hours by using mobile.

Table 4.74: Distribution of Common People according to Purpose of using mobile

Sl.no	Purpose of using mobile	Frequency	Percentage
1	Phoning	114	28
2	Surfing	35	9
3	Gaming	39	10
4	Astrology	15	4
5	Video recording	25	6
6	Audio recording	27	7
7	Camera	39	10
8	Messaging	49	12
9	Weather report	18	4
10	GPRS	16	4
11	FM	23	6
	Total	400	100

Purpose of use reflects the user pattern by the service consumer. The study shows that maximum respondents use mobile for phoning. While decreasing respective share of user pattern are messaging (12%), camera (10%), gaming (10%), surfing (9%), audio recording(7%), FM (6%), video recording(6%), astrology (4%), weather report(4%) and GPRS (4%). Hence, it is being observed that majority of the respondents use mobile primarily for phone calls while messaging and other services are for secondary uses.

Table 4.75: Distribution of Common People according to Receivingenvironmental messages

Sl.no	Receiving environmental messages	Frequency	Percentage
1	Yes	164	41
2	No	236	59
	Total	400	100

Getting environmental message reflects the eco-conscious service being rendered by the particular service provider. The finding reveals that majority of the respondents (59%) are not getting any kind of environmental messages whereas 41% of the respondents claim for getting environmental messages. Hence, it is being inferred that service for environmental message need to be part of regular message service.

Table 4.76: Distribution of Common People according to Opinion role of mobile phone

Sl.no	Opinion role of mobile phone	Frequency	Percentage
1	Totally agree	64	16
2	To some extent	104	26

3	A bit agreeable	74	18
4	Do not agree	86	22
5	Do not know	72	18
	Total	400	100

Role of mobile communication reflects the serviced being rendered by this communication device. The finding reveals that maximum respondents (26%) accepted the role of mobile communication. While 22% of the respondents do not agree with the role of mobile communication and another 18% of the respondents are undecided about its role. Nearly 16% of the respondents totally agree with the role of mobile communication and another 18% of the respondents partially agree with the role of mobile communication. Hence, it is being inferred that majority of the respondents accepted partial role of mobile communication in bringing environmental awareness.

Table 4.77: Distribution of Common People accordingto Service improvement Suggestions

Sl.no	Service improvement Suggestions	Frequency	Percentage
1	Picture message	153	38
2	No response	247	62
	Total	400	100

Suggestions reflect the intention of the person for better services and awareness. The finding reveals that majority of the respondents (62%) do not give any suggestions. While minority of the respondents (38%) suggested for inclusion of picture messages. Hence, it is being observed that maximum respondents are kept neutral and inclusion of picture messages is being suggested by the minority respondents.

Table 4.78: Distribution of Common People according to Concept of environment

Sl.no	Concept of environment	Frequency	Percentage
1	Air	78	19
2	Water	78	19
3	Land	70	18
4	Above all	174	44
	Total	400	100

Clarity of the concept reflects the degree of understanding people are having with the particular terminology or concept. The finding shows that nearly 44% of the respondents have well understanding of the concept of environment. While partial understanding is seen with respondents with the respective share of 19%, 18% and 19% each.Hence, it is being observed that maximum respondents have clear understanding of the concept and minority of them have partial understanding of the concept.

Table 4.79: Distribution of Common People according to Look at environmental problem

Sl.no	Look at environmental problem	Frequency	Percentage
1	Local level	95	24

2	State level	107	27
3	Above all	118	29
4	Do not know	80	20
	Total	400	100

Viewing environmental problems at various levels reflects the level of thinking people are having with the particular environmental problem. The finding shows that maximum of the respondents (29%) are prefer to view environmental problem at local as well as state levels. While 27% of the respondents choose to view the problem at state level and nearly 24% of the respondents prefer to view at local level. Minority of the respondents (20%) prefer to ignore the environmental problem. Hence, it is being observed that maximum respondents choose to deal the environmental problem at local as well as state level and minority of the respondents prefer to deal with environmental problem at respective levels of local and state.

