

**DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH BENGAL**

**MASTER OF ARTS-POLITICAL SCIENCES
SEMESTER -III**

**COMPARATIVE POLITICS
CORE 302
BLOCK-1**

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH BENGAL

Postal Address:

The Registrar,

University of North Bengal,

Raja Rammohunpur,

P.O.-N.B.U., Dist-Darjeeling,

West Bengal, Pin-734013,

India.

Phone: (O) +91 0353-2776331/2699008

Fax: (0353) 2776313, 2699001

Email: regnbu@sancharnet.in ; regnbu@nbu.ac.in

Website: www.nbu.ac.in

First Published in 2019



All rights reserved. No Part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without permission in writing from University of North Bengal. Any person who does any unauthorised act in relation to this book may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

This book is meant for educational and learning purpose. The authors of the book has/have taken all reasonable care to ensure that the contents of the book do not violate any existing copyright or other intellectual property rights of any person in any manner whatsoever. In the even the Authors has/ have been unable to track any source and if any copyright has been inadvertently infringed, please notify the publisher in writing for corrective action

FOREWORD

The Self Learning Material (SLM) is written with the aim of providing simple and organized study content to all the learners. The SLMs are prepared on the framework of being mutually cohesive, internally consistent and structured as per the university's syllabi. It is a humble attempt to give glimpses of the various approaches and dimensions to the topic of study and to kindle the learner's interest to the subject

We have tried to put together information from various sources into this book that has been written in an engaging style with interesting and relevant examples. It introduces you to the insights of subject concepts and theories and presents them in a way that is easy to understand and comprehend.

We always believe in continuous improvement and would periodically update the content in the very interest of the learners. It may be added that despite enormous efforts and coordination, there is every possibility for some omission or inadequacy in few areas or topics, which would definitely be rectified in future.

We hope you enjoy learning from this book and the experience truly enrich your learning and help you to advance in your career and future endeavours.

COMPARATIVE POLITICS

BLOCK- 1

Unit 1: Comparative Methods and Approaches.....	6
Unit 2: COMPARATIVE METHOD AND STRATEGIES OF COMPARISON	31
Unit 3: formal: INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH	56
Unit 4: Political Systems and Structural Functional Approach.....	81
Unit 5: Culture-centric and Political Economy	114
Unit 6: New Institutionalism and Comparative methods; advantage and problems of comparison	147
Unit 7: development: Theories of Modernization	176

BLOCK -2

Unit 8: Underdevelopment and Dependency theory	
Unit 9: World System and Post Development	
Unit 10: State Forms: Federalisms	
Unit 11: Patterns of Democracy : Authoritarian and the Security State	
Unit 12: Comparative Party Systems	
Unit 13: Theories of Revolutions	
Unit 14: Comparative studies of SAARC countries	

BLOCK 1 : COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Introduction to the Block

Unit 1 deals with the nature of comparative politics i.e., what is it that gives comparative political analysis its specificity: its characteristics, elements, constituents, perspective, purpose aims, and the ideological structural/contextual framework within which these are realized.

Unit 2 deals with Comparison are a familiar exercise for all of us. Most decisions in our daily lives, whether buying fruits and vegetables from the vendor or choosing a book or an appropriate college and career, involve making comparisons

Unit 3 deals with divided into different sections which take up in some detail the above concerns. Each section is followed by questions based on the section. Towards the end of the unit is provided a list of readings which should be used to 'supplement this unit.

Unit 4 deals with one of the modern approaches regarding Comparative Government and Politics. It is the Systems Approach

Unit 5 deals with Comparative politics seeks to study relationship among countries. It seeks also to find explanations for specific social and political phenomenon in these relationships.

Unit 6 deals with divided into two main sectors which take up in some detail the above we outlined themes. Each section is followed by questions based on the section.

Unit 7 deals with theories of Modernisation inform us about how the various parts of the world developed into industrial powers. The approaches/theories that describe and analyse how and why this happened are the subject of the initial part of this unit.

UNIT 1: COMPARATIVE METHODS AND APPROACHES

STRUCTURE

- 1.0 Objectives
- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Comparative Study of Politics: Nature and Scope
 - 1.2.1 Comparisons: Identification of Relationships
 - 1.2.2 Comparative Politics and Comparative Government
- 1.3 Comparative Politics: A Historical Overview
 - 1.3.1 The Origins of Comparative Study of Politics
 - 1.3.2 The Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries
 - 1.3.3 The Second World War and After
 - 1.3.4 The 1970s and Challenges to Developmentalism
 - 1.3.5 The 1980s: The Return of State
 - 1.3.6 The Late Twentieth Century: Globalisation and Emerging Trends/Possibilities
- 1.4 Comparative Study of Politics: Utility
 - 1.4.1 Comparing for Theoretical Formulation
 - 1.4.2 Comparisons for Scientific Rigour
 - 1.4.3 Comparisons Leading to Explanations in Relationships
- 1.5 Let us sum up
- 1.6 Key Words
- 1.7 Questions for Review
- 1.8 Suggested readings and references
- 1.9 Answers to Check Your Progress

1.0 OBJECTIVES

In this unit we shall focus on the nature, scope and utility of a comparative study of politics. Through these you will be able to look for answers to questions like,

- (a) what is the nature of comparative politics i.e., what is it that gives comparative political analysis its specificity: its characteristics,

elements, constituents, perspective, purpose aims, and the ideological structural/contextual framework within which these are realized,

(b) what constitutes its scope i.e., the range, field, or area of activity that it encompasses and,

(c) its utility i.e., its usefulness and relevance for enhancing our understanding of political reality, or how does comparative study help us understand this reality better.

It should be pointed out, however, that these aspects cannot be studied in isolation of each other in a compartmentalized form. For a proper understanding of the nature, scope and utility of a comparative study of politics, one has to look at the latter's development historically and see how its attributes evolved with changing contexts and concerns. The unit is divided into different sectors which take up in some detail the above I outlined themes. Each section is followed by questions based on the section. Towards the end of the unit is provided a list of readings which can be used to supplement this unit. A set of questions follow the readings which will help you assess your understanding. All terms which have specific meanings in comparative political analysis have been explained in the section on keywords.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

As the term itself points out, comparative politics is about comparing political phenomena. The emphasis is on both the method of inquiry i.e., comparative, and the substance into which inquiry is directed i.e., political phenomena. As will be pointed out in Unit 2 Comparative Method and Methods of Comparison, the comparative method is not the sole prerogative of comparative politics, and is used with equal ease in other disciplines as well e.g., Psychology and Sociology. Approaches It is the substance of comparative politics i.e., its subject matter, vocabulary and perspective, which gives comparative politics its distinctiveness both as a method and as a Specific field of study. The

nature and scope of comparative politics has been determined historically by changes in the above mentioned features i.e., (a) subject matter (b) vocabulary and (c) political perspective. To understand where, why and how these changes took place we have to look at what is the focus of study at a particular historical period, what are the tools, languages or concepts being used for the study and what is the vantage point, perspective and purpose of enquiry. Thus in the sections which follow, we shall look at the manner in which comparative politics has evolved, the continuities and discontinuities which have informed this evolution, the way in which this evolution has been determined in and by the specific historical contexts and socio-economic and political forces, and how in the context of late twentieth century viz, globalisation, radical changes have been brought about in the manner in which the field of comparative politics has so far been envisaged.

1.2 COMPARATIVE STUDY OF POLITICS: NATURE AND SCOPE

We mentioned in the previous section that the comparative method is commonly used in other disciplines as well. We also know from the earlier section, that comparative politics is distinguished from other disciplines which also use the comparative method, by its specific subject matter, language and perspective. In that case, we might well ask the question, is there at all a distinct field of comparative political analysis or is it a sub-discipline subsumed within the larger discipline of Political Science. The three aspects of subject matter, language, vocabulary, and perspective, we must remember, are inadequate in establishing the distinctiveness of comparative politics within the broad discipline of Political Science, largely because comparative politics shares the subject matter and concerns of Political Science, i.e. democracy, constitutions, political parties, social movements etc. Within the discipline of Political Science thus the specificity of comparative political analysis is marked out by its conscious use of the comparative method to answer questions which might be of general interest to political scientists.

1.2.1 Comparisons: Identification of Relationships

This stress on the comparative method as defining the character and scope of comparative political analysis has been maintained by some scholars in order to dispel frequent misconceptions about comparative politics as involving the study of 'foreign countries' i.e., countries other than your own. Under such an understanding, if you were studying a country other than your own, (e.g., an American studying the politics of Brazil or an Indian studying that of Sri Lanka) you would be called a comparativist. More often than not, this misconception implies merely the gathering of information about individual countries with little or at the most implicit comparison involved. The distinctiveness of comparative politics, most comparativists would argue, lies in a conscious and systematic use of comparisons to study two or more countries with the purpose of ideating, and eventually explaining difference's or similarities between them with respect to the particular phenomena being analysed. For a long time comparative politics appeared merely to look for similarities and differences, and directed this towards classifying, dichotomizing or polarising political phenomena. Comparative political analysis is however, not simply about identifying similarities and differences. The purpose of using comparisons, it is felt by several scholars, is going beyond 'identifying similarities and differences' or the 'compare and contrast approach', to ultimately study political phenomena in a larger framework of relationships. This, it is felt, would help deepen our understanding and broaden the levels of answering and explaining political phenomena. (See Manoranjan Mohanty, 'Comparative Political Theory and Third World Sensitivity', *Teaching Politics*, Nos. 1 & 2, 1975).

1.2.2 Comparative Politics and Comparative Government

The often encountered notion that comparative politics involves a study of governments arises, asserts Ronald Chilcote, from 'conceptual

Notes

confusion'. Unlike comparative government whose field is limited to comparative study of governments, comparative politics is concerned with the study of all forms of political activity, governmental as well as nongovernmental. The field of comparative politics has an 'all encompassing' nature and comparative politics specialists tend to view it as the study of everything political. Any lesser collection of comparative politics would obscure the criteria for the selection and exclusion of what may be studied under this field. (Ronald Chilcote, Introduction, *Theories of Comparative Politics*, p.4) It may, however, be pointed out that for long comparative politics concerned itself with the study of governments and regime types, and confined itself to studying western countries. The process of decolonization especially in the wake of the Second World War, generated interest in the study of 'new nations'. The increase in numbers and diversity of unit cases that could be brought into the gamut of comparison, was accompanied also by the urge to formulate abstract universal models, which could explain political phenomena and processes in all the units. Simultaneous to the increase and diversification of cases to be studied was also an expansion in the sphere of politics so as to allow the examination of politics as a total system, including not merely the state and its institutions but also individuals, social groupings, political parties, interest groups, social movements etc. Certain aspects of institutions and political process were especially in focus for what was seen as their usefulness in explaining political processes, e.g., political socialisation, patterns of political culture, techniques of interest articulation and interest aggregation, styles of political recruitment, extent of political efficacy and political apathy, ruling elites etc. These systemic studies were often built around the concern with nation-building i.e., providing a politico-cultural identity to a population, state-building i.e., providing institutional structure and processes for politics and modernisation i.e., to initiate a process of change along the western path of development. The presence of divergent ideological poles in world politics (Western capitalism and Soviet socialism), the rejection of western imperialism by most newly liberated countries, the concern with maintaining their distinct identity in the form of the non-aligned movement and the sympathy among most

countries with a socialist path of development, gradually led to the irrelevance of most modernization models for purposes of global large level comparisons. Whereas the fifties and sixties were the period where attempts to explain political reality were made through the construction of large scale models, the seventies saw the assertion of Third World-ism and the rolling back of these models. The Eighties saw the constriction of the levels of comparison with studies based on regions or smaller numbers of units became prevalent. With globalisation, however, the imperatives for large level comparisons increased and the field of comparisons has diversified with the proliferation of non-state, 'non-governmental actors and the increased interconnections between nations with economic linkages and information technology revolution.

In the section which follows we shall take up these developments in comparative political analysis, emphasizing in each case, the changes in the character and field of enquiry.

1.3 COMPARATIVE POLITICS: A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

The nature and scope of comparative politics has varied according to the changes which have occurred historically in its subject matter. The subject matter of comparative politics has been determined both by the geographical space (i.e. countries, regions) which has constituted its field as well as the dominant ideas concerning social reality and change which shaped the approaches to comparative studies (capitalist, socialist, mixed and indigenous). Likewise, at different historical junctures the thrust or the primary concern of the studies kept changing.

1.3.1 The Origins of Comparative Study of Politics

In its earliest incarnation, the comparative study of politics comes to us in the form of studies done by the Greek philosopher Aristotle. Aristotle studied the constitutions of 150 states and classified them into a typology of regimes. His classification was presented in terms of both descriptive and normative categories i.e., he not only described and classified

Notes

regimes and political systems in terms 'of their types e.g., democracy, aristocracy, monarchy etc., he also distinguished them on the basis of certain norms of good governance. On the basis of this comparison he divided regimes into good and bad - ideal and perverted. These Aristotelian categories were acknowledged and taken up by Romans such as Polybius (201 - 120 B.C.) and Cicero (106-43 B.C.) who considered them in formal and legalistic terms. Concern with comparative study of regime types reappeared in the 15th century with Macchiavelli (1469- 1527).

1.3 2 The Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries

The preoccupation with philosophical and speculative questions concerning the 'good order' or the 'ideal state' and the use, in the process, of abstract and normative vocabulary, persisted in comparative studies of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries signified the period when liberalism was the reigning ideology and European countries enjoyed dominance in world politics. The 'rest of the world' of Asia, Africa and Latin America were either European colonies or under their sphere of influence as ex-colonies. Comparative studies during this period (James Bryce's *Modern Democracies* (1921), Herman Finer's *Theory and Practice of Modern Governments* (1932) and Carl J. Friedrich's *Constitutional Government and Democracy* (1937), Roberto Michels, *Political Parties* (1915) and M. Duverger, *Political Parties* (1950)) were largely concerned with a comparative study of institutions, the distribution of power, and the relationship between the different layers of government. These studies were Eurocentric i.e., confined to the study of institutions, governments and regime types in European countries like Britain, France and Germany. It may thus be said that these studies were in fact not genuinely comparative in the sense that they excluded from their analysis a large number of countries. Any generalisation derived from a study confined to a few countries could not legitimately claim having validity for the rest of the world. It may be emphasised here that exclusion of the

rest of the world was symptomatic of the dominance of Europe in world politics dominance - which however, was on the wane, and shifting gradually to North America. All contemporary history had Europe at its centre, obliterating the rest of the world (colonized or liberated from colonisation) (a) as 'people without histories' or (b) whose histories were bound with and destined to follow the trajectories already followed by the Nature. SC# and Utility or advanced countries of the West. Thus the above mentioned works manifest their Cohpnrntive Study of Politcs rootedness in the normative values of western liberal democracies which carried with it the baggage of racial and civilisational superiority, and assumed a prescriptive character for the colonies/former colonies.

