CHAPTER – II

POLITICAL CULTURE
2.1: Political Culture: The Concept:

Political Culture is a distinct dimension of the culture of a society. Generally, it refers to the overall pattern of political psychology or the pattern of psychological orientations of the people of a society toward political objects. People, being members of their society, tend to form and develop patterns of perceptions and orientations toward the Societal Political System, its institutions and role-incumbents, leaders and fellow political actors, the ongoing political process, and also toward themselves as political actors. The pattern of such perceptions and orientations toward politics and the varieties of political objects, in general, may be termed as Political Culture. However, scholars are found to define Political Culture in different perspectives, and they have identified different sets of its attributes, themes, and components.

Gabriel A. Almond who may be considered as the pioneer of the concept of Political Culture, in contemporary time, defines it as “patterns of orientation to politics.” According to him, political culture is “a set of
attitudes, cognition, value-standards, and feelings toward the political system, its various roles and role-incumbents. It also includes knowledge of, values-affecting, and feelings toward the inputs of demands and claims into the system, and its authoritative outputs. On the whole, he points out: "When we speak of political culture of a society, we refer to the political system as internalized in the cognition, feelings, and evaluations of its population. Political Culture, thus, refers to the psychological dimension of the political system, and it also constitutes the foundation on which the Political System rests. As Almond emphatically asserts, "Every Political System is embedded in a particular pattern of orientations to political action," and "all Political Systems tend to perpetuate their cultures and structures through time." Therefore, in Almond's conceptualization, it is the pattern of Political Culture of the people of a society that tends to determine the prospect of stability, maintenance, and perpetuation of their Political System. The relationship between the pattern of Political Culture of the people and the structure of the Political System, whether allegiant or alienated, seems to be a major determinant of maintenance or change of a political system. Hence, every Political System, for realizing the goal of system-maintenance and perpetuation, tends to
inculcate in its people, through the process of political socialization, that pattern of political culture which is congruent and allegiant to its structure.  

On the concept of Political Culture and its major components, the conceptualization of David Easton seems to be significantly different from that of Gabriel. A. Almond. Easton is of the opinion that the people of a society form and develop attitudes toward their political system which is made up of three major components or objects such as the Political Community, the Regime, and the Authorities. The Political Community refers to the community of persons or members of the societal political system bound together affectively by a common division of political-labour. The Regime refers to the goals, norms, and rules of political interactions as well as the structure of Authority through which authoritative allocation of values for the society are expected to be made and implemented. The Authorities refer to all those persons who are the occupants or incumbents of the structure of Authority, and who, as a consequence, play roles in the making and enforcement authoritative decisions and policies. Toward all these three components of Political System, people tend to form and develop attitudes and orientations, what may be termed as patterns of Political Culture, that tend to determine its capacity “to persist in a world either of
The persistence of a Political System, according to Easton, necessitates successful sustenance of two essential variables of political life such as its ability to allocate values for the society, and its ability to induce most of its members to accept these allocations as binding for most of the time. So long as these two essential variables of Political life are sustained, a Political System may be said to persist even if it undergoes radical and frequent changes in its norms and forms. The goal of system-persistence, therefore, may be realized provided the people of a society are favourably oriented, at the very least, to the Political Community which signals their minimal readiness to work together as a coherent political entity. Otherwise, there would be no expectation of compliance on the part of the people to any authoritative allocation of values. However, according to Easton, the persistence of a Political System, irrespective of stability or change of its Authorities and Regime, tends to be crucially determined by the patterns of attitudes and orientations, supportive or otherwise, of its people not only toward the Political Community but also toward some kind of Regime and a set of Authorities at a given time, because the making of authoritative decisions as well as renderence of compliance to them by the people constitute the essential variables of political life. Therefore, for realizing the goal of system-persistence, Easton asserts, it becomes
imperative for a Political System to instill in its members an affective sense of Political Community and positive sentiments of generalized legitimacy and compliance to some kind of Regime and a set of Authorities, regardless of specific rewards and expectations, what he terms as ‘diffuse support’, through the process of political socialization.

According to Lucian W. Pye, Political Culture refers to the over-all pattern of people’s “attitudes, sentiments, and cognitions that inform and govern political behaviour in any society.” It is composed of their attitudes toward human nature and inter-personal relationship, power and the power-holders, individual liberty and State-authority, and their sentiments of loyalty and commitment to the Political System of which they are members. Such attitudes are not just random congeries but represent coherent patterns which tend to determine political behaviour of the individual as well as performance of the political institutions. As Pye points out, “For the individual, political culture provides controlling guide-lines for effective political behaviour, and for the collectivity, it gives a systematic structure of values and rational considerations which ensures coherence in the performance of institutions and organizations.” Thus, in the opinion of Pye, Political Culture Constitutes “the Ordered subjective realm of Politics” which gives
meaning to the polity, discipline to political institutions, and relevance to the individual’s political behaviour.

On the concept of Political Culture, Sidney Verba opines: “Political Culture........... refers to all politically relevant orientations whether of a cognitive, evaluative, or expressive sort. It refers to the orientations of all the members of a Political System, and it refers to orientations to all aspects of politics.”

