IMPACT AND EFFECT OF POLITICAL PROMOTION MESSAGE VIA FACEBOOK.

DR.S.RAHINI

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR IN MBA,

BISHOP HEBER COLLEGE,

(Affiliated to Bharathidasan University)

TRICHIRAPPALLI-620017

INTRODUCTION

Political marketing is worldwide trust that, sensation drives the correct decision and thus electorate are no exclusion for the alike since there is no indirect or direct currency. Political marketing involves the usage of marketing techniques, tools, and ways in political procedure. It is common in all places in the world. It is vital to interacting with the public people in order to exchange the information between the peoples.

Political publicity, internet advertising, famous person endorsements, mobile campaigning, fragment, opinion census, cadre relationship, micro objectives are some of the system widely used in political advertising. The necessities of political marketing are unavoidable in Indian democracy specified the political competition at regional, local and national level to battle the game of coalitions and midterm crisis. A politician, who performs this discipline with faith and dedication, definitely gains the competitive benefit to succeed the main share in election bank.

Politics are no exception to alter and thus inventive and advanced approach to political agitation is more crucial to inspire the followers, aim the election bank and discussion of the same to winning candidate. Start from the presented effort by followers, focus cluster networking, issue prominence, fund growing to public assemblies help by party higher person, political campaign manipulate voting assessment irrespective of the election bank politics of opponent parties and thus and incorporated process to improve the awareness is essential for victory.

FACEBOOK AND POLITICAL ACTIVITES

Facebook is one of the modern communication means which were adopted by the politicians to disseminate their ideas, influence the individuals' opinions, induce them to adopt their ideas, and

vote for them in elections. Facebook provides the workers in political marketing field with the access to the target audience by the advertising messages; it also provides Facebook users with various means for receiving the political promotion messages, interacting with each other, and exchanging the information.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The above shows that the marketing efforts designed to urge and persuade voters to vote for the candidate through the dissemination of information have influence on creating a positive image of the candidate. In this field (JoAnder and MicttAel, 2011) indicate that "all candidates will attempt to convey images on the positive side of each dimension-that is, images of competence, trustworthiness, and likeability rather than images involving ineptitude, dishonesty, or meanness. However, given that voters have heterogeneous preference, it is likely that more subtle positioning differences are important". Social networks such as facebook, twitter, messenger, Youtube...etc, have grown and recently became the most widespread means of communication in the world (ALsamydai, and Rudaina, 2012).(Park, Choi and Park, 2011) indicate that "Social media is a new paradigm for communications that is making surprising changes to the political and social landscape of the world. Networks like Facebook and Twitter made their impact felt when protestors used them to resist decades-old dictatorships in Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya.Today, Tunisia and Egypt are under new regimes, while Libya is on the verge of ushering in a new government of its own".

(Randi, Z., 2010) refers states that "In Korea, social networking grew rapidly with the introduction of smart phones, and as in the Middle East, political applications were quick to materialize. Social media had its first palpable effect in the 2010 local government elections, where voters in their 20s increased their turnout by7.5 percentage points over 2006. As the IT magazine Wired has noted, social media are the "pamphlets of the21st century, a way that people frustrated with the status quo can organize themselves."

As for the impact of Facebook in elections such as the presidential elections in the United States in 2008, (Jessica and others, 2011) note that "Social network sites such as facebook allowed users to share their political beliefs, support specific candidates, and interact with others on political issues".

(Scott P and al 2010) Suggest that both candidates and voters have increased their use of the internet for political campaigns. Candidates have adopted many internet tools, including social networking websites, for the purposes of communicating with constituents and voters, collecting donations, fostering community, and organizing events. On the other side, voters have adopted Internet tools such as blogs and social networking sites to relate to candidates, engage in political dialogue, pursue activist causes, and share information. Their study examined two years of posts on the Facebook walls of the three major contenders for the US Presidency in 2008: Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, and John McCain.