1.3.3 The Second World War and After

In the nineteen thirties the political and economic situation of the world changed. The Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in 1917, brought into world politics, Socialism, as an ideology of the oppressed and, as a critical alternative to western liberalism and capitalism. With the end of the Second World War a number of significant developments had taken place, including the waning of European (British) hegemony, the emergence and entrenchment of United States of America as the new hegemon in world politics and economy, and the bifurcation of the world into two ideological camps viz. (western) capitalism and (eastern) socialism. The majority of the 'rest of the world' had, by the time the Second World War ended, liberated itself from European imperialism. For a period after decolonization the notions of development, modernisation, nation-building, state-building etc., evinced a degree of legitimacy and even popularity as 'national slogans' among the political elite of the 'new nations'. Ideologically, however, these 'new nations', were no longer compelled to tow the western capitalist path of development. While socialism had its share of sympathisers among the new ruling elite of the Asia, America and Latin America, quite a number of newly independent countries made a conscious decision to distance themselves from both the power blocs, re~naining non-aligned to either. A number of them evolved their own specific path of development akin

Notes

to the socialist, as in the case of Ujama in Tanzania, and the mixed-economy model in India which was a blend of both capitalism and socialism. It may be worth remembering that the comparative study of governments till the 1940s was predominantly the study of institutions, the legal-constitutional principles regulating them, and the manner in which they functioned in western (European) liberal-democracies. In the context of the above stated developments, a powerful critique of the institutional approach emerged in the middle of 1950s. The critique had its roots in behaviouralism which had emerged as a new movement in the discipline of politics aiming to provide scientific rigor to the discipline and develop a science of politics. Known as the behavioural movement, it was concerned with developing an enquiry which was quantitative, based on survey techniques involving the examination of empirical facts separated from values, to provide value-neutral, non-prescriptive, objective observations and explanations. The behaviouralists attempted to study social reality by seeking answers to questions like 'why people behave politically as they do, and why as a result, political processes and systems function as they do'. It is these 'why questions' regarding deference in people's behaviours and their implications for political processes and political systems, which changed the focus of comparative study from the legal-formal aspects of institutions. Thus in 1955 Roy Macridis criticised the existing comparative studies for privileging formal institutions over non-formal political processes, for being descriptive rather than analytical, and case-study oriented rather than genuinely comparative. (Roy Macridis, *The Study of Comparative Government*, New York, Random House, 1955). Harry Eckstein points out that the changes in the nature and scope of comparative politics in this period show sensitivity to the changing world politics urging the need to reconceptualise the notion of politics and develop paradigms for large-scale comparisons. (Harry Eckstein, 'A Perspective on Comparative Politics, Past and Present' in Harry Eckstein and David Apter eds., *Comparative Politics: A Reader*, New York, Free Press, 1963.) Rejecting the then traditional and almost exclusive emphasis on the western world and the conceptual language approaches which had been developed with such limited comparisons in mind, Gabriel Almond and his colleagues of

the American Social Science Research Council's Committee on Comparative Politics (founded in 1954) sought to develop a theory and a methodology which could encompass and compare political systems of all kinds - primitive or advanced, democratic or non-democratic, western or non western. The broadening of concerns in a geographic or territorial sense was also accompanied by a broadening of the sense of politics itself, and in particular, by a rejection of what was then perceived as the traditional and narrowly defined emphasis on the study of formal political institutions. The notion of politics was broadened by the emphasis on 'realism' or politics 'in practice' as distinguished from mere 'legalism'. This included in its scope the functioning of less formally structured agencies, behaviours and processes e.g. political parties, interest groups, elections, voting behaviour, attitudes etc. (Gabriel Almond, *Political Development*, Boston, 1970). With the deflection of attention from studies of formal institutions, there was simultaneously a decline in the centrality of the notion of the state itself. We had mentioned earlier that the emergence of a large number of countries on the world scenery necessitated the development of frameworks which would facilitate comparisons on a large scale. This led to the emergence of inclusive and abstract notions like the political system. This notion of the 'system' replaced the notion of the state and enabled scholars to take into account the 'extra-legal', 'social' and 'cultural' institutions which were critical to the understanding of non-western politics and had the added advantage of including in its scope 'pre-state'/'non-state' societies as well as roles and offices which were not seen as overtly connected with the state. Also, with the change of emphasis to actual practices and functions of institutions, the problems of research came to be defined not in terms of what legal powers these institutions had, but what they actually did, how they were related to one another, and what roles they played in the making and execution of public policy. This led to the emergence of structural-functionalism, in which certain functions were described as being necessary to all societies, and the execution and performance of these functions were then compared across a variety of different formal and non-formal structures (Peter Mair, 'Comparative Politics: An Overview', p.315) . While the universal frameworks of systems and

Notes

structures-junctions enabled western scholars to study a wide range of political systems, structures, and behaviours, within a single paradigm, the appearance of 'new nations' provided to western comparativists an opportunity to study what they perceived as economic and political change. Wiarda points out that it was in this period of the sixties that most contemporary scholars of comparative politics came of age. The 'new nations' became for most of these scholars [ironically] 'living laboratories' for the study of social and political change. Wiarda describes those 'exciting times' which offered unique opportunities to study political change, and saw the development of new methodologies and approaches to study them. It was during this period that some of the most innovative and exciting theoretical and conceptual approaches were advanced in the field of comparative politics: study of political culture, political socialisation, developmentalism, dependency and interdependency, corporatism, bureaucratic-authoritarianism and later transitions to democracy etc. (Howard J. Wiarda, 'Is Comparative Politics Dead? Rethinking the Field in the Post-Cold War Era', *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 19, no.5.) This period saw the mushrooming of universalistic models like Easton's political system, Deutsch's social mobilisation and Shils' centre and periphery. The theories of modernisation by Apter, Rokkan, Eisenstadt and Ward and the theory of political development by Almond, Coleman, Pye and Verba also claimed universal relevance. These theories were claimed to be applicable across cultural, national, scope and ideological boundaries and to explain political process everywhere. The development of comparative political analysis in this phase coincided with the international involvement of the United States through military alliances and foreign aid. Most research in this period was not only funded by research foundations, it was also geared to the goals of US foreign policy. The most symbolic of these were the Project Camelot in Latin America and the Himalayan Project in India. This period was heralded by the appearance of works like Apter's study on Ghana. Published in 1960, *Politics of Developing Areas* by Almond and Coleman, sharply defined the character of the new 'Comparative Politics Movement'. The publication of a new journal in the US entitled

Comparative Politics in 1969 reflected the height of this trend. (Manoranjan Mohanty, 'Comparative Politics and Third World Sensitivity', *Teaching Politics*, Nos., I & 2, 1975). 'Developmentalism' was perhaps the dominant conceptual paradigm of this time. To a considerable extent, the interest in developmentalism emanated from US foreign policy interests in 'developing' countries, to counter the appeals of Marxism-Leninism and steer them towards a non-communist way to development. (Howard J. Wiarda, 'Is Comparative Politics Dead? Rethinking the Field in the Post-Cold War Era', *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 19, no.5, p.937)

1.3.4 The 1970s and Challenges to Developmentalism

Towards the 1970s, developmentalism came to be criticised for favouring abstract models, which flattened out differences among specific political-social-cultural systems, in order to study them within a single universalistic framework. These criticisms emphasised the ethnocentrism of these models and focussed on the Third World in order to work out a theory of underdevelopment. They stressed the need to concentrate on solutions to the backwardness of developing countries. Two main challenges to developmentalism which arose in the early 1970s and gained widespread attention were (a) dependency and (b) corporatism. Dependency theory criticised the dominant model of developmentalism for ignoring (a) domestic class factors and (b) international market and power factors in development. It was particularly critical of US foreign policy and multinational corporations and suggested, contrary to what was held true in developmentalism that the development of the already-industrialised nations and that of the developing ones could not go together. Instead, dependency theory argued, that the development of the West had come on the shoulders and at the cost of the non-West. The idea that the diffusion of capitalism promotes underdevelopment and not development in many parts of the world was embodied in Andre Gunde Frank's *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America* (1967), Walter Rodney's *How*

Europe Underdeveloped Alica (1972) and Malcolm Caldwell's *The Wealth of Some Nations* (1979). Marxist critics of the dependency theory, however, pointed out that the nature of exploitation through surplus extraction should not be seen simply on national lines but, as part of a more complex pattern of alliances between the metropolitan bourgeoisie of the core/centre and the indigenous bourgeoisie of the periphery satellite as they operated in a worldwide capitalist system. The corporatist approach criticized developmentalism for its Euro Allmerica ethnocentrism and indicated that there were alternative organic, = corporatist, often authoritarian ways to organise the state and state-society relations. (Ronald Chilcote, *Theories of Comparative Politics*, p. 16)

1.3.5 The 1980s: The Return of State

During the later 1970s and into the 1980s, still reflecting the backlash against the developmentalism, a number of theories and subject matters emerged into the field of comparative politics. These included bureaucratic-authoritarianism, indigenous concepts of change, transitions to democracy, the politics of structural adjustment, 'neoliberalism and privatisation. While some scholars saw these Approaches developments as undermining and breaking the unity of the field which was being dominated by developmentalism, others saw them as adding healthy diversity, providing alternative approaches and covering new subject areas. Almond, who had argued in the late 1950s that the notion of the state should be replaced by the political system, which was adaptable to scientific inquiry, and Easton, who undertook to construct the parameters and concepts of a political system, continued to argue well into the 1980s on the importance of political system as the core of political study. The state, however, received its share of attention in the 60s and 70s in the works of bureaucratic-authoritarianism in Latin America, especially in Argentina in the works of Guillermo O'Donnell e.g., *Economic Modernization and Bureaucratic Authoritarianism* (1973). Ralph Miliband's *The State in Capitalist Society* (1969) had also kept the interest alive. With Nicos Poulantzas's *State, Power, Socialism* (1978),

and political sociologists Peter Evans, Theda Skocpol, and others *Bringing the State Back In* (1985), focus was sought to be restored onto the state.

1.3.6 The Late Twentieth Century: Globalisation and Emerging Trends/Possibilities

- a) Scaling down of systems: Much of the development of comparative political analysis in the period 1960s to 1980s can be seen as an ever widening range of countries being included as cases, with more variables being added to the models, such as policy, ideology, governing experience, and so on. With the 1980s, however, there has been a move away from general theory to emphasis on the relevance of context. In part, this tendency reflects the renewed influence of historical inquiry in the social sciences, and especially the emergence of a 'historical sociology' which tries to understand phenomena in the very broad or 'holistic' context within which they occur. (Theda Skocpol and M. Somers, 'The Use of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, No.22, 1980 and P. Abrams, *Historical Sociology*, Ithaca, 1982). There has been a shying away from models to a more in-depth understanding of particular countries and cases where more qualitative and contextualized data can be assessed and where account can be taken of specific institutional circumstances or particular political cultures. Hence we see a new emphasis on more culturally specific studies (e.g., English speaking countries, Islamic countries), and nation specific countries (e.g., England, India), and even institutionally specific countries (e.g., India under a specific regime). While emphasis on 'grand systems' and model building diminished, the stress on specific contexts and cultures has meant that the scale of comparisons was brought down. Comparisons at the level of 'smaller systems' or regions, however, remained e.g., the Islamic world, Latin American countries, Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia etc.

Notes

- b) **Civil Society and Democratisation:** The disintegration of Soviet Union brought into currency the notion of the 'end of history'. In his article 'The End of History?' (1989), which was developed later into the book *The End of History and the Last Man* (1992), Francis Fukuyama argued that the history of ideas had ended with the recognition and triumph - of liberal democracy as the 'final form of human government'. The 'end of history', invoked to stress the predominance of western liberal democracy, is in a way reminiscent of the 'end of ideology' debate of the 1950s which emerged at the height of the cold war and in the context of the decline of communism in the West. Western liberal scholars proposed that the economic advancement made in the industrialised societies of the west had resolved political problems, e.g., issues of freedom and state power, workers' rights etc., which are assumed to accompany industrialisation. The U.S. sociologist, Daniel Bell in particular, pointed in his work (*The End of Ideology?: On the 'Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the 1950s*, 1960) that in the light of this development there was an ideological consensus or the suspension of a need for ideological differences over issues of political practice. In the late eighties, the idea of the 'end of history' was coupled with another late eighties phenomenon - globalisation. Globalisation refers to a set of conditions, scientific, technological, economic and political, which have linked together the world in a manner so that occurrences in one part of the world are bound to affect or be affected by what is happening in another part. It may be pointed out that in this global world the focal point or the centre around which events move worldwide is still western capitalism. In the context of the so called triumph of capitalism, the approaches to the study of civil society and democratisation that have gained currency give importance to civil society defined in terms of protection of individual rights to enter the modern capitalist world. There is, however, another significant trend in the approach which seeks to place questions of civil society and democratisation as its primary focus. If there are on one hand studies conforming to the contemporary interest of western capitalism seeking to develop

market democracy, there are also a number of studies which take into account the resurgence of people's movements seeking autonomy, right to indigenous culture, movements of tribals, dalits, lower castes, and the women's movement and the environment movement. These n\movements reveal a terrain of contestation where the interests of capital are in conflict with people's rights and represent the language of change and liberation in an era of global capital. Thus concerns with issues of identity, environment, ethnicity, gender, race, etc. have provided a new dimension to comparative political analysis. (See Manoranjan Mohanty, *Contemporary Indian Political Theory*, 2000).

- c) Information collection and diffusion: A significant aspect and determinant of globalisation has been the unprecedented developments in the field of information and communication technology viz., the Internet and World Wide Web. This has made the production, collection and analysis of data easier and also assured their faster and wider diffusion, worldwide. These developments have not only enhanced the availability of data, but also made possible the emergence of new issues and themes which extend beyond the confines of the nation-state. These new themes in turn form an important influential aspect of the political environment of the contemporary globalised world. The global network of social movements' organisations, the global network of activists is one such significant aspect. The diffusion of ideas of denlocratisation is an important outsole of such networking. The Zapastista rebellion in the southern Mexican state of Chiapas used the Internet and the global media to communicate their struggle for rights, social justice and democracy. The concern with issues regarding the promotion and protection of human rights which is dependent on the collection and dissemination of information has similarly become pertinent in the contemporary world.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

Notes

ii) Check your progress with the model answer given at the end of the unit.

- 1) Is it possible to say that comparative politics refers only to a method of studying governments?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

- 2) The nature, field and scope of comparative politics have evolved in response to the changing socio-political concerns over different historical periods. Comment.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

1.4 COMPARATIVE STUDY OF POLITICS: UTILITY

The question of utility of comparative politics is concerned with its usefulness and relevance for enhancing our understanding of political reality. It seeks to know how a comparative study helps us understand this reality better. First and foremost, we must bear in mind that political behaviour is common to all human beings and manifests itself in diverse ways and under diverse social and institutional set ups all over the world. It may be said that an understanding of these related and at the same time different political behaviours and patterns is an integral part of our understanding of politics itself. A sound and comprehensive understanding would commonly take the form of comparisons.

1.4.1 Comparing for Theoretical Formulation

While comparisons form an implicit part of all our reasoning and thinking, most comparatives would argue that a comparative study of politics seeks to make comparisons consciously to arrive at conclusions which can be generalised i.e. 'held true for a number of cases. To be able to make such generalisations with a degree of confidence, it is not sufficient to just collect information about countries. The stated in comparative political analysis is on theory-building and theory testing with the countries acting units or cases. A lot of emphasis is therefore laid, and energies spent, on developing rules and standards about how comparative research should be carried out. A comparative study ensures that all generalisations are based on the observation of more than one or observation of relationship between several phenomena. The broader the observed universe, the greater is the confidence in statements about relationship and sounder the theories.

1.4.2 Comparisons for Scientific Rigour

A9 will be explained in the next unit, the comparative method gives these theories scientific basis and rigour. Social scientists that emphasize scientific precision, validity and reliability, see comparisons as indispensable in the social sciences because they offer the unique opportunity of 'control' in the study of social phenomena. (Giovanni Sartori, 'compare, Why and How' in Mattei Dogan and , Ali Kazancigil eds., *Comparing Nations, Concepts, Strategies, Substance*, -1 Blackwell, Oxford, 1994.).

1.4.3 Comparisons Leading to Explanations in Relationships

For a long time comparative politics appeared merely to look for similarities and differences, and directed this towards classifying, dichotomizing or polarising political phenomena. Comparative political analysis is however, not simply about identifying similarities and differences. The purpose of using comparisons, it is felt by several

Notes

scholars, is going beyond 'identifying similarities and differences' or the 'compare and contrast approach' as it is called, to ultimately study political phenomena in a larger framework of relationships. This, it is felt, would help 'deepen our understanding and broaden the levels of answering and explaining political phenomena. (See Manoranjan Mohanty, 'Comparative Political Theory and Third World Sensitivity', Teaching Politics, Nos.1 & 2, 1975)

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your progress with the model answer given at the end of the unit.

- 1) What according to you is the usefulness of a comparative study of politics?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

1.5 LET US SUM UP

The nature and scope of comparative study of politics related to its subject matter, its field of study, the vantage point from which the study is carried out and the purposes towards which the study is directed. These have, however, not been static and have changed over time. While the earliest studies concerned themselves with observing and classifying governments and regimes, comparative politics in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was concerned with studying the formal legal structures of institutions in western countries. Towards the end of the Second World War, a number of 'new nations' emerged on the world scene having liberated them from colonial domination. The dominance of liberalism was challenged by the emergence of communism and the

powerful presence of Soviet Union on the world scene. The concern among comparatists changed at this juncture to studying the diversity of political, behaviours and processes which were thrown up, however, within a single overarching framework. The concept of 'systems' and 'structures-functions' came in vogue. These frameworks were used by western scholars particularly those in the United States to study phenomena like developmentalism, modernisation etc. While the political elite of the newly independent countries found concepts like development, nation-building and state building attractive, in many cases they evolved their own ideological stances and chose to remain non-aligned to either ideological blocs. In the late 1980s focus on studying politics comparatively within an overarching framework of 'system' declined and regional systemic studies assumed significance. The focus on state in these studies marked a resurgence of the study of power structures within civil society and its political forms, 'which had suffered a setback with; the arrival of systems and structures-functions into comparative politics. The petering out of Soviet Union in the same period, provoked western scholars to proclaim the 'end of history' marking the triumph of liberalism and capitalism. Globalisation of capital, a significant feature of the late nineteen eighties, which continues and makes itself manifest in technological, economic and information linkages among the countries of the world, has also tended to influence comparatists into adopting universalistic, homogenizing expressions like 'transitions to democracy', the 'global market' and 'civil society'. Such expressions would have us believe that there do not in fact remain differences, uncertainties and contests which need to be explained in a comparative perspective. There is, however, another way to look at the phenomena and a number of scholars see the resurgence of civil society in terms of challenges to global capitalism which comes from popular movements and trade union activism throughout the world.