He specifies its components, and points out: “The political culture of a society consists of the system of empirical beliefs, expressive symbols and values which defines the situation in which political action takes place.” These beliefs, according to Verba, may be of several kinds such as empirical beliefs about what the actual state of political life is, and normative beliefs as to the goals or values that ought to be pursued in political life; and these beliefs may have an important expressive or emotional dimension. Thus, in Varba’s conceptualization, Political Culture provides “the subjective orientation to politics” that tends to regulate the individual’s political behaviour as well as the performance of a political system.

Fred I. Greenstein conceptualizes Political Culture as patterns of political orientations comprising the individual’s dispositions, beliefs, and
attitudes toward political objects such as citizen-role, subject-role, and specialized role in the Political System.

Dennis Kavanagh defines Political Culture as "the emotional and attitudinal environment within which the political system operates." According to him it is composed of people's attitudes, beliefs, emotions and values that relate to their political system and to political issues.

Thus, conceptualizations on Political Culture are many and varied, and scholars have identified different sets of components and themes for discerning patterns of Political Culture. Among all these conceptualization, those of David Easton and Gabriel A. Almond seem to provide two major yet divergent perspectives. Almond's conceptualization focuses on the System-maintenance perspective where as Easton's conceptualization focuses on the System-persistence perspective. However, these two perspectives on Political Culture as the content of the Political socialization process ought to be combined together because the quest for political stability and the inevitability of 'Political Change, howsoever slow and marginal in case of some, tend to characterize every Political System. In real world situations, it is seen that every Political System undertakes endeavours to maintain and perpetuate itself by inducting the congruent Political Culture in its people
through the process of political socialization. At the same time, it is also seen that no political system, howsoever stable it may be, is immune from political changes, because changes in the political orientations of the people consequent upon changes in their socio-economic life and emergence of new ideas may necessitate corresponding changes in the norms and forms of the Political system for enabling it to persist in the midst of environmental changes. Therefore, what seems to be required is a combined perspective on Political Culture and its concomitant process of political socialization that synthesizes the system-maintenance perspective of Almond and the system-persistence perspective of Easton, and recognizes that the desire for political stability and the inevitability of political change are endemic to every Political System.

2.2: A. Typology of Political Culture:

For classifying political culture into different kinds and types, a convenient conceptual scheme has been suggested by Gabriel A. Almond. His formulation is manifest in his statement: "The political culture of a nation is the particular distribution of patterns of orientation toward political objects among the members of the nation."
Following Almond’s formulation, Political Culture may be discerned and characterized at the level of the individual as well as the collectivity on exploring the different dimensions of orientation toward major types of political objects. According to Almond, orientation is composed of cognition, affect, and evaluation, and hence may be discerned in respect of three dimensions such as cognitive dimension, affective dimension, and evaluational dimension. Cognition refers to the level of knowledge and awareness, accurate or otherwise, about an object; Affect refers to the feelings of attachment or alienation toward an object; and Evaluation refers to the judgement and opinion on an object as to whether it is good or bad, right or wrong, just or unjust. As regard political objects toward which the individual’s orientation may be enquired into, Almond categories them into four broad categories such as the National Political System as a General Object, the Input Objects, the Output Objects, and the Self as an Actor in the Political process. He is of the opinion that the three dimensions of orientation may be enquired in respect of the above four broad categories of political objects for discerning the particular distribution of patterns of political orientations at the level of the individual as well as the collectivity. For instance, an enquiry may be made of the individual’s level of awareness,
accurate or otherwise, of his National Political System and its salient attributes, such as its history, size, location, and constitutional characteristics etc., and also an investigation may be made of his affective and evaluational orientations toward his National Political System. Similarly, the individual’s cognitive, affective, and evaluational orientations may be enquired into in respect of the Input Objects such as parties and pressure groups, and the upward flow of demands into the political system, the Output Objects such as the Legislature, the Executive, the Judiciary and the downward flow of public policy, and also in respect of the self as an object relating to one's rights, obligations and the sense of political competence. Such an enquiring may bring out the particular distribution of patterns of orientations toward political objects at the level of the individual and the collectivity as well. Thus, according to Almond, the Political Culture of the individual as well as the Political Culture of the people of a nation may be empirically discerned and characterized on exploring the three dimensions of orientations toward the four broad categories of political objects. On the basis of the frequency of cognitive, affective, and evaluational orientations toward the National Political System in general, its Input and Output Objects and the self as a political actor, Almond brings out a classification of Political Culture into three pure types such as the Parochial Political Culture, the Subject Political Culture, and the Participant Political Culture.\(^{22}\)
2.2.1: Pure Types of Political Culture:

The Classification of Political Culture into three pure types such as the Parochial Political Culture, the Subject Political Culture, and the Participant Political Culture is based on the theoretical assumption that the individual as well as the population of a society is completely characterized by the corresponding pattern of Political Orientations.

The Parochial Political Culture is characterized by lack or absence of cognitive orientation about the National Political System, its Input and Output aspects and also about the Self as a political actor. Absence of cognitive orientation toward these four categories of political objects inevitably entails absence of affective and evaluational orientations. The parochial individual is, thus, not at all oriented toward the National Political System but is concerned with his personal problems and local affairs.

