

---

## Nature of Participation of the Santal Tribe in their Community based Traditional Decision Making Institutions: A Case Study of Purulia District in West Bengal

**Dr. Soumen Roy**

Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Sidho-Kanho-Birsha University, Purulia, West Bengal, India.

**Chinmay Sar**

Assiatant Professor, Department of Political Science, Bandwan Mahavidyalaya,(Affiliated to Sidho-Kanho-Birsha University), Purulia, West Bengal, India

---

### ARTICLE DETAILS

**Research Paper**

**Accepted:** 21-02-2025

**Published:** 14-03-2025

---

#### Keywords:

*Santal, Community, Traditional decision making institution, Panchayat, Participation, Social Order*

---

### ABSTRACT

The Santal community, an indigenous group, primarily found in parts of India, Bangladesh and Nepal. This community has a rich tradition of governance and decision-making which is rooted in their cultural heritage. Traditionally, the Santals have relied on a system of communal decision-making which is called 'Darbar' that reflects their values and societal norms. This system is deeply embedded in their way of life and plays a crucial role in maintaining social order and cohesion within the community. Decisions are often made after thorough discussion and consultation with community members. This process ensures that various viewpoints are taken into account. As a result, the final outcome reflects the collective will of the community. This paper tries to find out various stages of decision making in traditional institutions of Santal, their nature of participation in that system and to identify the various factors that hinder or facilitate their participation.

---

**DOI :** <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15030387>

---

**Introduction:**

For the Santals, religious beliefs embarrass every aspect of society, intertwining social and religious power. They hold a firm belief that Thakur Jiew created the Santals and that they are constantly surrounded by Bongas which is invisible supernatural beings who protect and guide them against evil. Murmu (2001) has classified Santal justice system into five parts such as i.) Family Justice (Orag), ii.) Village Justice (Atu), iii.) Porshi Justice, iv.) Disham Justice and v.) Shikar Council (Lo-Bir). Within Santal villages, the Ato More, literally meaning "five men of the village" (now numbering seven), serve as the guardians and village representatives in their communication with Bongas. These representatives include the Manjhi (village headman), Parnik (deputy headman), Jog Manjhi (overseer of village morals), Jog Parnik (deputy overseer), Godet (village messenger), Naike (village priest), and Kudam Naike (assistant village priest). The hierarchy of a Santal village consists of officials in the following order: Manjhi, Parnik, Jog Manjhi, Jog Parnik and Godet. Additionally, the Naike and Kudam Naike serve as the village's religious or sacral officials. Santal society is patriarchal because male members holding positions of authority and decision-making power. The contemporary judicial system and village leadership structure can be traced back to the ancient system of Santali society. Leadership is elected in a manner similar to a parliamentary democratic system, though not through a ballot box. Instead, leaders are chosen publicly during village meetings at the Jaher thane, where the community gathers to elect a leader from among them. The Santal society thrives on the collective efforts of all its members (Mandi, 2020, p.33).

**Village Council:**

The village council, known as "Monehor," is a fundamental social organization responsible for administering justice within the Santal community. Consisting of five members, it serves as the highest authority in the village. According to Archer (2014), the village community is the original court of tribal justice and intervenes in all disputes. This assembly ensures that the rites of birth, initiation and death, as well as the conduct of yearly festivals, the laws of exogamy and the canons of sex are properly observed. It upholds the principles of law, maintains civil rights and often acts as a court of registration. The council's function revolves around seven village officials who, despite being its servants in point of law, play a crucial role in the administration and maintenance of village laws. They rely on their integrity and influence.



At Santal village council's helm is the Manjhi or village headman. It is a hereditary position of great respect responsible for the overall management of the village including communal property and social work. The Manjhi's presence is essential in every ceremony. He guides the village in all matters. Assisting the Manjhi is the Parnik, who excels in judgment and determines the source of wrongdoing, ensuring justice and equality in the village. In the absence of the Manjhi, the Parnik presides over the council and may succeed the Manjhi if no suitable kin is available. The Jog Manjhi assists the Manjhi by maintaining discipline and overseeing social functions, particularly matters involving young men and women. The Jog Manjhi investigates and adjudicates issues of love and marriage. He ensures the safety of villagers during festivals. Supporting the Parnik is the Jog Parnik who steps in to perform the duties of the Jog Manjhi when necessary. The Godet, acting as the village messenger, keeps everyone informed about important events and collects elements for offerings and sacrifices. The Naeke or village head priest performs religious ceremonies and maintains the spiritual well-being of the village. His assistant is the Kudam Naeke who aids in religious duties and offers blood sacrifices for the villagers' success in hunting.