Check Your Progress 3

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

Notes

ii) Check your progress with the model answer given at the end of the limit.

1) What according to you is the usefulness of a comparative study of politics?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2) What are the features that determine the nature and scope of comparative politics?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3) Trace the development of Comparative Politics in the twentieth century bringing out (a) the specificities of the period before and after the second World War; (b) developmentalism and its critique; (c) late twentieth century developments.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

4) A comparative study of politics looks for explanations of political phenomenon in a framework of relationships. In the light of this statement comment on the developments in the field of comparative politics after the demise of colonial empires, through the cold war, upto the age of globalisation.

.....

1.6 KEY WORDS

Behaviouralism: The belief that social theories should be constructed only on the basis of observable behaviour, providing quantifiable data for research.

Civil society: The term has contested meanings. By and large it is understood as the realm of autonomous groups and associations.

Configurative: refers to a combination of favourable conditions or aspects of Nature, Scope and Utility of any observed political phenomenon, e.g., the necessary and sufficient conditions Comparative Study of Polite for revolution, democratic participation.

Control: A regulation or check - an important part of experiments where a parallel experiment or group of subjects is set up (control group) - to provide a standard of comparison for other experiment. In an experiment set up to study the effect of visual aids in learning, the control group will not be introduced with the condition (visual aid) whose influence is to be studied.

Democratisation: Refers to processes indicating the promotion of democracy, implying in particular, the granting of basic freedoms, increase in popular participation and electoral choices.

Descriptive: Statements giving empirical facts, delineating characteristics and I attributes. Dichotomy: Division into two strongly contrasted groups or classes. Eurocentric: Refers to the bias and distortions which emerge from the application of European values, beliefs and theories, to other cultures and groups.

Globalisation: Globalisation refers to a set of conditions, scientific, technological, economic and political, which have linked together the world in a manner so that occurrences in one part of the world are bound to affect or be affected by what: is happening in another part. Method:

Notes

Methods are ways of organising theories for application to data, also called 'conceptual schemes'. Types of method comparative (using more than one case), configurative (using a single case study) and historical (using time and sequence). Method is more about 'thinking about thinking'.

Methodology: The study of different methods of research, including the identification of research questions, the formulation of theories to explain certain events and political outcomes, and the development of research design.

Model: In simple terms an intellectual construct which simplifies reality in order , to emphasise the recurrent, the constant and the typical, which it presents in the I form of clusters of tracts or attributes. In other words, 'models' and 'types' are treated as synonyms.

Neoliberalism: An updated version of classical political economy, dedicated to, market individualism and minimal statism. Normative: The prescription of values and standards of conduct, dealing with questions pertaining to 'what should be' rather than 'what is'.

Post-behaviouralism: Refers to a period after 1970 and a methodology that accepts that observations and analysis of the political world are not free from certaii~ theoretical and value biases, yet strives to make strong inferences through empirical analysis.

Privatisation: The transfer of state assets from the public to the private sector, reflecting a contraction of state responsibilities. Systems theory: The theory that treats the political system as a self-regulating mechanism, responding to 'inputs' (demands and support) by issuing authoritative decisions or 'outputs' (policies).

Theory: a definitive and logical statement (or groups of statements) about how the world (or some key aspect of the world) 'works'. Known collectively as empirical theory (as opposed to normative theory), these statements make claims about relationships between variables that can be tested using systematic comparative analysis.

1.7 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

- 1) Is it possible to say that comparative politics refers only to a method of studying governments?

- 2) The nature, field and scope of comparative politics have evolved in response to the changing socio-political concerns over different historical periods. Comment.
- 3) What are the features that determine the nature and scope of comparative politics?
- 4) Trace the development of Comparative Politics in the twentieth century bringing out (a) the specificities of the period before and after the second World War; (b) developmentalism and its critique; (c) late twentieth century developments.
- 5) A comparative study of politics looks for explanations of political phenomenon in a framework of relationships. In the light of this statement comment on the developments in the field of comparative politics after the demise of colonial empires, through the cold war, upto the age of globalisation.

1.8 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Chilcote, Ronald H., Part I: Introduction, in Ronald H.Chilcote, Theories of Comparative Politics: The Search for a Paradigm Reconsidered, Westview Press, Boulder, 1994 (Second Edition).
- Landman, Todd, Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics: An Introduction, Routledge, London, 2000.
- Mair, Peter, 'Comparative Politics: An Overview', in R.E.Goodin and H.Klingemann eds., The New Handbook of Political Science, Oxford University Press, Oxford; 1996.
- Mohanty, Manoranjan, 'Moving the Centre in the Study of Political Thought and Political theory', in Manoranjan Mohanty, Contemporary Indian Political Theory. Samskriti, New ~eThi, 2000.
- Mohanty, Manoranjan, 'Comparative Political Theory and Third world Sensitivity', Teaching Politics, Nos.] & 2, 1975.

- Sartori, Giovanni, 'Compare, Why and How', in Mattei Dogan and Ali Kazancigil eds., *Comparing Nations, Concepts, Strategies, Substance*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1994.
- Wiarda, Roward J. 'Is Comparative Politics Dead? Rethinking the Field in the Post-Cold War Era', *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 19, no.5.

1.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 1

1) No it is not merely a method of studying governments. It is also concerned with analyzing issues concerning governance and formulation of abstract universal models which could explain political phenomena and processes in all Units. See sub-section 1.2.2 to elaborate.

2) The subject matter of comparative politics has been evolving and developing both in terms of geographical space as well as ideas and theories. It has therefore passed through significant developments and undergone important changes. For elaboration see sub-section 1.3.

Check Your Progress 2

1) Comparative Politics is useful for the building of theories, scientific analysis of issues and problems, explanation of phenomena etc.

Check Your Progress 3

1) See Section 1.5

2) See Section 1.3.6

3) Write your answer OR the basis of overall assessment of Section 1.3.

UNIT 2: COMPARATIVE METHOD AND STRATEGIES OF COMPARISON

STRUCTURE

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction: What is Comparison
- 2.2 Some Thoughts on Method
- 2.3 The Comparative Method: Why Compare
 - 2.3.1 Social Scientific Research
 - 2.3.2 Comparative Thinking
- 2.4 Methods of Comparison
 - 2.4.1 Experimental Method
 - 2.4.2 Case Study
 - 2.4.3 Statistical Method
 - 2.4.4 Focused Comparisons
 - 2.4.5 Historical Method
- 2.5 Let us sum up
- 2.6 Key Words
- 2.7 Questions for Review
- 2.8 Suggested readings and references
- 2.9 Answers to Check Your Progress

2.0 OBJECTIVES

Comparison is a familiar exercise for all of us. Most decisions in our daily lives, whether buying fruits and vegetables from the vendor or choosing a book or an appropriate college and career, involve making comparisons. When comparison is employed, however, to study social and political phenomena, there should be something about 'comparison' as a 'method' which makes it more appropriate than other methods for the purpose. To assess this appropriateness, we first need to know what is the comparative method and how it can be distinguished from other methods, some of which also compare e.g., the experimental and statistical methods. We should also understand as to why, we should use the comparative method rather than any other method. Again, how one

goes about comparing or planning strategies of comparison, is also important to bear in mind. In this Unit we will take up all these issues. After going through this unit you will be able to understand:

- What is method? What is the comparative method? How can the comparative method be distinguished from other methods?
- Why is the comparative method used? Which are the phenomenon which can be best understood\explained by this method?
- How does one use the comparative method in the study of politics?
- What are its relative advantages and disadvantages over other methods? and
- What is the significance of the comparative method to the field of Comparative Politics?

Each section ends with a question which will help you check your progress. There are explanatory notes for some key words at the end of the unit. These words will be highlighted in the text so that you can look up the meanings as and when they occur in the text.

2.1 INTRODUCTION: WHAT IS COMPARISON?

In the previous paragraph we noted how comparisons form part of our daily lives. None of us, however, live in a vacuum. Our daily lives are crisscrossed by numerous other lives. In so many ways our own experiences and observations of Approaches our environment get shaped and influenced by those of others. In other words, our observation of our immediate world would show that people and events are connected in a network of relationships. These relationships may be close or emotionally bound as in a family, or as the network expands in the course of our daily lives, professional (as in our place of work) or impersonal (as with our passengers in the bus in which we travel). These relationships or interconnectedness, however, may show a regularity, a pattern or a daily-ness, and may also themselves be regulated by norms

and rules e.g. the daily route of the bus, its departure and arrival timings etc.

The idea here is to show that whereas each individual might be seen as having a specific daily routine; there is at the same time a cumulative or aggregate effect, where a number of such individuals may be seen as following a similar routine. The lives of these individuals, we can say, has a pattern of regularity, which is comparable in terms of their similarity. Now, when the similarities can be clubbed together, irregularities or dissimilarities can also be easily picked out. Explanations for both similarities and dissimilarities can also be made after exploring the commonalities and variations in the conditions of their lives. In order to illustrate this let us imagine a residential colony. The majorities of the male residents leave for work by a chartered bus at 8 in the morning and return at 6 in the evening. Some residents, however, leave at 9 in the morning, in their respective cars, and return at 5 in the evening. The residents of the colony thus form roughly two groups displaying two kinds of patterns of behaviour. Explanations for both similarities within each group and dissimilarities between the two groups can be found by comparing individual situations or conditions in each group. While explanations for similarities can be seen i.e. the commonalities in the conditions, explanations of irregularity or dissimilarities between groups can be explained in terms of absence of conditions which permit the similarity in one group e.g., it may be found that those who travel by bus have a lot of things in common besides going to their offices in the chartered bus such as same office, absence of personal vehicles, more or less similar position in the office, location of offices on the same route etc. –

Those who travel by their cars, would likewise exhibit similarities of conditions within their group. The explanation for the different patterns between the groups can be seen in terms of the absence of conditions which permit similarities in the two groups e.g., the car group residents may be going to different offices which do not fall on the same bus route; they may be the only ones owning cars; their status in their offices may be higher etc. The explanations could be numerous and based also on

Notes

numerous other variables like caste, gender, political beliefs etc. On the basis of this observation of similarities and dissimilarities, propositions can thus be made in terms of a causal-relationship e.g. men/women who drive to work do so because there are no chartered buses to their place of work or men/women who own private vehicles are more likely to drive to work than those who do not own vehicles or upper class women are more likely to drive to work etc. Let us move on from this extremely simplistic example to the complex ways in which social scientists use comparisons.

The comparative method has taken many forms since Augustus Comte first employed the concept in 1853 in his foundational *Cours de philosophie positive*. Subsequently a variety of comparative methods have emerged in the social sciences with different goals, units of comparison, and types of data that reflect a variety of theoretical assumptions and interests. Comparison has formed the core of anthropology, sociology and other social sciences, to the extent that Emile Durkheim (1938) viewed all sociological analysis as necessarily comparative. Comparative methods have been employed for both quantitative and qualitative studies of such diverse phenomena as language, political organization, economic relations, religion, myth, kinship, marriage, and the family.

Three strategies are used in comparative methodologies: illustrative comparison, complete or universe comparison, and sampled-based comparisons (Sarana 1975). They are distinguished by the units of comparison (including cultures, societies, regions, or communities) and the particular items or features used to compare the units. Societies as units can be compared by examining items or traits such as institutions or practices. Illustrative comparison is the most common form of comparative analysis and has been employed extensively by theorists from diverse camps. Items are used as examples to explain or exemplify phenomena found in different units. They are chosen for their illustrative value and not systematically selected to be statistically representative. Illustrative comparisons are used in historical reconstructions, and to

support interpretations or general assertions. Ethnographic case studies are commonly justified as the source for illustrative comparisons.

The second strategy is complete or universe comparison, in which all elements of the domain within the study, defined geographically (e.g., global or regional) or topically (e.g., analytical concepts or institutions), form the units of comparison. Comprehensive regional ethnographic surveys and analyses of particular topics, such as the national population health indicators of the World Health Organization reports, employ this approach.

Finally, sampled comparison strategically delimits part of the whole, with the goal of selecting data that are statistically representative of the variations within the whole and are intended as the basis for statistical generalizations. While studies of this type abound in sociology and human geography, they are much less common in anthropology. Within anthropology, the most widely known example is the George Murdock's Human Relations Area Files.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with the model answers given at the end of the unit.

- 1) Drawing from your observations of your surroundings do a simple exercise of comparison, looking for explanations of why some persons act in a particular way.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2.2 SOME THOUGHTS ON METHOD

Before we begin studying the comparative method, let us first see what exactly a 'method' is and why it is considered so important. Method as we know from our experiences is a useful, helpful and instructive way of accomplishing something with relative ease. A piece of collapsible furniture, for example, comes with a manual guiding us through the various steps to set it up. While studying a phenomenon, method would similarly point to ways and means of doing things. We may not, however, unlike our example of the collapsible furniture, know the final shape or results of our explorations at the outset. We may not also have a precise instruction manual guiding us to the final outcome. We will simply have the parts of the furniture and tools to set it up in other words, 'concepts' and 'techniques'. These concepts (ideas, thoughts, and notions) and techniques (ways of collecting data) will have to be used in specific ways to know more about, 'understand or explain a particular phenomenon. Thus, it may be said, that the organization of ways of application of specific concepts to data is 'method'. Of course the manner of collection of data itself will have to be worked out. The concepts which are to be applied or studied will have to be thought out. All this will eventually have to be organised so that the nature of the data and the manner in which it is collected and the application of the concept is done in a way that we are able to study with a degree of precision what we want to study. In a scientific inquiry much emphasis is placed on precision and exactness of the method. Social sciences, however, owing to the nature of their subject matter, have had to think of methods which come close to the accuracy of scientific experiments in laboratories or other controlled conditions. A number of scholars, however, do not feel that there should be much preoccupation with the so called 'scientific research'. Whatever the believe of scholars in this regard, there is nonetheless a 'method' in thinking, exploring and research in all studies. Several methods, comparative, historical, experimental, statistical etc. are used by scholars for their studies. It may be pointed out that all these methods may use comparison to varying degrees. The comparative method also uses tools of the historical, experimental and statistical methods. It is also important to bear in mind that comparative method is

not the monopoly of comparative politics. It is used in all domains of knowledge to study physical, human and social phenomenon. Sociology, history, anthropology, psychology etc., use it with similar confidence. These disciplines have used the comparative method to produce studies which are referred variously as 'cross-cultural' (as in anthropology and psychology) and 'cross-national' (as in political science and sociology) seeming thereby to emphasize different fields. f

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer,

ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of the unit

- 1) What is method? Why do you think method is an important part of research?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2.3 THE COMPARATIVE METHOD: WHY COMPARE

2.3.1 Social Scientific Research

The comparative method has been seen as studying similarities and differences as the basis for developing a 'grounded theory', testing hypotheses, inferring causality, and producing reliable generalizations. Many social scientists believe that research should be scientifically organised. The comparative method, they believe, offers them the best means to conduct 'scientific' research i.e, research characterized by precision, validity, reliability and verifiability and some amount of

Notes

predictability. The American political scientist James Coleman, for example, often reminded his students, 'You can't be scientific if you're not comparing'. Swanson similarly emphasized that it was 'unthinkable' to think of 'scientific thought and all scientific research' without comparisons. (Guy E. Swanson, 'Frameworks for Comparative Research: Structural Anthropology and the Theory of Action' in Ivan Valier ed., *Comparative Methods in Sociology*, Berkeley, 1971, p. 145). Whereas in physical sciences comparisons can be done in laboratories under carefully controlled conditions, precise experimentation in social sciences under conditions which replicate laboratory conditions is not possible. If, for example, a social scientist wishes to study the relationship between electoral systems and the number of political parties, that cannot instruct a government to change its electoral system nor order people to behave in a particular way to test his/her hypothesis. Nor can be replicated a social or political phenomenon in a laboratory where tests can be conducted. Thus, while a social scientist may feel compelled to work in a scientific way, societal phenomena may not actually permit what is accepted as 'scientific' inquiry. She can, however, study 'cases' i.e., actually existing political systems and compare them i.e., chalk out a way to needy their relationship as worked out in the hypothesis, draw conclusions and offer generalizations. Thus the comparative method, though scientifically weaker than the experimental method, is considered closest to a scientific method, offering the best possible opportunity to seek explanations of societal phenomena and offer theoretical propositions and generalizations. The question you might ask now is what makes - comparative method, scientific. Sartori tells us that the 'control function' or the system of checks, which is integral to scientific research and a necessary part of laboratory experimentation, can be achieved in social sciences only through comparisons. He goes further to propose that because the control function can be exercised only through the comparative method, comparisons are indispensable in social sciences. Because of their function of controlling/checking the validity of theoretical propositions, comparisons have the scientific value of making generalized propositions or theoretical statements explaining particular phenomena making

predictions, and also what he terms 'learning from others' experiences':. In this context it is important to point out that the nature of predictions in comparative method have only a probabilistic causality. This means that it can state its results only in terms of likelihoods or probabilities i.e., a given set of conditions are likely to give an anticipated outcome. This is different from deterministic causality in scientific research which emphasizes certainty i.e., a given set of conditions will produce the anticipated outcome/result.