The Subject Political Culture is characterized by the presence of cognitive, affective and evaluational orientations toward the National Political System and its Output Objects, but the absence or lack of orientations toward the Input objects and the self as an actor in the Political process.
The Participant Political Culture is characterized by the presence of cognitive, affective and evaluational orientations toward all four categories of political objects such as the National Political System as a general object, its Input and Output Objects, and the Self as an object. The participant individual, therefore, tends to participate actively in the political process as he possesses a high sense of political competence. These three types of Political Culture are pure types which are not found exclusively in any Society in reality because the individuals are not oriented in the same degree and the same way. No individual is exclusively Parochial, Subject or Participant and no Political System may be characterized exclusively by Parochial, Subject or Participant Political Culture. In reality, the individual as well as the collectivity reveals the phenomenon of “Cultural mix”. Empirically, it is found that the individual is a mixture of parochial, subject and participant orientations, though these are present in different proportions in different individuals. Similarly, the population of a Society comprises of Parochial, Subject and Participant individuals though their number may vary from Society to Society. Therefore, the phenomenon of ‘Cultural Mix’ tends to characterize the individual as well as the collectivity. Hence, Almond feels impelled to classify Political Culture into mixed types in view of the real-world situations.
2.2.2: Mixed-types of Political Culture:

Almond classifies Mixed Political Cultures into four types such as the Parochial-Subject Culture, the Subject-Participant Culture, the Parochial-Participant Culture, and the Civic Culture.  

Parochial-Subject Culture

This is a type of Political Culture in which most of the members of a Political System are overwhelmingly parochial in their orientations, yet a portion of the population has rejected the exclusive claims of parochial and primordial institutions and groups, and has developed subject orientations of rendering obedience to the Central Government of the Polity. This type of Mixed Culture was prevalent in the erstwhile Ottoman Empire, and the Prussian Kingdom of the Middle Ages.  

The Subject-Participant Culture

This is a type of political Culture in which most of the people of a Political System have developed subject orientations as they continue to be
oriented toward the Central Governmental Authority, but they lack in self-orientations, where as a part of the population has acquired input Orientations and an active set of self-Orientations. This emerging group of participants, however, may find it difficult to play their roles in the political process, and hence can not become 'a competent self-confident', body of citizens' and they tend to remain democratic aspirants. This type of mixed culture was prevalent in France, Germany and Italy in the Nineteenth Century.

**The Parochial-Participant Culture**

This is a type of Political Culture in which an overwhelming majority of the population of a political system retains strong parochial orientations, and primordial allegiances, but they are required to develop Participant Culture as participatory Structures have been introduced in the Political System. However, the parochial allegiances of the People emanating from their identification with race, tribe, caste, language, religion, region etc. are so strong that the participant structures of their Political System function under heavy stress and strain, and tend to lose their participant nature in reality. This type of Mixed Political Culture is found in a number of Political Systems in Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Middle-East.
The Civic Culture

It is a type of Mixed Political Culture which represents a harmonious synthesis of participant, subject and parochial orientations in the psychology of most of the members of a Political System. It is an "allegiant participant" culture. Therefore, the individuals tend to participate actively in the political process and possess a high sense of political competence, and also render obedience to laws and the authority of the Political System. However, the acquisition of participant orientations do not conflict with their subject and parochial orientations, but these three types of orientations become harmoniously synthesized. Consequently the individual develops a high sense of national allegiance and loyalty, and he tends to accord priority to national allegiance, if necessary, against his parochial allegiance. Therefore, the Civic Culture is characterized by allegiant and positive orientations toward all the four categories of political objects, such as the National Political System as a general object, the Input Objects, the Output Objects and the Self as an actor in the political process. All these orientations do not work at cross purposes but are harmoniously synthesized together.

Almond’s classification of Mixed Political Culture, thus, reveals that the people of a society may have different types and patterns of orientations
toward the Political Objects. Such heterogeneity in political orientations may emerge because of different socialization experiences of different groups of people of the society. The population of a society may be divided into various groups on the basis of socio-cultural cleavages relating race, ethnicity, gender, class, caste, language, religion etc. and each group of people may have a distinct pattern of orientations as different from the patterns of orientations of other groups of people of the society. To describe and characterize such persistent and significant differences in political orientations among the groups of people of the society, Almond makes use of the term ‘Sub-culture’. He describes political sub-cultures as ‘component parts’ of the Political Culture of a Political System.

Moreover, according to Almond, within the Political Culture of a Society, there may be discerned ‘Role Culture’ characterized by distinct pattern of political orientations of the incumbents of specialized-structures of the Political System such as Political party, Interest group, Bureaucracy, Judiciary, and Media of communication etc.

The Political Culture of the people of a Society may also be dichotomized into “elite culture” and “mass culture”. Elite culture refers
to the distinct pattern of political orientations of the elites or the power holders and power-seekers of the society, where as 'mass culture' refers to the pattern of political Orientations of the common people.