These officials usually hold their positions for life, unless they step down or are dismissed due to negligence. The Magh festival is a significant event where the villagers address grievances and decide the fate of the officials. If an official fails in their duties, they may receive a warning or be removed from office after thorough deliberation. While these positions are hereditary, the village can choose others if necessary. The offices are prestigious. Sometimes they are offered lands, fees and privileges.

### **Pargana or Inter-Village Council:**

Above the village council, there exists a higher-level council known as the Pargana, Pir Pargana or Porshi. Each village is led by a Manjhi baba and a group of 10-12 villages is overseen by a Parganait who is elected by the Manjhis of the villages within that Pargana. This council addresses more complex and serious socio-religious disputes that the village council cannot resolve. Issues such as premarital motherhood, questions of paternity, breaches of social norms and unresolved conflicts between villages that the Manjhi baba could not settle are handled by this council. Pir Pargana also leads the panchayat-level Santal organization. A Muluk comprises 7 to 8 Gram panchayats and its leader is known as Muluk Pargana. It operates at the block level. At the sub-divisional level, the leader is called Tallat Pargana. The district-level head of the Santal organization is known as Zilla Pargana. At the state level, the leader is titled Pranat Pargana and at the national level, the head is called Desham Pargana or Desh Manjhi



which is the most prestigious position within the Santal community. Currently, the Desham Pargana is chosen from the Jhargram district in West Bengal.

### **Hunt Council or Supreme Court:**

The Annual Hunt or Lo-Bir-Sendra, acts as the Santal supreme court, convening once a year in the jungle. This event includes the hunt, song recitals and council meetings to address socio-religious and legal issues including serious offenses that could lead to excommunication. Appeals against decisions by the Des-Pargana are also considered. Though the traditional hunt has lost significance due to wildlife preservation laws, the modern form remains a ritualistic event focused on entertainment and upholding the Santal code of conduct. The Dihiri, who led the hunt, was crucial in organizing and guiding the process.

### **Review of Literature**

In "Socio-Economic Status of the Tribals of Purulia District in the Post-Colonial Period," Shyamal Kumar Daripa (2018) examines the tribal conditions in Purulia based on the 2011 census. He highlights the decline of traditional tribal culture due to imperialist and capitalist interventions which have disrupted the subsistent economic systems and resulting in alienation and extreme poverty. Subodh Ghosh's (1940) book, "Bharater Adivasi," discusses the social, cultural, religious, educational, anthropological and economic positions of tribals during the British period, emphasizing that tribal issues should be integrated with national problems for effective resolution. Sanjib Bandyopadhyay's (2013) study, "The Impact of Different Development Programmes on the Scheduled Tribe People in the Drought Prone Areas of West Bengal," argues for tailored developmental programs for each tribe, criticizing the "one-size-fits-all" strategy. Dhirendranath Baskey (2018) details the cultural aspects of various tribal communities, while Kalendranath Mandi (2020), Parimal Hembram (2018) and Salek Khokon (2019) focus on tribal movements including the Santal language movement.

### **Research Gap:**

A review of existing literature on the participation of tribal communities in West Bengal shows limited studies on the subject, with none focusing comprehensively on the political involvement of marginalized



groups like the Santal community in Purulia district. Most research addresses the social and economic conditions of the region's tribal people, overlooking their participation in the traditional decision-making institutions related to planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. This gap in the literature highlights the need for the present work.

### **Objectives of the study**

1. To analyze different levels of decision making institution of Santal.
2. To analyze the nature of participation of 'Santal' tribe in their different decision making institutions of the society.
3. To identify the various factors those hinder or facilitate their participation.

### **Research Questions**

1. What is the nature and types of participation of Santal of their traditional decision making process?
2. Do age, illiteracy, occupation, marital status and economic condition prevent Santal from participating in these institutions?