2.3.2 Comparative Thinking

Integrative 'thinking' or looking for relations and connections: We saw in the previous paragraph that some social scientists use the comparative method to develop a scientific inquiry. For others, however, 'thinking with comparisons' is an integral part of analyzing specific social and political phenomenon. Swanson for example, feels that 'thinking without comparisons is unthinkable'. 'No one', he points out, 'should be surprised that comparisons, implicit and explicit, pervade the work of social scientists and have done so from the beginning: comparisons among roles, organizations, communities, institutions, societies, and cultures'. (Swanson, 1971, p. 145) Emile Durkheim, the renowned German Sociologist affirms that the comparative method enables (sociological) research to 'cease to be purely descriptive'. (Emile Durkheim, *The Division of Labour in Society*, 1949, p.139) Even descriptions, however, points out Smelser, cannot work without comparisons. Simple descriptive words like 'densely populated' and 'democratic', he substantiates, 'presuppose a universe of situations that are more or less populated or more or less democratic' and one situation can be stated described only in relation comparison to the other. (Neil J. Smelser, *Comparative Methods in the Social Sciences*, Englewood, 1976, p.3) It is this 'presupposition of a universe' in which a descriptive category can be placed, within a set of relationships, helps us to analyse it better, feel quite a number of scholars. Manoranjan Mohanty therefore seeks to emphasize relationships rather than looking merely for similarities and dissimilarities among phenomena. The latter or the 'compare and contrast

Notes

approach' as he calls it would ultimately become 'an exercise in dichotomization, an act of polarizing'. In other words, such an exercise would lead to classification of likes in groups of isolated compartments so that a comparative exercise would become nothing more than finding similarities within groups and dissimilarities among them. For the identification of relationships of unity and opposition, one must modify one's questions. This would mean that the questions asked should not be such as to bring out answers locating merely similarities and dissimilarities but 'the relationship which exists between) them'. Only then shall one be able to understand the comparability of political systems like the United States of America (U.S.A) and United Kingdom (U.K), for instance which differ in their forms of government (Presidential and Cabinet forms, respectively). The need to look for relationships rather than only indicators of similarity and, dissimilarity is also asserted by Smelser. Smelser feels that often a comparative exercise ends up looking for reasons only for differences or 'dissimilarities' and gives explanations which are often 'distortions'. The fascination or preoccupation with the 'new' and the 'unique', in other words, what is seen as different from the rest, has always 'been part of human nature. Historically there has been a tendency to either praise these differences as 'pure' remainders of a previous age or see them as deviations from what is seen as normal behavior. Thus the emphasis on similarities and differences may lead to similarities or uniformities being seen as norms and dissimilarities and variations as 'deviations' from the norm. The explanations offered for such deviations might not only be distortions' but often lead to categorizations or classifications of categories in terms of binary oppositions, hierarchies or even in terms of the ideal (good) and deviant (bad). Often, in a system of unequal relationships, the attribution of differences and their reasons, results in the justification of the disempowerment of groups seen as different. We have seen in the history of colonialism that the colonised were deprived of freedom and the right to self-governance.

The colonising nation sought to justify this deprivation by describing the subject population as being incapable of self-rule because it had different

social structures and religious beliefs. The location of difference here came the vantage point of power - that of the colonising nations. In such situations oppositions like the West and East may indicate countries or people not only described as having different attributes but also separate existences even in terms of time. Thus while the colonising British were seen as having reached a stage of modernization, the colonised Indians were seen to exist in a state of timelessness, in other words trapped in a backward past. Historically, however, we have lived in a world which is marked by what Eric Wolf calls 'interconnections'. Thus the appeal to look for relationships is lent weight by Eric Wolf, whose work corrects the notion that the destiny of nations has historically been shaped by European nations while the others were merely quiet spectators. Wolf shows that historically interconnections have been and continue to be a fact in the lives of states and nations. (Eric Wolf, *Europe and the People Without History*, California, 1982). This means that looking for relationship is not only possible, ignoring such 'interconnections' will in fact be historically to valid.

Check Your Progress 3

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answers with the model answers given at the end of the unit.

1) How do comparisons help achieve the purposes of social-scientific research?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2) The purpose of the comparative method is to look for relationships rather than dichotomies. Elaborate.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2.4 METHODS OF COMPARISON

A variety of methods of comparison are used in social sciences.

2.4.1 Experimental Method

Although the experimental method has limited application in social sciences, it provides the model on which many comparatists aspire to base their studies. Simply put, the experimental method aims to establish a causal relationship between two conditions. In other words the objective of the experiment is to establish that one condition leads to the other or influences the other in a particular way. If, for example one wishes to study explain why children differ in > their ability to communicate in English in large-group setting, a number of factors may be seen as influencing this capability viz., social background, adeptness in the language, familiarity of surroundings etc. The investigator may want to study the influence of all these factors or one of them or even a combination of factors. It then isolates the condition factors whose influence she wants to study and thereby make precise the role of each condition Thus, in an experiment designed to study of Comparison the effect of social background on ability to communicate, social background will be the independent variable and the ability to communicate, the dependent variable. The investigator works out a hypothesis stated in terms of a relationship between the two conditions which is tested in the experiment viz., children coming from higher socio-economic background display better ability to communicate in English in large group settings. The results of the experiment would enable the investigator to offer general propositions regarding the applicability of her/his findings and compare them with other previous studies.

2.4.2 Case Study

A case study, as the name suggests focusses on in depth study of a single case. In that sense, while the method itself is not strictly comparative, it provides the data (on single cases) which can become the basis of general observations. These observations may be used to make comparisons with other 'cases' and to offer general explanations. Case studies, however, may, in a disproportionate manner emphasize 'distinctiveness' or what are called 'deviant' or unusual cases. There might be a tendency, for example, among comparatists to explore questions like why United States of America does not have a socialist party rather than to explore why Sweden along with most western democracies has one. We will study briefly Alexis de Tocqueville's classic studies of 18th century France (The Old Regime and the French Revolution, 1856) and 19th century United States (Democracy in America: Vol I, 1835; Vol II, 1840) to show how comparative explanations can be made by focusing on single cases. Both his studies seem to ask different questions. The French case attempts to explain why the 1789 French Revolution broke out and the U.S.A. case seems to concentrate on seeking reasons for, and consequences of, conditions of social equality in the U.S.A. While both these works were spaced by more than twenty years, there is an underlying unity of theme between them. This unity is partly due to Tocqueville's preoccupation in both with similar conceptual issues viz., equality and inequality, despotism and freedom and political stability and instability and his views on social structure and social change. Also underlying the two studies is his conviction regarding the inexorability of the Western historical transition from aristocracy to democracy, from inequality to equality. Finally, and this is what makes these individual works comparative, and according to some a single comparative study, is the fact that in both the studies the other nation persists as an 'absent' case or referent. Thus, his analysis of the American society is influenced by his perspective on the French society and vice versa. The American case was understood as a 'pure' case of 'democracy by birth', where the social evolution towards equality had 'nearly reached its natural limits' leading to conditions of political stability, a diminished sense of relative

deprivation among its large middle class and a conservative attitude towards change. The French case was an aristocracy (a system of hierarchical inequalities) which had entered a transitional stage in the 18th century, with conditions of inequality mixing with expectations and desire for equality, resulting in an unstable mix of the two principles of aristocracy and equality, leading to despotism, and culminating in the revolution of 1789. Thus Tocqueville's unique case study of individual cases was effectively a study of national contrasts and similarities within a complex model of interaction of historical forces to explain the divergent historical courses taken up by France and U.S.A.

2.4.3 Statistical Method

The statistical method uses categories and variables which are quantifiable or can be represented by numbers, e.g., voting patterns, public expenditure, political parties, voter turnout, urbanisation, population growth. It also offers unique opportunities to study the effects or relationships of a number of variables simultaneously. It has the advantage of presenting precise data in a compact and visually effective manner, so that similarities and dissimilarities are visible through numerical representation. The fact that a number of variables can be studied together also gives the unique opportunity to look for complex explanations in terms of a relationship. The use of the statistical method also helps explain and compare long term trends and patterns and offer predictions on future trends. A study, for example, of the relationship of age and political participation can be made through an analysis of statistical tables of voter turnout and age-categories. Comparison of this data over long periods, or with similar data in other countries/ political systems, or with data showing voter turnout in terms of religious groups, social class and age can help us make complex generalizations, e.g., middle class, Hindu, male voters between the age of 25 and 30 are the most prolific voters. Cross national comparisons may lead to findings like, middle class women of the age group 25 to 30 are more likely to vote in western democracies than in developing countries like India. The utility of this method lies in the relative ease with which it can deal with

multiple variables. It fails, however, to offer complete answers or give the complete picture. It can, however, be employed along with qualitative analysis to give more comprehensive explanations of relationships and the broad categories which the statistical method uses in order to facilitate their numerical representation.

2.4.4 Focused Comparisons

These studies take up a small number of countries, often just two (paired or binary comparisons), and concentrates frequently on particular aspects of the countries' politics rather than on all aspects. Comparative studies of public policies in different countries have successfully been undertaken by this method. Lipset distinguishes two kinds of binary or paired comparison: the implicit and explicit. In the implicit binary comparison, the investigators own country, as in the case of de Tocqueville's study of America, may serve as the reference: Explicit paired comparisons have two clear cases (countries) for comparison. The two countries may be studied with respect to their specific aspects e.g., policy of population control in India and China or in their entirety e.g., with respect to the process of modernization. The latter may, however, lead to a parallel study of two cases leaving little scope for a study of relationships.

2.4.5 Historical Method

The historical method can be distinguished from other methods in that it looks for causal explanations which are historically sensitive. Eric Wolf emphasizes that any study which seeks to understand societies and causes of human action could not merely seek technical solutions to problems stated in technical terms. 'The important thing was to resort to an analytic history which searched out the causes of the present in the past. Such an analytic history could not be developed out of the study of a single culture or nation, a single culture area, or even a single continent at one period in time, but from a study of contacts, interactions and 'interconnections' among human populations and cultures. The world of

Notes

humankind ' constitutes a manifold, a totality of interconnected processes, and inquiries that disassemble this reality into bits and then fail to reassemble it falsify reality Historical studies have concentrated on one or more cases seeking to find causal explanations of social and political phenomena in a historical perspective. Single case studies seek, as mentioned in a previous section, to produce general statements which may be applied to other cases. Theda Skocpol points out that comparative historical studies using more than one case fall broadly into two categories, 'comparative history' and 'comparative historical analysis'. Comparative history is commonly used rather loosely to refer to any study in which two or more historical trajectories are of nation-states, institutional complexes, or civilizations are juxtaposed. Some studies which fall in this genre, / like Charles, Louis and Richard Tillys 'The Rebellious Century 1810-1930', aim I at drawing up a specific historical model which can be applied across different national context. Others, such as Reinhard Benedix's Nation Building and Citizenship and Perry Anderson's Lineages of the Absolutist State, use comparisons primarily to bring out contrasts among nations or civilisations, conceived as isolated wholes. Skocpol herself subscribes to the second method i.e., comparative historical analysis, which aims primarily to 'develop; test, and refine causal, explanatory hypothesis about events or structures integral to macro units such as nation-states'. This it does by taking 'selected slices of national historical trajectories as the units of comparison', to develop causal relationship I about specific phenomenon (e.g. revolutions) and draw generalisations. There are two ways in which valid associations of potential causes with the phenomenon one is trying to explain can be established. These methods laid out by John Stuart Mill in his A system of Logic are:

(a) the method of Agreement and

(b) the method of Difference. The method of agreement involves taking up for study several cases having in common both the phenomenon as well as the set of causal factors proposed in the hypothesis.

The method of difference, which is used by Skocpol, takes up two sets of cases:

- (a) the positive cases, in which the phenomenon as well as the hypothesised causal relationships are present and the
- (b) the negative cases, in which the phenomenon as well as the causes are absent but are otherwise similar to the first set. In her comparative analysis of the French, Russian and Chinese Revolutions, in *States and Social Revolutions, A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China*, (Cambridge, 1979).

Skocpol takes up the three as the positive cases of successful social revolution and argues that the three reveal similar causal patterns despite much other dissimilarity. She takes up also a set of negative cases viz., failed Russian Revolution of 1905, and selected aspects of English, Japanese and German histories to validate the arguments regarding causal relationship in the first case. Critics of the historical method feel that because the latter does not study a large number of cases, it does not offer the opportunity to study a specific phenomenon in a truly scientific manner. Harry Eckstein for instance argues that generalisations based on small number of cases 'may certainly be a generalisation in the dictionary sense'. However, a generalisation in the methodological sense' ought to 'cover a number of cases large enough for certain rigorous testing procedures like statistical analysis to be used'. (Harry Eckstein, *Internal War*, 1964).

Check Your Progress 4

Note: i) . Use the space given below for your answers

ii) Check your answers with the model answers given at the end of the unit.

Notes

- 1) What is meant by experimental method? How far is this method appropriate for the study of political phenomenon in a comparative framework?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

- 2) Design a problem of comparative politics using the statistical method.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2.5 LET US SUM UP

Studying with comparisons is important for understanding and explaining political and social phenomenon. A comparative method helps us to go beyond mere descriptions towards looking for ways in which political and social processes can be explained and based on such explanations general theoretical propositions can be made. It reminds us of the network of interconnections that exist among social, political, economic and cultural phenomena which help us understand better the changing nature of our environment.

While historically the discipline explored broad questions in political science through between-country comparisons, contemporary comparative political science primarily uses subnational comparisons. The name comparative politics refers to the discipline's historical association with the comparative method, described in detail below. Arend Lijphart argues that comparative politics does not have a substantive focus in itself, but rather a methodological one: it focuses on "the how but does not specify the of the analysis." Peter Mair and Richard Rose advance a slightly different definition, arguing that

comparative politics is defined by a combination of a substantive focus on the study of countries' political systems and a method of identifying and explaining similarities and differences between these countries using common concepts.

Sometimes, especially in the United States, the term "comparative politics" is used to refer to "the politics of foreign countries." This usage of the term is disputed.

A final concern involves scrutinizing existing logics of comparative inquiry to account for the observed variation by means of testing empirical hypotheses, thereby either corroborating or falsifying them (Lijphart, 1975: 159; Przeworski and Teune, 1970; Guy Peters, 1998). Hence we explicitly aim at the relation between proposition and empirical evidence and consider that as the cornerstone of social science. This implies the use of positive theory development as a stepping stone to advancing our knowledge of politics and society. The central feature of this approach to social science is embedded throughout this book by the relationship between Research Question, Research Design and -- empirical -- quantitative data-analysis on the basis of statistical methods. All these concerns are in itself worthy of serious discussion and deliberation, and the main issue at hand is that the comparative approach often lacks coherence in terms of a set of theoretical references and related logics of inquiry. Therefore this chapter must be seen as an argument to relate theory and method in order to gain a viable and feasible approach to explain political and social processes. To this end we propose the following guidelines to define the comparative approach as a distinctive way of analyzing and explaining social and political developments. The guidelines can be considered as 'flags' that mark the process of doing research by means of the comparative method:

1. describe the core subject of comparative inquiry. In other words: the question what exactly is to be explained and how do we recognize a need for comparison, that is: what are the essential systemic features?

2. develop a view on which theoretical concepts can ‘travel’ comparatively as well as measure what is intended (internal validity) as well as possess a unifying capacity for explaining political and social processes in general (external validity)?

3. discuss the logic of the comparative method as a means to a goal, rather than as an end in itself. In other words, which instrument fits the Research Questions to be answered best by means of what type of Research Design? We therefore now turn to the next point on the agenda: the comparative approach as an important instrument of researching the relationship between politics and society.

Check Your Progress 5

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers

ii) Check your answers with the model answers given at the end of the unit.

