CHAPTER 2

POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION:
A THEORETICAL VIEW

2.1. Introduction:

A theory can be defined as a coherent group of general propositions used as principles of explanation and construction or reconstruction of a category of phenomena. It could also be a proposed explanation the status of which is still speculative in contrast to well - established propositions that are deemed as reporting matters of actual facts. It is also a branch of art or science which seeks to explicate its laws and methods in contrast to its praxis. In general, the word theory denotes a system of rules, laws or principles. This chapter presents the theoretical principles that guide the scholar to pursue the research in the most academically effective manner.

Socialization is a continual process by which a person gets a personal identity and learns the rules, values, behavior and social skills that are in sync with his or her social position. Political socialization is a process that endures for life. Political Scientists, Psychologists, philosophers, and Sociologists argue that the attitudes, beliefs, values, norms, and behavior one learns in infancy accompany one unto the grave. Various disciplines like Political Science, Anthropology, Sociology, Psychology, Philosophy and Psychoanalysis have dealt with the process of political socialization. In fact, there is not a definitive theory on political socialization. One thing is certain. It is generally agreed that children are most likely to be influenced by the political preferences of the parents. This can be regarded as a result of political socialization (Jennings, Niemi 1968; Tedin 1974).

Political socialization is a vague term. The definitions are numerous. Theorists like Cooley (1956); Piaget (1975); Bourdieu (2000); Berger, Luckmann (1966); Kohlberg (1981); and Harris (1995) conceptualize the phenomenon in their own personal manner. It is a novel concept, although Plato had stressed the central importance of training citizens in the Greek city states more than 2000 years ago.

Herbert H. Hayman was very much concerned about the above problem and he gave serious attention to it in 1957. He was of the view that people learn things early and gradually. It provides stability in their adult political life. He notes that it is a continuous process. The diverse concept of political socialization falls into two categories. The first type was represented by Langton (1969) who considered political socialization as a "way how society transmits its political culture from generation to generation". According to Sears (1975), one forms one's own values and personal reality during one's personal growth. Authors like Niemi and Hepburn (1995) opine that the research on political socialization has been developed from the studies on political behavior carried out in the latter half of the 1950s. Later, the term 'political socialization' began to be used in Hyman's eponymous work.

The concept of political socialization has covered many phases. The main focus was on the idea that parents are the most important agent of political socialization. Later scholars turned their attention to the impact of the mass media. During the next stage, attention was turned to childhood which was considered crucial in a person's political development. The 1970s is considered a vital period in political socialization research. But gradually the interest in the topic slowed down. According to Niemi and Hepurn (1995), "by the end of the 1970s, political

socialization had died a premature death". The irony is that "since the 1980s, new models and statistical methods were developed helping political socialization researchers analyze change over time in innovative ways" (Singer 2003).

The research on political socialization and books on it during the next few decades were few and far between. The situation changed from 2010 when hypotheses and findings of the early studies with new statistical methods began. "Several experiments were also conducted to examine classic causal hypotheses and these experiments usually measured short term effect of school and media which led to the conclusion that civic classes or exposure to certain media programmes have had its effect on adolescents' political values" (Paluck 2009). These studies are central to the larger debate on the theme of civic education's great impact on democratic development in society which began in the 1960s. The issues around which the question of political socialization revolves remain unresolved despite the lapse of several decades.

2.2. Rise and Development of Political Attitudes:

Citizens' political preferences, opinions and attitudes are believed to remain comparatively changeless once they have crossed the 'votable' age of eighteen. "One does not change from a politically apathetic teenager to an actively engaged citizen overnight simply because of becoming an adult. Encouragement to figure out the process of becoming politicians comes with the debate over low turnout among young cohorts started decades prior to the early political socialization studies of the 1950s" (Tingsten 1937).

Methodical researches on the phenomenon of political socialization had their beginning in the 1960s. Scholars have realized that "even children under the age of six years are capable of experiencing feelings about political parties" (Greenstein 1965). Even very young children are interested in political activities. Researchers on the subject turned their attention to this fact also. "Political socialization scholars argued that early socialization has the biggest impact on citizens' political learning over the life cycle" (Campbell 1960; Greenstein 1965; and Sears 1975). "Here the goal has been to see if specific patterns of early political socialization have long term consequences leading some individuals to become highly active citizens and others to be politically apathetic" (Dennis 1968).

Classic political socialization researchers proposed the hypothesis that adoption of political attitudes and values early in life promote their persistence for a very long time. According to Sears (1975) the question of attitude persistence from early socialization through adulthood "has been of anxious concern to virtually all who have written in the area."

Campbell (1960) and Converse (1966) in the US and Butler and Stokes (1969) in the UK employed a retrospective method to prove attitude persistence. Here adults were asked about their attitudes during their adolescence. This method, however, was considered unreliable by many scholars (Jaspess 2009).

An opposing hypothesis was that people adjust their views and behavior in sync with actual situations. According to some writers, this hypothesis is applicable to one's religious beliefs also. Campbell (1960) who advocated the persistence hypothesis said that "if the pressure is intense enough, a stable partisan identification

may actually be changed". Sometime later Niemi and Jennings (1991) carried out research in this field and revealed that persistent attitudes are only relatively stable.

2.3.   Political Socialization: A Means to Transmit Political Attitudes:

Political Socialization has been a much discussed subject. As pointed out by Almond and Coleman (1960), Political Socialization may not always manifest continuity, with considerable gap between generations. It is commonly seen that each new generation learns several attitudes and value systems from their parents. However, one shapes one's political attitudes and opinions, influenced by peer groups and the media. If this does not happen, children will be the mirror images of their parents. Viewed from this perspective, "Political Socialization is the study of how each generation invents its own attitudes and values: inter-generational transmission process are of less importance. Within the socialization perspective, the transmission process is carried out through socialization agents, among which family, school and media are regarded as crucial. Not surprisingly, family is given priority in most of the Political Socialization literature" (Lesthaeghe 2001).

A socialization agent exerts great impact on an adolescent or on a child. In the case of political socialization, there are both direct and indirect effects. Children often look up at their parents as their role models and their influence can be considered as an example of direct effect. For example, if parents are active in election campaigns, children are also likely to be active. "Indirect influence happens if parents talk and discuss politics with children. Children from families where frequent political discussion takes place are more likely to be politically active later in life" (Schmid 2012).

2.4.   Agents of Political Socialization:

Which agent is most effective in the matter of political socialization is a problematic question. Many thinkers consider family as the most important agent of political socialization as the parents spend most of their time with their children in their younger days, influencing them both directly and indirectly in the formation of their attitudes and views (Langton 1969; Dawson Prewitt 1968). Writers without number like Hyman (1959); Jennings (1968); Stoker Boweers (2001); Jaros (1973); Langton (1969); Valentino, and Sears (1998) hold this opinion. The socializing impact of parents is the strongest at the tender age of children and as they grow older it lessens. "At that moment other political socialization agents, like schools, peer groups, or voluntary associations, start to exert more influence on the value patterns of adolescents" (Niemi 1978; Plutzer 2002; Rosenstone and Hansen 2003). It has been noted that there has been a higher percentage of turnout of young first time voters who live at home. It shows that families have a great influence in civic participation during elections (Hansen 2012).

Educational institutions are the second crucial agents of political socialization. They include teachers and peers. Teachers transfer knowledge and help develop the cognitive skills and talents of students and pupils. The discussions debates and seminars about public issues, society, and politics make the young generation intellectually enlightened. Having analyzed high school seniors and parents, Jennings and Niemi (1968) arrived at the conclusion that "it is nevertheless clear that any model of socialization which rests on assumptions of pervasive currents of parent to child value transmission of the types examined here in serious

need of modification". Other scholars like Hooghe, Stolle (2003); Niemi, Junn (1998); and Yates, Youniss (1999) also stress the significant effect of the educational system on students' political knowledge and behavior. The changes in educational style and curriculum, open class room climate, option to visit school councils, and participate in youth parliaments have helped deepen the political knowledge of students and their future political behavior (Torney, Purta 2001).

In their writings, Rosenstone and Hansen (2003), and Verba and Nie (1972) point out the relationship between level of education and electoral participation. They are unanimous that education promotes political participation. Verba (2003) observers that education is in fact the strongest factor influencing political activity of students, a view shared by Shields and Goidel (1997) also.

There are two theories that explain why education happens to be a strong factor influencing political socialization and participation. Firstly, education equips one with the necessary skills to get politically involved enlightening one on democratic ideals. "People with higher education participate at higher rates because their schooling provided them with the "skills people needed to understand the abstract subject of politics, to follow the political campaign, and to research and evaluate the issues and the candidate" (Wolfinger, Rosenstone 1980). Secondly, "the schooling system socializes people into individuals that supports voting turnout because of its promotion of political efficacy, interest in politics or civic duty" (Campbell 1960).

Educational system is an important channel of political socialization, with college attendance viewed as a significant source of political learning. However,

Highton (2009) argues that cognitive ability is a proxy for pre - college socialization. Resultantly, the connection between education and political sophistication might be spurious. Therefore, attention should change to exploring whether socialization determines an individual's level of political sophistication.

A controversy has been raging among psychologists about the influence of parents over the children. According to Harris (1995), the empirical evidence of a 'parental effect' on children when they have become adults does not have a solid base. The implication is that it is peer groups rather than parents who influence children in political socialization. In this context, Harris (1995) says that a group rather than family serves as an agency of children's development in any field. While several scholars consider that political attitudes and values are determined by the milieu and agents of socialization, there are others who hold that personal attitudes can be influenced by genetic factors, that is to say, even our political dispositions are embedded in the genes (Alford 2005; Harris1995). The old question as to who or what most influences a person's attitudes and philosophy of life still remains a moot point. Several scholars have dwelt on the question which socialization agent is the most influential. The question still continues to be posed, and no satisfactory answer is forthcoming.

Other socializing agents have of late begun to draw the attention of researchers and scholars. Many of them have stressed the centrality of academic experiences, the role of the media, the peer groups, and other political socialization agencies (Galston 2001; Sapiro 2004). "This shift in attention clearly has had a number of policy consequences. For example, in various countries and education

systems, attention for civic education efforts has been re – invigorated as a result of studies showing a significant impact of at least some forms of civic education" (Neemi, Junn 1998). The political scientist Charles Merriam noted in the 1930s of the last century the tremendous role radio and film had in the education of people. These agencies reach news and information to tens of thousands of people around the world and they have an instant and constant influence on them. The political experiences of most people are vicarious in nature because they do not have personal contact with bureaucrats or politicians. The internet, social media, and television are the most potent agencies of mass communication currently and their vital role in political socialization cannot be overemphasized. They are all major sources of information about everything under the sun and beyond.

Political socialization covers all political teachings and even politically irrelevant social attitudes. It trains individuals to become effective members of a political community. It was Herbert Hyman who was concerned with western political phenomena who first promoted the concept of political socialization. The students of the developing nations soon began to draw on his ideas. Hyman (1959) speaks of socialization of the individual as "his learning of social patterns corresponding to his societal positions as mediated by various agencies of society". Following Hyman, Forman states that "political socialization will be defined as the learning of politically relevant social patterns corresponding to societal positions as mediated through various agencies of society". He adds that the term 'political' is confusing. Frey (1964) sees it as a "process by which a group, organization, or society inculcates social attitudes and behavior into its members. 'Political

socialization' refers not only to the information about and evaluation of formal government, but also includes more general attitudes towards the use and distribution of power".