Thus, the political culture of a society may be a composite of different patterns of political orientations of its members as well as groups of people. Such heterogeneity in Political Culture seems to be the outcome of different and divergent socialization experiences of the people. But, in a society in which people obtain identical socialization experiences, the emerging political culture may be characterized by homogeneity. However, whether the Political Culture of a society is homogeneous or heterogeneous, its overall tendency ought to be supportive of the structure or form the Societal Political System so that the latter may have stability and viability. In case of incongruence between the Political culture of the people and the structure of the Political System the consequences may be political instability leading to political change. Hence, the relationship between the political culture and the structure of the Political System seems to deserve exploration and analysis.
2.3: The Culture–Structure Relationship:

Since the Political Culture of the people of a society constitutes the foundation of the Political System, the stability and survival of the latter seems to be crucially determined by a congruent relationship with the former. In this context, Gabriel A. Almond points out that a congruent political structure is one which is appropriate for the pattern of political culture of the people of a society in the sense that “political cognition in the population would tend to be accurate……… and affect and evaluation would tend to be favourable. On the contrary, the relationship between the Political Culture and the Political Structure may be said be apathetic and weak when the Political Structure is cognized by the people but their affective and evaluational orientations approach zero or indifference, where as the relationship between the Political culture and the Political Structure may be said to be incongruent or alienated when people tend to develop negative affect and evaluation toward the Political Structure.

Therefore, a Political System is likely to experience stability and viability in its working provided its structural arrangement is supported and sustained by the Political Culture of its people. Hence, Political Stability
appears to be dependent upon congruence between the Political Culture of the people and the structure of the National Political System. For instance, the structure of a Democratic Political System is likely to remain stable provided its people tend to have allegiantly participant Political Culture or the Civic Culture. Thus, the pattern of Political Culture of the people of a Society seems to be the most important determining variable that accounts for and explains the prospect of stability or change of a Political System. Therefore, every Political System tends to undertake endeavour, through the process of political socialization, to instill in its people that pattern of Political Culture which is congruent and allegiant to its structure. However, the process of political socialization may or may not contribute toward the formation of allegiant and congruent political culture in the people. Hence, it becomes imperative to undertake a study and analysis of the process of political socialization through which patterns of Political Culture are formed in the people of a Society.

2.4: Political Culture and Political Socialization:

Political Culture is the content of the process of political socialization because it is formed and shaped in the individual as a consequence of his exposure to and interactions with varieties of political socializers. Political
socialization refers to the process of political learning where-in the individual tends to learn political as well as politically relevant non-political orientations and dispositions, and as a consequence, his political self is formed, and his political culture is shaped. It is viewed by scholars in different perspectives. Herbert H. Hyman defines it as the process of "learning of Social patterns"\(^{39}\) that influences significantly the political behaviour of the individual as well as the performance of the Political System. Almond views it as "the process of induction into the Political Culture."\(^{40}\) He also asserts "All Political Systems tend to perpetuate their cultures and structures through time, and that they do this mainly by means of the socializing influences of the primary and secondary structures through which the young of the society pass in the process of maturation."\(^{41}\) Eckstein considers it as "the process through which values, cognitions, and symbols are learned and internalized, through which operative social norms regarding politics are implanted, political roles institutionalized and Political consensus created, either effectively or ineffectively."\(^{42}\) Greenstein is of the opinion that political socialization encompasses. "all political learning, formal and informal, deliberate or unplanned, at every stage of the life-cycle, including not only explicitly political learning but also nominally non-political learning of politically relevant personality characteristics."\(^{43}\) Easton defines Political
Socialization as “those developmental processes through which individuals acquire political orientation and patterns of behavior.” He also asserts that political socialization “Contributes to the capacity of a political system to persist in a world of either of stability or change.” Langton views political socialization as the process by which “society transmits its political culture from generation to generation.” He also points out that it encompasses all those “processes, mediated through various agencies of society by which an individual learns politically relevant attitudinal dispositions and behavior patterns.”

All these notions and views indicate that political socialization is the process of political learning through which the individual learns political as well as politically relevant non-political orientations, values, beliefs and dispositions as a consequence of his exposure to and interactions with numerous socializers or agents of socialization throughout his life. Thus, political socialization is a lifelong process of political learning, and through it, patterns of political culture are formed and shaped in the individual at different stages of his life. It may, therefore, be termed as an ‘interaction-acquisition’ process because the individual tends to learn and acquire patterns of orientations as and when he interacts with the socializers who may transmit manifestly or latently, deliberately or non-deliberately, political
orientations as well as non-political orientations that may become politically relevant subsequently for the individual. In this process of political learning of the individual, a number of political socializers may play significant roles and may contribute toward the formation of his political culture at different stages of his life. Among them, some universal and important socializers are the Family, the School, the Peer Group, the Mass-media, the Secondary Groups, and the Political world.

2.4.1: Role of the Family:

The Family is the first political socializer to write on the clean political slate of the individual and to cast deep imprint upon him during the early phases of his life, especially during his childhood and adolescence, in the context of formation of his political and politically-relevant orientations. The individual is born in the family, and is reared up in its environment during the formative years of his life. As the child is unable to sustain himself, he completely depends upon the parents for satisfaction of the material needs of life such as food, clothes, and shelter. He also depends upon the parents for bodily protection and safety, as well as for love and affection. Such dependence of the child upon the parents induce him to consider them as very significant persons. Moreover, the parents are viewed by the child as
very significant persons as they present themselves as Authority figures in the family in their relationship with the child, and they dispense rewards to him for approved behavior and punishment for deviant behavior. Therefore, the child tends to view his parents as Models, and tends to learn and imitate preferred values, beliefs, and attitudes of the parents. As James C. Davies points out "the family provides the major means for transferring the mentally naked infant-organism into adult, fully clothed in its own personality. And most of the individual's political personality—his tendencies to think and act politically in particular ways—have been determined at home several years before he can take part in politics as an ordinary citizen or as a political prominent."