- 1) What are the different methods of comparison? What are the relative advantages of each in the study of comparative politics?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

- 2) Can one compare without having a historical perspective? Give the advantages and disadvantages of the historical method in the light of this statement.

.....
.....

.....

2.6 KEY WORDS

Control: a regulation or check - An important part of experiments where a parallel experiment or group of subjects is set up (control group) - to provide a standard of comparison for other experiment. In an experiment set up to study the effect of visual aids in learning, the control group will not be introduced with the condition (visual aid) whose influence is to be studied.

Causal Explanation: A way of understanding something by holding that some fact(s) lead to the appearance of other facts e.g., overpopulation may be the cause of housing problem.

a) Probabilistic Causality: A probabilistic causality is said to exist when the statement of results and predictions are made only in terms of likelihoods or 'probabilities i.e., a given set of conditions are likely to give an anticipated -. Outcome.

b) Deterministic Causality: Deterministic causality is the preferred way of I understanding relationships in scientific research as it emphasizes certainty i.e., a given set of conditions will produce the anticipated outcome result.

Generalisations: A general statement made in a manner so that it can be seen as holding true in a number of cases.

Grounded theory: A grounded theory is a framework of explanations of specific events etc. or explanatory principles and ideas which are derived from systematic study and observations of facts.

Hypothesis: This is a statement which holds something to be true under some conditions e.g. land lords would decrease continuously as population increases. Method: Methods are ways of organising theories for applications to data, also called 'conceptual schemes'. Types of method comparative (using more than one case), configurative (using a single case study) and historical (using time and sequence). Method is more about 'thinking about thinking'.

Model: In simple terms an intellectual construct which simplifies reality. In order to emphasize the recurrent, the constant and the typical, which it presents in the form of clusters of traits or attributes. In other words, 'models' and 'types' are treated as synonyms. **Precision:** The attribute of being exact, definite or accurate.

Predictability: Something which can be predicted or expected to happen.

Reliability: A test of credibility e.g., the reliability of a test is confirmed if it gives the same result (under the same conditions) every time. **Techniques:** Techniques link method to the relevant data. Techniques vary in appropriateness -sampling, interviews etc.

Propositions: A statement (like a generalization) confirming or denying a relationship between two variables. The statement is expected to have a general application.

Validity: This is also a test of credibility, confirming soundness or adequacy, e.g., the validity of an experiment studying pressure differences will be confirmed if the data studied actually represents pressure differences and not something else, viz., temperature differences.

Variables: Something which is not fixed; something which is changeable; in an experiment a variable is a category which is subject to change by the experimenter [(a) independent variable] or as a result of the experiment.

[(b) Dependent variable]. (c) Intervening variable: Variables which may occur in between and interrupt or influence the result.

Verifiability: Which can be confirmed or tested to be true.

2.7 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

- 1) Drawing from your observations of your surroundings do a simple exercise of comparison, looking for explanations of why some persons act in a particular way.
- 2) What is method? Why do you think method is an important part of research?
- 3) How do comparisons help achieve the purposes of social-scientific research?

- 4) The purpose of the comparative method is to look for relationships rather than dichotomies. Elaborate.
- 5) What is meant by experimental method? How far is this method appropriate for the study of political phenomenon in a comparative framework?
- 6) Design a problem of comparative politics using the statistical method.
- 7) What are the different methods of comparison? What are the relative advantages of each in the study of comparative politics?
- 8) Can one compare without having a historical perspective? Give the advantages and disadvantages of the historical method in the light of this statement.

2.8 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Hague, Rod, Martin Harrop and Shaun Breslin, *Comparative Government and Politics*, Macmillan, London, 1993, third edition, (Chapter two).
- Mohanty, Manoranjan, 'Comparative Political Theory and Third World Sensitivity', *Teaching Politics*, No. 1&2, 1975.
- Sartori, Giovanni, 'Compare, Why and How', in Mattei Dogan and Ali Kazancigil (ed.), *Comparing Nations, Concepts, Strategies, Substance*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1994.
- Smelser, Neil J., *Comparative Methods in the Social Sciences*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1976 (Introduction).
- Clark, William; Golder, Matt; Golder, Sona (2019). *Foundations of Comparative Politics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: CQ Press. p. 6. ISBN 978-1-5063-6073-7.
- Lijphart, Arend (1971). "Comparative politics and the comparative method". *American Political Science Review*. 65 (3): 682–693. doi:10.2307/1955513. JSTOR 1955513.
- Mair, Peter (1996). "Comparative politics: An introduction to comparative overview". In Goodin, Robert E.; Klingemann, Hans-Dieter (eds.). *A New Handbook of Political Science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 309–335. ISBN 0-19-

Notes

- 829471-9. Archived from the original on 2011-06-06. Retrieved 2008-08-25.
- Rose, Richard; MacKenzie, W. J. M. (1991). "Comparing forms of comparative analysis". *Political Studies*. 39 (3): 446–462. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9248.1991.tb01622.x. Archived from the original on 2012-10-21.
 - Hopkin, J. [2002 (1995)] "Comparative Methods", in Marsh, D. and G. Stoker (ed.) *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 249–250
 - van Biezen, Ingrid; Caramani, Daniele (2006). "(Non)comparative politics in Britain". *Politics*. 26 (1): 29–37. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9256.2006.00248.x. Archived from the original on 2013-01-05.
 - Gerber, Alan; Green, Donald (2012). *Field Experiments: Design, Analysis, and Interpretation*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Company. ISBN 978-0393979954.
 - Mahoney, James; Thelen, Kathleen, eds. (2015). *Advances in Comparative-Historical Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
 - Geddes, Barbara (2010). *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. ISBN 978-0-472-09835-4.
 - Simmons, Erica; Rush Smith, Nicholas (2017). "Comparison with an Ethnographic Sensibility" (PDF). *PS: Political Science & Politics*. 50 (1): 126–130. doi:10.1017/S1049096516002286. Retrieved 7 November 2019.
 - Hall, Peter (2003). "Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Politics". In Mahoney, James; Rueschemeyer, Dietrich (eds.). *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0-521-81610-6.
 - King, Gary; Keohane, Robert; Verba, Sidney (1994). *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. ISBN 0-691-03470-2.

2.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 1

- 1) Write on the basis of your personal observations.

Check Your Progress 2

- 1) See Section 2.2

Check Your Progress 3

1) The comparisons are undertaken on the basis of testing hypothesis, inferring causality and producing reliable generalizations. As such they are characterised by precision, validity, reliability and verifiability the necessary aspects of scientific research.

- 2) See Sub-section 2.3.2

Check Your Progress 4

- 1) See Sub-section 2.4.1
- 2) Design on the basis of what you have learnt in this unit.

Check Your Progress 5

- 1) See Section 2.4
- 2) Design your answer with the all over analysis from the unit.

UNIT 3: FORMAL: INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH

STRUCTURE

- 3.0 Objectives
- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 The Institutional Approach
 - 3.2.1 The Institutional Approach: A Historical Overview
 - 3.2.2 The Institutional Approach and the Emergence of Comparative Government
- 3.3 Institutional Approach: A Critical Evaluation
- 3.4 The Institutional Approach in Contemporary Comparative Study
- 3.5 Let us sum up
- 3.6 Key Words
- 3.7 Questions for Review
- 3.8 Suggested readings and references
- 3.9 Answers to Check Your Progress

3.0 OBJECTIVES

In this unit we shall focus on (a) what constitutes the institutional approach (b) the significance of this approach in making comparisons (c) the units of comparisons (d) the specific questions this approach seeks to answer or alternatively, what are the questions which this approach can possibly answer, and what are its aspirations and capacities (e) how does this approach explain differences and similarities. After going through these you will be able to understand:

- what are the bases of comparison in this approach.
- where from does it derive its tools of comparison and
- what purposes are sought to be served by such comparisons
- what, in other words, is the vantage point of this approach
- the limitations, and conversely, the importance of this approach both at present and at the time when this approach constituted the main field of comparative political analysis.

This unit is divided into different sections which take up in some detail the above concerns. Each section is followed by questions based on the section. Towards the end of the unit is provided a list of readings which should be used to 'supplement this unit. Questions towards the end of the unit will help you to assess your overall understanding of the Institutional approach. All terms which have specific meanings in comparative political analysis have been explained in the section on keywords.

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The institutional approach to comparative political analysis, simply put, is a comparative study of institutions. The nature (comparative) and subject matter (institutions) of study are thus quite evident. If, for example, one were to study the relative significance of the upper houses in parliamentary democracies, one would study the upper houses in several parliamentary democracies (e.g., the Rajya Sabha in India and the House of Lords in United Kingdom) and assess their relative significance in each case. One could then, on the basis of this comparative study of such institutions, arrive at generalized conclusions and explanations pertaining to their relevance or even utility in parliamentary democracies e.g. the constitution of upper houses of parliament lacks representative character or the hereditary character of upper houses erodes the democratic character of legislatures. One could also, for example, look at the upper houses of parliaments to study the historical contexts which shape the evolution of a particular upper house. One could, for example, examine the contexts (social and economic) of the evolution of the two houses of Parliament in United Kingdom to see why the House of Lords retained a hereditary character. One could understand the contexts in which the current initiatives to end its hereditary character emerged. For a long time, comparative political analysis was associated primarily with a comparative study of institutions. Comparative political analysis may in fact be said to have begun with a study of institutions. Thus if one were to trace the evolution of comparative politics as a discipline of study, one can see the study of institutions as marking the point where the

comparative method first began to be used. The study of institutions, however, not only marked the beginning of comparative study, it remained more or less the predominant approach in comparative politics up to the nineteen fifties. Thus one can propose that traditional comparative political analysis was confined to the study of institutions and the various ways in which these institutions manifested themselves in the distribution of power and the relationships between the various layers and organs of government.

3.2 THE INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH

The study of institutions has a long history beginning perhaps with the philosophical explorations of the ideal state in Plato's Republic. In the section which follows we shall attempt an overview of the manner in which the institutional approach has evolved historically. We shall also, because we are primarily interested with studying the approach within the field of comparative political analysis, concern ourselves especially with the historical moment at which the institutional approach assumed a comparative character. We may, however, as a matter of introduction, describe here characteristic features of the institutional approach differentiate it from other approaches viz., the political systems economy approach etc. It is generally agreed that any approach or enquiry into a problem displays certain characteristics pertaining to (a) subject matter (i.e. what is being studied) (b) vocabulary (the tools or the language) and (c) the choice of political perspective (which determines the vantage point and indicates the direction from and to what purposes enquiry is directed at). If the features of the institutional approach were considered against each of these three counts, it may be seen as marked out by (a) its concern with studying institutions of government and the nature of distribution of power, viz., constitutions, legal-formal institutions of government (b) its largely legalistic and frequently speculative and prescriptive/ normative vocabulary, in so far as it has historically shown a preoccupation with abstract terms and conditions like 'the ideal state' and 'good order' (c) a philosophical, historical or legalistic perspective. A characteristic feature of this has also been its ethnocentrism. That is major works which are as representing the institutional, approach in, comparative

politics, and have concerned themselves only with governments and institutions in western countries. Implicit in this approach is thus a belief in the primacy of western liberal democratic institutions. This belief not only sees western liberal democracy as the best form of government, it gives it also a 'universal' and 'normative' character. The 'universal' character of western liberal / democracy that this form of government is 'not only the best, it is also universally applicable. The 'normativity' of western liberal democracies follows from this assumption. If it is the best form of governance which is also universally applicable, liberal democracies is the form of government which should be adopted everywhere. This prescribed norm i.e. liberal democracy, however, also gave scope to an important exception. This exception unfolded in the practices of rule in the colonies and in the implications (a) that the institutions of liberal democracy were specifically western in their origin and contexts, (b) that non-western countries were not fit for democratic self-rule until such time as they could be trained for the same under western imperialist rule. In the-sections which follow we shall study in some detail, the origins of the Institutional approach from antiquity to the first quarter of the present century when it became a predominant approach facilitating comparative study.

There is a strong belief that philosophy, history and law have bestowed to the study of politics and it is in the field of institutional approaches. Institutional approaches are ancient and important approach to the study of Political Science. These approaches mainly deal with the formal aspects of government and politics. Institutional approach is concerned with the study of the formal political structures like legislature, executive, and judiciary. It focused on the rules of the political system, the powers of the various institutions, the legislative bodies, and how the constitution worked. Main drawback of this approach was its narrow focus on formal structures and arrangements. In far-reaching terms, an institution can be described as 'any persistent system of activities in any pattern of group behaviour. More concretely, an institution has been regarded as 'offices and agencies arranged in a hierarchy, each agency having certain functions and powers.

Notes

The study of institutions has been dominant not only to the arena of comparative politics, but to the political science field as a whole. Many writers have argued that institutions have shaped political behaviour and social change. These authors have taken an "institutionalist" approach which treat institutions as independent variables. In the last twenty-five years, the field of comparative politics has experienced the advent of the "new institutionalism," which developed in reaction to the behavioural perspectives that exercise a significant influence on the field during the 1960s and 1970s.

The new institutionalism body can be divided into three analytical approaches:

- i. Historical institutionalism
- ii. Rational choice institutionalism
- iii. Sociological institutionalism

These three theoretical approaches developed autonomously from each other.

The institutional approach to political analysis emphasises on the formal structures and agencies of government. It originally concentrated on the development and operation of legislatures, executives and judiciaries. As the approach developed however, the list is extended to include political parties, constitutions, bureaucracies, interest groups and other institutions which are more or less enduringly engaged in politics.

In the descriptive-institutional approach, the stress is on facts rather than values. In other words, the approach provides factual and historical answers to such questions as;

1. - What are the historical sources of parliamentary supremacy over the kingdom?
2. - What are the procedures followed when a bill becomes law?
3. - By what electoral arrangement are values or representatives chosen?

4. - What are the relative merits and demerits of rigid and flexible constitutions?

Though, descriptive-institutional approach is slightly old, political experts still concentrate chiefly on scrutinising the major political institutions of the state such as the executive, legislature, the civil service, the judiciary and local government, and from these examinations, valuable insights as to their organisation can be drawn, proposals for reform conversed and general conclusions obtainable. The approach has been critiqued for the disregard of the informed aspects of politics, norms, beliefs, values, attitudes, personality and the processes. Institutional approach is also criticized for being too narrow. It ignores the role of individuals who constitute and operate the formal as well as informal structures and substructures of a political system. Another problem is that the meaning and the range of an institutional system vary with the view of the scholars. Researchers of this approach ignored the international politics (J. C. Johari, 1982).

The study of institutions has been central not only to the "eld of comparative politics, but to the political science "eld as a whole. #any authors have argued that institutions have shaped political behavior and social change. These authors have taken an \$institutionalist% approach which treat institutions as independent variables. In the last twenty five years the "eld of comparative politics has perienced the emergence of the new institutionalism, which developed in reaction to the behavioral perspectives that exercise a significant in (hence on the "eld during the. The new institutionalism body cans be divided into three analytical approaches: historical institutionalism, rational choice institutionalism, and sociological institutionalism.

The study of institutions has been central not only to the field of comparative politics, but to the political science field as a whole. Many authors have argued that institutions have shaped political behavior and social change. These authors have taken an “institutionalist” approach which treat institutions as independent variables. In the last twenty-five

Notes

years the field of comparative politics has experienced the emergence of the “new institutionalism,” which developed in reaction to the behavioral perspectives that exercise a significant influence on the field during the 1960s and 1970s. The new institutionalism body can be divided into three analytical approaches: historical institutionalism, rational choice institutionalism, and sociological institutionalism. These three theoretical islands developed independently from each other. I will provide a review of the three analytical approaches.

Historical Institutionalism

This approach developed in response to group theories of politics and structural-functionalism (Hall and Taylor 1996). Historical institutionalists sought to expand both approaches by “borrowing” existent ideas and adding new assumptions to them. From group theory, historical institutionalists borrowed the assumption that conflict among rival groups for resources is at the heart of politics (Hall and Taylor 1996). From the structural-functionalists, historical institutionalists borrowed the assumption that the state is made up of interacting parts.

The big contributors to this approach are Steinmo and Thelen. Steinmo and Thelen see institutions as a constraint upon individuals and their choices (Koelble 1995). They argue that institutions are a determinant of choices and preferences. Steinmo and Thelen critique the rational choice approach for viewing affect the behavior of individuals, historical institutionalists use two approaches – the calculus and the cultural approaches. institutions as a constraint upon individuals but not as determinants of choice.