Easton and Hess consider political socialization as a process in which a person psychologically matures in a society, acquiring a certain range of political orientations, whereas Almond (1960) views political socialization as "the process of induction into the political culture. Its end product is a set of attitudes, cognitions, value standards, feelings towards the political system, and its various roles". While Almond and Verba (1963) define political socialization in their work *Civic Culture,* they imply that it "refers to the specifically political orientation – attitudes towards the political system and its various parts and attitude towards the role of the self in the system." It is the internalization of these attitudes which constitutes the political socialization process.

LeVine interprets "political socialization process as the acquisition by an individual of behavioral disposition relevant to political groups, political systems, and political process", while Eckstein (1963) construes it as a "process through which values, cognitions, and symbols are learned and internalized through which operative social norms regarding politics are implemented, political roles institutionalized and political consensus created, either effectively or ineffectively". Eckstein and Roberta Sigel (1955), on the other hand, lay emphasis on the process stating that "political socialization refers to the learning process by which the political norms and behaviors acceptable to an ongoing political system are transmitted from generation to generation".

Richard Rose (1964) concurs with them when he says that "political socialization is a stabilizing influence, but not a stagnating one". According to Easton and Dennis (1969), political socialization means "those development processes by which persons acquire political orientation and pattern of bahaviour" Austin Ranney (1987) opines that "political socialization generally means the process by which ordinary people develop their attitude towards their political system."

Gillin states that "by the term socialization we mean the process by which the individual develops into a functioning member of groups according to its standards conforming to its modes, observing its traditions and adjusting to the social situations." L.D. Child is of the opinion that "political socialization covers the whole process by which an individual born with behavioral potentialities of immense range is led to develop actual behavior which is customary and acceptable for him according to the members of his group."

Robert Sigel, opines that goal of political socialization is to train or to develop individuals so that they become well – functioning members of a political society. S. Bhatnagar has given a very blanket definition of political socialization. He says that it means all political learning, formal or informal, deliberate or unplanned, latent or manifest, diffuse or specific, at every stage of the life cycle, including not only explicit political learning but also apparently non – political learning of the general culture which affects political behavior" (Agarwal 2009). Easton (1968) states that "political socialization is an important key variable in the understanding of the political system" which is an infrastructure for his theory of political socialization.

Rush and Althoff (1971) define political socialization as "the process by which an individual becomes acquainted with the political system and which determines his perceptions of politics and his reactions to political phenomena. It involves the examination of the social, economic, and cultural environment of society upon the individual and upon his political attitudes and values. Political socialization is the most important link between the political and social systems, but may vary considerably from one system to another."

Patrick (1977) avers that political socialization concerns itself with learning experiences that shape human potentialities in the socio cultural context. Almond and Powell say that there are two types of political socialization - the manifest and the latent. It is manifest when "it involves the explicit communication of information and values of feelings towards political objects." Latent political socialization is "the transmission of non-political attitudes which affect attitudes towards analogous roles and objects in the political system. Such orientation affects his attitudes towards political leaders and his fellow citizens."

Allan R. Ball and Guy Peters (2005) observe that it is a process that continues throughout life. The same view is held by Almond and Powell (1966). Frank and Elizabeth Estana say that the process of socialization starts from the time when the child becomes aware of a wide environment, feels increasingly perceptive in response to particular situations and comes to have an outlook that becomes increasingly coherent and total where before it was fragmented and limited. It is at this stage that the general attitude of the children towards authority, obedience,

resistance, cooperation, and aggression is created. What a child gets from his or her family is developed in the school.

Easton and Dennis (1969) state that at the school stage the process has four phases. "They are recognition of authority through particular individuals, distinction between public and private property, recognition of political institutions such as national legislature, and distinction between political institutions and persons engaged in the activities associated with those institutions".

Most of the definitions given above have a common pattern. Essentially they all mean that political socialization is a process through which an individual internalizes what is politically relevant in a given context. The task of socializing their members has been entrusted to various sub units or agencies by organizations, societies, and nations. The primary agency is the family. The secondary agencies are schools, occupations, mass media and political parties.

When political feelings, values, and beliefs, are passed on directly, it is an instance of manifest political socialization. The process can be considered as latent when political feelings, values, and beliefs are transmitted indirectly from the social systems. Coleman (1965) stresses the importance of the study both latent and manifest socialization. A third category used is time span which is closely related to the above two categories of agencies. Time span may be connected with an individual's formative or mature years or both. If one feels that most political socialization can be accounted for studying the manifest aspects of the primary agency, one would expect that one would also concentrate on the formative years.

2.5.   Political Socialization and Political Culture:

The political values and political conduct of individuals or agents constitute political culture. In this context, one may call to mind Aristotle's reference to a "state of mind" that could inspire either political change or stability. The concept is as ancient as politics itself. Aristotle, the great Greek philosopher, wrote about a "state of mind" that could inspire either political change or stability. Machiavelli, the celebrated Italian statesman and political philosopher, underlined the importance of the values and feelings of identity and commitments. Edmund Burke, Irish statesman, orator, and writer, acclaimed the customs which enable   political institutions to fulfill their goals. The contemporary understanding of political culture has been greatly influenced by the classic book *The Civic Culture* co - authored by Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba. It has led to the contemporary multi - causal, relational, and mixed approaches to the study of the concept (Thompson, Ellis, Wildavsky 1990).

The concept of political culture became part of the present political analysis in the 60s of the last century. It was the American political thinkers Ulam, Beer, and Almond who popularized the term, and it is now indispensable to the study of different political systems. Political Socialization and political culture are closely related phenomena. By phenomenon is meant a fact, occurrence, or circumstance observed or observable. Political socialization immensely influences a people's culture. It passes political culture across generations. The process of political socialization is a threefold one – the maintenance, transformation and creation of a

new political culture. Political socialization and political culture are indistinguishable from each other.

Marx and Weber relate theories of political culture to some basic assumptions. For Marx, the beliefs and symbols of culture in capitalist society were conceived as part of a superstructure of ideology and false consciousness. The interest of the bourgeoisie was represented by the superstructure. Hence, culture becomes static protecting the vested interests of the bourgeoisie. It means that the phenomenon of culture is born out of the material practices of society.

"Culture has two levels – general and particular. At the general level culture is composed of the beliefs and symbols of ideal types of authority, and at a particular level it is comprised of the praxis of a people" (Dasgupta 2011).

Gabriel A. Almond is considered as the originator of the concept of political culture. He has observed that every political system is rooted in a particular pattern of orientation to political actions. Political culture can be described as the totality of behavior and attitudes in a certain political community. "Every individual citizen learns and steadily internalizes within his personality the knowledge and feelings about the on - going politics in his community" (Almond 1963). According to Almond and Powell (1966), "Political culture consists of attitudes, beliefs, values, and skills which are current in an entire population, as those special propensities and patterns which may be found within separate parts of the population." Political culture is not about the happenings in the world of politics but about people's perceptions about such happenings. They are rather logical and interrelated in their

totality. They are not accidental either. So a distinctive political culture prevails in every society.

Lucian Pye (1965) is an authoritative political culture theorist. According to him, political culture is "the set of attitudes, beliefs, and sentiments which give order and meaning to the political process and which provide the underlying assumptions and rules which govern the politics in the political system."

To Lucian Pye, political culture is a personal realm of politics. It has two levels. At the individual level, it offers controlling guidelines of effective political behavior. At the collective level, it provides a methodical and logical structure of values and rational considerations that ensure cogency in the functions of institutions and organizations. Pye, affirms that "Political culture is thus the product of collective histories and of individual life, histories of the political system which evolves from conscious learning about politics. It gives behavioral form of analysis to such terms as ideologies, national spirit, and values of people" (Pye 1965). Again, Pye argues that political culture is found in the mind of man and in the pattern of actions, feelings, and reflections which he has internalized.

"Political culture" as Sidney Verba (1963) points out, "consists of the system of empirical beliefs, expressive symbols, and values which define the situation in which political action takes place." So it covers both the political ideals and operating norms of a polity. Pye states that "the notion of political culture assumes that the attitudes, sentiments, and cognitions that inform and govern political behavior in any society are not just random congeries but represent a coherent pattern which fit together and are mutually reinforcing. In spite of the great

potentialities for diversity in political orientations, in any particular community there is a limited and distinct political culture" (Pye 1965). Sidney Verba, considers political culture as a system being composed of empirical beliefs, expressive symbols, and values.

Samuel H. Beer (1998) point out that certain facets of the general culture of a society pertain to the performance of a government. This is what is called political culture. A.R. Ball's (2005) observation that political culture has got as its components the attitudes, beliefs, emotions and values of a society is very pertinent here.

Almond and Verba (1980) enunciate the concept of political culture empirically in their surveys applying them to the US, Mexico, Great Britain, Germany and Italy. From the surveys, they have identified three different types of political culture - the parochial political culture based on localism, particularism, and interpersonal trust. The second type is the 'subject political culture'. It's vital feature is the compliance with and confidence in the legal authority of the state. The third type is termed 'the participant political culture'. He or she either supports or rejects the decisions of the government. Modern democracies are instances of this kind of political culture.

Robert Putnam's seminal study of *Making Democracy Work* (1993) is an authoritative study of the political culture in Italy. Here the author goes beyond the methodological individualism of the behaviorist approach. Putnam's neo – Tocquevillian approach has a wider perception of political culture in which is included non-political concepts that are vital to the construction of political meaning. Concepts such as "Social capital" and "trust" were all the rage in Political Science in

early 21st century. They have inspired numerous empirical studies of 'associational life'. "Empirical political scientists have identified several different norms of citizenship in the United States and Europe. These include, besides the "duty based" norms of citizenship, the "engagement" and the "solidarity" norms of citizenship" (Dalton 2008; Denters, Gabriel, and Torcal 2007). These three civic norms have been products of socio - economic changes. The analysis of political culture has a wider scope today than in the 1950s when it emerged first. Then it had encompassed individual perceptions about governments, social and cultural values, religious beliefs, symbols like flags, as well as hymns and texts whereas today it covers the developments around the world in the context of the advent of the global village.

The sections above lead one to the inescapable conclusion that political socialization and political culture are a reciprocal phenomenon. There is no political socialization without political culture and vice versa.

2.6.   Political Socialization and Political Cohesion:

When various sections of people come together leading to political and cultural cohesion, it facilitates political socialization. Originally, each Naga tribe followed its own unique customs and usages. Till the arrival of the British, each tribal community had an isolated existence clinging to their savage practices. With the introduction of modern education, there was a cultural, political and intellectual cohesion among the various Naga tribes as well as the people outside the North – East. Most of the teachers in the schools that sprang up in the region were also from outside the Naga territory. In this milieu, there emerged the situation where there was a closer rapport among different communities, facilitating and promoting

political socialization. In order to acquire a deep insight into the phenomenon, a study on the relation between political cohesion and political socialization is an academic imperative.

