NOTES

CHAPTER I

1. By 'family' and 'family elders' we shall usually refer to father, parents, head of family; they will also be taken to constitute 'family authority'.


3. Only after the study was completed, the researcher came to know about Surendra K. Gupta, *Citizen in the Making (Socialization for the Citizenship Role in a Democratic Society)* (Delhi: National Publishing House, 1975.)

4. In keeping with our interest in childhood political learning the questions put to the respondents concerned this period. There was, however, one exception. They were required to report about the reaction of the family authority to their initial and manifest interest and activity in politics. Because most of them began their elementary political behaviour when they were between 15 to 20 years in age, they presumably encountered such reaction....
sometime during the same period. That evidently formed a part of post-childhood political socialisation by the family authority.

6. 'Respondents' refers to those who responded to the questionnaire. It will be interchangeably used with 'political socialisees' and "young people".


CHAPTER II

1. The figures in parentheses indicate number of the respondents.

2. 91 respondents mentioned occupations of their respective fathers or family heads. The following is the breakdown: cultivation 31, business 14, clerkship 5, teaching 11, medical and engineering profession 3, other 27. 18 respondents did not mention any.

3. Three fathers or family heads were illiterate. 32 read in primary or middle school, 28 in high school, four in college but did not obtain any qualifying degree. 26 obtained under-graduate degree, four post-graduate degree. 12 respondents did not report on the point.

4. Among the rest eight were Brahmns, four Vaidya, thirteen Kayastha and two Baniya. The fact that some would not provide any information on their fathers' or family heads' occupation or education
or caste, is probably explained by their reluctance to let others know what they thought, would diminish the elders' or their own image.

5. 83 respondents described economic condition of their families during their childhood as "fairly well", 14 as "considerably good", and 12 as "very bad". For 55 of the respondents the situation at the time of the survey did not change; 33 experienced deterioration of, and 21 improvement over, the earlier condition. When economic condition of the family was used as a variable, an overall estimate was mainly used. This was found out by suitably combining economic conditions during their childhood and at the time of the survey. Accordingly, for 19 families the overall economic condition was 'considerably good', for 22, "fairly well", and, for 28 "very bad".

6. Others as heads of the family included grand-parents (15), uncle or aunt (9), and senior siblings (3).

7. In 55 families more than one elder did the job; some different arrangements prevailed in five families.

8. In 40 families some one person took decision for the entire family; in six, decisions were taken by the individuals concerned.

9. The incidence of decision-making after discussion among the family elders was comparatively higher in the joint families than in the nuclear families. 44 out of 71 joint families followed such procedure, while exactly half of 38 nuclear families did so. This is probably because there are usually many elders in the joint family and each of them has significant, if not co-equal, place
In the family structure due to considerations other than mere adulthood.

10. 57 respondents scored above the median mark on the discipline scale; six had the median score; the scores of the rest fell below it.

11. Some statistically significant bias on the part of the mother for the male child has been found. In 86.67 per cent cases of the mother being somewhat or totally disapproving of punishment given by a male superior to a child, the child concerned was a boy. The chi square obtained is 4.20 which, with one degree of freedom, is significant at .05 level. Q is .616.

12. Compliance with the parents or the family head was related to compliant child's sex. The boys complied rather than not, more than the girls. The girls even slightly outnumbered the boys in the category of those who refused to comply with the family authority. The chi square obtained is 4.97 which, with one degree of freedom, is significant at .05 level. Q is .490.

13. Child's feeling of psychological strain in expressing displeasure at 'injustice' done by the family authority to him was related to the financial situation of the family during his childhood. The majority (71.68 per cent) of those who were brought up in families in not considerably good financial shape reported feeling such strain; a comparatively less significant majority (57.14 per cent) who were brought up in families which were in considerably good financial position, felt free rather than constrained to express displeasure. The chi square obtained is 4.30 which,
with the degree of freedom, is significant at .05 level. \( \chi^2 \) is 5.41. It is interesting, though statistically not significant, that all the respondents coming from families in considerably good economic situation actually registered displeasure; and all those who never did so came from families with opposite kind of financial situation.