### **Profile of the Study Area**

Purulia district has a total population of 2,930,115, with 540,652 individuals belonging to scheduled tribes, accounting for 18.45% of the district's population. The Santal population is 339,094, representing 62.71% of the scheduled tribe population and 11.57% of the district's total population, according to the 2011 census. This study will focus on two blocks within Purulia Zilla Parishad: Bandwan and Manbazar<sup>2</sup>, both of which have the highest tribal populations and are the most socioeconomically backward in the district. Bandwan block, located in the southeastern part of Purulia, has a tribal population of 49,232, making up 51.86% of its total population. Manbazar<sup>2</sup> block, bordered by Manbazar<sup>1</sup> to the north, Ranibandh to the east, Bandwan to the south, Patamda to the east, and Barabazar to the west, has a tribal population of 47,580, which constitutes 48.97% of its total population. From these two blocks, four gram panchayats have been chosen in respect of Santal population. These Gram Panchayats are Kumra GP and Kuchia GP from Bandwan block area, Dighi GP and Buribandh GP from Manbazar<sup>2</sup> block area. A purposive sampling of 100 respondents from each GP had been taken into account under the study. Total 400 respondents' responses have been recorded.

### **Research Methodology**



To address the research questions, data was collected from both primary and secondary sources. Primary data was gathered through interviews with respondents, government reports and publications. Secondary sources included newspapers, books, scholarly articles and periodicals. The study involved extensive fieldwork using a sample survey method, employing both interview and questionnaire techniques for quantitative and qualitative data analysis. A pilot survey was conducted and a probability simple random sampling technique was adopted with random numbers generated using the lottery method. Quantitative data was supplemented by qualitative data.

### **Data Analysis**

The male-female ratio in the given panchayats is balanced, with each panchayat (Kutchia, Kumra, Dighi, and Buribandh) having 50 males and 50 females, totaling 100 people each. In Total, there are 200 males and 200 females, making the total population across all panchayats 400 (Table 1).

In terms of age, 46.75% are between 18-34 years, 26.25% fall in the 35-50 years range and 27% are over 51 years old. Regarding education, 56.75% are illiterate, 27.25% have completed primary education, 9% have secondary education, 4% have higher-secondary education, 2.5% are graduates, and 1% have post-graduate qualifications. For occupation, 13.75% are unemployed, 22.25% are cultivators, 41.25% work as agricultural laborers, 17.75% are non-agricultural laborers, 4.5% are engaged in business and 0.5% are in government service. In terms of marital status, 34.75% are unmarried, 53.5% are married, 3.75% are widows and 8% are widowers. In terms of monthly income, 5.25% earn under 1000, 31.75% earn between 1001-2000, 26% have an income range of 2001-5000 and 37% earn above 5000 (Table 2).

In the Darbar meetings across the blocks of Bandwan and Manbazar II, participation varies. In Kutchia, 44% participate regularly, 16% casually and 40% never. In Kumra, 42% are regular participants, 20% casual and 38% never. Dighi has 39% regular, 29% casual and 32% non-participants, while Buribandh shows 48% regular, 32% casual and 20% non-participants. In total, out of 400 participants, 43.25% are regular attendees, 24.25% participate casually and 32.5% never participate in the meetings. This data reflects varying levels of engagement within these communities (Table 3).

The respondents' views on the Darbar highlight the role and influence of traditional tribal meetings in their communities. An overwhelming majority, 99.5%, are aware of the Darbar, with 96% receiving timely information about the meetings. However, participation of women in these meetings remains low, with only 37.5% of respondents stating that women attend. There is a strong belief, at 97.25%, that



decisions are not made before the meetings, indicating strong transparency. Despite this, 96.5% believe that the Darbar has benefitted people at the grassroots level. Participation in the Darbar is varied, with 21% participating as beneficiaries, 63.5% as the audience and 15.5% involved in community development. When it comes to resolving social problems, 96% prefer to address issues through traditional tribal leaders. In situations where there are differences of opinion between traditional leaders and modern institutional leaders, 75.25% prefer to support leaders who uphold justice. Meanwhile, 17.5% support traditional tribal leaders, and only 4.25% favor formal institutional leaders. The data indicates a strong preference for traditional systems and justice-oriented leadership within these communities (Table 4).

The participation in Pargana meetings is broken down by Gram Panchayat and categorized into regular, casual, and never participants. In the Bandwan block, Kutchia had 10% regular participants, 52% casual participants and 48% who never participated. Kumra had 25% regular, 37% casual and 48% who never participated. In the Manbazar II block, Dighi had 9% regular, 49% casual and 42% who never participated, while Buribandh had 17% regular, 30% casual and 53% who never participated. Overall, 15.25% were regular participants, 42% were casual and 47.75% never participated out of a total of 400 respondents (Table 5).