Decades of research on political behavior lead one to the ineluctable conclusion that group identities are integral to politics (Huddy 2003). "Social identities based on race, ethnicity, religion, gender, and other characteristics can generate political cohesion through a shared outlook and conformity to norms of political activity". Huddy, Khatib, Theiss and Morse share the view that "Within a democratic polity, national identities boost support for civic norms, drive democratic engagement, and increase support for a muscular response to national threat" (Huddy, Khatib, 2007; Theiss Morse 2009).

Simon and Klandermans are of the view that pro – life, pro-environment, feminist, and conservative stances promote political cohesion and commitment to political action. One should be knowledgeable about the psychology of every group which is indispensable to the study of political behavior (Simon, Klandermans 2001). In this context, "The political cohesion of certain racial, ethnic, and religious groups within specific polities such as African Americans in the United States or religious Jews in Israel is also apparent"(Shamir, Arian 1999; Tate 1994).

Political identity is also social identity which is of political relevance. "Many social identities, such as Asian in the United States, Chinese in Indonesia, or Turks in the Netherlands, lack a distinct political outlook" (Freedman 2000; Junn, Masuoka 2008; Phalet, Baysu, and Verkuyten 2010). As Campbell says, "a political identity can emerge in a formal political group, when group members develop a similar set

of political beliefs and adhere to group norms in support of a specific political party, candidate, policy issue, or course of political action" (Campbell 1960). Other political identities also spring from social identities that have a political content. The groundwork for the development of group-based political cohesion is there in the very concept of political identity.

There are four major theories that highlight the ingredients in the development of group-based political cohesion. The goal is to arrive at the factors that lead to cohesion. Political cohesion involves common political attitudes, and behavior that can be directly attributed to group membership. The core of political cohesion is subjective group identity which helps distinguish group-based cohesion from a common political outlook derived from the simple aggregation of individual members.

The words 'cognitive' and 'cognition' have their root in the Sanskrit word 'gnan' meaning 'knowledge', which itself has the same etymology. There is no denying the importance of categorization underscored by a cognitive approach to the development of group cohesion. Here indeed is the relevance of Self-Categorization Theory (SCT). This theory attributes "group cohesion to cognitive factors such as the situational salience of a group identity that arouses a collective sense of self. The shift from personal to collective identity is accompanied by increased adherence to group norms and 'heights' self-stereotyping factors that are logical precursors to political cohesion" (Hogg, Hardie, Reynolds 1995; Terry, Hogg 1996; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, Wetherell 1987). Salience may be defined as the readiness to assume an identity (Simon 2004).

"The political effects of self-interest are most pronounced when government decisions or actions have large, clear, and certain effects on an individual's interests" (Sears, Funk 1991). "At times, self - interest can motivate political action" (Begley, Alker 1982; Green, and Cowden 1992). "But the political effects of self-interest need to be disentangled from those of group interest, which is often more powerful politically" (Bobo 1983).

"Some theorists argue that additional beliefs are needed to create political cohesion even when group members share a sense of common fate" (Klandermans 2001). "Subjective deprivation is critical to the relative deprivation theory that one's group finances, access to power, or other tangible interests are deteriorating or worse than those of other groups" (Gay 2006). "Relative deprivation theorists refer to this as a sense of fraternal deprivation and contrast it with egoistic deprivation, which arises when an individual feels personally deprived when compared to an individual or group" (Brown 2010).

"Social Identity Theory (SIT) emphasizes the importance of symbolic concerns such as a group's social standing as central to the development of group cohesion. There are two distinct branches of social identity theory (SIT): the version developed by Tajfel (1981) and Tajfel and Turner (1979) known as social identity theory, and self-categorization theory referred to earlier as a cognitive elaboration of Social Identity Theory" (Turner 1987). Both theories acknowledge the origins of social identity in cognitive and motivational factors. But self-categorization theory emphasizes the cognitive factors (Hogg 1996). Cognitive factors alone completely account for intergroup discrimination. Motivational factors associated with the

protection of group status are pivotal to intergroup conduct. The social identity theory formulated by Tajfel (1981), and Tajfel and Turner (1979) stressed the need on the part of group members "to differentiate their own groups positively from others to achieve a positive social identity" (Turner 1987). Group autonomy has important political implications: group identity and in-group prejudice appear among members of high-status groups. (Bettencourt, Dorr, Charlton, Hume, 2001). But the development of group identity is less certain among members of low-status groups.

"The reach of social constructivism extends well beyond the dynamics of identity, but it included here for the insight it gives to the development of political cohesion" (Duveen 2001; Erikson 1993). Social constructivism refers to the notion that "concepts attain meaning through social process. It has been noted by several critics that social identity theorists have examined only the socially fluid nature of identities and not their meaning" (Duveen 2001; Huddy 2001; Reicher 2004). "From a social constructivist perspective, it is difficult to understand the consequences of group identification without understanding its subjective meaning to group members" (Billig 1995). "This may be especially true for politically relevant identities that are often the target of political manipulation - efforts by politicians and group entrepreneurs to create, define, and redefine identities to serve their political ends" (Erikson, 1993 and Reicher 2004).

Several important points emerge from the evolutionary approach to group cohesion. First and foremost, group identities do not necessarily foster out-group antipathy since their primary function is to promote internal cooperation (Halevy, Bornstein, Sagiv 2008). Secondly, a stress on cooperation provides a corrective to

research on political conflicts springing from different identities. "Political psychologists are only now beginning to address a number of intriguing questions concerning the link between identity and politics cooperation: "To what extent do group identifiers favor government programmes that assist fellow group members"? (Theiss, Morse 2009). "To what extent they vote, and engage in other forms of collective political activity"? (Huddy, Khatib 2007). "Or value the lives of fellow group members to a greater degree than those of outsiders"? (Pratto, Glasford 2008) Thirdly, the evolutionary approach emphasizes the importance to group cohesion fostering cooperation and ensuring punishment of violators.

All subjective group identities need not translate into group-based solidarity. It is the norms and beliefs that connect group membership to particular attitudes and actions that give political content to groups and cohesion. Only when social and political cohesion becomes meaningful can political socialization take place, especially in the ethno cultural ambience of the North – East. Generally speaking, groups with strongly identified members who share common political ideologies and activities are likely to be more politically cohesive than others. This is true in the case of the people of the North - East. Despite the fact that the North – East is not politically – charged, and despite the fact that the region abounds in different ethnic identities, the environment there is conducive to political socialization because of the commonality of interests and attitudes of the people.

2.7. Political Socialization and Political Participation:

Political socialization and political participation are intimately interlinked. The latter has now grown into a subfield of Political Science, inspired by normative

concerns. "The classic reference is a simple notion of "participatory democrats" urging more participation as opposed to "realist democrats" who allegedly take no interest in levels of participation at all" (Parry 1992; Norris 2002). Thinkers like Verba and Nie (1972) raise both normative and empirical questions in their study of political participation in America. But their critics join issue with them for excluding other notions from their theory (Mansbridge 1997).

Theorists like Schumpeter (1942) and Sartori (1987) opined that he role of most citizens visa -a - visa political participation is limited to that of voting their leaders out of office. This is generally considered as a liberal model of democracy. Without the political participation of the citizens, there is no rationale for a government to exist. A government is or the government is not at the will of the people in a democratic polity. It is political participation that gives stability to a government.

Michael Rush and Philip Althoff are of the view that the degree of political participation changes from one society to another. In primitive societies, it was very high. In modern societies it is related to literacy and communication facilities. In totalitarian societies, it is very limited. People's indifference to political participation is due to political apathy, frustration, alienation and sheer cynicism.

"To Karl Marx and his followers, political participation meant the active action of the people at various levels in accordance with the importance of any issue. As the process of transformation of society and the production relations intensity, a larger and larger number of people are drawn into to various participatory actions (Urmila Sharma, S.K. Sharma 2000).

Samuel P. Huntington and John M. Nelson define political participation as the activity that is designed to influence the actions of a governmental, which tantamount to that of Verba and Nie. Satyabrata Chakraborty (2005) in his book *Political Sociology* gives the views of G. Parry G. Moyser and N. Day on political participation. "It consists of taking part in the process of formulation, passage, and implementation of public policies. It is concerned with action by citizens which is aimed at influencing decisions which are, in most cases, taken by public representatives and officials". Chakraborty adds "According to Almond and Verba the process of political participation is a continuation of an earlier process that of political socialization" (Chakraborty 2005).

Etymologically, participation in its democratic context refers to the act of taking part in decision - making process" (Sartory 1987). Gould (1988) says that it is marked by involvement in decision making. In Barber's (1984) words "politics in the participatory mode … is self-governing by citizens rather than representative government". "In contrast to seeing participation as an attempt to influence decision makers, then what participatory democrats have in mind is participation in direct decision making" (Nagel 1987).

2.8.   Political Socialization and Political Communication:

Samir Dasgupta (2011) says that "Political communication is a process of transmission of politically relevant information from one part of the political system to another and between the social and the political systems as well. It is a dynamic element of a political system and the process of political socialization, participation, and recruitment are dependent upon it. The communication of knowledge, values

and attitudes are fundamental to all the three process since it is these which determine the political activity of individuals" (Dasgupta 2011).

There have been abundant theories about politics and communication. Blumker and Gureviteh observe that "A strong spur to innovative transformations throughout the democratic world was political parties' campaigning techniques involving determined, high profiled, well- resourced, and statically directed efforts to project their agenda to voters through the mass media. Varyingly termed a "professionalized advocacy" model (Blumker, Gureviteh 1995), a "Strategic Communication" model (Bennet, Manheim 2001) and a "Going public" model (Kernell 1997) of political communication, numerous notions or types of this development have been postulated such as: impoverished information provision; narrowed political discourse; elevation of perceptions of political reality; increased negativity and reliance on attack campaigning; pervasive cynicism; and heightened political journalist conflict".

Bennets's (1990) theory of press state relations holds "that the news 'indexes", the range of views that dominates elites' public communication such that open elite debate over an issue will result in diverse media coverage, while in the more common case of elite consensus, the press will offer a narrow digest of the unified perspective". Since the formulation of this theory, however, communication specialists seem to have been increasingly challenged by many campaigning groups. Their attempts have been bolstered by online communication channels also. This theory gives a useful guide to empirical political communication research. It is

designed to specify the materials politicians make available when tailoring their publicity to journalistic news values.

Now we come to the subject of mediatization of political theories (Esser, Stromback 2014). This refers to a long term change process in which the media's distinctive ways of regarding the world are said to be becoming increasingly influential in politics, "As the media becomes the most important source of information about politics and society, as they become independent from political and social institutions, as their coverage of politics is increasingly guided by media rather than a political logic, and as political institution and actors themselves are guided by a media rather than a political logic, the logic of media institutions will increasingly shape politicians' publicity efforts and shape political institutions as policy making sources" (Schulf 2014).