Historical institutionalists define institutions as the “formal or informal procedures, routines, norms and conventions embedded in the organizational structure of the polity or political economy” (Hall and Taylor 1996). When it comes to the one of the big questions of institutional analysis, how institutions

The calculus approach emphasizes the aspects of human behavior that are based on strategic calculation – individuals seek to maximize their goals given by their preference and they act strategically in the pursuit of those goals (Hall and Taylor 1996). It is important to note that preferences and goals are exogenously to the analysis. Institutions affect human behavior mainly by providing actors decreasing the level of uncertainty about the behavior of other actors by providing information, rules and norms.

The cultural approach argues that human behavior is not fully strategic; rather it is bounded by an individual's worldview. This approach does not see individuals as utility maximizers, but as “satisficers” whose actions are dependent on context rather than strategic calculation (Hall and Taylor 1996). Also, institutions provide moral or cognitive templates for interpretation which in turn affect the identities, self-images, and preferences of individuals.

Historical institutionalists are attentive to the relationship between institutions and ideas. They emphasize the importance of institutions but they do not posit institutions as the only causal force in politics; other factors play a role such as socioeconomic development and diffusion of ideas. Some of the weaknesses of this approach is that it does not incorporate some aspects of individual decision making to its analysis. Some of the strengths of this approach include its emphasis on the effect of political struggle on institutional outcomes and how institutional outcomes then affect political struggles. This approach should be more useful to the analysis of institutional development and policymaking (Koelble 1995).

Rational Choice Institutionalism

The rational choice institutionalism was born out of the study of American congressional behavior (Hall and Taylor 1996). These scholars were trying to explain why congressional outcomes were considerably stable and they decided to look at institutions. They found that

Notes

institutions of the Congress lowered transactions costs among legislators making the passage of legislation stable.

Some of the big names of this approach are North, Levi and Rothstein. North and Levi respond to the historical institutionalists and sociological institutionalist's view that individuals act upon bounded rationality. They argue that if individuals do not realize their interest, it is because they do not have complete information and are subject to transaction costs (Koelble 1995).

Rational choice institutionalists assume that individuals have a fixed set of preferences and they behave in manner that maximizes the attainment of these preferences. One of the unique assumptions of rational choice institutionalists see politics as a series of collective action problems (Hall and Taylor 1996). Individuals are constraint to take actions in the absence of institutional arrangements that pose guarantees complementary behavior of other individuals.

Some of the weaknesses of the rational choice institutionalism include: (a) rational choice institutionalists are unable to provide an adequate predictive theory of action since it does not specifies how preferences come about and why they vary from individual to individual; (b) sociological institutionalists argue that the rational choice institutionalists view that individuals create institutions in order to further their goals is incorrect because individuals cannot choose among institutions and rules; (c) rational choice institutionalism ignores social structure. The rational choice institutionalist approach ought to be more useful for the analysis of interactions between organizations and individuals (Koelble 1995).

Sociological Institutionalism

This approach emerged from organizational theory. These scholars wanted to challenge the view that some parts of the world reflect a formal rationality while some others reflect culture. They argued that the "institutional forms and procedures used by modern organizations were

not adopted simply because they were most efficient for the task at hand ... instead... these forms and procedures should be seen as culturally specific practices” (Hall and Taylor 1996).

Sociological institutionalists define institutions more broadly than any other approach. Powell and DiMaggio define institutions not just as “rules, procedures, organizational standards, and governance structures, but also as conventions and customs” (Koelble 1995). They go further and make the assumption that institutions define “rational actors.” When it comes to the relationship between individuals and institutions, scholars use the cultural approach to explain outcomes. They argue that institutions affect behavior of individuals by socializing individuals into particular institutional roles and individuals consequently internalize norms related to these roles.

One of the weaknesses of this approach is that it does not explain how institutions originate. Another weakness is the operationalization of culture. Some of the strengths of this approach are: (a) it is able to explain how institutions affect individuals’ preferences or identities; (b) it provides an explanation how actors choose strategies from culturally-specific repertoires (Hall and Taylor 1995).

3.2.1 The Institutional Approach: A Historical Overview

Perhaps the oldest comparative study of governments was made by Aristotle who studied constitutions and practices in Greek city-states. Contrasting them with politics in the so called 'barbarian' states, Aristotle made a typology of governments distinguishing between monarchies, oligarchies and democracy and between these 'ideal' governments and their 'perverted' forms. The study of comparative politics at this stage was marked by what may be called an interrelation between facts and values. At this stage of its origins, a study of institutions did not attempt to 'analyse' the 'theory and practice' of government as emphasised by

James Bryce in the late nineteenth century, to which we will come later in the course of this section. There was instead an overwhelming desire to explore 'ideal' states and forms of governments. In other words there was more emphasis on speculations i.e on questions about what 'ought' to be, rather than an analysis seeking explanations of what 'is' or what actually existed. With Machiavelli (*The Prince*) in the sixteenth century and Montesquieu (*The Spirit of Laws*) in the middle of the eighteenth century, the emphasis on empirical details and facts about existing state of affairs came to be established. Montesquieu was, however, followed mainly by constitutional lawyers, whose vocation determined that they concentrate more on the contents i.e., the theoretical (legal-constitutional) framework of governments rather than the manner in which these frameworks unfolded in practice. Tocqueville, in many ways, was the forerunner of the study of 'theory and practice' of governments, which became the essence of the institutional approach in comparative political analysis in later years. (Refer to Tocqueville's studies of American and French democracies in Unit 2: Comparative Method and Strategies of Comparison). Bagehot (*The English Constitution*, 1867) made another significant contribution to the development of this element of the institutional approach in his study of the British Cabinet drawing important points of comparison with the American Executive. It was, however, Bryce, Lowell and Ostrogorski, who in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, made important contributions to comparative study of institutions and by implication to the evolution of comparative governments as a distinct branch of study.

3.2.2 The Institutional Approach and the Emergence of Comparative Government

The Contributions of Bryce, Lowell and Ostrogorski Bryce, Lowell and Ostrogorski's works towards the end of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century changed radically the contents of the institutional approach and thereby the nature and scope of comparative politics. Assessing their contributions Jean Blondel asserts that Bryce and Lowell were in fact the democracy and examined the working of the legislatures

and their decline. Lowell's works *Governments and Parties in Continental Europe* (1896) and *Public Opinion and Popular Government* (1913) where he undertakes separate studies of France, Germany, Switzerland etc. and a comparative study of referendums and its impacts respectively were equally important. Similarly, Ostrogorski's study *Democracy and the Organisation of Political Parties* (1902) which aimed to test the hypothesis, so to speak, of the 'democratic' or 'oligarchical' character of political parties was a pioneering work of the time. It is important now to see exactly how these works augmented and in fact changed the manner in which institutions were so far being studied.

i) 'Theory and Practice of governments':

We mentioned in the earlier section that comparative study of governments tended to be philosophical speculative or largely legal-constitutional i.e., they were either concerned with abstract notions like the 'ideal state', or with facts regarding the legal constitutional frameworks and structures of governments. Based on liberal constitutional theory they studied the formal institutional structures with emphasis on their legal powers and functions. The works formed part of studies on 'Comparative Government' or 'Foreign Constitutions'. These works were seen to be relevant to the elites' efforts in institutional-building in various countries. This is why in the newly independent countries institutionalism acquired some fascination. Bryce and Lowell, however, emphasised that the existing studies were partial and incomplete. A more comprehensive study of governments should according to them include also the working of the legal-constitutional frameworks of governments. Such a study, they stressed, required not only a study of the theoretical bases or contexts of governments (i.e. the legal constitutional framework and governmental institutions) but also an equal emphasis on the study of 'practices of government'. To focus just on constitutions, as lawyers do, was insufficient as it would lead to ignoring the problems of their operation and implementation. On the other hand to focus exclusively on practice, without grounding it in its theoretical (constitutional) framework, would again be an incomplete

Notes

study, as one may lose sight of the contexts within which the problems of implementation emerge. It was thus, primarily with Bryce and Lowell that the content of institutional approach in comparative political analysis came to be defined as a study of the 'theory and practice of government'.

ii) Focus on 'facts': A significant component of these studies was the concern to study 'practice' through an analysis of 'facts' about the working of governments. To study practice one needed to discover, collect and even 'amass' facts. Bryce was emphatic in his advocacy to base one's analysis on facts, without which, he said, 'data is mere speculation': 'facts, facts, facts, when facts have been supplied each of us tries to reason from them'. A major difficulty, however, which collection of data regarding practices of governments encountered was the tendency among government to hide facts than to reveal them. Facts were thus difficult to acquire because governments and politicians often hid facts or were unwilling to clarify what the real situation is. Nonetheless, this difficulty did not deter them from stressing the importance of collecting data about almost every aspect of political life, parties, executives, referendums, legislatures etc. This effort was sustained by later comparatists like Herman Finer (*Theory and Practice of Modern Government*, 1932) and Carl Friedrich (*Constitutional Government and Democracy*, 1932).

iii) Technique: The search for facts also led Bryce and Lowell towards the use of quantitative indicators, on the basis of the realization that in the study of government, qualitative and quantitative types of evidence have to be balanced. Finally, however, Bryce and Lowell felt that conclusions could be firm only if they were based on as wide a range of facts as possible. Therefore, their studies extended geographically to a large number of countries which, at the time, had institutions of a constitutional or near constitutional character. They therefore, attempted to focus their study on governments of western, central and southern Europe. It was, however, with Ostrogorski's work that comparative political analysis began to focus on studying specific institutions on a comparative basis. In 1902, Ostrogorski published a detailed study of political parties in Britain and America. Later, significant works on the role of political parties was done by Michels (*Political Parties*, 1915) and M. Duverger (*Political Parties*, 1950).

Major criticisms of the institutional approach came in the 1950s from 'system theorists' like Easton and Macridis who emphasised the building of overarching models having a general global application. They attempted to understand and explain political processes in different countries on the basis of these models. These criticisms and the defense offered by institutionalists will be discussed in the next section.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with the answer given at the end of the unit.

1) What do you understand by the institutional approach?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2) What are its various characteristics?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3) Examine the characteristics of the institutional approach at the turn of the nineteenth century.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3.3 INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH: A CRITICAL EVALUATION

It is interesting that criticisms of the institutional approach in comparative political analysis have come in successive waves, in the early part of the twentieth century and then again in the nineteen fifties. There has been after each wave of criticism a resurgence of the approach in a replenished form. Before the study of institutions acquired a comparative character (however limited) at the turn of the century, the approach was criticised, (a) as given to speculation; (b) as largely prescriptive and normative; (c) concerned only with irregularities and regularities without looking for relationships; (d) configurative and non-comparative focussing what it did on individual countries; (e) ethnocentric as it concentrated on western 'democracies'; (f) descriptive as it focussed on formal (constititional and governmental) structure; (g) historical without being analytical (h) contributors within this framework were so absorbed with the study of institutions that differences in cultural settings and ideological frameworks were completely ignored while comparing, say, the upper chambers of the UK, USA and USSR; (i) methodologically they were accused as being partial, incomplete and theoretically, it was said they missed the substance of political life. We saw, however, that with Bryce and his contemporaries the nature and content of the institutional approach underwent a significant change, acquiring in a limited way a comparative character, and attempting to combine theoretical contexts with practices of governments. In the nineteen fifties the institutional approach as it developed with Bryce, Lowell and Ostrogorski, came again under increasing criticism by political scientists like David Easton and Roy Macridis. In his work *The Political System* (1953), David Easton made a strong attack against Bryce's approach calling it 'mere factualism'. This approach, alleged Easton, had influenced American Political Science, in the direction of what he called 'hyperfactualism'. While admitting that Bryce did not neglect 'theories', the latter's (Bryce's) aversion to making explanatory or theoretical models, had led, asserted Easton, to a 'surfeit of facts' and consequently to 'a theoretical malnutrition'. (You will study in another unit about 'system building' as the basis of Easton's 'systems approach' to

studying political phenomena. It will not, therefore, be difficult to understand why Easton felt that Bryce's approach had misdirected American Political Science onto a wrong path.) Jean Blondel, however, defends the institutional approach from criticisms like those of Easton, directed towards its so called 'factualism'. Blondel would argue first that the charge of 'surfeit of facts' was misplaced because there were in fact very few facts available to political scientists for a comprehensive political analysis. In reality very little was known about the structures and activities of major institutions of most countries, particularly about the communist countries and countries of the so called Third World. The need for collecting more facts thus could not be neglected. This became all the more important given the fact that more often than not governments tended to hide facts rather than transmit them. Secondly, the devaluation of the utility of facts regarding institutions and legal arrangements, by the supporters of a more global or systemic approach was, to Blondel, entirely misconstrued. Institutions and the legal framework within which they functioned formed a significant part of the entire framework in which a political phenomenon could be studied. Facts about the former thus had to be compared to facts about other aspects of the political life to avoid a partial study. Facts were, in any case needed for any effective analysis. No reasoning could be done without having 'facts' or 'data'. This coupled with the point that facts were difficult to acquire made them integral to the study of political analysis.

In 1955 Roy Macridis pointed out the need for a 'reorientation' in the comparative study of government. He emphasised that in its existing form comparative study has been 'comparative in name only'. Macridis described the orientation of institutional approach as 'non-comparative', 'parochial', 'static' and 'monographic'. A good proportion of work was moreover, he asserted, 'essentially descriptive'. This was because the analysis was historical or legalistic and therefore 'rather narrow'. (See Roy Macridis, *The Study of Comparative Government*, pp.7- 12). It was however, realized in the 1950s, and continued to be the concern, that there remained actually a paucity of fact from which valid

Notes

generalizations could be made. There was thus, asserts Blondel, a 'surfeit of models' rather than a 'surfeit of facts'. Blondel emphasized that building models without grounding them in facts would result in misinformation. This misinformation, given that facts about some countries were harder to come by, was likely to affect and at times reinforce preconceptions about the countries. Thus while writing about Latin American Legislatures in 1971, W. H. Agor remarked that there was a tendency to assert that legislatures in that part of the world were very weak. Statements such as these, he said, were based on 'extremely impressionistic evidence' that is, in the absence of 'facts' consciously collected for the purposes of the study. Thus the need for collecting and devising ways of collecting facts was stressed emphatically by followers of the institutional approach. The criticisms were, however, followed by works which had a more comparative focus and included non-western countries. Further, there was also an attempt to undertake studies comparing structures not determined by legal-constitutional frameworks e.g. G.Sartori's work on Parties and Party Systems (1976) which included in its scope in a limited way communist countries and those of the Third World, and F.Castles' study of Pressure Groups and Political Culture (1967).

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with the answer given at the end of the unit.

- 1) What are the limitations of the institutional approach as put forward by Easton and Macridis?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

- 2) How does Blondel build up a case in defense of the institutional approach?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

3.4 THE INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH IN CONTEMPORARY COMPARATIVE STUDY

Institutionalism remained more or less the exclusive approach in comparative politics, up to the nineteen fifties. As discussed in a previous section (3.2), the ' approach became distinctive with the works of Bryce, Lowell and Ostrogorski.

Pioneering work was done in comparative politics by Herman Finer (Theory and Practice of Modern Governments, 1932) and Carl Friedrich (Constitutional Government and Democracy, 1932). Grounded in liberal Constitutional theory, they studied the formal institutional structures with emphasis on their legal powers and actions. These works formed part of studies on 'Comparative Government' or 'Foreign Constitutions' and were considered relevant to the elites' efforts in institutional building in various countries. In newly independent countries, the institutional approach, appearing as it did, to emphasise institution-building, acquired prominence.

The main focus of the institutional approach (i.e. its subject matter) was (a) law and the constitution, (b) historical study of government and the state understand the manner in which sovereignty, jurisdictions, legal and instruments evolved in their different forms, (c) the manner in which structures of government functioned (theory and practice) which included study of distributions of power and how these manifested themselves between nation and state, centre and local government,

Notes

administration bureaucracy legal and constitutional practices and 'principles.

An underlying assumption of the approach was a belief in the uniquely character of democracy. This meant, as stated in the Introduction that democracy was seen as not only western in its origins but its elsewhere was imagined and prescribed only in that form. This led, in order to legislative the the in relation and western (section 3.1), application mentioned earlier, to a largely westcentric study i.e. a concentration on coun Europe and North America. Blondel feels that the decline in the i approach in the 1950s was in part due to its inability to accomm of inquiry 'on western (liberal) governments' particularly the p Communist~ countries of Eastern Europe and the newly indepe Asia and Latin America. Thus an approach which prided itself theory with practice found itself unable to modify its framew study facts which did not conform to liberal constitutional de decline of the institutional approach in the 1950s was due in earlier, to the concerns by system theorists to building theoretical generalisations, rather than conclusions derived from facts.

