CHAPTER III

MEASURING MODERN POLITICAL CULTURE

The broad purpose of this study, which may be recalled briefly, is to compare and differentiate between the political cultures of elite and mass groups emerged, as they do, in the post independence development of India. Political culture has been conceptualised in terms of some attitudes, beliefs and value orientations towards elements of the political system prevailing in India. Taking clue from the available literature (e.g. Almond and Verba, 1963; Elazar, 1970; and Jones, 1974) the study starts with the assumption that modernity distinguishes elite political culture from its mass counterpart. Thus, the modernisation of political culture is the key variable which has been introduced in relevance to the purpose of this study. The themes and sub themes of modern political culture has been culled out of the current literature both theoretical and empirical.

The present study is not only concerned with the modernisation of political culture. It is also the central concern of this study to show how far the dependent variable of political culture when conceived of in the form of modern attitudes, values and orientations of the sample
groups, can be explained in terms of a battery of independent variables described in the previous chapter. To achieve this research goal there is need to develop a dependable and reliable measure of modernisation of political culture which could lend itself to the proposed analysis in the study. The present chapter is an attempt of it.

Having delineated and described the independent variables and their measurement in the previous chapter, it would be in order to now turn to the dependent variable of the measurement of political culture, what follows in this chapter.

Various Scales and Their Applicability:

Several attempts have been made in the recent years for the development of measures of the modernisation of political culture in different countries (Almond and Verba, 1963; P.B. Mayer, 1973; Barnes and Sani, 1974; Charles A. Johnson, 1976; Robert Presthus, 1977 et al.).

Besides, there are some modernity scales, Smith and Inkeles, 1966; Doob, 1967; Dawson, 1967; Kahl, 1968; Stephenson 1969; Schnaiberg, 1970; Armer and Youtz, 1971, et. al. which may not have precisely been developed for the
modernisation of political situation but have some common inter-related, components, such as, change-proneness, a sense of personal efficacy and planning, achievistic orientation, and several others regarding the sampling of items and their contents, and measurement procedures, which all have direct bearing on measuring the modernisation of political culture.

There are a few studies which are concerned with the measure of modernity of political culture. These authors have tried to construct the scale so that modern political culture can be differentiated from non-modern political culture. Different levels of development provide the basis for such demarcation. Study of Almond and Verba (1963) is the pioneering work in this direction. They constructed the scale to compare the political culture of USA, UK, Italy, Mexico and Germany. P.B. Mayer (1973) compared the modern political culture of Tiruchirapalli with political culture of Jabalpur in India. Barnes and Sani (1974) studied the political culture of Italy. On comparison they found that Mediterranean culture area can be distinguished by certain particular traditional attitudes and behaviours. Charles A. Johnson (1976) studied the political culture of American States. He examined the Elazar's (1970) formulations who identified
the three predominant cultures in the United States. Robert Presthus (1977) interviewed the federal and provincial legislators, and measurement was made to compare the Canadian political culture with the more liberal political culture of United States. Jesus & Benitez (1970) in their study of Philippine, developed the scale to measure the patterns of distribution of the political culture among the identifiable sectors of the society. Bun-Woong (1977) and Hong-Koo, Lee (1978) have tried to measure the political culture in Korean society. They have selected the elite and low income residents of Korea as sample. Simeon & Elkins (1974) and John Wilson (1974) concentrated on the regional political cultures of Canada.

These scales developed for the measurement of the modernity of political culture contain some common themes or sub-themes.

Mention can be made of these common themes, such as, people's awareness of the political system, feelings toward government and politics, patterns of partisanship, obligation to political participation, sense of civic competence, organisational membership, political socialization, political rationality, expectations of treatment at the hands of government officials, government activities, innovative activity, openness of the political system,
political efficacy, political alienation, political activism, attitude toward public and private ends, political trust etc.