14. 88 respondents scored above the median mark on the Attitude towards Parents Scale; 19 attained the median score; the rest fell below it.

15. 74 respondents scored above the median mark in evaluation of the fathers or the family heads; one made the median score, and 18 scored below it. 18 respondents did not answer the relevant question.

16. The relevant question had two open categories in "16 or less" and "22 or more". When computing the average age these were taken as 16 and 22. The actual average age will be slightly higher because 15 respondents were 22 years or more in age at the time of reporting.

17. All quotations are from the answers to an open-ended question as to whether or not the respondents thought that their family had influenced their political views and participation.

18. 25 respondents had been interested in politics for more than four years and 21 for a period between one year to two years.

19. 17 respondents maintained the initial level of their interest in politics; in the case of seven others interest in politics had waned.
20. 66 respondents said that they were not active party supporters. This added to the number of the active party supporters takes the total (94) above the number mentioning themselves as party supporters (88). This is probably due to some (6) non-party supporters erroneously describing themselves also as not-active party supporters.

It may be noted that 64.00 per cent of those respondents who were associated with students' union in the college were active political participants, while 63.46 per cent of those without such association were not so. (The chi square obtained in this case is 5.07 which, with one degree of freedom, is significant at .05 level. \( \chi^2 \) is .611). This is quite natural because the students' unions are youthwings of various political parties in West Bengal.

21. 45 respondents reported to have withdrawn their support to the parties they used to support at the initial stage of their interest in politics. When this number is added to the number of those (54) who have not shifted their loyalty to parties, take the total above the number (88) of party supporters. It is felt that some (11) of those 45 respondents must be the respondents who had never been party supporters.

22. 68.31 per cent of those initiated in political interest by some person continued to support the same parties since the beginning of their interest in politics, while 54.60 per cent of those taking interest in politics due to some subjective reason, like faith in ideology, did so.
23. This is evidenced by the number of the respondents scoring above the medians on dimensions of "expectation", "evaluation" and "affect"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Above Median</th>
<th>At Median</th>
<th>Below Median</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>62 (56.88)</td>
<td>14 (12.84)</td>
<td>38 (30.28)</td>
<td>109 (100.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>33 (30.28)</td>
<td>10 (09.17)</td>
<td>66 (60.55)</td>
<td>109 (100.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>44 (40.37)</td>
<td>15 (13.76)</td>
<td>50 (45.87)</td>
<td>109 (100.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. The respondents were grouped into three classes on the basis of differences in their experience of congruence between their expectations from the political authority and their fulfilment through its performance: those who experienced high congruence (N = 20); those who experienced low congruence (N = 62); and those who experienced incongruence (N = 27). Their mean scores (14.9, 15.3 and 14.5, respectively) on their attitude to deviant behaviour on the part of the political authority were not significantly different from each other.

25. The respondents were asked to mention the parties in whose activities their fathers or family heads took active part. In response to a different question they were required to state whether or not they supported the parties their elders used to support. Answers to these two questions provide the basis of inference.

26. This is based on the strength of relevant correlation coefficients: $r = -0.017$ between "congruence between expectation and experience of performance" and "affect" among the Communist party
supporters \( (N = 10) \)

\[ r = .088 \] between the same among the non-Communist party supporters \( (N = 9) \).

\[ r = .129 \] between the same among the supporters of the two kinds of parties taken together \( (N = 19) \).

\[ r = -.098 \] among all the respondents \( (N = 109) \).

CHAPTER III

1. This is determined on the basis of median score in the scale to measure early political exposure of the respondents through the family; 19 respondents scored above the median, 17 made the median score and 73 scored less than it.

2. This probably did not imply any motive on the part of the family elders to make the respondents politically informed. The permission to stay on must have been given casually or on sentimental grounds.

3. These included the father in five cases and senior sibling in three cases. The others mentioned were: family acquaintance (11), local senior (4), local political leader (11), and someone else (9). The last category comprised school and college teachers (3).
local friends (2), student leader (2); one respondent wrongly mentioned "economic problems of the country" and another, "self". Two respondents had initially thought that none was responsible for their interest in politics, but later mentioned names of two such persons.