The reasons for non-participation in Pargana meetings among respondents are a total of 13% of respondents cited a lack of interest and knowledge, with 9 respondents from Kutchia, 4 from Kumra, 24 from Dighi, and 15 from Buribandh. Lack of time was the most common reason, accounting for 39.75% of responses, with 41 respondents from Kutchia, 56 from Kumra, 27 from Dighi, and 35 from Buribandh. Previous bad experiences deterred 8.5% of respondents, including 6 from Kutchia, 3 from Kumra, 17 from Dighi, and 8 from Buribandh. A lack of communication and information was a reason for 18.25% of respondents, with 14 from Kutchia, 21 from Kumra, 19 from Dighi, and 19 from Buribandh. Political conflict was a reason for 2.5% of respondents, with 4 from Kutchia, 1 from Kumra, 3 from Dighi, and 2 from Buribandh. Other reasons were cited by 18% of respondents, including 26 from Kutchia, 15 from Kumra, 10 from Dighi, and 21 from Buribandh (Table 6).

The participation in Lo-Bir meetings is outlined by Gram Panchayat in the Bandwan and Manbazar II blocks. In Bandwan, Kutchia had 9% regular participants, 21% casual participants, and 70% who never participated, while Kumra had 7% regular, 14% casual, and 79% who never participated. In Manbazar II, Dighi had 19% regular participants, 14% casual participants, and 67% who never participated, while



Buribandh had 5% regular, 11% casual, and 84% who never participated. Overall, across all Gram Panchayats, 10% were regular participants, 15% were casual, and 75% never participated out of 400 respondents (Table 7).

The reasons for non-participation in Lo-Bir meetings among respondents from different Gram Panchayats (GPs) are as follows: A total of 31.25% of respondents cited a lack of interest and knowledge, with 45 respondents from Kutchia, 39 from Kumra, 24 from Dighi, and 17 from Buribandh. Lack of time was the most common reason, accounting for 36.25% of responses, with 31 respondents from Kutchia, 29 from Kumra, 48 from Dighi, and 37 from Buribandh. Previous bad experiences deterred 4% of respondents, including 2 from Kutchia, 5 from Kumra, 0 from Dighi, and 9 from Buribandh. A lack of communication and information was cited by 4.25% of respondents, with 1 from Kutchia, 3 from Kumra, 6 from Dighi, and 7 from Buribandh. Political conflict was a reason for 5.25% of respondents, including 5 from Kutchia, 4 from Kumra, 1 from Dighi, and 11 from Buribandh. Other reasons were cited by 19% of respondents, including 16 from Kutchia, 20 from Kumra, 21 from Dighi, and 19 from Buribandh (Table 8).

The socio-economic background of respondents participating in various events reveals insightful trends across multiple parameters. Age distribution shows that the majority of participants fall in the 18-34 years category, with a gradual decrease as age increases. Specifically, 46.75% of respondents belong to this age group, with varying levels of participation: 22.75% in Darbar, 19.25% in Parshi, and 14% in L-Bir events. The 35-50 years group comprises 26.25% of the respondents, while those above 51 years represent 27%. Participation rates in all three events decrease with age, although the eldest group maintains significant involvement.

Regarding education, the majority of respondents are illiterate, accounting for 56.75%, with participation percentages higher among this group: 38.5% in Darbar, 28.5% in Parshi, and 10.75% in L-Bir. As education levels increase, the participation rates decline across all events, with postgraduate respondents showing minimal involvement.

Occupation-wise, agricultural laborers form the largest group at 41.25%, actively participating in Darbar (31.25%), Parshi (25.25%), and L-Bir (8.5%). Cultivators and unemployed individuals also form substantial groups, while government service holders are the least represented.





Marital status reveals that married individuals comprise the majority at 53.5%, with significant participation rates: 36.25% in Darbar, 28% in Parshi, and 13% in L-Bir. Unmarried respondents also participate actively, while widows and widowers show limited engagement.

The monthly income parameter highlights a significant proportion of respondents earning between 1001-2000 units (31.75%), with Darbar participation reaching 28.25%. Income brackets correlate with participation, where higher income groups participate less frequently in events, particularly in Darbar and L-Bir.

These trends suggest that socio-economic factors such as age, education, occupation, marital status, and income significantly influence participation rates in the cultural events under study (Table 9).