Schulf (2014) contends that "there is no such thing as universal media logic and that new media enables politicians to bypass the mainstream journalistic provision as previously. Moreover, the formidable challenge of theorizing how the media presence may affect policy - making across the range of areas that government deals with, as well as across the range of dimensions along which policy ideas may be processed, has barely been faced. Over all, the mediation theory has to take on board the fact that the traffic between media and political process does not run along a one – way street but comprises instead a multiplicity of reciprocal interactions with varying consequences" (Schulf 2014).

The theory of 'spill - over effects' propounded by Pfetsch, Adam, and Bennet (2013) addresses political communication issue. "They have developed a frame work

for investigating the conditions under which challengers' online communication agendas may spill over into traditional mass media agendas, with corresponding chances of influencing public opinion and politician's policy agenda, with corresponding chances of influencing public opinion and politicians' policy agendas" (Pfetsch, Adam, and Bennet 2013).

Among all the theories explained above, the concept of The Hybrid Media System set forth by Chadwick (2013) is the most integrative of these theories. He argues that "we must move beyond dichotomous thinking about old and new media, since political communication today involves an intermixing and blending on all its levels – its structure, modes of actor involvement, media logic, news production process, message content, and citizen's consumption diets" Chadwick (2013).

In contrast, other scholars have discovered potentials enriching democratic dialogue through online communications, including advances toward "deliberative democracy. Katz, Ali, and Kim (2014), for instance, have created a fourfold typology of conversation modes and their functions for democracy. But, Fishkin (1997) has argued that "realizing deliberation will depend on how it is organized", and Coleman and Blumler (2009) have maintained that "to be effective, deliberative channels must be articulated to the state's policy – making institutions".

"Political communication is the process by which language and symbols, employed by leaders, media or citizens exert intended or unintended effects on the political cognitions, attitudes, or behavior of individuals or on outcomes that bear on the public policy of a nation, state, or community" (Denton and Kuypers; Mc Nair, 1995; Smith, 1990). Political communication can be considered as "the practice of

using language to move people to think and act in ways that they might not otherwise think and act" (Ball 2011).

Karl Deutsch (1963) gives special emphasis to the idea and practice of political communication. According to him, "no governments can take correct decisions without proper information flow. But the problem is in what way and to which extent those who receive information should be a competent person. If there is less distortion in sending information, it can be said that communication system is efficient". Here he gives emphasis to feed back. Feedback can be sourced from national and international channels and information channels along with the communication network. A good communication system can correlate post information experiences with incoming information experiences (Palekar 2010).

2.9.   Political Socialization and Political Development:

The notion of political development is to be analyzed in the context of modernization. Theorists on modernization hold that every society has the tendency to move to a single more modern form from a traditional form. The philosopher Hegel once remarked that the concept of development presupposes the existence of a dormant germ that strives to realize itself. Political development is often identified with political modernization and westernization. According to Almond and Powell (1966), Political development is predicated on two fundamental ideas - structural differentiation and cultural secularization. They refer to the process of roles getting changed and becoming specialized or the emergence of a new structure where people become analytical and empirical in their political concepts.

In their theory of political development, Almond and Powell (1966) steered clear of all ethnocentric frameworks. Theirs is a probabilistic theory grounded on three important variables. They are 'role differentiation, subsystem autonomy, and cultural secularization'. Role differentiation is all about a variety of roles performing different significant activities. Subsystem autonomy refers to several structures that have at least a minimum autonomy in their domains. Here one system does not dominate over others. Almond and Powell (1966) suggest that "as the political system becomes differentiated from other social systems, the rulers begin to develop secular goals and a rational sense of the relationship between means and ends and of one set of ends as over against other ends".

The theory derived from Almond and Powell's premises can be construed as follows. "If there is a growth in the differentiation of roles, in the number of subsystems that are autonomous, and in the decision-making process characterized by a sober evaluation of means and end, then the political system will become more developed, that is, it will acquire greater capabilities" Almond and Powell (1966). The theory of Almond and Powell about political development has been criticized because it could not explain the process of political decline. It is when the processes of state and nation-building are accompanied by Political development that the increase in the capabilities of the power-holders occurs.

When he emphasizes the need for authority, Huntington's theory of political development from all the other contemporary and subsequent theoretical attempts, the stress on authority. "Authority has to exist before it can be limited, and it is authority that is in scarce supply in those modernizing countries where government

is at the mercy of alienated intellectuals, rambunctious colonels, and rioting students" (Huntington 1968).

Finally, Huntington's theory of political development is to be praised because it is being fully political. Essentially, Huntington's theory means that in the event of the existing authority is challenged, new organizations must be formalized. Political development will certainly follow.

"If the existing authority is challenged by an increase in the rate of political participation, new organizations and procedures must be institutionalized. Then, political development will be the outcome. Where and when the organizations and the procedures will prove too weak, not adaptable, not complex, not autonomous, not coherent, then political decay will most certainly follow" (Huntington 1968).

The contributions made by modernization theorists like Karl Marx, Max Weber and Emile Durkheim are of great significance to the study of political development. In 1848 Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels argued that a political system is directly related to the existing mode of production. This means that there is a political order for every stage of production and economic development in a linear progress towards modernity. But it is possible to surmount the specific moments of transition. Marx and Engels affirm that societies were scattered while they were moving down the road to socialism.

Marx Weber says that the propensity towards the complexity of mass industrial society entailed the movement of traditional societies to   bureaucratic organizations. According to Durkheim, division of labor and interdependence are the

hallmarks of a modern society. In his opinion, the loss of traditional values increases unhappiness and insecurity among masses.

Samuel P. Huntington and Dominguez (1975) are pioneers in the advancement of the concept of political development. They contend that "political development is an independent concept though it is partially affected by the process of modernization". They have observed that the concept of development springs from modernization. It is applicable to any political system at all times. They also state that "development would be identified with one type of political system, rather than a quality, which might characterize any type of social system".

Leonard Binder considers political development as changes in the type and style of politics. The works of the committee on Comparative Politics of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) dealt with the theme of political development in an authoritative fashion. As chairman of SSRC, Gabriel Almond introduced a broad conception of political development in the early 1960s.

The two different views of political development put forth by James S. Coleman may be described as historical and typological. This was an evolutionary perspective. It regarded political development as a process that emerges as an open ended increase in the ability of man to launch a new structure and culture that can resolve problems.

Samir Dasgupta in his book *Political Sociology* quotes Gabriel Almond and G. Bingham Powell Jr. as having said in their book *Comparative Politics: A Development Approach* thus: *"To elaborate further, this development syndrome was well described by Gabriel Almond and G. Bingham Powell Jr. in their book*

Comparative Politics: A Development Approach. Political development to a large extent depends on historical and political systems that evolved over a period of time when considered the societies that developed over the past four decades reveal the growing power and impact of the political system as an independent variable. The political system is certainly a political force for modernizing the social and economic system" (Dasgupta 2011).

Lucian Pye (1966) pioneered the analysis of the concept of development in depth and continued evolving his ideas leaving a lasting impression on the writings about political development (Mahajan, Chand 2009).

According to Rostow and Pye, the aim of political developments is ultimately the unity of a nation and widening the base of political participation. To A. Almond, political development involves acquisition of new capabilities. Hagar says that political development denotes the growth of institutions and practices that enable a political system to manage its own basic problems more efficiently in the short run. In the long run it works towards more responsiveness from a political system According to Alfred Diamont, the aim of political development is not the creation of a particular political condition but of an institutional framework for solving a wide gamut of social problems. Eisenstadt holds that political development implies the ability on the part of a political system to face effectively emerging political demands and organizations.

2.10. Political Socialization and Political Modernization:

Political socialization and political modernization go in tandem. They have mutuality about them. When political modernization takes place in a society, political

socialization also concurrently occurs. Social philosophers and thinkers have consistently devoted their mind to examine both phenomena and wrote up volumes on the theme. The writings of several of them are reviewed in the following pages.

The concept of political modernization tends to be interpreted in different ways. Viewed from a normative and local perspective, political modernization aims at the reformation of given political and democratic institutions. Other thinkers connect it to the idea of governance. Here it loses its normative and local focus. There are yet other scholars to whom political modernization is only an analytical concept that helps in understanding structural changes in relation to day- to-day political praxis.

There are various concepts of political modernization in scientific literature. In general, modernity refers to the social life organizations that appeared in the west from the seventeenth century onwards. Eventually their influence became worldwide. According to Giddens, modernity "is a cluster of cultural and structural processes, of typical institutional forms, which came in to being on the crossroads of capitalism, industrialism and the nation state" (Giddens 1990).

"The term political modernization stands for the transformation of political culture in response to the changes in social and physical environment in view of this essential fact that political change is intricately related to a wide spectrum of social economic factors" (Morton R 1971). S.N. Eisentadt has this to say about political modernization: "Political modernization includes changing the legitimate source of authority, differentiating political structures and expanding participation in politics" (Eisentadt 1962).

C.E. Black (1966) recounts the phases of modernization as "the challenge of modernity to traditional society, consolidation of modernizing leadership as traditional leaders decline in significance, the transformation of economy and society from rural and agrarian to urban and industrial, and, the integration of society".

Huntington S.P. (1968) in his book *Political Order in Changing Societies* stresses the significance of stability in the midst of the swift social and political transformations that occur as part of modernization. Modernization denotes economic growth, industrialization, and political activism and increasing social mobility. Huntington wanted to regulate and control the process of modernization. Preventing new groups from entering politics, limiting exposure to mass media, and controlling the mobilization of the masses are some of the agencies that help in this matter. With regard to the issue of political decay, Huntington says that it is the result of corruption, instability, authoritarianism and violence.

In his book *The Politics of Modernization,* David Apter (1965) differentiates between the phenomena of development and political modernization. According to him, 'development' springs from the increase in and integration of functional roles. He considers political modernization as a consequential development of social mobilization and economic development.

"Karl Deutsch defines social mobilization as "a process by which major clusters of old social, economic, and psychological commitments are eroded or broken and people become available for new patterns of socialization and behavior". According to Huntington, "political modernization contains three more elements in addition to political development and social mobilization. Those three elements are

rationalization of authority, differentiation of structure and expansion of political participation" (Mahajan 2009). When the resources of a nation are used in an effective way, political modernization and the establishment of a modern society take place.

According to Benjamin Swartix, in modernization human energy is systematically and purposively applied for various human purposes. In Marion J. Levy's comparative approach, the degree of modernization is related to the multiplication of efforts people put together using both animate and inanimate sources of power. P. Samuel Huntington considered modernization as a multi – dimensional process effecting changes in all domains of human thinking and activity. The term 'modernization' was first used by Daniel Larner. In his words, "Political modernization refers to the development of sufficiently flexible and powerful institutional frameworks which would be capable of meeting the growing demands and accommodating the changes that the society experiences. Factors influencing the modernization in the developing states are love for tradition, conflict over method of modernization, social political equality, and ideology, absence of a strong political party, non - continuous development process, and growing disparity over the socio economic values" (Dasgupta 2011).