Undoubtedly these scales provide for confidence and insights, particularly in terms of contents and methodological procedures to any researcher for constructing a measure of political culture, specifically suitable for his purpose of research, yet it must be hardly emphasized that no single scale has been lifted in total to be replicated in the present research situation. Rather, a new whole scale was constructed by this researcher for good reasons given as under.

Simeon and Elkins (1979) mentioned four problems which confront a researcher when he tries to measure the concept of political culture. First, it is difficult to set free the concept from structural and psychological variables; second, it is an abstract concept, which can not be directly seen, heard or touched; third, for most of the members of a society, culture is unconscious, inexplicable and it can not be inferred directly from the conscious responses of the people; and fourth, culture is the collective attribute of a people but only an aggregate of peoples response can not describe it. They further mention that culture in a real sense is psychological. People
express it and manifest it without being aware of it. During the rapid change political culture can be identified easily but in a daily routine it is difficult to be identified by a member in his own society.

This leads to another problem of measurement of political culture. The problem of equivalence of meaning. Some authors, such as, Almond and Verba (1963), Moshe M. Czudnowski (1968), Walter A. Rosenbaum (1975), to mention a few of them, have given serious consideration to it. Their contention is that any study of political culture involves comparison between the orientations of social groups toward specific political objects. During the comparison meaning of things shift from group to group. Which meaning is equivalent to which is difficult to identify in this inter group shifting.

The issue of validity poses another problem in relation to the scaling of cultural dimensions. The measurement of a feeling, attitude or behavior—whether a question, a set of questions, or some other indicator may be called valid if it measures what it purports to measure (Abraham Kaplan, 1964). An estimate of one’s political information is valid when it probes this and not one’s political interest. For an investigator, the question is, "Am I measuring what I think I am measuring". (Rosenbaum,
The problem gets further compounded when seen in the context of inter-group shifting of the meaning of culture.

The problem of reliability of a scale meant to measure political culture is one which needs to be taken care of. A scale is considered reliable when it yields similar results under similar conditions. More accurately, "If we measure the same set of objects again and again with the same or comparable measuring instruments, will we get the same or similar results" (Rosenbaum, 1975).

After discussing all these problems one can say that-

(i) Attitude scales are not generalisable beyond the group for which they were constructed. That is to say, the reliability, once determined, does not remain constant across groups or cultural contexts, and,

(ii) Items in the constructed scale are 'scalable' only in the context chosen for the purpose of research. But when context changes, they become unscalable.

Due to these good reasons, a bold decision was taken in the present study to formulate its own measure of the modernity of political culture, after subjecting it to the requisite tests of scalability of the characteristic of
culture defined as modern political culture, its validity and reliability. For this purpose it had to lay down three criteria for its guidance: (i) The measure had to be based on a sound definition of modernity of political culture (ii) It should have reflected the socio-cultural attributes of the elite-mass groups in rural-urban context (iii) It should yield results comparable to the findings of existing researches in the field. Therefore it was decided to formulate an operational concept of modern political culture, reflecting the socio-cultural and psychological characteristics of the sample groups in the region and compare the results with the findings of some recent researches in this field.

CONSTRUCTING THE MODERN POLITICAL CULTURE SCALE:

While constructing a scale the very first thing one should be clear about is its contents i.e. the things or characteristic which are to be measured. The question is of how objectively, reliably, and validly the scale performs and which, of course need to be looked into rigorously by the researcher. This research had set out, as the first chapter would bear out, in search of operational concept of modern political culture. A sizable literature, both theoretical and empirical was scanned to delineate
certain themes or sub-themes to comprise the concept of modern political culture. This over, the problem was now to select items or questions bearing on the selected themes and sub-themes so as to be able to put the whole concept on same scale. In what follows are given these themes and the relevant items even at the cost of some repetition.