### **Findings:**

Participation in Darbar meetings shows variation across the blocks of Bandwan and Manbazar II, with some communities having a higher rate of regular attendance while others have a notable portion who never participate. The majority of respondents are aware of the Darbar and receive timely information about the meetings, yet women's participation remains relatively low. There is a prevalent belief that decisions are not predetermined before the meetings, leading to indicate transparency. Most respondents feel that the Darbar has had a positive impact at the grassroot level. When it comes to resolving social issues, traditional tribal leaders are preferred over modern institutional leaders, with a strong inclination towards leaders who are perceived as just.

Participation in Pargana meetings is similarly categorized, with regular, casual, and non-participants distributed across the Gram Panchayats. In Bandwan, participation rates vary, with some panchayats having more regular attendees while others have a higher rate of casual or non-participants. The leading reasons for non-participation include a lack of time, interest, and communication, with previous negative experiences and political conflict being less common factors. In Lo-Bir meetings, regular participation is low across the Gram Panchayats, with a significant portion of respondents never participating. The primary reasons for this include a lack of time, interest, and knowledge, with other factors like political conflict and previous negative experiences also contributing to the low participation rates. So illiteracy and lack of awareness do not hamper their participation but economic dependency plays a pivotal role in respect of Santal's participation.

The socio-economic background of event participants reveals significant trends across age, education, occupation, marital status, and income. Most participants belong to the 18-34 age group, with participation decreasing as age increases, though the eldest group remains notably engaged. Illiterate respondents, making up the majority, show higher participation rates compared to those with higher education levels. Agricultural laborers are the most active occupational group, while government service holders participate the least. Married individuals form the largest segment, actively engaging across events, while income patterns show greater involvement from those earning between 1001-2000 units, with declining participation in higher income groups.

**Table 1: Male-Female Ratio**

Panchayat Name	Male	Female	Total
Kutchia	50	50	100
Kumra	50	50	100
Dighi	50	50	100
Buribandh	50	50	100
Total	200	200	400

Source: Field Study, 2024

**Table 2: Respondents Socio-Economic profile**

Parameter	Classification	Number	Percentage(%)
Age	18-34 Years	187	46.75%
	35-50 Years	105	26.25%
	More than 51 Years	108	27%
Education	Illiterate	227	56.75%
	Primary	109	27.25%
	Secondary	34	9%
	Higher-Secondary	16	4%
	Graduate	10	2.5%
	Post-Graduate	4	1%
Occupation	Unemployed	55	13.75%
	Cultivator	89	22.25%
	Agricultural Laboural	165	41.25%
	Non-Agricultural Laboural	71	17.75%
	Business	18	4.5%
	Government Service	2	0.5%
Marital Status	Unmarried	139	34.75%
	Married	214	53.5%
	Widow	15	3.75%
	Widower	32	8%

Monthly Income	Under 1000	21	5.25%
	1001-2000	127	31.75%
	2001-5000	104	26%
	Above 5000	148	37%

Source: Field Study, 2024

**Table 3: Participation in the meeting of the Darbar**

Block	Gram Panchayat	Regular Participants No. (%)	Casual Participants No. (%)	Never Participants No. (%)	Total Participants
Bandwan	Kutchia	44 (44%)	16 (16%)	40 (40%)	100
	Kumra	42 (42%)	20 (20%)	38 (38%)	100
Manbazar II	Dighi	39 (39%)	29 (29%)	32 (32%)	100
	Buribandh	48 (48%)	32 (32%)	20 (20%)	100
Total		173 (43.25%)	97 (24.25%)	130 (32.5%)	400

Source: Field Study, 2024

**Table 4: Respondents view about Darbar**

Parameter	Respondents view	Name of GP				Total No.(%)
		Kutchia No.(%)	Kumra No.(%)	Dighi No.(%)	Buribandh No.(%)	
Do you know about Darbar	Yes	98 (98%)	100(100%)	100(100%)	100(100%)	398 (99.5%)
	No	2(2%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	02 (0.5%)
Do you get information for attending Darbar meeting in time	Yes	96(96%)	95(95%)	99(99%)	92(92%)	382 (95.5%)
	No	4(4%)	5(5%)	1(1%)	8(8%)	18 (4.5%)
Do the women attend such meetings	Yes	32(32%)	45(45%)	48(48%)	25(25%)	150 (37.5%)
	No	68(68%)	55(55%)	52(52%)	75(75%)	250 (62.5%)
Do you think the decisions	Yes	02(2%)	0(0%)	5(5%)	04(4%)	11(2.75%)