Modernization is a process wherein resources are rationally utilized whose aim is the founding of a rational society. When modernization occurs in a society, the political culture there changes in sync with the milieu. Sinai's views are relevant in this context: "A modern society is based on advanced technology and the spirit of science, a rational view of life, a secular approach to social relations, a feeling for

justice in public affairs and above all else, on the acceptance in the political realm of the belief that the prime unit of the polity should be the nation state" (Dasgupta, 2011).

In the book *Political Sociology* edited by B.K. Nagla, the following quotation dwells on political modernization at length: "Political modernization in the accepted sense of the term assumes universality of a political consensus based on political individualism or citizenship role. The organization of the political system through governmental and party administration, the communication of political values and ideologies, and the interplay among various political groups, such as national and regional political elites, their followers etc, are expected to be rationally constituted in bureaucracies through wider structural differentiation of political roles and statuses. Hence a modern political structure is supposed to be not fused but differentiated, not holistic but individualistic, and not hierarchical but corporate" (Nagla 1999).

2.11. The Concept of Tribe:

As the researcher concentrates her study on political socialization among the Angami tribal people of Nagaland, an understanding of the concept of tribe and tribalism is pivotal to a better understanding of the theme. In the following paragraphs, the theories and definitions of famous scholars of tribal studies are reviewed and discussed.

'Tribe' is an elusive term and concept that has defied a definitive definition from the part of anthropologists and sociologists who strove to study the subject. "Definition or conceptualization of tribe always becomes difficult for sociologists and anthropologists not only for variety of socio – economic milieu but also for their

continuous assimilation and acculturation with wider social structure. Debate on concept of tribe still continuous among scholars across disciplines" (Sills 1976).

Intensive and extensive anthropological studies about the tribal phenomenon in every continent have been prosecuted by scholars such as L.H. Morgan, Mayer Fortes, E.E. Evans Pritchard, Bronislaw Malinowski, and A.R. Radcliffe Brown. Family, kinship, marriage, religion, magic, economy, political institution, law and social relation of primitive tribes were sought to be studied by them from an ethnographic perspective (Mair 1972). The various definitions of 'tribe' is grounded in an evolutionary framework.

The evolutionist L.H. Morgan and functionalist Emile Durkheim in their studies point out that those primitive tribal societies are not static but dynamic evolving in tune with changing times and changing spatial ambience. To both the term denotes change and development which are a dynamic phenomenon.

In his book *Ancient Society,* (1877) Morgan defines tribe as "a completely organized society where all forms of social relations are dominated by kinship relation". For him, "tribal society is completely organized in such a way that their form of social organization is capable of reproducing itself. A tribe is a collection of number of clans who have distinct nomenclature, separate language, distinct political organization and a territory under their own possession (Morgan 1877).

Based on the idea of segmented society developed by Emile Durkhem, Marshall Shalins distinguishes between state and non - state societies. According to him "tribe is a segmental organization which is composed of equivalent and

unspecialized multifamily group, clan, or band. Collection of band has a kingdom to coordinate its economic, social, and religious activity" (Marshal 1968) .

According to Maurice Godelier, tribe is at once a type of society and a stage of evolution. At each phase evolution is marked by a special kind of social organization. He rejects Shalin's idea of band, tribe, and chiefdom. He conceptualizes tribe even as he underscores the mode of production. "Mode of production of tribe determines its social organization since tribal mode of production in every stage of evolution is different from other modes of production (Godelier 1977).

As a social system, the tribal system had existed before the appearance of Nation – States and persisted even thereafter. According to some theorists, tribal culture is the "natural" state of man. Barkataki says that tribe is a homogenous and indigenous community with a common language or dialect, a common ancestry, a specific geographical area and a kinship - based political system (Barkataki 1981).

A "tribe" is a traditional social division. It is comprised of a group of interrelated families or societies with a common culture and language. To the western mind, a tribe is associated with a tribal leader. The popular representatives interact with them. "The word 'tribe' originally referred to the three divisions of the Roman people, often taken as derivative of 'tres', THREE, though formation is unclear" (Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English language 2001).

G.W.B. Huntingford says that each tribe has a common name, a common language, a common territory and they nurse the feeling that those who do not share the same name are outsiders or even enemies. The Imperial Gazetteer of India, the Oxford Dictionary, The Chambers Twentieth Century Dictionary and the Webster's

New Millennium Dictionary offer their own definitions and explanations of the term 'tribe'. All these works emphasize the fact that a tribe is a collection of families with a common name, a common language, a common territory, common customs and usages, and a common ancestry. The Constitution of India does not give a precise definition of a tribe. However "Article 232(1) of the Constitution empowers the president to "specify the tribe or tribal communities" as Scheduled Tribes in relation to that State or Union Territory. The parliament is empowered to either include or exclude any tribe or tribal community from the notified list".

Rivers holds the view that a tribe is a social group whose members speaks a common language and work together for common goals, especially during war and aggression. He does not use common habitation in his definition because tribal communities are nomadic groups. Almond and Powell say that North – East India is a region where the tribal people are a part of an indivisible state organization as the non – tribal people are. At the conceptual level, a state is a political system that is representing a government (Almond and Powell 1972). When the above observations are taken into confidence, it is clear that European and American anthropologists sought to give general criteria to conceptualize tribe. Tribes differ from one another on account of ecological, economic, historical and socio cultural characteristics.

S.L. Doshi in his book S*ocial Anthoropology* says that "According to anthropologists, tribe is a group of people living in isolated forests and hills. Their language is different from the language spoken by mainstream people. They live on hunting, food gathering, and fishing. Socio - cultural institutions are highly influenced

by their consanguine relation. They have faith in animism, naturism, and religion and the rituals of tribes are influenced by magical practices" (Doshi 2001). "Paradoxically, tribes in India may not be similar compared with tribes of Africa or the aborigine of Australia or tribes of other parts of the world. Even though a great degree of communities exist among them in terms of socio – economic life, the world view of them cannot be defined and conceptualized with universal criteria" (Doshi 2001).

Right from the beginning of Indian civilization, tribes have constituted a significant proportion of its population. The Vedas, the Puranas, the epics Ramayana, and Mahabharata testify to the tribal social formation in India. Currently, the tribal population in India numbers 8.6% of the nation's total population, which stands at a whopping 104 million+, as per the decennial census of the year 2011 "Tribes in various parts of India including a big number of them in North - East India until recently remained isolated from main land. To elaborate, during dominant British period, Indian tribes became object of the study of colonial administrators, missionaries and anthropologist. Hutton, Risley, Elwin, Lowie and others tried to understand social structure and culture of Indian society in general and of tribes in particular. F.B. Bailey and W.H.R. Rivers too became interested in the study of tribes in India" (Beteille 2008).

After independence, the approaches of Western European scholars influenced Indian scholars such as S.C Roy, Nirmal Kumar Bose, D.N. Majumdar, Surajit Singha, T.C. Das, P.K. Chattapadyay, B.K. Roy – Barman, P.N. Mishra, L.K.A. Iyer, and subsequently G.S. Ghurye, S.C. Dube, L.P.Vidyarthi, Aiyappan, M.N. Srinivas, A.R. Desai, and Andre Beteille. They studied Indian tribal systems

against the back ground of the borrowed concepts, methods, and approaches from Western European scholars.

Risely, Elwin and Grigson designate tribal people in India as aboriginals. Hutton considers them as primitive tribes. To G.S. Ghurye, they are backward Hindus. They are also described as Adivasis by some scholars and reformers. After independence, they were included in the scheduled tribe category.

According to D.N. Majumder, the hallmark of Indian tribes are territorial affiliation, endogamy, and tribal leadership, unity of language or dialect, maintenance of social distance with other tribes or caste and homogeneity of ethnic or territorial integration. His definition highlights distinct social, ethnic and territorial identity of Indian tribes. According to him, Indian tribes confine themselves to a specific geographical location and do not intermingle with the people of the mainstream. The problematic issue of the definition and conceptualization of Indian tribes is put in focus by Virginius Xaxa. He contends that the British used the term in many senses. In one sense, it means a group of people of common ancestry. In another sense, it refers to a group of people living in a savage condition. Earlier tribes were distinguished from non-tribal people religion - wise. The difficulty in distinguishing animism from religion was a problem that the census officials faced while considering who belonged to which or who belonged to Hinduism.

The constitution of India, Article 366 (25) defines Scheduled tribes as "such tribes or tribal communities or part of or groups within such tribes or tribal communities as are deemed under Article 342 to the scheduled tribes (STs) for the purpose of this constitution".

Isolation theory is an inheritance of British colonialism. It is rooted on the policy of 'leave tribes untouched'. Isolation theory was aimed at preventing the association of the tribal people and the masses. To prevent their intermingling, the British deliberately refused to develop transportation facilities in the tribal belt. Varrier suggested that a 'National Park' be set up in a wild and remote part of the country. It was to be administered by a Commissioner of tribes. Here the tribe folk could live in peace and freedom under the commissioner. Tribal Councils and village headmen exercised power in their community affairs.

"Non – tribal settlers in the area required to take license. Missionaries of any other religion were not permitted to break up tribal faith. Tribal form of religion would be continued for betterment of tribe. Tribal way of life should be protected and freedom respected and maintained. Tribes' contact with outside should be minimized to save them from exploitation and domination. Economic development should be given high priority and education should be on line of Wardha Scheme simplified according to the need of tribal people. Fishing and hunting be freely permitted and dictatorship of subordinate official within tribal area should come to an end" (Elwin, Baiga 1986).

In another book "The Aboriginals" (1943) Verrier Elwin discusses four classes of Indian tribes with reference to their stage of cultural development. First, he deals with nearly three million tribal people who are considered to belong to the purest groups. They are a robust and dynamic people. Verrier Elwin observes that their traditional religion, tribal organization, fine arts and their mythology still remain in their original form.

Secondly, a good proportion of these tribes maintain contact with the people of the plains as a result of which many changes take place. They love to live a village life. The institution of village dormitory helps preserve their traditions. They do not share their personal effects with others. They follow what may be called shifting cultivation. Their intermingling with the outside world has had a deleterious influence on them.

The third category of tribes numbers about twenty million. Theirs is the largest section of total tribal population. They are passing through a particular phase of transformation. They belong to be lowest rung of society. Many of these people have embraced the Christian faith. Modernization has alienated them from their roots to a great extent.

"The fourth category consists of old aristocracy of the country, represented today by the great Bhil and Naga Chieftain, Gond Raja, a few Binshevarand Bhuyia landlords. Korku nobleman, wealthy Santal and Uraon leaders and some highly cultured Munda. They retain their traditional names, their clan, totem rules and observe elements of tribal religion despite adoption of full Hindu faith and live in modern or even European style. This group of tribes has won battles with others. They acquired aristocratic tradition, economic stability, affluence, outside encouragement, a certain arrogance, and self-confidence, characteristics of ancient aristocrat family and modern entrepreneur. This group has secured benefit of civilization, without injuries to themselves. He also suggests giving some protection to tribal people in the transition period during which they must learn to stand on their own feet and become strong enough to resist those who exploit them" (Desai 1977).