Basic Components of Modern Political Culture:

To measure the modernity of political culture five major themes were selected. At the time of selection it was sincerely taken in to consideration that the themes must suit to the cultural context of the area of study. These themes, as stated previously are (i) Trust or Identification with Fellow Citizens (ii) Equality or Absence of Arbitrary Distinctions of Status (iii) Liberty (iv) Loyalty and Commitment (v) Activist and Achievement Orientation. These broad themes were deemed to describe the general qualities of a person who possesses modern political culture and for each theme some indicators are constituted or themes were to be selected. The total items for the five dimensions are twenty seven. Operational definitions of these dimensions, as stated earlier too, are again spelt out as below.

Trust Or Identification:

This includes two types of identification (a) Vertical form of identification - In this form people
express their trust & sense of attachment with some superordinate political units. It may be the political parties, public representatives, Judiciary, Legislative or other superordinate units. (b) Horizontal identification - is concerned with the sense of integration, individuals have with the other people who inhabit the same political system. It is another thing that they may belong to different caste, creed, religion, regional belongings.

Political trust in the present study is a feeling, an openness, cooperation or a tolerant attitude in working with others in civic life, more particularly, political trust expresses the intensity of a person's conviction that other or groups mean him well in political life (Rosenbaum, 1975).

Equality:

Indicates that every body is equal irrespective of parochial or primordial issues, such as birth, religion, region, or language and that status is to be awarded in accordance with performance and achievement rather than whim or ascription.

Liberty:

In true sense liberty implies a universal love or dignity of the individual or his personality. It refers to a positive attitude of tolerance of variations in thinking
and acting. It enables a person to acknowledge the difference of political opinion, open political discussion and participation in different campaigns—all resulting in pluralism. It may be the feeling of freedom to communicate to others on political questions, cooperation between the members of opposite political parties etc.

Loyalty and Commitment:

Refers to a deep or unambiguous sense of identification with a unit or units of which an individual consider himself a member. Modern orientation in this respect represents a trend from parochial loyalties or particularistic norms to universalistic norms. The cases like, the public welfare, consideration of deserving issues or obedience to law come near to the loyalty and commitment.

Activist and Achievement Orientation:

It stresses the expectations among the people of a political system that the activities of the government must produce changes in the society or the lives of its members. Although such changes put a heavy weight of demands on the political process.
Selection of these themes is based on the assumption that modernity is an integrated whole rather than a mere aggregate of discrete elements. This form of conceptualization serves not only one of the research objectives for the present study but also helped the research to create a composite measure of modern political culture that combined the measures of all the selected characteristics of modernity. The objectives of this study demanded both a composite index of modernity of political culture as well as various indices of the component themes of modern political culture.

Framing the Items:

After selecting the theme - components of modernity scales, a long list of questionnaire items was prepared. The questionnaire items, either created by this investigator or borrowed from the available literature in direct or modified forms to measure each of the five dimensions, were largely of the fixed alternative type, including some multiple choice type as well as of agree/disagree format too. Those items which were vague in meaning, difficult in communicability and diffused in variable - relatedness, were eliminated by rigorous pretesting. After the preliminary elimination, and being tested by a pilot survey, 27 interview items were, finally,
selected. The sorting out of items in to themes was done by researcher himself on the basis of theoretical rationale and past researches as cited above. By this way, 27 items were distributed in to 5 dimensions to provide a summary measure of the cultural modernity of elite - mass groups as it is shown in the table given below.

Table 4

Major Dimensions with Number of items combined to Measure the Modernity of Political Culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Trust or Identification with Fellow citizens</td>
<td>TIF</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Equality</td>
<td>EQL</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Liberty</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Loyalty &amp; Commitment</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Political Activist &amp; Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: - For full view of the scale items kindly see the questionnaire in appendix A.
After preparing the questions, it was necessary to determine as to which responses were to be codified as modern and which ones as 'non-modern' (or traditional). In the list of dichotomised questions, it was easy to discriminate the two ends of dichotomy as 'modern' or 'traditional' as per our model of cultural modernity. It is ensured that the alternative responses to each item constituted a continuum, one end of which represented modernity and the other traditionality. The questions with two fixed alternative answers yielded simple dichotomisation. But, this could not be said about the questions having three or more alternative answers. Hence, it was decided to determine the "cutting points" which dichotomised the answers to each of these questions into modern and traditional categories. Medians of the frequency distribution to these questions were taken as their cutting points after taking a clue from Smith and Inkeles (1966) and Raghuvanshi (1984). This procedure gave us dichotomies of answers, one part of each being classified as 'modern' and the other as 'traditional'.