Family may undertake both latent and manifest political socialization of the child. Family may directly and deliberately transmit to the child some non-political values and orientations which may be politically relevant subsequently when he grows up and performs adult political roles. For instance, the parents usually ask the child to perform gender-appropriate roles. The female child is instructed to be homely and docile while the male-child is asked to be active in social life. Such instructions may be imbibed by the children, and may contribute toward formation of their dispositions and behavior patterns accordingly. Subsequently, the consequence may be
passivity of the females and activeness of the males in the political arena. These inferences have been found to be true in empirical situations as reported by Fred. I. Greenstein, who on the basis of empirical surveys, finds that boys are better informed of and more interested in politics and public affairs than girls.

The parents may also transmit non-deliberately some non-political orientations with subsequent political implications. For instance, the child, through interactions with his parents and other members of the family, tends to learn his social group identifications in respect of race, ethnicity, class, caste, religion, language, region etc. However, these group-identifications are not explicitly political but later on, these may have political implications when, as an adult, he would perform political roles.

Moreover, the family’s authority-structure may also contribute significantly toward the formation of the child’s personality which may be politically relevant subsequently. For instance, in a family, where the parents administer rigid discipline over the child, give little opportunity to express himself, and also render affection conditional upon the child’s overt obedience, it may be inferred that there is an authoritarian parental authority structure. Such authoritarian child rearing practices may instill in the child
authoritarian values, and consequently the child may develop an authoritarian personality characterized by “dominance-submissiveness” tendency, a tendency to submit unquestioningly to the superior, and dominate over the subordinates, and during adulthood, he may develop an authoritarian personality. On the contrary, in a family where the child is treated affectionately by the parents, and is allowed and encouraged to participate in the decision-making process of the family, it may be inferred that there is a democratic parental authority structure. Exposure of the child to such democratic parental authority structure may facilitate formation of democratic orientations, dispositions and personality in the child. During adult life, when he would perform political roles, most probably, he would be conscious of his rights, liberties and obligations and would actively participate in the political process.

There are a number of empirical studies which reveal the correlationship between the family authority structure and the development of politically relevant personality of the individual. Robert Le Vine, in his study of the Neur and the Gusii – two segmentary patrilineages in Africa, reports that the Neur child is treated kindly and affectionately while the Gusii father treats his child rudely and punishes him severely for indiscipline.
These two different child rearing practices and the family authority structure, according to Le Vine, induce the Neur child to develop egalitarian and democratic attitudes and the Gusii child to develop authoritarian attitudes. Le Vine finds that these personality traits become politically relevant subsequently on performance of political roles in adult life. Also Lucian W. Pye, in his study of Burma, finds that, from a very early age, the Burmese child is "taught to be completely submissive before any form of authority and to expect that a passive and yielding attitude is more likely to please those with power," and that is why Burmese child develops an authoritarian personality which is reflected in political life when he plays his adult political role. Robert E. Lane, in his study of Americans, finds that the family where the parents inflict severe punishment on the child, the consequence is development of authoritarian attitudes. Dean Jaros, and Fred I. Greenstein, in their study on American children, find that children reared up in authoritarian environment tend to develop authoritarian personality. Frank A. Pinner in his comparative study of High School and University Students of Belgium, Netherland and France, finds that the authoritarian child rearing practices, particularly parental over protection, have resulted in the development of feelings of political distrust in the children of those
countries. Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba, in their empirical study of political attitudes of citizens of five countries, such as USA, UK, Germany, Italy and Mexico, find that those who had opportunity to participate in the family decision-making process in a meaningful way during childhood possess participant orientations and a high sense of political competence. Thus, the family authority structure seems to have great impact on the child in the context of formation of his politically relevant personality.

Besides performing the latent political socialization function, the family may also undertake manifest political socialization of the child. The child may learn explicitly political orientations as a consequence of his exposure to political discussions at home. The parents may directly transmit political values, beliefs and attitudes to the child. Orientations of the child toward political leaders, governmental authority figures, public policies, laws and the political process may be shaped directly through parental discussions of politics in the family. Parental political discussions as well as their interest and activity in the political process may transmit to the child participant political orientations. For instance, Milbrath, on the basis of adult recall data in America, reports that those who feel themselves active and efficient in politics, have recalled that they have been reared up in
families where parents not only discussed politics at home but also were active in the political process.