Since the late nineteen sixties and seventies, however, the institutional I approach resurfaced in a form which is called 'new institutionalism' and can be seen as having retained these its focus characteristics: on the study (a) of As theory the term and suggests, practice of institutions. new institutionalism, I The approach stressed the importance of state and its institutional structures. (P. Evans, D. Rueschmeyer and T. Skocpol eds., *Bringing the State Back In*, 1985), Without providing an overarching framework within which the institutions may be said to function (as in structural-functional approach). It focussed instead on the manner in which the institutions interrelate. (b) While refraining from making overarching frameworks, the approach did not, however, avoid making generalise conclusions. The preoccupation with the collection of facts, also did not diminish. In striving for this combination, i.e., an adherence to fact based study aimed towards making generalised conclusions,

however, the institutional approach, was careful to 'draw conclusions only after careful fact-finding efforts have taken place'.

Check Your Progress 3

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with the answer given at the end of the unit.

- 1) What is the state of institutional approach in comparative political analysis now?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

3.5 LET US SUM UP

The institutional approach in its various forms has been an important constituent of comparative political analysis. The study of institutions of governance was at the core of political analysis be it the explorations of the ideal state of Plato's Republic or the typology of States proposed by Aristotle in his Politics. In its classical and early modern forms the approach was more philosophical and speculative, concerned with ideal typical states and prescribing the norms of ideal governance. With Montesquieu and his successors the preoccupation of the approach with legal-constitutional frameworks or structures of democracies became entrenched. The belief in institutions of liberal constitutional democracies, however did not translate into a study of the manner in which the structures of governance functioned. More often than not, at least till the end of the nineteenth century, the intricacies of the legal-constitutional structures or the theoretical framework of governance, continued to seize the attention of political scientists and legal experts. So far, thus the approach could be said to have been characterized by a preoccupation with institutions and legal-formal institutions of

Notes

government and normative values of liberal democracy. This approach was propagated also by colonial regimes to popularize European liberal values in the colonies. The works of the institutionalists were also extremely relevant to the elite's efforts in institution building in various countries. This is why in the newly independent countries institutionalism acquired some fascination. It was, however, only by the late nineteenth and early twentieth century that scholars like Bryce, Lowell and Ostrogorski, broke new grounds in the study of institutions

(a) by combining the study of theoretical-legal-constitutional framework with facts about their functioning and,

(b) giving the study a comparative flavor by including into their works the study of institutions in other countries. Thus, the approach, by the first quarter of the twentieth century, could be said to have acquired a limited comparative character and rigour by-combining in its analysis theory and practice of institutions. In the nineteen fifties, however, the approach came under attack from 'system builders' like Easton and Macridis. The latter criticized the approach

(a) for overemphasizing facts

(b) for lacking theoretical formulations which could be applied generally to institutions in other countries and

(c) for lacking a comparative character. These theorists preferred on their own part to build 'holistic' or 'global' 'models' or 'systems' which could explain the functioning of institutions in countries all over the world.

An important criticism leveled against the practitioners of the institutional approach was their west centric approaches i.e. their failure to take up for study institutions in the countries of the Third World, and communist countries of Eastern Europe. The failure to study these countries emanated in effect from the normative framework of this approach which could accommodate only the theoretical paradigms of western liberal-constitutional democracies. The lack of tools to understand the institutions in other countries of the developing and the

communist worlds resulted in a temporary waning of the influence of this approach. It resurfaced, however, in the late sixties and early seventies, in a form which while retaining its emphasis on facts, did not shy away from making generalized theoretical statements, without, however, attaining to build inclusive models.

Check Your Progress 4

Note: i) Space given below is provided for your answer

ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of the unit.

- 1) Give an overview of the historical development of the institutional approach distinguishing between its significant characteristics at each stage.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

- 2) How far do you think is the institutional approach effective in studying political processes in a comparative perspective?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3.6 KEY WORDS

Configurative description: Study of political institutions oriented towards a detailed description of some countries without the use of any explicit conceptual framework. Empiricism: A strand in philosophy that attempts to tie knowledge to experience. Pure empiricists would argue that the basis of true knowledge is facts which are derived through sense perceptions. Ethnocentrism: The application of values and theories

Notes

drawn from one's own culture to other groups and people's ethnocentrism implies bias or distortion. Fact: A fact is what is said to be the case and it is associated with observation and experiment. Formal-legalism: the constitutional orientation comprising detailed descriptions of the rules, supposedly governing the operations of cabinets, legislators, courts and bureaucracies. Liberal democracy: a form of democratic rule that balances the principle of limited government against the ideal of popular consent. Its 'liberal' features are reflected in a network of internal and external checks on government that are designed to guarantee liberty and afford citizens protection against the state. Its 'democratic' character is based on a system of regular and competitive elections, conducted on the basis of universal suffrage and political equality. Model: A theoretical representation of empirical data that aims to advance understanding by highlighting significant relationships and interaction. Non-comparison: Most of the texts in the field of comparative government either studied one single country or engaged in parallel descriptions of a few countries. Normative: The prescription of values and standards of conduct; what 'should be' rather than what 'is'. Parochialism: Restricted or confined within narrow limits e.g., in comparative politics there was a typical bias in the selection of relevant countries to be studied - the United Kingdom, France, Germany and the United States of America - and in the relevant variables to be employed for description. Perspective: The term widely used in social sciences to talk about different ways of seeing, interpreting and experiencing social reality. Value: Values are states which are supposed to be much more tied up with judgement and subjectivity. Values are suppositions, they are not objective and they do not apply to all people.

3.7 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

- 1) What do you understand by the institutional approach?
- 2) What are its various characteristics?
- 3) Examine the characteristics of the institutional approach at the turn of the nineteenth century.
- 4) What are the limitations of the institutional approach as set out by Easton and Macridis?

- 5) How does Blondel build up a case in defense of the institutional approach?
- 6) What is the state of institutional approach in comparative political analysis now?

3.8 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Apter, David E., 'Comparative Politics, Old and New' in Robert E. Goodin and Hans H.D. Klingeman eds., *A New Handbook of Political Science*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996.
- Blondel, Jean, *The Discipline of Politics*, Butterworths, London, 1981. (Chapter 7: Middle Level Comparisons)
- Blondel, Jean, 'Then and Now: Comparative Politics', *Political Studies*, XLVII, 1999, pp. 152- 160.
- Wiarda, Howard J., *New Directions in Comparative Politics*, Westview Press, Boulder, 1985.
- Kim, HeeMin. 1997. "Rational Choice Theory and Third World Politics: The 1990 Party Merger in Korea." *Comparative Politics* 30(1): 83-100.
- Hall, Peter (2003). "Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Politics". In Mahoney, James; Rueschemeyer, Dietrich (eds.). *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0-521-81610-6.
- King, Gary; Keohane, Robert; Verba, Sidney (1994). *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. ISBN 0-691-03470-2.
- Anckar, Carsten. "On the Applicability of the Most Similar Systems Design and the Most Different Systems Design in Comparative Research." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 11.5 (2008): 389–401. Informaworld. Web. 20 June 2011.

3.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 1

1) The approach is based on the study of various institutions in comparison with each other. This compares similarities and differences in the composition and functions of similar institutions e.g. executive, legislature etc. and tries to draw conclusions.

2) Comparison of similar institutions; context of their origin, development and working; drawing conclusions; making suggestions for changes or improvements on the basis of conclusions.

3) See Sub-section 3.2.2

Check Your Progress 2

1) See section 3.3

2) Blondel pointed out the limitations of structural Functional approach and as yet lack of sufficient information about the institutions. He also emphasised the importance of institutions and legal frameworks. For elaboration see 3.3.

Check Your Progress 3

1) See section 3.4

Check Your Progress 4

1) Write your answer on the overall understanding of the Unit.

2) See section 3.5 and also use overall assessment of the Unit.

UNIT 4: POLITICAL SYSTEMS AND STRUCTURAL FUNCTIONAL APPROACH

STRUCTURE

- 4.0 Objectives
- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 Systems Approach
 - 4.2.1 What is the Systems Approach?
 - 4.2.2 Geneses of the Systems Approach
 - 4.2.3 Historical Context
- 4.3 General Systems Theory and Systems Theory
 - 4.3.1 General Systems and Systems Approaches: Distinctions
 - 4.3.2 Systems Analysis: Characteristic Features
 - 4.3.3 Systems Approaches: Concerns and Objectives
- 4.4 Derivatives of the Systems Analysis
 - 4.4.1 Political System Derivative
 - 4.4.2 Structural - Functional Derivative
 - 4.4.3 Cybernetics Derivative
- 4.5 Systems Theory : An Evaluation
 - 4.5.1 Limitations of the Systems Approach
 - 4.5.2 Strength of the Systems Approach
- 4.6 Structural Functionalism
 - 4.6.1 History of Structural Functionalism
- 4.7 Varieties of Functional Analysis
 - 4.7.1 Applying Functional Analysis to the Study of Politics
- 4.8 Terminology Used in Structural-Functional Analysis
 - 4.8.1 Function and Structure
 - 4.8.2 Requisites and Prerequisites
 - 4.8.3 Concrete and Analytic Structures
 - 4.8.4 Institutions, additional Structures, and Utopian Structures
 - 4.8.5 Ideal and Actual Structures
- 4.9 Criticisms of Structural Functionalism
- 4.10 Let us sum up
- 4.11 Key Words

- 4.12 Questions for Review
- 4.13 Suggested readings and references
- 4.14 Answers to Check Your Progress

4.0 OBJECTIVES

This unit deals with one of the modern approaches regarding Comparative Government and Politics. It is the Systems Approach. After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- To explain the meaning, genesis and historical background of this approach;
- To distinguish between general systems theory, system theory and political system theory;
- To state the characteristic features and objectives of the systems theory;
- To amplify some of the derivatives (such as input-output, structural-functional, cybernetics' models) of the systems theory;
- To evaluate the systems theory in its proper perspective.

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The traditional approaches and characteristics of their own limitations, by and large, proved irrelevant in making the study of comparative governments and politics fruitful. These approaches, in their analysis of comparative governments and politics, have been largely, historical, formalistic, legalistic, descriptive, "explanatory and thus, have become proverbial, static and hour or less monographic. These are narrow in the sense that their description is confined to the study of western political system; they are formal legal in the sense that their analysis is inclined excessively to the study of only and merely legal institutions; and they are subjective in the sense that they do not put the political systems in any objective, empirical and scientific test. The modern approaches to the study of comparative governments and politics, while attempting to remove the defects inherent the traditional approaches, seek to understand in a clearer perspective, and objectively review the major

paradigms, conceptual frameworks and contending models so to understand and ' Approaches assess their relevance. Obviously, the modern approaches are, rather scientific, realistic, analytical and those that have brought revolution in comparative politics, Sidney Verba sums up the principles behind this revolution, saying, "Look beyond description to more theoretically relevant problems; look beyond the formal institutions of government to political processes and political functions; and look beyond the countries of Western Europe to the new nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America." The revolution was directed, as Almond and Powell rightly point out, toward (a) the search for more comprehensive scope, (b) the search for realism, (c) the search for precision, (d) the search for the theoretical order.

The modern approaches to the study of comparative governments and politics are numerous. One such approach is the systems approach, also called the systems theory or the systems analysis. "This approach is, and in fact, has been the most popular way of looking at any political activity. According to Prof. Kaplan it is, the study of a set of inter-related variables, as distinguished from the environment of the set and of the ways in which this set is maintained under the impact of environment disturbances. It focuses on sets of patterned relations involving frequent inter-actions and a substantial degree of interdependence among the members of a system as well as established procedure for the protection and maintenance of the system (William A. Welsh : Studying Politics, 1973, p.65). You have already studied institutional approach to comparative politics in the last unit. In this unit, an attempt shall be made to study, review and examine the systems approach, another modern approach to the study of comparative politics. While discussing the systems approach, its various aspects such as the genesis of the approach, its historical context, its distinction from the general systems theory, its characteristics and its strength and weaknesses shall be taken into view. Political system as say the input-output analysis and structural-functional analysis as the two salient derivatives of the systems approach shall be elaborately discussed.

4.2 SYSTEMS APPROACH

4.2.1 What is the Systems Approach?

The System approach is the study of inter-related variables forming one system, a unit, a whole which is composed of many facts, a set of elements standing in interaction. This approach assumes that the system consists of discernible, regular and internally consistent patterns, each interacting with another, and giving, on the whole, the picture of a self-regulating order. It is, thus, the study of a set of interactions occurring within and yet analytically distinct from, the larger system. What the systems theory presumes include:

- i) the existence of a whole on its own merit;
- ii) the whole consisting of parts;
- iii) the whole existing apart from the other wholes;
- iv) each whole influencing the other and in turn, being influenced itself;
- v) the parts of the whole are not only inter-related, but they interact with one another and in the process creating a self-evolving work;
- vi) the parts relate themselves into a patterned relationship, while the whole exists, and keeps existing.

The emphasis of the systems theory is on the articulation of the system and of its Systems Approach component and the behaviours by means of which it is able to maintain itself over time.

4.2.2 Geneses of the Systems Approach

The systems approaches its origins traced to natural resources, though numerous involvement aimed at the unification of science and scientific analysis may be said to have worked for this approach. The original idea of systems analysis edme from biology and the11 adopted by the social scientists. The German biologist Ludwig Van Bertalanfly was the first to

state the formulations of the general systems theory way back in 1930s, and it was from the general systems theory that the social scientists evolved and formulated the concept of the systems theory. Bertalanffy defined system in a set of 'elements studying in interaction'. Elaborating the concept of system, Anatol Rapoport says, that it is

- i) something consisting of a set (finite or infinite) of entities,
- ii) among which a set of relations is specified, so that
- iii) deductions are possible from some relations to others or from the relations among the entities to the behaviour or the history of the system.

The application of the 'systems' approach to politics, Professor S.N. Ray points out, L'allos one to see the subject in such a way that 'each part of the political canvas does not stand alone but is related to each other part' or that 'the operation of one part cannot be fully understood without reference to the way in which the whole itself operates. David Easton (A system Analysis of Political Life, 1965), Gabriel Almond (Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach, 1978), David Apter (Introduction to Political Analysis, 1978), Karl Deutsch (Nation and World: Contemporary Political Science, 1967), Morton Kaplan (System and Process in International Politics, 1957 or with' Harold Lasswell, Power and Society, 1950) and other leading American social scientists pioneered the systems analysis in Political Science. More specifically, Easton was one of the few Political Scientists to suggest the utility and importance of the systems analysis for politics while defining a political system as that "behaviour or set of historical through which alternative allocations are made and implemented for society".

4.2.3 Historical Context

The systems approach, like any other modern approach, has evolved in a historical perspective. As the traditional approaches to the study of comparative politics proved futile, the need to understand it in a scientific manner became more important. The influence of other

Notes

disciplines, both natural and social sciences and their mutual interdependence gave a new impetus for looking out these disciplines, comparative politics including, afresh and brought to the fore the idea that scientific analysis is the only way to understand politics. The study of political systems became, as times passed on, more important than the study of Constitutions and governments, the study of political processes came to be regarded more instructive, than the study of political institutions. The post-second World War period witnessed, in the USA particularly, a fundamental shift in the writings of numerous American scholars when they began to borrow a lot from other social and natural sciences so as to give new empirical orientation to political studies which helped ultimately to examine numerous concepts, out in the process enriched their findings. The Social Science Research Council (USA) contributed a lot to provide an environment in which scientific analysis in comparative politics could be carried on. Some other American foundations such as the Ford Foundation, the Rockfellar Foundation, and the Carnegie Foundation Approaches provided liberal funds for studies in comparative politics. Thus, it was possible to introduce new approaches, new definitions, and new research tools, in comparative politics. All this led to what may be conveniently termed as revolution in the discipline: a revolution of sorts in the definition of its mission, problems and methods' (See Michael Rush and Philip Althoff, An Introduction to Political Sociology). The introduction of the systems analysis, like other modern approaches, in comparative politics by writers like Easton, Almond, Kaplan was, in fact, a reaction against the traditional tendency of uni-dimentional, impeding, in the process, the patterns of scientific analysis which make possible the unformal of all knowledge. The systems approach is one of the nod ern approaches that help to understand political activity and political behavior clearly than before. It looks out the social phenomenon as a set of interactive relationships so considered; the systems analysis covers not only the science of politics but also virtually all social sciences.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of this unit.

1) The idea of the systems approach comes from

- a) Astronomy
- b) Biology
- c) Astrology
- d) Economics

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2) The emphasis of the systems approach is on :

- a)
- b)
- c)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3) One of the following is not the proponent of the systems theory:

- a) David Easton
- b) Morton Kaplan
- c) Harold Laski
- d) Gabriel Almond

.....
.....
.....