In his Assimilation Theory enunciated by G.S. Ghurye in the book *The Scheduled Tribes* (1956), the assimilation of Indian tribes into the Hindu society is analyzed. He puts Indian tribes under three categories. To the first category belong Rajgonds and other tribes. They were an organized people with a high position in the Hindu society. A large number of tribes who adopted Hinduism belong to the second category. The Hill people who resisted foreign culture belong to the third category. Ghurye observes that "tribal people in India are backward Hindus, differing only in degree from other segments of Hindu society. Their backwardness is due to their imperfect integration into Hindu society. Tribes of India slowly absorbed certain Hindu values and life style through continuous and regular contact with Hindus. Due to Hindu influence, many tribal people have given up liquor, received education, and have changed certain malpractices and habits and adopted Hinduism as their religion" (Ghurye 1995).

It was Jawaharlal Nehru, the first prime minister of India, Who put forward this theory. His aim was to promote tribal welfare and development. With this end in view, he advocated the adoption of two types of measures. They were protective measures and promotional measures. Besides, Nehru laid down five principles for the progress of the tribes.

They are:

1) Promotion of traditional tribal arts and culture.

2) Protection of tribal rights to land and forest.

3) Training the tribal people in civil administration and tribal development.

4) Various schemes for tribal development may be implemented through their own social and cultural institutions.

5) Their progress is to be adjudged not by the money spent but by the human character that has evolved (Nehru 1958).

Nehru did a lot to bring the tribal communities across India into the national mainstream, which was a reflection of his humanism.

The policy of the integration of various tribes with the mainstream society adopted by the Central Government has as its aim a responsible and creative partnership. It may be described as a form of progressive acculturation which is supposed to lead to economic viability, equality, and upward mobility bringing the tribes to the national mainstream. The policy also aims at protecting the unique tribal way of life and saving them from all kinds of exploitation and discrimination.

Articles 371B, 371C, 371G, and 371H consider Assam, Manipur, Mizoram, and Arunachal Pradesh respectively. The Fifth schedule and the Sixth Schedule of the Indian constitution merely pertain only to the administration of the Scheduled areas and the scheduled tribes. The Sixth Schedule pertains to the administration of the tribal areas in Assam, Meghalaya, Tripura, and Mizoram. The Fifth schedule is concerned with the administration of other scheduled areas and tribes.

2.12. Conclusion:

Political socialization research has produced many findings and many theories. Most of them enjoy wide spread acceptance. However, in the context of more recent studies, these are now sought to be redefined. Political socialization being a lifelong process, scholars continues to look at the phenomenon from various

perspectives based on different perceptions. Earlier studies had emphasized the role of the family, academic institutions and peer groups in promoting political socialization. However, recent studies have revealed that the mass media such as newspapers, the radio, and the T.V and social media like whatsapp, facebook, YouTube, Instagram, and Twitter play no small role in political socialization. In order to get a deeper insight into political socialization, themes such as political culture, cohesion, participation, communication, development, and political modernization have been dwelt upon in this chapter. The phenomenon of tribe and tribalism with special reference to North – East India has also been examined thoroughly, constituting as it does an inevitable part of socialization. It is hoped that the points expatiated upon above will go a long way in prosecuting the study on political socialization more comprehensively.

References:

A, Downs. *An Economic Theory of Democracy* . New York: Harper & Raw, 1957.

A., Chadwick. *The Hybrid Media System: Politics and Power.* England : Oxford University Press, 2013.

A., Voci. "The Link between Identification and In - Group Favouritism: Effects of Thret of Social Identity and Trust - Related Emotions." *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 2006: 45, 265 - 284.

A.K. Majumdar, Bhanwar Singh, ed. *Political Sociology.* Paipur: RBSA Publishers, 1999.

A.L, Freedman. Chinese Oversese in Malaysia, Indonesia and the United States. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Abramowitz, Saunders. "Ideological Relignment in the U. S.Electorate." *The Journal of Politics* 60 (1998).

Alford J.R, Funk C.L.,Hibbing J.R. "Are Political Orientations Genetically Transmitted?" *American Political Science Review* 2, no. 99 (2005): 153-167.

Almond G.A., Coleman,james S., ed. *The Politics of the Developing Areas.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1960.

Almond, Powel. *Comparative Politics: A Development Approach.* Boston: Little Brown and Co, 1966.

Almond, Verba, ed. *The Civic Culture Revisited.* Boston: Little Brown & Co, 1980.

Andreychick M.R., Gill M.J. "Ingroup Identity Moderates the Impact of Social Explanations on Intergroup Attitudes: External Explanations are not Inherently Prosocial." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 2009: 1632 -1645.

Ashmore R.D., Deaux, McLaughlin Volpe,. "An Organising Frame Work for Collective Identity: Articulation and Significance of Multidimensionality." *Psychological Bulletin* 1, no. 130 (2004): 80 - 114.

B, Barber. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

B, Highton. "Revisiting the Relationship Between Educational Attainment and Political Sophistication." (The Journal of Politics) 4, no. 71 (2009): 1564.

B, Simon. Identity in Modern Society: A Social Psychological Perspective. Malden: Blackwell, 2004.

B, Simon, Klandermans B. "Politicized Collective Identity: A Social Psychological Analysis." *American Psychologist* 56 (2001): 319-331.

Ball, Alan R. *Modern Politics and Government.* Palgrave: Macmillan, 2005.

Beer, Samuel, Ullam Adam. *Patterns of Government.* New York: Random House, 1958.

Begley T.M., Alker H. "Anti - Busing Protest: Attitudes and Actions." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 1982: 45, 187 - 197.

Bennet W.L, Segerberg. The Logic of Connective Action: Digital Media and the Personalization of Contentious Politics. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Bennet W.L., Iyengar S. "A New Era of Minimal Effects: The Changing Foundations of Political Communication." *Journal of Communication*, 2008: 707-731.

Bennet, Mancheim. The "big spin: Strategic Communication and the Transformation of Pluralist Democracy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Berger P, Luckmann T. The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge . Garden City New York: Doublday, 1966.

Beteille, Andre. *Concept of Tribe with Special Reference to India, in Indian Tribes and Mainstreme.* Edited by Chaudhury, Saumendra Mohan Sukant K. Jaipur: Rawat Publications, 2008.

Bettencourt B.A., Dorr, Charlton K,Hume D.L. "Status Differences and in - Group Bias: A Meta Anylitical Examination of Status Stability, Status

legitimacyand Group Permeablity." *Psychological Bulletin* 4, no. 127 (2001): 520 - 542.

BlumlerJ.G, Gurevitch M. *The Crisis of Public Communication.* London: Koutledge, 1995.

Bobo L.D., Hutching V.L. "Perceptions of Racial Group Competition: Extending Blumer's Theort of Group Position to a Multiracial Context." *American Sociological Review*, no. 61 (1996): 951 - 972.

Brewer M.B., Caporael L.R. An Evolutinary Perspective on Social Identity: Revisiting Groups. New York: Psychology Press, 2006.

Butler, Stokes. "Political Change in Britain: Force Shaping Electoral Choice." *Midwest Journal of Political Science* (St. Martin's Press) 16 (1969).

C, Gould. Rething Democracy: Freedom and Social Cooperation in Politics, Economy and Society. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

C.G. Chann, G.H.Elder. "Famly Influences on the Social Participation of Youth: The Effects of Parental Social Involvement and Farming." *Rural Sociology* 66 (2001): 22-41.

C.H, Cooley. *Social Organization.* Transaction Publishers, 1956.

Campbell A, Converse P, Miller W. E, Stokes D.E. *The American Voter.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1960.

Campbell. *The American Voter.* New York: Yale University Press, 1960.

Campbell, Converse, Miller, Stokes. *The American Voter.* New York: Wiley, 1960.

Castano E. Yzerbyt V.Y, Bourguignon D. Seron E. "Who May Enter? the impact of in Group Identification on in Group/ out Group Categorization ." *Journal of Experiemental Psychology*, 2002: 315 - 322.

Chaio J.Y. Bowman N.E., Gill H. The Political Gender Gap: Gender Bias in Facial Inferences that Predict Voting Behavuor. Plosone, 2008.

Chakraborty, Satyabrata, ed. *Political Sociology.* New Delhi: Macmillan, 2005.

Chandra, Prakash. *Development of Indian Tribes.* New Delhi: Discovery Publishing House, 2006.

Chaudhury, Patnaik. *Indian Tribes and Mainstream.* New Delhi.

Citrin J., Wright M. "Defining the Circle of We: American Identity and Immigration Policy." 3, no. 7 (2009).

Clofstad. *Civic Talk Peers,Politics and the Future of Democracy.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011.

Converse. *The Concept of Normal Vote.* New York: Wiley, 1966.

D, Miller. *The Competitive Model of Democracy.* Edited by Duncan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

D, Sears. *Political Socialization* . Addison- Wesley: Handbook of Political Science , 1975.

D.E., Campbell. "Voice in the Classroom: How an Open Classroom Climate Fosters Political Engagementamong Adolescents." *Political Behavior*, 2008: 437- 454.

D.J, Schildkraut. *Americanism in the Twenty - First Century.* New york: Canbridge University Press, 2011.

D.J., Schildkraut. "The More Things Change... American Identity and Mass and Eliteresponses to 9/11." *Political Psychology* 3, no. 23 (2002): 511 - 535.

Dambrun M., Taylor D.M., McDonald D.M., Crush J. Meot A. "The Relative Deprivation - Gratification Continuum and the Attitudes of the South Africans Toward Immigrants: A Test of the V -Curve Hypothesis." *International Relations and Group Processes*, 2006: 1032 - 1044.

Danters B, Gabriel O, Torcal M. *Norms of Good Citizenship.* London: CQ Press, 2007.

Dasgupta, Samir, ed. *Political Sociology.* New Delhi: Pearson Publication, 2011.

Dasgupta, Samir, ed. *Political Sociology.* New Delhi: Pearson, 2011.

Dawes C.T., Flower J.T. "Partisanship, Voting, and the Dopamine." *Journal of Politics*, 2009.

Dawson, Prewitt K. *Political Socialization.* Boston: Little Brown, 1968.

De Dreu, C.K.W.,Greer, L.L.VanKleef, Shalvi, Handgraaf. "Oxytocin Promotes Human Ethnocentrism." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 2011, 1262 - 1266.

Desai. *Tribes in Transition,.* Edited by Romesh Thaper. Delhi: Macmillan, 1977.

Doshi, Jain. *Social Anthoropology.* New York: Rawat Publications, 2001.

Durkheim, Emile. *The Division of Labour in Society.* New York: The Free Press, 1977.

E, Theiss Morse. *Who Counts as an American: The Boundaries of Nationl Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

E, Theiss-Morse. Who Counts as an American: The Bounderies of National Identity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

E., Katz. *Nowhere to Go: Some Dilemmas of Delibrative Democracy.* Edited by Kenski K. Jamieson. England : Oxford University Press, 2015.

Easton, David. "The Theoretical Relevance of Political Socialization." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 1, no. 2 (1968): 125 - 146.

Ellemers N., Wilke H., Van Knippenberg A. "Effects of the Legitimacy of Low Group or Individual Status as Individual and Collective Status - Enhancing Strategies ." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1993: 766 - 778.