This list of coding has been given in Appendix B. Answers classified as 'traditional' and 'modern' were scored as 1 and 2 respectively.
The 'ones' and 'twos' scored by each respondent were first summed up and then averaged for each respondent by dividing the sum of each by the number of questions they answered. Therefore, the total score a respondent received by this procedure was the estimate of his/her cultural modernity based only on the number of questions they answered. When a respondent had not answered a particular question, the item was not considered in calculating their average score. By this method every respondent received an average score between 1.00 and 2.00. To have the equivalent score but ranging from 0 to 100, we multiplied the original average score in the range from 1.00 to 2.00 by 100 and then, subtracted 100. This method, as used by Smith and Inkeles (1966) and Raghuvanshi (1984) too, may be expressed as under:

An individual Score = Summation of scores on items \( \times \) 100 - 100

Number of items answered
### Table - 5

**Some Characteristics of Modern Political Culture Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y 1</th>
<th>Y 2</th>
<th>Y 3</th>
<th>Y 4</th>
<th>Y 5</th>
<th>Y 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust or Identification</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>36.73</td>
<td>71.25</td>
<td>60.12</td>
<td>51.50</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>53.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>38.68</td>
<td>67.07</td>
<td>51.29</td>
<td>42.40</td>
<td>44.63</td>
<td>54.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>23.32</td>
<td>27.85</td>
<td>29.07</td>
<td>28.33</td>
<td>26.62</td>
<td>19.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activist &amp; Achievement</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>7-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Items</td>
<td>(.63)</td>
<td>(.75)</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
<td>(.69)</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split half</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman - Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Validity and Reliability of the Scale:

One of the functional prerequisites of a valid and reliable scale is that it should effectively discriminate among individuals in the characteristics it has been purported to measure. It has already been shown that the scale described above did that. Within the limits of a maximum range from 0 to 100, the elite-mass respondents in the sample earned scores all the way from a low of 0 to a high of 100 points. The question before us now was, whether this scale discriminated among individuals with sufficient degrees of reliability and validity. Any scale which could do this is performing well.

Validity of the Scale:

The construction of research instrument must meet the criteria of validity and reliability. A measuring instrument is valid if it evokes genuine responses from respondents and measures what it is avowedly meant to measure, that is, if the differences in scores on it reflect true differences among individuals in the characteristic it seeks to measure. It is reliable if it yield consistent measures, that is, if its repeated use on the same respondents under identical conditions yields the same data.
Generally, the validity of a measuring instrument is established by various procedures depending upon various kinds of validity, namely, content, construct, empirical, concurrent validity etc. As for validity of the research tool of the present research, the following steps to establish the content validity of the instrument were taken.

(1) The items and components which were considered, most appropriate contents and indicators of the construct of modernity of political culture, have been framed in to the questionnaire.

(2) The operational terms of the quality of being modern in political perceptions and the content area to be measured, are defined very carefully.

(3) The conception of modernity of political culture is checked against a number of theoretical and empirical studies of modernity found that other scientists also mentioned the related basic dimensions and themes in one or other form.

(4) Majority of the respondents were familiar with the nature and purpose of the study before responses from them were elicited on any socio-psychological dimension of political culture.

(5) Each theme in the scale discriminates between those persons who are 'modern' and those who are not modern in their political perceptions. Steps mentioned above ensure, in our view, that our research instrument has sufficient validity for measuring cultural modernity.
Reliability of the Scale:

Reliability of the cultural modernity scale in this study has been tested by Internal Consistency Test further corrected by Spearman - Brown formula.