Sebastian stier et.all published in 2018 titled "Election campaigning on social media: politics, audiences and the mediation of political communication on Facebook and twitter" focusing on the German federal election campaign 2013, this article investigates whether election candidates address the topics most important to the mass audience and to which extent their communication is shaped by the characteristics of Facebook and Twitter. Based on open-ended responses from a representative survey conducted during the election campaign, we train a human-interpretable Bayesian language model to identify political topics. Applying the model to social media messages of candidates and their direct audiences, we find that both prioritize different topics than the mass audience. The analysis also shows that politicians use Facebook and Twitter for different purposes. We relate the various findings to the mediation of political communication on social media induced by the particular characteristics of audiences and sociotechnical environments (Andersen Kim Normann et.all 2019)

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study is trying to test the impact and effect of political promotion message via Facebook. The study focus on two aspects. Primary focuses on college student respondent in politics and the secondary focus is through social media. The period of the study is six months. The study was conducted at Thiruchirappalli district in Tamil Nadu. Research design in the study is descriptive research. Descriptive research includes survey and fact- finding enquiries of different kinds. Sampling design in the study is convenience sampling. The primary data was collected based on the structured questionnaire. The population of the research covers the universe who are within the age of 19-22 and those who are the under graduate and post graduate students in colleges having Facebook accounts. The researcher posted the questionnaire in the Facebook accounts of the friends list and friends of friends list. Sample size of the research is 500 which

was equally distributed among five groups as each group 100.Collected responses from arts and science college, Polytechnic, engineering, B. Ed college and from medical college students.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY: The study is about the social media influence on politics and also about the impacts and effect of the political promoting messages via Facebook on college students. This study is focusing on Facebook users' interest in political promoting messages posted on Facebook. It is trying to know about how Facebook users deal with the political promoting messages sent to them via Facebook and trying to find out, how the political promotion message influence the individual political choice.

HYPOTHESIS:

- ❖ There is a significant correlation between the age of the respondents and impact of political promotion VIA Face book in various dimensions.
- ❖ There is a significant association between the year of study of the respondents and impact of political promotion VIA Face book in various dimensions.
- ❖ There is a significant difference between the respondents' Gender and impact of political promotion VIA Face book in various dimensions.
- ❖ There is a significant variance among the respondents' type of college with regard to various dimensions of impact of political promotion VIA Face book.
- ❖ There is a significant variance among the domicile of the respondents with regard to various dimensions of impact of political promotion VIA Face book.

DISCUSSION :

60.4% of the respondents are in the age group of 19 to 20 years, 43.4% of the respondents are 2nd year students, 52.8% of the respondents are from urban background,39.8% of the respondents are liberal and 5.6% of the respondents are very liberal regarding their nature,39.6% of the respondents are using Facebook daily.47% of the respondents are using Facebook through mobile phones, 52.8% of the respondents are sometimes posting status about political views, 58.2% of the respondents have high level of interest in politics. 50.8% of the respondents have high of level effect on the political situation. 57% of the respondents are dealing with message at high level. 62.8% of the respondents have high level of

reliability. 53.4% of the respondents have high level of effect on orientation. 59.4% of the respondents have high level of effect on the choice.

FINDINGS:

➢ It is observed from the Table-I all dimension have a significant associate with political interest, effect on the situation, dealing with message, reliability, effect on the orientation and effect on the choices. It is observed that the effect on the orientation and choices are highly significant associate with overall dimension. It is inferred that the dimension of political interest is highly significant associate with effect on the orientation. It is observed from the Table-I that the dimension of effect on the political situation is highly significant associate with effect on the orientation. The dimension of dealing with message is highly significant associate with reliability. It is observed from the (table-I) that the dimension reliability is highly significant associate with effect on the choices.

➢ It is inferred from the Table-II that there is significant association between the year of study of respondents with regard to impact of political promotion via facebook in the dimension of dealing with message, reliability and effect on the orientation.

➢ It is inferred from the above Table-III that there is significant difference between the gender of the respondents with regard to impact of political promotion via Facebook in the dimension of political interest, effect on the political situation, effect on the orientation and overall.

➢ It is inferred from the above Table-IV that there is significant difference between the type of college with regard to impact of political promotion via Facebook in the dimension of reliability, dealing with message, effect on the orientation, effect on the choices and overall.

➢ It is inferred from the above Table-V that there is significant difference between the respondents domicile with regard to impact of political promotion via Facebook in the dimension of effect on the political situation.

FINDINGS:

From the analysis shows that there is a significant relationship between the ages of the respondents with regards dimension of effect on the orientation and effect on the

choices.Hence: Null hypothesis is rejected, research hypothesis is accepted. Karl Pearson co-efficient correlation test was applied to above hypothesis.