Elwin, Verrier. *A Philosophy of NEFA.* Shillong: Government of Assam, 1957.

The Baiga. Delhi: Gian Publishing House, 1986.

Esser, Stronmback. Mediatization of Politics: Understanding the Transformation of Western Democracies. England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

F, Greenstein. *Children and Politics.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.

F., Greenstein. *Children and Politics* . New Haven : Yale University Press, 1965.

Falomir - Pichaster J.M. Gabarrot F., Mugny G. "Group Motives in Threatning Contexts: When Loyalty Conflict Paradoxically Reduces the Influence of an Antidiscrimination Ingroup Norm ." *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 2009: 196 - 206.

Fieldhouse, Cutts. "The Companion Effect: Household and Local Context and the Turnout of Young People." *The Journal of Politics* 74, no. 3 (2012).

Fowler J.H., Kam C.D. "Beyond the Self: Social Identity, Altruism, and Political Participation." *Journal of Politics*, 2008: 813 - 827.

G, Sartory. *The Theory of Democracy Revisited.* London: Chatham House, 1987.

G., Duveen. "Representations, Identities, Resistence." (Blackwell) 2001.

G.A. Almond, J.S. Coleman. *The Politics of the Developing Areas.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960.

G.L., Cohen. "Party over Policy: The Dominating Impact of Group Influence on Political Beliefs." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* , 2003: 85, 808 - 822.

Gabriel A, A, G.B. Powell. *Comparative Politics Today: A Word View.* London: ScottForesman & Company, 1987.

Gay, C. "Seeing Difference; The Effect of Economic Disparity on Black Attitudes Toward Latinos." *American Journal of Political Science*, no. 50 (2006): 982 - 997.

Ghurye, G.S. *The Scheduled Tribes.* Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1995.

Godelier, Maurice. *Perspectives on Marxist Anthropology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Green D, Palmquist B, Schickler E. *Partisan Hearts and Mind: Political Parties and the Social Identitiesof Voters.* New Haven, london: Yale University Press, 2002.

Green D.P. Palmquist B., Schickler E.,. Partisan Hearts and Minds: Political Parties and the Social Identities of Voters. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

Green D.P., Palmquist B., Schickler E. Partisan Heart and Mnds: Political Parties and the Social Identities of Voters. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

Greenstein. *Children and Politics.* New haven: Yale University Press, 1965.

H, Blumer. "Race and Prejudice as a Sense of Group Positon." *Pacific Sociological Review* 1 (1958): 3-7.

H, Blumer. "Race and Prejudiceas a Sense of Group Position." *Pacific Sociological Review*, 1958: 3-7.

H, Tajfel. *Human Groups and Social Categories.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

H, Tingsten. *Political Behavior.* London: King, 1937.

H., Tajfel. *Human Groups and Social Categories.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

H.H, Hyman. Political Socialization; A Study in the Psychology of Political Behavior. Glencoe: Free Press, 1959.

H.H., Hyman. Political Socialization: A Study in the Psychologyof Political Behavior. Glencoe iii: Free Press, 1959.

Halevy N, Bornstein, Sagiv. "In Group Love and out Group Hate as Motives for Individual Participation in Intergroup Conflict." *Psychological Science*, 2008: 405 - 411.

Hallin, Mancini. *Comparing Media System: Three Models of Media and Politics.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Hansaria. *Sixth Schedule to the Constitution.* New Delhi: Universal Law Publishing, 2005.

Hazarika, Sanjoy. Comments on Draft National Policy on Tribes. New Delhi: MSS, 2004.

Hess, David Easton Robert D. "The Child's Political World." *Midwest Journal of Political Science* 6, no. 3 (1962): 229 - 246.

Hogg M.A, Hains S.C. "Friendship and Group Identification: A new Look at the Role of Cohesiveness in Group Think." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 28 (1996): 323-341.

Hogg M.A, Hardie, E.A, Reynolds K.J. "Prototypical Similarity, Self Categorization, Depersonalized Attraction: A Perspective on Group Cohesiveness." *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1995: 159-177.

Hogg M.A., Reid S.A. "Social Identity, Self- Categorization, and the Communication of Group Norms." *Communication Theory*, 2006: 7 - 30.

Huddy L, Khatib N. "American Patriotism, National Identity, and Political Involvement." *American Journal of Political Science*, 2007: 63-77.

Huntington S.P. *Political Order in Changing Societies.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.

Huntington S.P, Dominguez. *Political Development (in Handbook of Political Science).* Vol. 3. Wesely: Addison, 1975.

J, Dennis. "Major Problems of Political Science Research." *Midwest Journal of Political Science*, 1968: 85 - 114.

J, Elster. *Introduction in Deliberative Democracy.* Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1998.

J, Fearson, ed. *Deliberation as Discussion.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

J, Kean. *Democracy and Media Decadence.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

J, Mansbridge. "Normative Theory and Voice and Equality." *American Political Science Review* 2, no. 91 (1997): 423 - 425.

J, Nagel. *Participation.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1987.

J, Schumpeter. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy.* London: Allen and Unwin, 1942.

J.E., Camrron. "A Three Factor Model of Social Identity." *Self and Identity* 3 (2004): 239 - 262.

J.E., Transue. "Identity Salience, Identity Acceptance, and Racial Policy Attitudes: American National Identity As a Uniting Force." *Americal Journal of Political Science*, 2007: 78 - 91.

J.L., Gibson. "Group Identities and Theories of Justice: An Experimental Investigation into the Justice and Injustice of Land Squatting in South Africa." *Journal of Politics*, 2008: 700 -716.

J.R., Harris. "Where is the Child's Environmen? A Group Socialization Theory of Development." *Psychological Review* 3 (1995): 458.

Jack, Dennis, ed. *Socialization to Politics: A Reader.* New York: John Wiley, 1979.

Jaspers, Lubbers, De Graaf. "Measuring Once Twice: An Evolution of Recalling Attitudes in Survey Research." *Europian Sociological Review* 25.

Jennings, Niemi. "The Transmission of Political Values from Parent to Child." *The American Political Science Review* 1, no. 62 (1968): 169-184.

Jennings, Niemi,. *The Transmission of Political Values from Parent to Child.* The American Political Science Review, 1968.

Junn J, Masuoka N. "Asian American Idntity: Shared Racial Status and Political Context." *Perspectives on Politics*, 2008: 729-740.

K., Deaux. "Reconstructing Social Identity." *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin* 19 (1993): 4 - 12.

K.P, Langton. *Political Socialization.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Kapur, Anup Chand. *Principals of Political Science.* New Delhi: S. Chand and Company, 2009.

Katz E. Ali C, . Kim J. Echoes of Gabriel Tarde: What We Know Better or Differently 100 Years Later . Los Angels : Annenberg Press, 2014.

Kinder D.R. Adams, G.S.,Gronke P.W. "Economics and Politics in the 1984 American Presidential Election." *American Journal of Political Science*, 1986: 33, 491 - 515.

L, Kohlberg. The Philosophy of Moral Development: Moral Stages and the Idea of Justice. San Francisco: Harperand Row, 1981.

L, Pfesch B. Adam S. Bennet W. "The Critical Linkage Between Online and Offline Media: An Approach to Researching the Conditions of Issue Spill - Over -." *The Public*, 2013: 9-12.

L., Guimond S. Dube - Simard. "Relative Deprivation Theory and the Quebec Nationalist Movement: The Cognition - Emotion Distinction and the Personal Group Deprivation Issue." *Jopurnal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1983: 44, 526 - 535.

L., Huddy. "Context and Meaning in Social Identity: A Response to Oakes." *Political Psychology*, 2002: 825-834.

L., Huddy. "From Social to Political Identity: A Critical Examination of Social Identity Theory." *Political Psychology*, no. 22 (2001): 127 - 156.

L., Mason. "The Rise of Universal Agreement: Issue Verses Behavioural Polarization in the American Electorate." *American Behavioural Scientist*, no. 57 (2012): 140 - 158.

L.D., Bobo. "White Opposition to Busing:Symbolic Racism or Realistic Group Conflict?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, no. 45 (1983): 1196 - 1210.

L.M, Bartels. "Beyond the Running Tally: Partisan Bias in Political Perception ." *Political Behavior*, 2002: 117 - 150.

L.R., Brewer M.B. Caporael. An Evolutionary Perspective on Social Identity: Revisiting Groups. New York: Psychology Press, 2006.

Lesthaeghe, Moors. Life Course Transition and Value Orientations: Selection and Adaption. Brussels: Vrije Universiteit Brussel, 2001.

Lewis G.J., Bates T.C. "Genetic Evidence for Multiple Biological Mechanisms Underlying in - Group Favouratism." *Psychological Science* (Ps) 11, no. 21 (2010): 1623 - 1628.

Lowery B.S., Unzueta M.M., Knowles E.D., Goff P.A. "Concern for the Ingroup and Opposition to Affirmative Action." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 6, no. 90 (2006): 961 - 974.

Lucian Pye, Sidney Verba, ed. *Political Culture and Political Development.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Luhtanen R., Crocker J. "A Collective Self - Esteem Scale: Self Evaluation of one's Social Identity." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, no. 18 (1992): 302 - 318.

M. Hooghe, D. Stolle. "Life - Cycle and Cohort Differences in the Socialization Effect of Voluntary Participation." *Europian Political Science* 2, no. 3 (2003): 49-56.

M., Billing. "Rhetorical Psychology, Ideological Thinking, and Imagining Nationhood." Edited by Klaqndermans H. Johnston. (University of Minnesota Press) 1995.

M., Levendusky. The Partisan Sort: How Liberals Became Democrates and Conservatives Became Republicans. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.

M., Simon B.Kulla C.Zobel. "On Being more than just a Part of the Whole: Regional Identity and Social Distinctiveness ." *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1995: 325 - 340.

M.A, Hogg. Intragroup Processes, Group Structure and Social Identity. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

M.B, Brewer. "The Importance of Being We: Human Nature and Intergroup Relations." (American Psychologist) 2007: 728 -738.

Mair, Lucy. *An Introduction to Social Anthropology.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Malka A., Lelkes Y. "More than Ideology: Conservative Liberal Identity and Receptivity to Political Cues." *Social Justice Research*, 2010: 156 - 158.

Malka A., Lelkes Y. "More than Ideology: Conservative - Libera Identity and Reseptivity to Political Cues." *Social Justice Research*, 2010: 156 - 188.

Marshal. Tribesman Foundations of Modern Anthropology Series. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1968.

Martikainen P, Martikaine T, Wass H. "The Effect of Socioceonomic Factors on Voter Turnout in Finland." *European Journal of Political Research* 44 (2005): 41-56.

Mazzoleni G, Stewart J, Horsfield B, ed. *The Media and Neo- Populism: A Contemporary Comparative Analysis.* Westport: Praeger, 2003.

McFarland, Thomas R.J. "Bowling Young: How Youth Voluntary Associations Influence Adult Political Participation." *American Sociological Review* 71 (2006): 401 - 425.

Miller A.H, Gurin P., Gurin G, Malanchuk O. "Group Consciousness and Political Participation." *American Journal of Political Science*, 1981: 494-511.