The internal consistency reliability is an estimate of the extent to which a scale is free from random variation among items. The approach to such an estimate is what is called coefficient of equivalence or split-half reliability. In this procedure all the even-numbered items in one half and all the odd numbered items in other half are placed. The correlation between the scores obtained on the two parts of a test is the estimate of the reliability of the test. Applying this method on 27 items of modern political culture scale, we got 74.0 as an index of split-half reliability. This procedure is based upon a correlation between the scores obtained on only half of the test. Therefore, the Spearman - Brown formula is used to determine the reliability of the entire test. By using this formula, the reliability index of our measurement tool came to be as high as 82.03.

Considering these points the measure of cultural modernity used in this study may be summarily characterised as follows :-
Due to the respondent's changed psychological and socio-culture background, no modernity scale available in the literature could be replicated in the present study. Therefore, it was decided to construct an specific cultural modernity scale which has yielded results comparable to the findings of past researchers, although these are very few and far between in this field and has reflected the socio-cultural and psychological characteristics of the sample.

As per the concept of modern political culture a culturally modern person is one, who has trust with the fellow citizens and super ordinate political units, observe equality and liberty in outlook, have loyalty and commitment with the nation and national laws and is politically active.

A composite index of cultural modernity has been constructed which has enabled the researcher to express each respondent's score on a scale from 0 to 100.

As a result of the theoretical consideration which guided the selection of themes and the face validity of items used in the scale, we have succeeded in constructing a research instrument, whose internal consistency reliability coefficient is 82.03 when calculated by the Spearman - Brown formula.
METHODS AND TECHNIQUES OF ANALYSIS

To achieve the research objectives and test the hypotheses, as spelt out in the previous chapter, there is need of research method which can utilise the data collected through survey research. To meet the requirements of the study comparative method is used which include two types of statistical analyses.

(A) Cross Tabular Analysis.

(B) Correlational Analysis.

Cross - Tabular Analysis:

The cross tabulation technique is used to examine and analyse the relationship between the nominal or ordinal categories of the independent variables and the ordinal categories of the cultural modernity scores. Multi cross-tabulation is also used for partialling the influence of supposedly extraneous variables when attention is to be focused on the real relation between any two variables. Standardization summarizes the specific classes of observations into a single measure by which we may test the validity of the relation between variables. The significance of relationship between the two cross-tabulated variables was tested in the following ways:
(i) Chi-square \((X^2)\) is not a measure of association but merely a technique to test the significance of association or independence between the variables (Guilford, 1965: 338-339). This technique was employed to test the significance of association between two variables using the formula of Mueller and Schuessler (1961:262). In the present study no measure of association among six nominal and ordinal variables was calculated because in terms of our null-hypotheses, the test of Zero association is all that was required.

(ii) To bring into sharp focus the relationship between composite index of political culture modernity and those of family SES and exposure variables, a device using deciles was employed. On the basis of a composite index, we devided the sample frequencies into deciles, ranging from those having the smallest score to those having the highest on the composite SES scale or, for that matter, the exposure scale. Having done this, respondents scoring high on cultural modernity scale were distributed by their family socio-economic status and exposure scores in deciles. This device has enabled us to ascertain the proportion of those in each decile who scored 'high' in each decile.
Correlational Analysis:

Various techniques of correlational analysis were used to measure the degree of association between quantified variables, both independent and dependent.

(i) The product – moment, correlation coefficient (Pearson's r) was utilised to determine the size and significance of correlation between two variables.

(ii) Z distribution was used to test the significance of difference between two independent correlation coefficients. First, the two r's were transformed into Fisher's Z coefficients and then Z ratio was calculated by dividing their differences by the standard error of that difference. For a two tailed test, Z ratios of 1.96 and 2.58 are considered to be significant at .05 and .01 levels respectively.

(iii) Correlation coefficient between two split-half scores of attitudinal modernity (one based on odd-numbered items and the other on even numbered items) computed for reliability test was corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula as stated by Guilford (1965:457).