in the meeting were taken before the meeting	No	98(98%)	100(100%)	95(95%)	96(96%)	389 (97.25%)
Do you think that such meetings have benefitted the grass root level people	Yes	99(99%)	100(100%)	97(97%)	90(90%)	386 (96.5%)
	No	1(1%)	0(0%)	3(3%)	10(10%)	14 (3.5%)
If you participate then what is the nature of participation	As beneficiary	11(11%)	24(24%)	32(32%)	17(17%)	84 (21%)
	As audience	74(74%)	64(64%)	45(45%)	71(71%)	254 (63.5%)
	Community development.	15(15%)	12(12%)	23(23%)	12(12%)	62 (15.5%)
Do you prefer to solve all social problems (that arise in your society) through the traditional tribal leaders	Yes	99(99%)	100(100%)	92(92%)	93(93%)	384 (96%)
	No	1(1%)	0(0%)	8(8%)	7(7%)	16 (4%)
In cases of differences of opinions between traditional tribal leaders and modern institutional leaders (not you), to whom does your preference of support goes	Leaders who support justice	79(79%)	84(84%)	74(74%)	64(64%)	301 (75.25%)
	Traditional Tribal Leaders	19(19%)	10(10%)	16(16%)	25(25%)	70 (17.5%)
	Formal Institutional Leaders	2(2%)	4(4%)	5(5%)	6(6%)	17 (4.25%)
	No Answer	0(0%)	2(2%)	5(5%)	5(5%)	12 (3%)

Source: Field Study, 2024

**Table 5: Participation in the meeting of the Pargana**

Block	Gram Panchayat	Regular Participants No. (%)	Casual Participants No. (%)	Never Participants No. (%)	Total Participants No. (%)
Bandwan	Kutchia	10(10%)	52(52%)	48(48%)	100
	Kumra	25(25%)	37(37%)	48(48%)	100
Manbazar II	Dighi	9(9%)	49(49%)	42(42%)	100
	Buribandh	17(17%)	30(30%)	53(53%)	100
Total		61(15.25%)	168(42%)	191(47.75%)	400

Source: Field Study, 2024

**Table 6: Reason for non-participation in Pargana**

Parameter	Respondents view	Name of GP				Total No.(%)
		Kutchia No.(%)	Kumra No.(%)	Dighi No.(%)	Buribandh No.(%)	
Reason for non participation in Pargana meeting	Lack of interest and knowledge	9(9%)	4(4%)	24(24%)	15(15%)	52 (13%)
	Lack of time	41(41%)	56(56%)	27(27%)	35(35%)	159 (39.75%)
	Previous experience is not good	6(6%)	3(3%)	17(17%)	08(8%)	34 (8.5%)
	Lack of communication and information	14(14%)	21(21%)	19(19%)	19(19%)	73 (18.25%)
	Political conflict	4(4%)	1(1%)	3(3%)	2(2%)	10 (2.5%)
	Other reason	26(26%)	15(15%)	10(10%)	21(21%)	72 (18%)

Source: Field Study, 2024

**Table 7: Participation in the meeting of the Lo-Bir**

Block	Gram Panchayat	Regular Participants No. (%)	Casual Participants No. (%)	Never Participants No. (%)	Total Participants
Bandwan	Kutchia	9(9%)	21(21%)	70(70%)	100
	Kumra	7(7%)	14(14%)	79(79%)	100

Manbazar II	Dighi	19(19%)	14(14%)	67(67%)	100
	Buribandh	5(5%)	11(11%)	84(84%)	100
Total		40(10%)	60(15%)	300(75%)	400

Source: Field Study, 2024

**Table 8: Reason for non participation in Lo-Bir meetings**

Parameter	Respondents view	Name of GP				Total No. (%)
		Kutchia No.(%)	Kumra No.(%)	Dighi No.(%)	Buribandh No.(%)	
Reason for non participation in Lo-Bir meeting	Lack of interest and knowledge	45(45%)	39(39%)	24(24%)	17(17%)	125 (31.25%)
	Lack of time	31(31%)	29(29%)	48(48%)	37(37%)	145 (36.25%)
	Previous experience is not good	2(2%)	5(5%)	0(0%)	9(9%)	16 (4%)
	Lack of communication and information	1(1%)	3(3%)	6(6%)	7(7%)	17 (4.25%)
	Political conflict	5(5%)	4(4%)	1(1%)	11(11%)	21 (5.25%)
	Other reason	16(16%)	20(20%)	21(21%)	19(19%)	76 (19%)