4. 'Interest and 'participation' are qualitatively different forms of political behaviour; hence, the elders' reaction to the two are also expected to be similarly different. Both of them have been considered together in order to broaden the basis of the elders' reaction. It is believed that the elders generally begin to take note of political behaviour of the young only when it is more than a mere interest in politics. The elders' perception of this varies, but usually their concern develops when the child's association with a party or some party supporter seems to threaten his studies, future career or any of the elders' personal or social interests.

That the respondents would correctly remember the family authority's reaction as it was expressed exactly when the authority first came to know about their political behaviour, cannot, obviously, be taken for granted. It is, however, assumed that it would not jeopardise the attempt to find out the respondents' perception of the authority's initial reaction; our interest lies in perception of the fact rather than in the fact itself.

5. There was a very weak correlation ($r = .12$) between 'early exposure of respondents to politics' and 'family authority's reaction to respondents' initial political interest and activity'.
6. It is interesting that the respondents' early exposure to politics had a stronger relationship ($r = .47$) with their level of political interest and activity than family authority's reaction to their initial political interest and activity ($r = .27$).

7. In the first case, 62.80 per cent respondents of those who were encouraged by their family elders to stay with the elders while they discussed politics, were also taken by them to local political meetings; while, 82.22 per cent respondents of those who were not so encouraged, did not have the opportunity to accompany the elders to such meetings. The chi square obtained, 7.34, with one degree of freedom, is significant at .01 level. $Q$ is .770.

In the second case, 85.71 per cent of those who went to local political meetings with the family elders were also taught by them to love and admire some political leaders; while 60.00 per cent of those who were not taken to such meetings, were not similarly taught. The chi square obtained, 5.09, with one degree of freedom, is significant at .05 level. $Q$ is .800.

8. 61.82 per cent of those who received favourable reaction to their initial political interest and activity from the family authority had been taught to love and admire some political leader; while 62.16 per cent of those who received 'indifference' to or 'disapproval' of their initial political behaviour, had not been similarly taught. The chi square obtained is 6.46 which, with one degree of freedom, is significant at .02 level. $Q$ is .762.

75 per cent of those were encouraged to stay on while the family elders discussed politics, later received favourable
reaction from the father or the family head; while 66.67 per cent of those not so encouraged, did not receive any favourable reaction from the father or the family head. The chi square obtained, 4.93, with one degree of freedom, is significant at .05 level. Q is .714.

9. None of the individual experiences included within the overall process of early political exposure was taken as an adequate basis for observation on the family's role. It may also be noted that the respondents' acknowledgement of the family's influence on their political selves, had nothing to do with their initiation into politics by some family member or acquaintance.

CHAPTER IV

1. The correlation between early exposure of the respondents to politics through the adult members of the family and the level of the former's political interest and participation is \( r = .470 \) \( (F_{1.107} = 30.84 \quad \alpha = .001) \); it explains, however, only twenty-two per cent variation in political behaviour of the young people. The correlation between the father's or the family head's reaction to the respondents' initial political interest and activity and the level of their political interest and participation is
Whether or not some young people were initiated into politics by some family elder had nothing to do with the level of their political interest and participation.

The observation is based on the sizes of Qs in Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3. The respondents were classified into 'High' and 'Low' groups on the basis of the nature of their experiences on these occasions.

The respondents reported the family elders' reaction to their political interest and activity when it first began to develop. Apparently, such reaction was, then, of a particular time or occasion. This is found to be correlated with different kinds of political behaviour of the young which must have developed over time. This would imply that such reaction, though rooted to a particular stage of development of political behaviour in the respondents was so important as to have been taken into consideration by them even when they were developing different order of political behaviour. The average age of the respondents was 19.5 years and the majority of them had developed different kinds of political behaviour during a five-year span in their early life (viz. 15 years to 20 years in age). Hence one may suggest that the elders' reaction could remain "live" throughout this small number of years. But this is no adequate proof of the strength of the elders' initial reaction. Moreover, it is unusual for an elder to react to young one's political behaviour only once; or, if nature of young one's political behaviour
changes, not to change his reaction accordingly. We suggest that we take what was reported by the respondents as their elders' reaction to their initial political interest and activity as the respondents' perception of attitude their elders' usually had towards the respondents' political behaviour.