Table 4.80: Distribution of Common People according to Effect of polluted Nambul River

Sl.no	Effect of polluted Nambul River	Frequency	Percentage
1	Loktak pat	169	42
2	NingthemPukhri	72	18
3	Above all	88	22
4	Do not know	71	17

	Total	400	100

Identification with the source of pollution reflects the degree of familiarity people are having with that particular source. The finding shows that about 42% of the respondents are well aware of the pollution source. While 17% of the respondents are unaware of the pollution source. Nearly 18% of the respondents wrongly identify the pollution source and another 22% of the respondents are not familiar with the pollution source. Hence, it is being inferred that majority of the respondents are well aware of the pollution source and minority of them are not aware about the pollution source.

Table 4.81: Distribution of Common People according to Awareness of Wild life protection Act of 1972

Sl.no	Awareness of Wild life protection Act of 1972	Frequency	Percentage
1	Sangai	147	42
2	Siroi Lily	75	18
3	Above all	100	22
4	Do not know	78	18
	Total	400	100

Familiarity with particular act and rules reflects the level of awareness people are having with the particular act and rules. The finding reveals that only 22% of the respondents are familiar with act. While 18% of the respondents do not have any knowledge of the act. Maximum respondents (42%) are partial familiar with act while another 18% of the respondents are also partially familiar with the act. Hence, majority of the respondents are not fully aware of the act.

Table4.82: Distribution of Common People according to Common air pollutant

Sl.no	Common air pollutant	Frequency	Percentage
1	Dust	157	39
2	Fly ashes	70	18
3	Above all	104	26
4	Do not know	69	17
	Total	400	100

Identification with the common pollutant reflects the degree of awareness people are having with the particular pollutant. The finding shows that majority of the respondents (39%) are able to identify with the common pollutant while minority of the respondents (17%) are not having any knowledge of the common pollutant. Nearly 18% of the respondents wrongly identify with the common pollutant. Hence, it is being observed that majority of the respondents are familiar with the common air pollutant. But, minority of them are not familiar with the common air pollutant.

Table 4.83: Distribution of Common People according to Awareness of "Sangai Samu"

Sl.no	Awareness of "Sangai Samu"	Frequency	Percentage
1	Samu Kabui	85	21
2	Dr. Th. Shamungou	111	28
3	Above all	71	18
4	Do not know	133	33

	Total	400	100

Personality awareness reflects the level of awareness people are having with the person and the actitivities associated with him. Further, it reflects the kind of media attention given to that person and their activities. The finding shows that only 28% of the respondents are able to identify the personality. While majority of the respondents (33%) are unaware of the personality. Nearly 21% of the respondents are not properly aware of the personality while another 18% of the respondents are wrongly identifying the personality. Hence, it is being inferred that majority of the respondents are unaware of the personality and minority of the respondents are familiar with the personality.

Table 4.84: Distribution of Common People according to Awareness of the eminent environmentalist

Sl.no	Awareness of theeminent environmentalist	Frequency	Percentage
1	Dr. R.K. Ranjan	105	26
2	Babaloo Leitongbam	98	25
3	Above all	69	17
4	Do not know	128	32
	Total	400	100

Personality awareness reflects the level of awareness people are having with the person and the activities associated with him. Further, it reflects the kind of media attention given to that person and their activities. The finding shows that only 26% of the respondents are able to identify the personality. While majority of the respondents (32%) are unaware of the personality. Nearly 17% of the respondents are not properly aware of the personality while another 25% of the respondents are wrongly identifying the personality. Hence, it is being inferred that majority of the respondents are unaware of the personality and minority of the respondents are familiar with the personality.

Table 4.85: Distribution of Common People according to Awareness of the Forest Minister

Sl.no	Awareness of the Forest Minister	Frequency	Percentage
1	Education and CAF & PD	71	18
2	IFCD and Printing & Stationary	76	19
3	Forest and Environment	125	31
4	Do not know	128	32
	Total	400	100

Identification of the concerned minister reflects the level of awareness people has with the minister and the portfolio he held. The finding reveals that 31% of the respondents are well aware of the minister and the portfolio he held. Majority of the respondents (32%) are unaware of the minister and the portfolio he held. Minority of the respondents nearly 18% and 19% respectively are unaware of the portfolio held by the minister. Hence, it is being observed that maximum of the respondents are unaware of the minister and the portfolio he held. Only minimum of the respondents are well aware of the minister and the portfolio he held.