From the analysis shows that all the dimension have significant associate with the dimension of political interest, effect on the situation, dealing with message, reliability, effect on the orientation and effect on the choices. Especially effect on the orientation and effect on the choices have highly significant with overall dimension.Hence: Null hypothesis is rejected, research hypothesis is accepted. Inter correlation matrix was applied to above hypothesis.

From the analysis shows that there is a significant association with the year of study of respondents with regard to impact of political promotion via Facebook in the dimension of dealing with message, reliability and effect on the orientation.Hence: Null hypothesis is rejected, research hypothesis is accepted. Chi-square was applied to above hypothesis.

From the analysis shows that there is significant difference between the gender of the respondents with regard to impact of political promotion via Facebook in the dimension of political interest, effect on the political situation, effect on the orientation and overall. Hence: Null hypothesis is rejected, research hypothesis is accepted. Z-test was applied to above hypothesis.

From the analysis shows that there is significant variance among the respondent's type of college with regard to impact of political promotion via Facebook in the dimension of reliability, dealing with message, and effect on the political orientation, effect on the choices and over all. One way analysis was applied to above hypothesis.Hence: Null hypothesis is rejected, research hypothesis is accepted.

From the analysis shows that there is significant variance among the respondents domicile with regard to impact of political promotion via Facebook in the dimension of effect on the political situation. One way analysis was applied to above hypothesis.Hence: Null hypothesis is rejected, research hypothesis is accepted.

FINDING RELATED TO LOW AND HIGH LEVEL IMPACT OF POLITICAL PROMOTION VIA FACEBOOK:

➢ 41.8% of the respondents have low level of interest in politics and 58.2% of the respondents have high level of interest in politics.

➢ 49.2% of the respondents have low level of effect on the political situation and 50.8% of the respondents have high level of effect on the political situation.

➢ 43.8% of the respondents are dealing with message at low level and 57% of the respondents are dealing with message at high level.

➢ 37.2% of the respondents have low level reliability regarding political promotion message on Facebook site and 62.8% of the respondents have high level of reliability.

➢ 46.6% of the respondents have low level of effect on orientation and 53.4% of the respondents have high level of effect on orientation

➢ 40.6% of the respondents have low level of effect on the choice and 59.4% of the respondents have high level of effect on the choices.

FINDINGS RELATED TO ASSOCIATION (OR) DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS AND VARIOUS DIMENSION OF IMPACT OF POLITICAL PROMOTION VIA FACEBOOK

➢ There is significant relationship between respondents age with regards that the dimension of effect on the orientation and effect on the choices.

➢ All dimensions have a significant associate with political interest, effect on the situation, dealing with message, reliability, effect on the orientation and effect on the choices. The effect on the orientation and choices are highly significant associate with overall.

➢ There is significant association between the year of study of respondents with regard to impact of political promotion via Facebook in the dimension of dealing with message, reliability and effect on the orientation.

➢ There is significant difference between the gender of the respondents with regard to impact of political promotion via Facebook in the dimension of political interest, effect on the political situation, effect on the orientation and overall.

> There is significant difference between the type of college with regard to impact of political promotion via Facebook in the dimension of reliability, dealing with message, effect on the orientation, effect on the choices and overall.

> There is significant difference between the respondents domicile with regard to impact of political promotion via Facebook in the dimension of effect on the political situation.

CONCLUSION:

On the overall scenario the youth are very much interested in Facebook. But at the same time they are very clear about certain facts like political trends and campaigns. The political messages are not making much difference in youth via Facebook. The messages should be appealing and sensitive. Facebook is creating all types of advertisement platform for users. So the political messages are not attracting the like general marketing messages.

REFERENCES:

1.Acquisition Engine. "The Top Ten Best Social Media Marketing Campaigns of All Times." August 24 2012

2.Allowing Marketing and Media. "Tweens, Teens Willing to Welcome Brands to Social Networks." Marketing Charts. April 5 2011.

3.Bennett, Lance. "The Personalization of Politics: Political Identity, Social Media and Changing Patterns of Participation." The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 644.20 (2012): 10-39.

4.Cassata, Donna. "Enthusiasm doesn't translate to votes." Associated Press, 3 March 2007, sec. A, p. 9.

5.Callahan , Ezra. "Consider the Vote Rocked." Facebook Blog, 17 November 2007,

6.Coleman, Stephen, and Jay G. Blumler. The Internet and Democratic Citizenship: Theory, Practice and Policy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Common Sense Media. "Digital Footprint and Reputation."