4. M. Kent Jennings and Richard G. Niemi suggest the possibility of socialising agents other than the family taking up "ambiguous or empty psychological spaces" in the mind of the young people as a result of the parents' inability to emit relevant cues. That the respondents who had experienced adult "indifference" were divided into two nearly equal groups of 'high' and 'low' politically behaving individuals would mean that other agents were involved in political socialisation of the first category of respondents; absence of such extra-familial agents coupled with the dampening role of the political socialisees' perception of their elders' indifference, probably explains low level of political behaviour of some respondents.


5. The explanation of similarity probably lies in the fact that party support considered here was orientational rather than participatory. A good majority of the respondents described themselves as party supporters but a few mentioned themselves as
active party supporters. Again, the dimensions of political
behaviour on which questions were framed to determine respondents'
political interest and participation level related to orientation,
mainly.

6. Some may argue that it was sheer lethargy of some respondents
which would explain why they picked up the party supported by
the family authority. But lethargy would imply a low level of
their political interest and participation. It is found,
contrary to the above line of reasoning, that those reporting
inter-generation party support similarity showed a higher level
of political interest and participation than those reporting dis-
similarity. There is, however, no statistically significant
relationship.

7. No direct attempt was made to know whether or not the respondents'
fathers or family heads had asked them to extend support of the
parties these elders had chosen for themselves. The respondents
were, however, required to say whether or not they supported
parties which had the support of such elders. The observation
in the text is, hence, based on inference.

8. It may be debated whether one becomes allegiant to the party
supported by the family authority because of greater possible
socialisation under his auspices, or, the family authority
becomes liberal in socialising the young in politics as a
'reward' to him for picking up the elder's favourite party.
Our data do not allow us to settle the debate. But it can be
maintained that political socialisation by the socialiser and political behaviour of the socialised are developmental processes and they react on each other.

9. It is found that those initiated into politics by someone belonging to the family or an acquaintance of it were also more socialised into politics by the family than those initiated by outsiders. The difference, however, is not statistically significant.

10. Favourable reaction of the family authority seems to have been successful in developing consistent and active party support in some respondents. 72.23 per cent of those receiving 'favourable reaction' became consistent as well as active party supporters; only 23.57 per cent and 36.84 per cent of those experiencing 'indifferent' and 'unfavourable' reactions, respectively, could become so. The relevant chi square, 6.94, with two degrees of freedom, is significant at .05 level. This, probably, reflects the association between such reaction and growth of consistency in party support of the respondents.

11. The correlation is weak ($r = .329$) though significant ($F_{1,107} = 12.30 \ \alpha = .001$).

If the respondents are classified on the dimensions of political socialisation by the family the level of their political interest and participation, on the basis of mean into "High" and "Low" groups, we find that the majority (58.90 per cent)
of those who developed a high level of political interest and participation had received a high degree of political socialisation by the family; conversely, the majority (69.44 per cent) of those with a low political interest and participation, had received a low degree of political socialisation.

12. This is based on the absence of any correlation between the respondents' childhood experience of decision-making process followed by the family elders and their childhood share, if any, in relevant decision-making, on the one hand, and the positions they took with reference to the following statements in the questionnaire:

(1) Political leaders in authority position should allow fullest public participation in governmental decision-making even if it slows down performance.

(2) Political leaders in authority position should always keep dominant socio-economic interests of the country in mind while formulating policies. The second statement was not, however, taken into account while calculating the respondents' scale score on their "expectation from political authority".