Moreover, as Langton points out "one area in which the family is undoubtedly important is in transmitting party identifications. In the American context, party preference is directly transmitted by the parents, and acquired by the child. An empirical study as early as 1954 by Bernard Berelson and his associates reveals that among American adults 90 percent of those who vote prefer the same party as their parents. Some empirical evidences, in the American context, also reveals strong congruence of party preferences between parents and children. For instance, the survey and investigations conducted by Herbert McGregor and Harold Dahlgren, Angus Campbell and his associates, Philip Nogee and Murray Levin, Philip Converse and George Dupeux, V.O.Key Jr., Fred I. Greenstein, and Kenneth P.Langton, M. Kent Jennings and Richard G.Niemi find strong parent-child congruence on party preference in America. Thus, the family may contribute significantly toward the manifest political socialization of the child.
2.4.2: **Role of the School:**

The School is the first public institution where the child, beyond his family environment, spends some of the formative years of his life. In the School, the child not only learns formal curricular instructions, but also participates in extra-curricular activities as well as interacts with his teachers and other school-mates. Through these curricular and extra-curricular experiences in the School, the child may learn explicitly political orientations as well as politically relevant non-political orientations. The School may, therefore, act as a political socializer, in the context of both latent and manifest political socialization of the pre-adult through various agencies and mechanisms such as the Curriculum, the Teacher, the School-rituals, the School-extra-curricular activities, and the School-social milieu. 70

The School-curriculum may be one of the most important instruments through which manifest and deliberate political socialization of the pre-adult may take place. The curricular content in the text-books may be so designed that political values may be directly learned and acquired by the student. Through the curriculum the School may undertake civic education or political indoctrination of its students and may contribute toward creation of an allegiant and integrated citizenry by inculcating in them desired political values and orientations.
In the School, curricular instructions are imported by the Teacher. Therefore the Teacher may play an important role in the context of political socialization of the pre-adult during his school life. The Teacher presents himself as an authority figure in the class-room as he maintains discipline and order, and requires the students to obey the rules of the school. Thus, he inculcates in the students the value of discipline and respect for rules, and provides training for future citizenship. Moreover, the teacher, by way of exercising his authority in the class-room, indirectly transmits authority-orientations which the students may learn inadvertently and which may shape their political orientations subsequently. The teacher's authority pattern may be authoritarian or democratic depending upon performance of his role in the class-room and interactions with students. Where the teacher is too strict and rigid in his relationship with the students in the curricular activities, his authority pattern may be said to be authoritarian. But, where the teacher interacts with his students with warmth and affection, and encourages them for active participation in curricular programmes, his authority pattern may said to be the democratic. The teacher's authority pattern, whether authoritarian or democratic, tends to transmit authority-orientations to the students. Consequently, the students may learn such authority-orientations as
a consequence of their exposure to the teacher-authority pattern, and their personality may be shaped accordingly. Exposure to the democratic authority pattern of the teacher is likely to develop in the students democratic orientations and a high sense of competence, whereas exposure to authoritarian authority structure of the teacher is likely to result in the formation of authoritarian orientations in the students. Positive linkage between the teacher's authority pattern and the latent, inadvertent political socialization of the socializee have been empirically found by some researchers. For instance, Almond and Verba, in their cross-national study, find evidences of positive linkage between the democratic-authority pattern of the teacher and student's acquisition of participatory orientations, and they report that those who recalled being allowed to participate in classroom discussions have been found to possess a high degree of political competence than those who had been denied such participation.

The School, through observance of national festivals, rituals and celebrations, may also undertake manifest political socialization of the students by way of directly and deliberately transmitting to them values of nationalism and patriotism. Moreover, in the context of latent political socialization of the students, the impact of the holding of extra-curricular activities such as debate competitions, sports and athletic activities etc.
seems to be enormous as the students tend to learn participatory orientations through their participation in the school extra-curricular activities. Another avenue for latent political socialization of the students relates to the school-social milieu. The pattern of social composition of the student-population of the school, whether homogeneous or heterogeneous, may inadvertently serve to instill values of group identification and conflict or harmony and cooperation, which may subsequently influence the formation of their political orientations.

Thus, on the whole, the school seems to have tremendous potentiality in shaping the pre-adults’ political orientations as well as their non-political orientations that may be politically relevant subsequently when they would come to play roles in the political process of the society as its citizens.

2.4.3: Role of the Peer Group:

The peer group refers to “a form of primary group composed of members sharing relatively equal status and intimate ties.” It is also known as “age-homogeneous group” or “age-homogeneous friendship groups” and “informal face to face group”. The individual may be a member of
different peer groups, at different stages of his life, such as children play group in childhood, friendship clique, adolescent gang, youth group in adolescence and work group in adulthood.

The peer group is usually formed among intimate friends of the same age, and as such, it is characterized by highly personal and emotional interpersonal relationships among age homogeneous friends. The peer relationship is also egalitarian, as there is no authority structure or authority relations among the peers. Therefore, peer-relationships may provide the most congenial environment for transmission of values and orientation from the peers to the socializee.

The peer-group may undertake latent political socialization of the socializee by way of transmitting to him politically relevant non-political orientations such as participatory orientation, and orientation of self-competence. These non-political orientations, on being extended to the political arena, may induce him to participate actively in the political process of the society. Some research findings reveal positive linkage between peer-group membership and the individual's participatory political orientations. For instance, Hess and Torney, 79 in their empirical study on American
school students, find that peer group membership tends to increase the student’s participatory political orientations. Almond and Verba, also in their cross-national survey, find linkage between the membership in peer group and citizens’ feelings of subjective political competence.

The peer group may also undertake manifest political socialization of the socializee by way of transmitting explicitly political values and orientations. In totalitarian societies, for instance in the people’s Republic of China, political values are directly transmitted through the peer groups which are found to instill pro-regime values successfully in the individual. But, research evidences do not find support for the peer group’s role in transmitting the pro-regime values in democratic societies.