7.Collins, Adam - Falk Campaign Communications Director. Interview by author. Madison, Wisconsin, 24 April2007

8.Cultural Politics of Emotion. New York: Routledge, 2004.

9..Ellison, Nicole, Rebecca Heino, and Jennifer Gibbs. "Managing Impressions Online: Self-Presentation Processes in the Online Dating Environment." Journal of Computer Mediated Communication 11.2 (2006): 152-77.

10..http://blog.facebook.com/blog.php?post=2219007130.

11.Forster, Stacy. "Taking politics to the people on Facebook." Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, 10 September 2006.

12.Goldfarb, Zachary A. "Facebook flexes political might." The Washington Post, 3 February 2007.

13.Gulati, Jeff and Christine Williams. Study on Candidates' use of Facebook, referenced in "Bentley College

14.Professors Update Data on Candidates' Use of Facebook as Campaign Heads Into Final Days." Ascribe Newswire, 2 November 2006.

15.Habermas, Jürgen. "The Public Sphere," 1974, printed in The Information Society Reader. New York: Routledge,2004.

16.James, Carrie, et al. Young People, Ethics, and the New Digital Media: A Synthesis from the Goodplay Project. Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2011.

17.McGirt, Ellen. "Hacker. Dropout. CEO." Fastcompany, May 2007, p. 74.

18.Trippi, Joe. The Revolution Will Not Be Televised. New York: HarperCollins, 2004.

19.Uricchio, William. "Cultural Citizenship in the Age of P2P Networks." Media Cultures in a Changing Europe. Eds. Ib Bondebjerg and Peter Goldings. Bristol: Intellect Press Ltd., 2004. 139-164.

20.van Dijck, José, and David Neibord. "Wikinomics and its Discontents: A Critical Analysis of Web 2.0 Business Manifestos." New Media & Society 11.5 (2009):855-74.

21.van Dijck, José. The Cutlure of Connectivity: A Critical History of Social Media. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

22.Wells, Chris. "Citizenship and Communication in Online Youth Civic Engagement Projects." Information, Communication & Society 13.3 (2010): 419-41.

Annexure:

TABLE :I

INTER CORRELATION MATRIX AMONG VARIOUS DIMENSIONS

OF IMPACT OF POLITICAL PROMOTION VIA FACE BOOK

	Political interest	Effect on the political situation	Dealing with messages	Reliability	Effect on the orientation	Effect on choices	Overall
Political interest	1						
Effect on the political situation	.424**	1					
Dealing with messages	.448**	.475**	1				
Reliability	.405**	.524**	.562**	1			
Effect on the orientation	.481**	.573**	.514**	.607**	1		
Effect on choices	.435**	.539**	.474**	.663**	.703**	1	
Overall	.647**	.756**	.812**	.787**	.809**	.809**	1

** Correlation is **significant** at the **0.01** level

* Correlation is **significant** at the **0.05** level

TABLE :II

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE YEAR OF STUDY OF THE RESPONDENTS AND IMPACT OF POLITICAL PROMOTION VIA FACE BOOK IN VARIOUS DIMENSIONS

S.no	Political Promotion Via Face Book	Year of study				Statistical Inference
		1st year (n:181)	2nd year (n:217)	3rd year (n:76)	4th year (n:26)	
1.	**Political interest** Low level High level	 73 108	 91 126	 35 41	 10 16	x^2=0.846 df =3 p > 0.05 Not Significant
2.	**Effect on the political situation** Low level High level	 80 101	 116 101	 39 37	 11 15	x^2=4.014 df =3 p > 0.05 Not Significant
3.	**Dealing with messages** Low level High level	 72 109	 113 104	 24 52	 6 20	**x^2=16.311** df =3 p < 0.05 **Significant**

Continued...

S.no	Political Promotion Via Face Book	Year of study				Statistical Inference
		1st year (n:181)	2nd year (n:217)	3rd year (n:76)	4th year (n:26)	
4.	**Reliability**					$x^2=10.747$ df =3 p < 0.05 **Significant**
	Low level	54	97	24	11	
	High level	127	120	52	15	
5.	**Effect on the orientation**					$x^2=10.318$ df =3 p < 0.05 **Significant**
	Low level	85	114	25	9	
	High level	96	103	51	17	
6.	**Effect on the choices**					$x^2=3.965$ df=3 p>0.05 Not Significant
	Low level	67	94	28	14	
	High level	114	123	48	12	
7.	**Overall** Low level High level	78 103	117 100	34 42	10 16	$x^2=6.055$ df=3 p>0.05 Not Significant