13. This is based on two weak correlations between the respondents' attitude toward the parents and their attitude toward deviant behaviour of those in the political authority position \((r = .373)\), and, between their evaluation of the father or the family head as person and their evaluation of the political authority's performance \((r = .197)\).
14. A large majority (80.73 per cent) had very 'high' affect toward the father or the family head; while it came to demonstrating affect toward the political authority, the majority (59.63 per cent), inclined toward 'low affect. Only a small majority (17.20 per cent) made 'low evaluation of the father or the family head but the respondents were divided in almost equal groups making 'high' and 'low evaluation of the political authority.

15. The young people were mostly highly dogmatic and ethnocentrist. Those who were high on ethnocentrism were also high on dogmatism, those low on the former, low also on the latter. It was also found that variation in ethnocentrism made for variation in dogmatism, but variation in the latter did not make for variation in the former.

16. This is based on size of correlation \( r = 1.003 \).

17. Not all the respondents mentioned their evaluation of the father or the family head as persons. Hence, they were classified into three groups. These groups differed in their mean scores on "dogmatism" as follows: those \( (N = 47) \) who evaluated the father or the family head on all the traits specified in the relevant question, scored 198.1 on "dogmatism" scale; those \( (N = 35) \) who evaluated on some of the traits, scored 194.5; and those \( (N = 16) \) who did not evaluate at all, scored 194.4. The correlation coefficient is: \( r = .793 \).
18. 31.20 per cent of the total respondents were 'uncertain' in their answer to one question or another in the scale measuring their 'affect' toward the political authority; similarly, 15.6 were 'uncertain' in their 'expectations' from it; and 27.3, in their 'evaluation' of its performance.

19. This analysis was suggested by the paper written by Steven H. Chaffee, Jack M. McLeod, and Daniel Wackman, "Family Communication Patterns and Adolescent Political Participation", in Socialization to Politics: A Reader, ed. by Dennis.

20. If the two experiences of being consulted and of showing of displeasure by the respondents in their childhood are separately considered similar difference in their political interest and participation level is revealed. If the former is combined with the pattern of decision-making by the family elders, the same trend is observed: the respondents from the families in which they were consulted during their childhood by their elders and the elders themselves took decisions usually after discussion among themselves, were more interested and active in politics ($\bar{x} = 16.31$) than those ($\bar{x} = 15.00$) from the families in which they were not consulted in their childhood and one elder usually took all decisions.

21. It is difficult to rule out that the respondents might have projected their fathers or family heads in their own image. 42 respondents (72.41 per cent) of those (58) who characterised themselves as usually either complying with or not with adult
directives reported that their father or family head either approved or disapproved their initial interest and activity in politics; on the other hand 24 respondents (55.81 per cent) of those (43) who had occasionally complied and occasionally did not, reported about the indifference of their fathers or their family heads towards their initial interest and activity in politics. The chi-squared obtained, 8.22, with one degree of freedom, is significant at .01 level. Q is .537. May be, what underlay these were contrasting ideas about how human reactions should be.


Similar observation has been made by Jennings and Niemi:


CHAPTER V

1. Attempt to find the combined effect of these three variables did not yield significant result.
2. Economic status, caste identity and location of residence of the fathers or the family heads were not important in the determination of the nature of their own political orientation and participation. Only the level of their education seems to have been a factor in their choice of party for which they actively participated in politics. 78.56 per cent of those fathers and family heads who had education up to graduation from high school actively supported a Communist party; the rest, the Congress Party. On the other hand, 61.25 per cent, those receiving education beyond the high school level gave their active support to the Congress Party; the rest, a Communist party. The chi square obtained, 10.74, with one degree of freedom, is significant at .01 level. Q is .882. Incidentally level of education did not decide whether or not they would at all actively participate in politics under the banner of any party or to what extent they would socialise their young into politics. It may be noted, in this connexion, that intergenerational educational difference had nothing to do with similarity and dissimilarity in intergenerational party affiliation, contrary to the finding of Halim Barakat in Arab Societies.