However, in case of democratic societies, the peer group may transmit group-appropriate political orientations and values to the political socializee. The peer group may perform reinforcing role of inducting its members in its values and orientations provided the peers come from identical socio-economic back-ground. But it may perform re-socializing role if the peers come from different socio-economic background. Several empirical findings reveal the re-inforcing and re-socializing roles of the peer groups. One of the
classic illustration of both the re-socializing and re-inforcing roles of the peer-group comes from the panel study of Bennington College Students conducted by Newcomb\textsuperscript{82} and his associates in the 1930s. Newcomb found that students of conservative families gave up their conservative political values and adopted liberal political values and orientations mostly due to the re-socializing influence of the peers. Again Newcomb\textsuperscript{83} and his associates found the reinforcing influence of the peers when they, on re-interviewing the same students after twenty-five years, observed that they have retained the liberal political values and attitudes due to the influence of the peers. These two studies of Newcomb bring to light the re-socializing and re-inforcing roles of the peer group.

Also, some other empirical studies in the American Context, conducted by Bernard Berelson\textsuperscript{84} and his associates, Kenneth, P.Langton,\textsuperscript{85} Martin Levin,\textsuperscript{86} Sebert, Jennings and Niemi,\textsuperscript{87} and Angus Compbell\textsuperscript{88} reveal that the peer group plays a significant role in the political socialization process.
2.4.4: Role of the Mass-Media:

Mass-media refers to the media for mass-communication such as News Papers, Radio, Television, Films, Books, Magazines and Periodicals etc. which disseminate varieties of information to people. Because of their earlier and quicker availability to the people, Mass-media may play significant roles as political socializers.

Mass-media may transmit both the politically relevant non-political information, values and views as well as explicitly political information and orientations, and as such, may contribute toward the latent and the manifest political socialization of the individuals. They may transmit implicit political information in non-political wrappings. For instance, stories and articles in books and magazines, film shows, songs and music and other non-political programmes transmitted through the Radio and the Television may indirectly and inadvertently infuse in the individual a sense of cultural-identification or patriotism, values of co-operation or conflict, localism or nationalism and even feelings of self potency.

Such non-political learning through the media exposure may be generalized and transferred to the political arena. Therefore, the media
communication package which is designed "merely to entertain the audience, or to sell a product and make money for a producer, may well serve the latent function of political socialization." Moreover, the non-political communications transmitted through the Mass-media may serve as the buffer between the individual and his political world. If the individual becomes continuously exposed to the political information transmitted through mass-media, he may be bored, and he may avoid such exposure. Therefore, the non-political communication package transmitted through mass-media may serve as a buffer between the individual and the political world, and may save him from an overdose of political information and may thus "produce a responsive audience for political news".

Mass-media may also directly transmit political information and orientations through news bulletins in the Radio and Television, political news, views and the editorial in the news papers, political articles and essays in the magazines and the periodicals. These explicitly political information, news and views as transmitted through the mass-media may help increase the level of political knowledge and awareness of the individual, and may also shape his political values, attitudes and beliefs. Thus, the mass-media seem
to have tremendous potentiality to undertake the latent political socialization as well as the manifest political socialization of the socializee.

2.4.5: Role of the Secondary Groups:

The Secondary Groups are formally organized for realization of definite objectives. There are two types of secondary groups such as political groups and non-political groups. Both the types of secondary groups may play significant roles as political socializers and may contribute toward the formation of the individual’s political orientations.

Political Secondary Groups are characterized by distinct and definite political objectives. Instances of such groups are political parties which undertake political mobilization of the people explicitly in support of their respective objectives and ideologies. Political parties also undertake political education of the people by organizing public meetings and rallies, conducting political discussions and debates, ventilating their policies, values and ideologies through the mass-media such as radio, television, books, magazines, newspapers and journals. Thus, parties and other political groups may undertake intentional manifest political socialization of the individual who, on exposure to the information transmitted by them tends to
acquire their political values and views. They may also undertake latent political socialization of their own members who through participation in party activities, may develop participant political orientations and the sense of political competence.

As distinguished from the Political Secondary Groups, the Non-Political Secondary Groups are characterized by non-political objectives. Instances of such groups are the various types of pressure Groups and interest Groups such as Trade Unions, Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Teachers Association etc. These non-political secondary groups tend to undertake only latent political socialization of their members who, through participation in their respective group activities, may learn participatory orientations. Such non-political participatory experiences may be transferred to the political arena and may facilitate the development of participant political orientations and feelings of political competence in the socializee. Empirical studies conducted in the American context by Robert E. Lane, William Kornhouser, Milbrath, and Sidney Verba illustrate positive relationship between participation in non-political secondary group and the development of participant political orientations and feelings of political efficacy. Almond and Verba, also analysing adult recall data from five
nations under their study, conclude that those individuals "who are members of non-political organizations are more likely to feel subjectively competent than those who belong to no organization." 97

2.4.6: Role of the Political World:

The political world which refers to the total political process of the society seems to be immensely significant in the context of manifest political socialization of the individual. Exposure of the individual to the political world, and experiences of direct involvement in it may contribute a lot in shaping the political orientations and dispositions of the individual. The individual may gain political experiences directly through the performance of political roles such as voting in the elections, contesting in the elections, petitioning the government, ventilating political demands, participation in political movements and playing roles as role incumbent in various input and output structures of the Political System. He may also gain political experiences directly on attending political meetings and listening to political discussions. These direct political experiences acquired by the individual as a result of his exposure to, and participation in the political world may acquaint him with the political reality, and therefore may "serve to correct or complete the political learning that took place during the pre-adult years." 98
2.4.7: Pre-Conditions for Agental Influence:

The political socializers are many and varied, and they may undertake both manifest and latent political socialization of the individual. They tend to transmit deliberately or non-deliberately, both explicitly political orientations and politically relevant non-political orientations, and they tend to contribute toward the formation and development of patterns of political orientations or political culture in the political-socializee. However, the extent of influence of these political socializers upon the socializee may depend on certain pre-conditions such as exposure, communication and receptivity. A socializer may exert influence only when the socializee comes into contact with it. The exposure of the socializee to the socializer, thus, seems to be a vital pre-condition before political learning takes place. Moreover, the socializer is required to communicate to the socializee, and that too, deliberately for undertaking the latter’s political socialization. But, despite the exposure of the socializee to the socializer, and the deliberate transmission of orientations made by the socializer to the socializee, the political socialization of the socializee seems to depend upon the receptivity to such communication. However, the receptivity of the political socializee to agental communication is likely to be affected by two other factors such as
the nature of relationship between the agent and the learner, and secondly, the timing of communication made by the agent. The political socializee is most likely to receive agental communication well when he understands it, and his understanding is likely to depend upon his cognitive maturity which, in turn, develops with his biological maturity. Therefore, the agental communication should be so timed as to be understood, received and inculcated by the individual. Moreover, the receptivity of the political socializee to agental communication may depend upon the intensity of emotional relationship, between the agent and the learner. The receptivity of the socializee may be high when emotional relationship between the agent and learner remains strong and intimate. Thus, on the whole, these three factors such as exposure, communication and receptivity are the vital pre-conditions for agental influence, and these pre-conditions tend to determine the extent of agental influence upon the political socializee.100

2.5: Political Culture and the Political System:

Patterns of Political culture or Political orientations as formed in the individuals through the process of political socialization tend to determine their political behaviour and roles which, in turn, tend to influence
significantly the performance of the Political System in the context of its stability or change. The Political System is likely to remain stable and viable if its structure is congruent to the over-all pattern of political culture of its people; on the contrary, the structure-culture incongruence is likely to signal and pave for a change of the Political System in conformity with the emerging pattern of political culture. Thus, the pattern of political culture seems to determine not only the political behaviour of the individual but also the working of the Political System. Hence, as Almond emphatically asserts, “the connecting link between micro- and macro-politics is political culture.”

The pattern of political culture of the people of a society also seems to be a major determinant of the level of development of its Political System. Political development refers to the development of a political system, and may be assessed with reference to the “development syndrome” as conceptualized by the committee on Comparative Politics of the Social Science Research Council of USA. The Development Syndrome consists of three principal variables, such as Equality, Capacity and Differentiation. The variable of Equality involves three criteria such as popular participation in the Political process, adherence to universalistic laws, and respect for achievement-oriented recruitment system. The variable of capacity deals with the outputs of a Political System with special reference to the magnitude, scope and scale of governmental performance, effectiveness and
efficiency in the execution of public policy, and rationality in administration. The variable of differentiation involves greater differentiation and autonomy of structures, and their functional specialization as necessiated by the increasing division of political labour in the Political System. These criteria of political development may characterize a Political System provided the crises of identity, Legitimacy, penetration, participation, integration, and distribution are successfully resolved by it. However, successful and peaceful resolution of these crises that occur in the process of political development seems to be “profoundly affected by the character of the political culture of a society.” Political development may be facilitated, as Almond points out, by the development of the political culture on its becoming increasingly secularized. The secularization of political culture, according to him, involves acquisition of rational, analytical, and empirical orientations to political action by the people of a society. Consequently, through the process of cultural secularization, there may emerge “The Civic Culture” which is characterized by allegiant-participant political orientations of the people. Such a pattern of political culture may induce the citizens to develop a high sense of national identity, as well as loyalty and commitment to the Political System, and also rational orientations for participation in the political process. Legitimization of the Political System
may enable it to get its distribution outputs accepted by the people and also to integrate itself and to penetrate into the society effectively. Thus, the formation of the Civic Culture may help resolve the crises of political development, and consequently, may facilitate the emergence of a developed political system characterized by the attributes of equality, capacity and differentiation.

On the whole, the pattern of political culture of the people of a Society seems to be a major determining variable that explains and accounts for not only the prospect of stability and viability of the Political System but also the level of its development. It may, therefore, be concluded that a study and analysis of the pattern of political culture of the people of a society would provide meaningful insights for understanding and appreciating the dynamics of the Societal Political System.

In view of the tremendous relevance of the pattern of political culture as a major determinant of the individual's political behavior and the working of the Political System, an academic endeavor has been undertaken in the following chapters to enquire into and analyse the patterns of Political Culture and the process of Political Socialization of the Tribal Political Leaders of Sundargarh District of Orissa. Since the formation of political
culture seems to be significantly influenced by the socio-economic attributes of the individual, an enquiry into the socio-economic profile of these tribal political leaders has been undertaken in the following Chapter No.III.
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