TABLE :III

'Z' TEST BETWEEN THE RESPONDENTS' GENDER AND VARIOUS DIMENSIONS OF IMPACT OF POLITICAL PROMOTION VIA FACE BOOK

S.No	Political Promotion Via Face Book	$\bar{X}$	S.D	S.E	Statistical Inference
1.	**Political interest** Male **(n:250)** Female **(n:250)**	5.6120 6.1800	2.03520 1.92938	.12872 .12202	**z =3.202** df=498 **p < 0.01** **Significant**
2.	**Effect on the political situation** Male **(n:250)** Female **(n:250)**	8.0280 8.9680	3.12703 2.68548	.19777 .16984	**z = 3.606** df=498 **p < 0.001** **Significant**
3.	**Dealing with messages** Male **(n:250)** Female **(n:250)**	10.8800 11.5880	4.94808 4.69151	.31294 .29672	z =1.642 df=498 p > 0.05 Not Significant
4.	**Reliability** Male **(n:250)** Female **(n:250)**	5.3400 5.4240	2.26914 1.79586	.14351 .11358	z =0.459 df=498 p > 0.05 Not Significant
5.	**Effect on the orientation** Male **(n:250)** Female **(n:250)**	5.4840 5.9000	2.42348 2.17368	.15327 .13748	**z =2.020** df=498 **p < 0.05** **Significant**

Continued……

S.No	Political Promotion Via Face Book	$\overline{X}$	S.D	S.E	Statistical Inference
6.	**Effect on choices** Male **(n:250)** Female **(n:250)**	 8.2480 8.4800	 3.49792 2.93736	 .22123 .18578	z =0.803 df=498 p > 0.05 Not Significant
7.	**Overall** Male **(n:250)** Female **(n:250)**	 43.5920 46.5400	 14.56799 12.27269	 .92136 .77619	**z =2.447** df=498 **p < 0.05** **Significant**

TABLE;IV

ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG THE RESPONDENTS TYPE OF THE COLLEGES WITH REGARD TO VARIOUS DIMENSIONS OF IMPACT OF POLITICAL PROMOTION VIA FACE BOOK

S.NO	Source	Df	SS	MS	$\overline{X}$	Statistical Inference
1.	**Political interest** Between Groups Within Groups	 4 495	 19.992 1978.600	 4.998 3.997	G1=5.5600 G2=6.1500 G3=6.0300 G4=5.9100 G5=5.8300	F=1.250 P > 0.05 Not Significant
2.	**Effect on the political situation** Between Groups Within Groups	 4 495	 60.868 4280.130	 15.217 8.647	G1=7.9300 G2=8.9800 G3=8.5200	F=1.760 P > 0.05 Not

S.NO	Source	Df	SS	MS	$\overline{X}$	Statistical Inference
						Significant
					G4=8.3700	
					G5=8.6900	
3.	**Dealing with messages**				G1=10.4200	**F=3.347**
	Between Groups	4	306.512	76.628	G2=11.8000	P < 0.05
	Within Groups	495	11333.110	22.895	G3=12.0000	**Significant**
					G4=10.1500	
					G5=11.8000	
4.	**Reliability**				G1=4.8400	**F=3.104**
	Between Groups	4	51.048	12.762	G2=5.5900	P < 0.05
	Within Groups	495	2034.990	4.111	G3=5.5800	**Significant**
					G4=5.2000	
					G5=5.7000	

Continued……

S.NO	Source	Df	SS	MS	$\overline{X}$	Statistical Inference
5.	**Effect on the orientation**				G1=4.8300	**F=4.975**
	Between Groups	4	102.828	25.707	G2=6.1200	P < 0.01
	Within Groups	495	2557.740	5.167	G3=5.8800	**Significant**
					G4=5.9500	
					G5=5.6800	
6.	**Effect on choices**				G1=7.2100	**F=4.445**
	Between Groups	4	180.352	45.088	G2=8.6500	P < 0.05
	Within Groups	495	5021.400	10.144	G3=8.3600	**Significant**
					G4=8.7300	
					G5=8.8700	
7.	**Overall**				G1=40.7900	**F=3.875**
	Between Groups	4	2776.432	694.108	G2=47.2900	P < 0.05

| | Within Groups | 495 | 88658.390 | 179.108 | G3=46.3700 G4=44.3100 G5=46.5700 | **Significant** |