Source: Field Study, 2024

**Table 9: Respondents Socio-Economic Background in Participation**

Parameter	Classification	Number (%)	Participation in Darbar	Participation in Parshi	Participation in L-Bir
			No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)
Age	18-34 Years	187(46.75%)	91(22.75%)	77(19.25%)	56(14%)
	35-50 Years	105(26.25%)	83(20.75%)	69(17.25%)	24(6%)
	More than 51 Years	108(27.00%)	96(24%)	63(15.75%)	20(5%)
Education	Illiterate	227(56.75%)	154(38.5%)	114(28.5%)	43(10.75%)
	Primary	109(27.25%)	79(19.75%)	65(16.25%)	36(9%)
	Secondary	34(9%)	15(3.75%)	13(3.25%)	10(2.5%)
	Higher-	16(4%)	10(25%)	8(2%)	8(2%)



	Secondary				
	Graduate	10(2.5%)	8(2%)	7(1.75%)	2(.5%)
	Post-Graduate	4(1%)	4(1%)	2(.5%)	1(.25%)
Occupation	Unemployed	55(13.75%)	39(9.75%)	24(6%)	19(4.75%)
	Cultivator	89 (22.25%)	64(16%)	59(14.75%)	22(5.5%)
	Agricultural Laboural	165 (41.25%)	125(31.25%)	101(25.25%)	34(8.5%)
	Non-Agricultural Laboural	71 (17.75%)	27(6.75%)	21(5.25%)	20(5%)
	Business	18 (4.5%)	13(3.25%)	4(1%)	5(1.25%)
	Government Service	2 (0.5%)	2(0.5%)	0	0
Marital Status	Unmarried	139 (34.75%)	99(24.75%)	80(20%)	41(10.25%)
	Married	214 (53.5%)	145(36.25%)	112(28%)	52(13%)
	Widow	15 (3.75%)	5(1.25%)	1(.25%)	1(.25%)
	Widower	32 (8%)	21(5.25%)	16(4%)	6(1.5%)
Monthly Income	Under 1000	21 (5.25%)	18(4.5%)	5(1.25%)	2(.5%)
	1001-2000	127 (31.75%)	113(28.25%)	53(13.25%)	39(9.75%)
	2001-5000	104 (26%)	84(21%)	69(17.25%)	25(6.25%)
	Above 5000	148 (37%)	55(13.75%)	82(20.5%)	34(8.5%)

Source: Field Study, 2024

## References

1. Baske, D. (2018). *Paschimbanger Adivasi Samaj (part 1 and 2)*. Kolkata: Baske Publication.
2. Khokon, S. (February, 2019). *Bidroh- SangrameAdibasi*. Kolkata: Kathapakash.
3. Mandi, K. (2020). *Santali Vasa Andoloner Itihas*. Purulia :SilyPrakasani.
4. Hembram, P. (2018). *Sangbidhanik Swikritir Dabite Santali Vasa Andoloner Itihas*. Kokata :Adivasi Sahitya Prakashani.
5. Sen, S. (1942). *Bharater Asivasi Samaj, Poribesh o Sangram*. Kolkata: Bookpost Publication.



6. Ghosh, S. (2018). *Bharater Adivasi*. Kolkata: National Book Agency Pvt. Ltd.
7. Daripa, S.K., (February, 2018). *Socio Economic Status of The Tribals of Purulia District In the Post colonial Period*. International Journal of Research in Social Sciences. Vol.8. Issue.2: pp. 727-738.
8. Bandyopadhyay, S. (2013). *The Impact of Different Development Programmes on the Scheduled Tribe People in the Drought Prone Areas of West Bengal – A Case Study*. Business Spectrum. Vol.3. No.1.
9. Mandi, K. (2020). *Santali Vasa Andoloner Itihas*. Purulia :Sily Prakasani
10. Archer, W. G. (2014). *Tribal Law and Justice: A Report on the Santal*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company Pvt. Ltd.
11. Murmu, R. (2001). *Jaher Bonga Santarh Ka*. Kolkata:Audim Publication.