Morgan, Lewis H. *Ancient Society.* Chicago: Charles H. Kerr and Company, 1877.

Morton R, Davies, Vaughan A. Lewis. *Models of Political System.* Delhi: Vikas, 1971.

N., Huddy L. Khatib. "American Patriotism, National Identity, and Political Involvement." *American Journal of Political Science* 1, no. 51 (2007): 63 - 77.

Nagla, B.K., ed. *Political Sociology.* New Delhi: Rawat Publications, 1999.

Nehru, Jawaharlal. In his Forword to Second Edition of Verrier Elwin . *A Philosophy for NEFA.* Government Press, 1958.

Nemi, Hepburn. The Rebirth of Political Socialization. Perspectives on Political Science. Vol. 1. 1995.

Niemi R, G, Junn. *Civic Education: What Makes Students Learn.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Niemi, Hepburn. The Reburth of Political Socialization.Perspectives of Political Science. 1995.

Niemi, Jennings. "Issues and Inheritance in the Formation of Party Identification." *American Journal of Political Science* 35, no. 4 (1991): 970 - 988.

P, Bourdieu. *Pascalian Meditation.* Stanford Calif: Stanford University Press, 2000.

P, Norris. *Democratic Phoenix: Reinvesting Political Activism.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Paluck E.L, Green D. "Difference, Dissent and Dispute Resolution: An Experimental Intervention Using Mass Meadia to Change Norms and Behaviou in Rwanda." *American Political Science Review*, 2009.

Parry G., Moyser G. *Political Participation and Democracy in Britain.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Perloff, Richard M. Political Communication: Media and Politics in a Digital Age. New York, 2014.

Pfetsch, Esser. *Comparing Political Communication.* New York: Routledge, 2004.

Phalet K, Baysu G,Verkuyten M. "Political Mobilization of Dutch Muslims: Religious Identity Salience, Goal Framing and Normative Constrains ." *Journal of Social Issues*, 2010: 759-777.

Piaget.J. *The Origins of Intellegence in Children .* New York: International Universities Press, 1975.

Plutzer. "Becoming a Habitual Voter: Inertia, Resources and growth in Young Adulthood." *American Political Science Review* 96, no. 1 (2002): 41 - 56.

Pratto F, Glasford D.E. "Ethnocentrism and the Value of Human Life." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2008: 1411 - 1428.

Putnam, Robert. Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000.

Pye, Lucian. *Aspects of Political Development.* Boston: Little Brown & Co, 1966.

R, Dalton. The good Citizen: How a Younger Generation is Reshaping American Politics. Washington DC: CQ Press, 2008.

R, Dawson. *Political Socialization.* Bobbs Merril, 1966.

R., Brown. *Prejudice: Its Social Psychology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

R., Tripathi R.C. Srivastava. "Relative Deprivation and Intergroup Attitudes." *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1981: 11, 313 - 318.

R.B., Alan. *Modern Politics and Government.* London: The Macmillan Press, 1993.

R.C.Agarwal. *Political Theory.* New Delhi: S.Chand and Company, 2009.

R.Dahl. *A Preface to Democratic Theory.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Ramaswamy, Sushila. Political Theory: Ideas and Concepts . New Delhi, 2008.

Reicher S., Hopkins N. Self and Nation: Categorization, Contestation, and Mobilization. London: Sage, 2001.

Robert A. Dahl, Bruce Stinebrick. *Modern Political Analysis.* New Delhi: PHI Learning, 2010.

Roccas S., Brewer M.B.,. "Social Identity Complicity." *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2002: 88 - 106.

Rosenstone S.J., Hansen J.M. *Mobilization, Participation and Democracy in America.* New York: Longman, 2003.

S, Chambers. Reasonable Democracy: Jurgen Habermas and the Politics of Discourse. New York: Cornell University Press, 1996.

S, Kernell. Going Public: New Strategies of Presidential Leadreship . Washington DC: CQ Press, 1977.

S., Green. "Understanding Party Idntification: A Social Ideology Approach." *Political Psychology*, 1999: 393-403.

S., Reacher. "The Context of Social Identity: Domination, Resistence, and Change." *Social Psychology*, 6, no. 25 (2004): 921 -945.

S.A., Hogg M.A.Reid. "Social Identity, Self Categorization, and the Communication of Group norms." *Communication Theory*, 2006: 7 - 30.

S.A.Palekar. *Political Sociology.* Delhi: Mangalam, 2010.

S.L. Doshi, P.C. Jain. *Social Anthropology* . Jaipur: Rawat Publications, 2001.

S.N, Eisentadt. *The Political Systems of Empires,.* New York: Free Press of Glencose, 1962.

S.S. Ralhan, S.R. Lambat. *Political Sociology.* Nwe Delhi: Common Wealth, 2006.

S.S. Ralhan, S.R. Lasbat. *Political Sociology.* Delhi: Commonwealth, 2006.

Scheepers D., Ellemers N. "When the Pressure is up: The Assesment of Social Identity Threat in Low and High Status Groups ." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 2005: 41, 192 - 200.

Schmid K., Tausch N.,Hewstone M., Hughes J.,Cairns E. "The Efects of Living in Segregated vs. Mixed Areas in Northern Ireland: A Simultaneous Analysis of Contact and Threat Effects in the Context of Micro - Level Neighbourhoods." *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 2 (2008): 56 - 71.

Schmid. "The Value Social Responsibility as a Motivating Factorfor Adolescence Readiness to Participate in Differebt Types of Political Actions and its Socialization in Parent and Peer Contexts." *Journal of Adolescence* 35 (2012).

Sears. *Political Socialization.* Addiison: Wesley, 1975.

Shamir M, Arian A. "Collective Identity and Electrol Competition in Israel." *American Political Science Review*, no. 93 (1999): 265-277.

Shields T.G., Goidel R.K. "Participation Rates, Socioeconomic Class Biases,and Congressional Elections: A Cross Validation." *American Journal of Political Science* 2, no. 41 (1997): 684-691.

Sidanius J., Levin S.,Van Laar, Sears D. O. The Diversity Challenge: Social Identity and Intergroup Relations on the College Campus . New York: Russell Sage, 2008.

Sidanius, Patto. Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theort of Social Hierchy and Social Oppression. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Sills, david L. *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences.* Vol. 16. New York: MacMillan and Free Press, 1976.

Simon B, Klandermans. "Political Collective Identity: A Social Psychological Analysis." *Americn Psychologist*, no. 56 (2001): 319 - 331.

Simon B., Grabow O. "The Politization of Migrants: Further Evidence that Politizised Collective Identity is a Dual Identity." *Political Psychology* 5, no. 31 (2010): 717 - 738.

Simon B., Kulla C., Zobel m., 1995. "On Being more than just a Part of the Whole: Regional Identity and Social Distinctiveness ." *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1995: 325 - 340.

Singer J, Willett J. Applied Longitudinal Data Analysis: Modeling Change and Event Occurance. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Sniderman P., Hagendoorn L., Prior M. "Predisposition Factors and Situational Triggers: Exclusionary Reactions to Immigrant Minorities." *American Political Science Review*, 2004: 35 - 49.

Sniderman P., Hagendoorn L., Prior M. "Predispositional Factors and Situational Triggers: Exclusionary Reactions to Immigrant Minorities." *American Political Science Review* 1, no. 98 (2004): 35- 49.

Stephan W.G., Stephan C.W. *An Integrated Threat Theory of Intergroup Behavior.* Chicago: Nelson Hall, 2000.

Struch N., Schwartz S.H. "Intergroup Aggression: Its Predictors and Distinctness from in Group Bias." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1989: 56, 364 - 373.

T.H., Erikson. Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspective. Boulder : Pluto Press, 1993.

Tajfel H., Turner. An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict. In The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations. Edited by Worchel W.G. Austin. 1979.

Tausch N., Hewstone M., Kenworthy J., Cairns E., Christ O. "Cross - Community Contact, Perceived Status Differences, and Intergroup Attitudes in Northern Ireland: The Mediating Roles of Individual level Versus Group - lLevel Threats and the Moderating Role of Social Identification." *Political Psychology*, 2007: 53 - 68.

Tedin. The Influence of Parents on the Political Attitudes of Adolescents . The American Political Science Review , 1974.

Terry D.J, Hogg M.A. "Group norms and Attitude- Behaviour Relationship: A Role for Group iIdentification." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 1996: 776-793.

Thompson, Ellis, Wildavsky. *Cultural Theory.* Boulder: Westview, 1990.

Tilley C, Tarrow S. *Contentious Politic* . England and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Torgler B., Schneider F. "What Shapes Attitudes Towardpaying Taxes? Evidence from Multicultural European Countries." *Social Science Quarterly*, 2007: 443 - 470.

Torgler B., Schneider F. "What Shapes Attitudes Toward Paying Taxes? Evidence Frommulticultural European Countries." *Social Science Quarterly*, 2007: 443 -470.

Torney, Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, Schulz. Citizenship and Education in Twenty Eight Countries: Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age Fourteen. Amsterdam: IEA, 2001.

Turner J.C, Hogg M.A, Oakes P.J, Reicher S.D, Wetherell M.S. *Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self Categorization Theory.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987.

Turow J., Tuci L. *Contentious Politics* . New York : Oxford University Press, 2008.

Tyler T.R., Blader S.L. Cooperation in Groups Procedural Justice, Social Identity and Behavioural Engagement. Philadelphia: Psychology press, 2000.

Urmila Sharma, S.K.Sharma. *Principals and Theory of Political Science.* Vol. 2. Delhi: Atalantic Publishers, 2000.

Van Bavel J.J., Packer D.J, Cunningham W.A. "The Neural Substrates of Ingroup Bias." *Psychological Science*, 2008: 1131 - 1139.

Vanneman R.D., Pettigrew T.F. "Race and Relative Deprivation in the Urban United States ." *Race*, 1972: 461 - 486.

Verba S, Nie N. Participation in America Political Democracy and Equality. New York: Harper & Co, 1972.

Verba S, Schlozman K.L, Brady H. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics* . Cambridge: Hardward University Press, 1995.

Verba S., Schlozman, Burns, Zuckerman. *Family Ties: Understanding the Intergenerational Transmission of Participation.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2003.

Verba, Schlozman, Brady,. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.

W, Riker. Liberalism against Populism: A Confrontation between the Theory of Democracy and the Theory of Social Choice. New York: Waveland Press, 1982.

W, Schulf. *Mediatization and New Media.* Edited by Stromback Esser. England: Palgrave, 2014.

W.L, Bennet. "Towards a Theory of Press - State Relations in the United States." *Journal of Communication*, 1990: 103 - 125.

Wolfinger R.E, Rosenstone S. *Who Votes?* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.

Y. Bhatti, K.M.Hansen. "Leaving the Nest and the Social Act of Voting:Turnout among First- Time Voters." *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 22 (2012): 380-406.

Yates M, Youniss J. Roots of Civic Identity: International Perspectives on Community Service and Activism in Youth. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Zaller. The Rule of Product Substitution in Presidential Campaign News. England: Westview Press, 2001.