G1= Arts and Science G2= Engineering G3= Medical G4= Poly-technique G5= B.Ed

TABLE :V

ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG THE RESPONDENTS DOMICILE WITH REGARD TO VARIOUS DIMENSIONS OF IMPACT OF POLITICAL PROMOTION VIA FACE BOOK

S.NO	Source	Df	SS	MS	$\overline{X}$	Statistical Inference
1.	**Political interest** Between Groups Within Groups	2 497	5.053 1993.539	2.526 4.011	G1=5.9839 G2=5.9659 G3=5.7586	F=0.630 P > 0.05 Not Significant
2.	**Effect on the political situation** Between Groups Within Groups	2 497	70.287 4270.711	35.143 8.593	G1=7.6129 G2=8.7727 G3=8.3966	**F=4.090** P < 0.05 **Significant**
3.	**Dealing with messages** Between Groups Within Groups	2 497	93.716 11545.906	46.858 23.231	G1=10.4355 G2=11.6174 G3=10.9368	F=2.017 P > 0.05 Not Significant
4.	**Reliability**				G1=5.2742	F=3.105

| | Between Groups | 2 | 25.743 | 12.872 | G2=5.5909 | P > 0.05 |
| | Within Groups | 497 | 2060.295 | 4.145 | G3=5.1034 | Not Significant |

Continued……

S.NO	Source	Df	SS	MS	$\bar{X}$	Statistical Inference
5.	**Effect on the orientation**					
	Between Groups	2	20.765	10.382	G1=5.7258 G2=5.8636	F=1.955 P > 0.05
	Within Groups	497	2639.803	5.311	G3=5.4195	Not Significant
6.	**Effect on choices**					
	Between Groups	2	37.039	18.520	G1=8.0968 G2=8.6212	F=1.782 P > 0.05
	Within Groups	497	5164.713	10.392	G3=8.0690	Not Significant
7.	**Overall**					
	Between Groups	2	1057.467	528.733	G1=43.1290 G2=46.4318	F=2.908 P > 0.05
	Within Groups	497	90377.355	181.846	G3=43.6839	Not Significant

G1= Semi-urban G2= Urban G3= Rural

FRIEDMAN TEST FOR STUDENTS PREFERENCE TO SHARE POST ON FACE BOOK SITE

S.no	Students preference on Face book site	Mean Rank	Rank
1.	Celebrities news	4.38	7
2.	Current event	4.98	5
3.	Quotes	4.86	6
4.	News	5.00	4
5.	Work	4.11	8
6.	Politics	3.93	9
7.	Music	5.97	1
8.	Jokes and memems	5.89	2
9.	General	5.87	3

Age and Effect on the orientation	(-)**0.106***	**P < 0.05** **Significant**
Age and Effect on choices	(-)**0.096***	**P < 0.05** **Significant**

Thre is a signifivcant ralatio

S.no	Political Promotion Via Face Book	Year of study				Statistical Inference
		1st year (n:181)	2nd year (n:217)	3rd year (n:76)	4th year (n:26)	
3.	Dealing with messages					$x^2=16.311$ df =3 p < 0.01 Significant
	Low level	72	113	24	6	
	High level	109	104	52	20	

S.no	Political Promotion Via Face Book	Year of study				Statistical Inference
		1st year (n:181)	2nd year (n:217)	3rd year (n:76)	4th year (n:26)	
4.	Reliability					$x^2=10.747$ df =3 p < 0.05 Significant
	Low level	54	97	24	11	
	High level	127	120	52	15	
5.	Effect on the orientation					$x^2=10.318$ df =3 p < 0.05 Significant
	Low level	85	114	25	9	
	High level	96	103	51	17	

INTER CORRELATION MATRIX AMONG VARIOUS DIMENSIONS OF IMPACT OF POLITICAL PROMOTION VIA FACE BOOK

	Political interest	Effect on the political	Dealing with messages	Reliability	Effect on the orientation	Effect on choices	Overall
Political interest	1						
fdEffect on the political situation	.424**	1					
Dealing with messages	.448**	.475**	1				
Reliability	.405**	.524**	.562**	1			
Effect on the orientation	.481**	.573**	.514**	.607**	1		
Effect on choices	.435**	.539**	.474**	.663**	.703**	1	
Overall	.647**	.756**	.812**	.787**	.809**	.809**	1