3. Extending active support to a party is taken as a case of higher form of political behaviour. One can be interested in politics contd....
even if one does not reach that level. The study did not explore the impact of the family elders’ political behaviour short of that level on their political socialiser role. However, some respondents were asked to give their assessment of level of political interest of adult members of the family. The information when cross-tabulated with the data on the family authority’s reaction to initial political interest and activity of the young respondents shows that 85 per cent of those elders with "some or no interest" in politics exhibited "non-favourable" reaction; while 62.50 per cent of those who had "much interest" in politics were favourable in their reaction. "Non-favourable" means "indifference" and "disapproval" on the part of the family authority. The chi square obtained, 8.51, with one degree of freedom, is significant at .01 level. Q is .809.

4. The rural-urban differential was not relevant for the total political socialisation process.

5. General culture may intervene in the political socialisation by the family by way of prohibiting the elders to assist development of excessive interest and activity in politics, particularly in case the individual concerned is of very tender age or a girl. Even those elders who would like the minimum age for voting lowered, are found advising their own children, even when considerably grown-up, against indulging in politics. They may use any argument like the corrupt nature of politics and politicians, the probable damage interest in politics may do to their career, politics being strictly an adult preoccupation, women being...
unsuitable for such a pursuit, and the like. Some elders, on the other hand, may ignore such cultural prohibitions. In our study, the elders were not found to be attaching importance to the age and sex of the political socialises. That was probably because these respondents, in the eye of the family elders, did not very often indulge in very serious types of political activity; or did not exhibit a potential ability for the same; or, we did not consider such political behaviour. That if and when the elders perceive "dislikeable" political behaviour they do object, is suggested by one girl's recollection: "Because, I am a girl, most of the members of the family, particularly mother, are not willing to allow me to take active part in politics".

Fred. I. Greenstein has suggested the possibility of disappearance of once prevailing political and politically relevant sex differences due to the convergence of adult sex roles, creating increasing tendency in adults to offer similar treatment to young boys and girls. It may be added that it is not always necessary for adults to experience such convergence in their own lives; they may observe it happen in the lives of other adults.


6. In 19 cases when outsiders were involved in rural respondents' political initiation, such outsiders were either local political leaders (10) or gentleman significantly interested in politics (1).
or student leader (2). That is, in 68.42 per cent cases, political agents or someone akin to it were responsible. Incidentally only in one out of eleven cases of some local political leader initiating young people in politics, the boy concerned belonged to the town.

7. Duration of political interest had affected the nature of the respondent's political participation as well. Less than four years' of duration was not enough to lead majority of the respondents to active political participation or active party support, while a small majority of those who had entertained interest in politics for more than four years had become active political participants or active supporters of political party.

8. Majority (67.19 per cent) of those who had begun with extending support to a party, not supported by their fathers or family heads, tended to change their party affiliation. It would mean that it was easier for some agents of political recruitment and socialisation to win over such young men who were not rooted in their family's political tradition. It was also found that some (23.86 per cent) of those who changed, opted for party supported by the fathers or the family heads. It would seem that time may restore the young to the political tradition of the family. Of course this may not be due only to family's efforts to win back the young.

9. Family political socialisation was not related to difference in duration of the respondents' interest in politics. Duration

contd .......
in interest does not depend on inborn qualities of the individual; it is result of some political socialisation or alternatively, of interest satisfaction.

10. The fact that we did not have a big sample and that when considering ideology of the political socialisers or of the young people we had a very small number of respondents about whom inference could be made, put serious limitations on search for such intervening variables.

11. The girls had a tendency to be consistent (69.76 per cent) in their party support. Tendency among the boys to change (52.61 per cent) their party affiliation was not, however, comparatively marked. On the question of choosing a party both the boys (61.90 per cent) and the girls (52.35 per cent) tended to select parties other than those supported by their fathers or family heads. The relationships, in either case, are not statistically significant.

Sex did not touch one's orientation to political authority, also. Contrary to reports by Hadley Cantril and Mildred Strunk, young women in my study did not have lesser tolerance of deviant behaviour on the part of those in authority position than young men, and did not surpass their male counterparts in "middle order" answers if this could be taken as measure of uncertainty in orientation to or information on the political authority. However, because no attempt was made to ascertain whether meanings of "tolerance of political non-conformity" in two cases contd ....
were identical, and there is difference between the two cultures the women belonged to, it is difficult to insist that the findings are comparable.