Table 4.86: Distribution of Common People accordingto Identifiying Food Mark

Sl.no	Identifiying food mark	Frequency	Percentage
1	Pure vegetarian food	178	44
2	Non-vegetarian food	71	18
3	Both	69	17
4	Do not know	82	21
	Total	400	100

Food marks are the eco-marks that enable an individual of easy identification of vegetarian and non-vegetarian foods. Identification of the food mark reflects the degree of awareness possessed by an individual for eco-marks or symbols. The finding reveals that nearly 44% of the respondents are able to identify the symbol. While 18% of the respondents are wrongly identifying the symbol and another 17% of the respondents are getting confused with the symbol. Nearly 21% of the respondents do not have knowledge of the symbol. Hence, it is being observed that majority of the respondents are well aware of the symbol.

Table 4.87: Distribution of Common People according to Identifying Eco-friendly Symbol

Sl.no	Identifying Eco-friendly symbol	Frequency	Percentage
1	Environment friendly consumer goods	169	42
2	Environment unfriendly consumer goods	116	29
3	Do not know	115	29
	Total	400	100

Eco-friendly symbols are the eco-marks that enable an individual easy identification thing. Identification of the eco-marks reflects the level of awareness possessed by an individual for eco-friendly things. The study shows that nearly 42% of the respondents are able to identify the symbol. While 29% of the respondents are wrongly identifying the symbol and another 29% of the respondents are unable to identify the symbol at all. Hence, it is being inferred that majority of the respondents are well aware of the symbol while minority of the respondents are do not have unaware of the symbol.

Table 4.88: Distribution of Common People according to Understanding environmental message

Sl.no	Understanding environmental message	Frequency	Percentage
1	Nambul River	72	18
2	Loktak Lake	120	30
3	Above all	134	33
4	Do not know	74	19
	Total	400	100

Ability to understand the environmental message leads an individual to conservation behaviour. The finding shows that maximum respondents (33%) are well aware of the environmental message while 19% of the respondents are unable to understand the environmental message. Nearly 18% as well as 30% of the respondents do not have proper understanding of the environmental message. Hence, it has been observed that majority of the respondents are able to digest the environmental message.

Table 4.89: Distribution of Common People according to Switching habit

Sl.no	Switching habit	Frequency	Percentage
1	Turn-off	250	62
2	Turn-on	150	38
	Total	400	100

Switching habit reflects the energy conscious nature of the personand individuals act accordingly. The table shows that about 62% of the respondents having turning off habit of switches when unattended while only 38% of the respondents keep turn on the switches when unattended. Hence, majority of the respondents are energy conscious people.

Table 4.90: Distribution of Common People according to Preference of short distance travelling

Sl.no	Preference of short distance travelling	Frequency	Percentage
1	Car	70	17
2	Bicycle	90	23
3	Foot	172	43
4	Bikes	68	17
	Total	400	100

Preference reflects in one's behaviour. Therefore, individuals act accordingly based on their preferences and set their priorities. The study reveals that majority of the respondents (43%) prefer to walk by foot while minority of the respondents i.e. 17% each prefer to travel by bikes and car. While another 23% of the respondents choose bicycle. Hence, it has been inferred that majority of the respondents prefer to energy saving practices..

Table 4.91: Distribution of Common People according to Preferability of renewable energy:

Sl.no	Preferability of renewable energy	Frequency	Percentage
1	Good option	263	66
2	Bad option	137	34
	Total	400	100

Renewable energy is the alternative source of energy.Preferability of renewable energy reflects the awareness of the individual about it. The study shows that maximum respondents (66%) prefer renewable energy and accepted it while minority of the respondents (34%) do not prefer it. Hence, it is being observed that maximum respondents are well aware about the renewable energy.

CHAPTER V

ROLE OF MEDIA IN ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS(JOURNALISTS)

5.ANALYSIS BASED ON THE VIEW OF THE (JOURNALISTS):