.....
.....
4) State briefly the inherent defects of the traditional approaches. (State .only three)

- a)
- b)
- c)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

4.3 GENERAL SYSTEMS THEORY AND SYSTEMS THEORY

4.3.1 General Systems and Systems Approaches: Distinctions

It is usually the practice to confuse the systems approach with the general systems theory. The systems analysis may have sprung from the general systems theory, but the two are different in many respects. To identify the systems theory with the general systems theory amounts to committing the philosophical error of the first order. While the general systems theory gives the impression of a system as one which is as integrated as the parts of the human body together, the systems theory does recognise the separate existence of parts. What it means is that the general systems theory advocates organised unity of the system whereas the systems theory speaks of unity in diversity. That is one reason that the general systems theory has been rarely applied to the analysis of potential and social phenomena. The systems theory has been successfully applied to the political phenomenon. David Easton, for

example, has applied the systems theory to politics. Professor Kaplan has brought out the distinction between the general systems theory and the systems theory. He says, "... systems theory is not a general theory of all systems. Although general systems theory does attempt to distinguish different types of systems and to establish a framework within which similarities between systems can be recognised despite differences of subject matter, different kinds of systems require different theories for explanatory purposes. Systems theory not only represents a step away from the general theory approach but also offers an explanation for why such efforts are likely to fail. Thus the correct application of systems theory to politics would involve a move away from general theory toward comparative theory." Furthermore, it has not been possible to make use of the concepts of general systems theory in social sciences such as political science while the systems theory has been able to provide concepts (such as input-output, stability, equilibrium, and feedback) which have been well accepted by the empirical political scientists.

4.3.2 Systems Analysis: Characteristic Features

Systems analysis implies system as a set of interactions. It is, as O.R. Young says, "a set of objects, together with relationships between the objects and between their attributes." To say that a system exists is to say that it exists through its elements, say objects; and its elements (objects) are interacted and they interact within a patterned frame. Systems analyst perceives inter-related and a web-like objects and looks for ever-existing relationships among them. He is an advocate of the interactive relationship, among the objectives his major concerns are

- i) to emphasize the patterned behaviour among the objects of the system,
 - ii) to explain the interactive behaviour among them,
 - iii) to make a search for factors that help maintain the system.
- Systems analysis elaborates, for understanding the system itself, a set of concepts. These include system, sub-system, environment, input, output, conversion process feedback, etc.,

System implies persisting relationships, demonstrating behavioural patterns, among its numerous parts, say objects or entities. A system that constitutes an element of a larger system is called a sub-system. The setting within which a system occurs or works is called environment. The line that separates the system from its environment is known as boundary. The system obtains inputs from the environment in the form of demands upon the system and supports for its functioning. As the system operates, inputs are subjected to Approaches what may be called conversion process and it leads to system outputs embodying rules to be forced or policies to be implemented. When system outputs affect the environment so to change or modify inputs, feedback occurs. Systems approach has, therefore, characteristic features of its own. These features may be summed up briefly as under:

- i) A social phenomenon is not what exist in isolation; it is not just numerous parts joined together to make a whole. It is a unit, a living unit with an existence and goal of its own.
- ii) Its parts may not be and in fact, are not organically related together, but they do make a whole in the sense that they interact and are inter-related. Specific behavioural relationships pattern them into a living system.
- iii) It operates through a mechanism of inputs and outputs and under within an environment which influences it and which, in turn, provides feedback to the environment.
- iv) Its main concern is as to how best it can maintain itself and faces the challenges of decay and decline.
- v) It implements patterned relationships among its numerous parts, explaining their relative behaviour and role they are expected to perform.

4.3.3 Systems Approaches: Concerns and objectives

The system analysis is concerned with certain objectives. It addresses itself to the nations order, change and goal realization as Welsh points

out. The first concern of the systems approach, Welsh says, is 'maintenance of the system's integrity' which, he asserts, depends on system's ability to maintain order. Obviously, the system would evolve 'regularised procedures,' 'by which society's scarce resources' would be so distributed that its members are sufficiently satisfied and would, in no case, permit a situation of chaos and collapse. The second concern of the systems approach, as indicated by Welsh, is how the system meets the challenges of change in its environment. Changes in the environment are natural, so are natural environments effects on the system. It is the system that has to adapt itself realities the environmental changes especially to the technological and changes. The systems approach identifies the conflict between of responding to the changes and the already engineered the environment, and also the capacities to remove the conflict. The third objective of the systems approach is the importance it gives to the goal. -realisation as the central aspect of the system. Why do people organise themselves? Why do people indulge in persistent patterns of interaction and interdependence? Why do people accept particular modes of attitude so as to demonstrate specific behaviour? Obviously, they do so because they want to pursue certain goals that they feel are important. No system call exists over a substantial period of time without articulating, determining and pursuing some specific identifiable goals. Welsh concludes, "The process by which these goals come to be defined for the system as a whole, and by which members of the, system pursue these goals, are important foci in the systems approach."

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below .for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of this unit.

- 1) Bring out two main differences between the General Systems Theory and the Systems Theory.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2) Explain the following terms briefly:

- i) Inputs
- ii) Outputs
- iii) Sub-system
- iv) Feedback

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3) State any two characteristics of the Systems Approach.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

4) With which concerns is the system approaches mainly associate any three objectives.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

4.4 DERIVATIVES OF THE SYSTEMS ANALYSIS

4.4.1 Political System Derivative

Political system or the input-output approach is one derivative of the systems analysis. David Easton has been one of the early political scientists to have introduced the systems approach to politics. He has been able to provide "an original set of concepts for arranging at the level of theory and interpreting political phenomena in a new and helpful way" (Davies and Lewis: Models of Political Systems). He selects the political system as the basic unit of analysis and concentrates on the intra-system behaviour of various systems. He defines political system as "those interactions through which values are authoritatively allocated and implemented for a society". It would be useful to highlight some of the characteristic features of Easton's concept of political system and these, briefly, are:

- a) Political system implies a set of interaction through which values are authoritatively allocated. This means the decisions of those, who are in power, are binding.
- b) Political system is a system of regularized persistent patterns of ' relationships among the people and institutions within it.
- c) Political system, like any natural system, has in it a self-regulating system by which it is able to change, correct and adjusts its processes and structures.
- d) Political system is dynamic in the sense that it can maintain itself through the feedback mechanism. The feedback mechanism helps the system to persist through everything else associated it may change, even radically.
- e) Political system is different from other systems or environments physical, biological, social, economic, ecological, but in coverable to their influence. Boundary lines separate them.

Notes

- f) Inputs through demands and supports put the political system at work while outputs through policies and decisions throwback what is not accepted as feed- back.

O.R. Young sums up the essentials of Easton's political system, saying: "Above all, the political system is seen as a conversion process performing work, producing output and altering its environment, with a continuous exchange between a political system and its environment based on the steady operation of the dynamic processes. At the same time, this approach provides numerous concepts for dealing both with political dynamics in the form of systematic adaptation processes and even with purposive redirection in the form of goal changing feedback. Easton's political system approach has been severely attacked. Professor S.P. Verma regards it as an abstract-ion whose relation to empirical politics (which is classic) is impossible to establish. Eugene Meehan says that Easton does less to explain the theory and more to create the conceptual framework. His analysis, it may be pointed out, is confined to the question of locating and distributing power in the political system. He seems to be concerned more with questions such as persistence and adaptation of the political system as also with regulation of stress, stability and equilibrium and thus advocates only the status quo situation. There is much less, in Easton's formulation, about the politics of decline, disruption and breakdown in political system as Young points out. Despite all claims that the political system approach is designed for macro-level studies, Easton has not been able to go beyond North America and the Western World. Easton's political system or input-output would deal only with the present and has, therefore, no perspective of future and has less study of the past. The merits of the input-output or political system approach can not be ignored. The approach has provided an excellent technique for comparative analysis. It has also provided a set of concepts and categories which have made comparative analysis more interesting and instructive. Young has admitted that Easton's analysis is "undoubtedly the most inclusive systematic approach so far constructed specifically for political analysis by a political scientist." According to Eugene Meehan, "Easton has

produced one of the few comprehensive attempts to lay the foundation for systems analysis in political science and to provide a general functional theory of politics."

4.4.2 Structural - Functional Derivative

The structural functional analysis is another derivative of the systems approach. Coming in through sociology and originating mainly in the writings of anthropologists like Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown, and adopted in political science, especially in comparative politics by Gabriel Almond, structural functional analysis is basically concerned with the phenomenon of system maintenance and regulation. The basic theoretical proposition of this approach is that all systems exist to perform functions through their structures. The central question of this approach, as Young says, is: 'What structures fulfil what basic functions and under what conditions in any given society'? The basic assumptions of the structural-functional derivative of the systems approach are :

- 1) Society is a single inter-connected system in which each of its elements performs a specific function and whose basic goal is the maintenance of the equilibrium;
- 2) Society, being a system as a whole, consists of its numerous parts which are inter-related;
- 3) The dominant tendency of the social system is towards stability which is maintained by its own in-built mechanism;
- 4) System's ability to resolve internal conflicts is usually an admitted fact;
- 5) Changes in the system are natural, but they are neither sudden nor revolutionary, but are always gradual and adaptive as well as

Notes

- 6) System has its own structure, with its own aims, principles and functions. The structural-functional derivative speaks of the political system as composed of several structures as patterns of action and resultant institutions with their assigned functions.

A function, in this context, means, as Plato (Dictionary of Political Analysis) says, 'some purpose served with respect to the maintenance or perpetuation of the system', and a structure could be related to "any set of related roles, including such concrete organisational structures as political parties and legislatures." So the structural-functional analysis, Piano continues, "involves the identification of a set of requisite or at least recurring functions in the kind of system under investigation. This is coupled with an attempt to determine the kinds of structures and their interrelations through which those functions are Approaches performed." Gabriel Almond's classic statement of structural-functional analysis is found in the introduction to *The Politics of the Developing Area*, 1960. Briefly summed up: All political systems have a structure, i.e. legitimate patterns of human interactions by which order is maintained; all political structures perform their respective functions, with different degrees in different political systems;

Input functions include

- a) political socialisation and Recruitment;
- b) interest articulation;
- c) interest aggregation;
- d) political communication;

Output functions include

- i) rule-making,
- ii) rule-application,
- iii) rule-adjudication.

Almond, while considering politics as the integrative and adaptive functions of a society based on more or less legitimate physical coercion, regards political system as "the system of interactions to be found in all independent societies which perform the functions of integration and adaptation by means of the employment or threat of employment of more or less legitimate order-maintaining or transforming system in the society." He is of the opinion that there is interdependence between political and other societal systems; that political structures perform the same functions in all systems; that all political structures are multi-functional; and that all systems adapt to their environment when political structures do have behave dysfunctional. There is a basic difference between Easton's input-output model and Almond's structural-functional approach. While Easton lays emphasis on interaction and interrelationship aspects of the parts of the political system, Almond is more concerned with the political structures and the functions performed by them. And this is perhaps the first weakness of the structural-functional analysis which talks about the functions of the structures and ignores the interactions which are characteristics of the numerous structures as parts of the political system. Almond's model suffers from being an analysis at the micro-level, for it explains the western political system, or to be more specific, the American political system. There is undue importance on the input aspect, and much less on the output aspect in his explanation of the political system, giving, in the process, the feedback mechanism only a passing reference. Like Easton, Almond too has emerged as status-quoist, for he too emphasized on the maintenance of the system. While commenting on Almond's insistence on separating the two terms - structures and functions, Sartori says, "The structural-functional analysis is a lame scholar. He claims to walk on two feet, but actually on one foot - and a bad foot at that. He cannot really visualize the inter-play between 'structure' and 'function' because the two terms are seldom, if even, neatly disjointed, the structure remains throughout a kin brother of its inputted functional purposes." And yet, merit of the structural-functional model cannot be ignored. The model has successfully introduced new conceptual tools in political science, especially in comparative politics. So considered, the structural-

functional analysis has really enriched our discipline. It has also offered new insights into political realities. And that is one reason that this model has been widely adopted, and is being used as a descriptive and ordering framework.

4.4.3 Cybernetics Derivative

Cybernetics or communication approach is another derivative of the system 1 analysis. Karl Deutsch (*The Nerves of Government*, 1966) may rightly be called the chief exponent of the Cybernetics model. Cybernetics is defined as the 'science of communication and control'. Its focus is "the systematic study of I communication and control in organisations of all kinds. The viewpoint of Cybernetics suggests that all organisations are alike in certain fundamental characteristics and that every organisation is held together by communication." Because 'governments' are organisations, it is they were information-processes are mainly represented. So are developed Deutsch's concepts in his Cybernetics approach, especially information, communication and channels. Information is a patterned relationship, between events, Communication is the transfer of such patterned relations; and channels are the paths or associative trails through which information is transferred. Deutsch rightly says that his book, the *Nerves of Government*, deals less with the bones of the body politic and more with its nerves its channels of communication. For him, the 'core-area of politics is the area of enforceable decisions, and ensure of politics' is the 'dependable coordination of human efforts for the attainment of the goals of society'. Hence, he looks at the political system, which according to him is nothing but a system of decision-making and enforcement, as a network of communication channels. Drawing largely from the science of neuro-physiology, psychology and electrical engineering, Deutsch is able to perceive similarities in processes and functionhl requirements, between living things, electronic machines and social organisations. "the brain, the computer, the society, all have characteristics which make them organisations: they have the capacity to transmit and react to information" (Davies and Lewis : *Models of Political Systems*, 197 1).

The characteristic features of the cybernetics model of the systems analysis can be, briefly, stated as under:

- 1) Feedback constitutes a key concept in the cybernetics model. It is also called a servo-mechanism. By feedback, Deutsch means a communications network that produces action in response to input information.
- 2) All organizations, including a political system, are characterized by feedback mechanisms. It is feedback that introduces dynamism into what may be otherwise a static analysis.
- 3) Cybernetics introduces certain sub-concepts of the feedback concept and there are negative feedback, load, lag, gain and lead. Davies and Lewis explain these terms "A negative feedback is one which transmits back to itself information which is the result of decisions and actions taken by the system and which leads the system to change its behaviour in pursuit of the goals which it has set itself.

Load indicates the total amount of nation which a system may possess at a particular time. Lag indicates the amount of delay which the system experiences between reporting the consequences of decisions and acting on the information received. Gain is an indication of the manner in which the system responds to Approaches the information that it has received. Load illustrates the extent to which a system has the capacity to react to predictions about the future consequences of decisions and actions."

- 4) What types of systems emerge in the light of meaning given to the sub concepts of feedback concepts may be stated as : Deutsch says that all political systems are goal-seeking entities; the chances of success in goal seeking are related to the amount of load and lag; up to a point they may be positively related to the amount of gain, although at high rates of gain, this relationship [may be reversed, and they are always positively related to the amount of load (Young, Systems of Political Science, 1997); A system may over-respond to

Notes

information received and it is likely that any increase would be dysfunction to the realisation of the system's goals.

Deutsch's cybernetics model deals with communication, control and channels against Easton's input-output model of interactions and interrelationships and Almond's structural-functional analysis of stating structures and their functions, All these seek to explain the functioning of the system - its ability to adapt itself amidst changes and its capacity to maintain itself over time. Deutsch's model has numerous drawbacks : it is essentially an engineering approach which explains the performance of human beings and living institutions as if they sic machines, the cybernetics are concerned more with what decisions are the how and why they are concluded and towards which ends; the approach is quantity-oriented, and hence is quality-oriented; it seeks to store information and overlooks its significance; the approach is sophisticated in so far as it is complex, it is complex in so far as it does not help understand the phenomenon. As a derivative of the systems approach, cybernetics analysis has helped in the search of analogies which has, in turn, contributed to development of hypotheses conceiving human behaviour. To that extent, the approach has added to our understanding of the system scientifically. Furthermore, the cybernetic devices, such as computing and data processing, proved to be extremely useful to political scientists in their research efforts.

Check Your Progress 3

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of this unit.

- 1) Give any three characteristic features of Easton's input-output model.

.....
.....
.....

-
.....
- 2) State the strength and weakness of Easton's political system model.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

- 3) Which of the following is the chief characteristic of the Structural-Functional Analysis
- a) values to be authoritatively allocated.
 - b) rule-making, rule-application, rule-adjudication.
 - c) nerves, rather than bones and muscles, are important features of the body politic.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

- 4) State briefly the chief demerits of Deutsch's cybernetics theory.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

- 5) Compare the Easton's, Almond's and Deutsch's derivatives of the Systems Approach.

.....
.....
.....

.....
.....

4.5 SYSTEMS THEORY: AN EVALUATION

4.5.1 Limitations of the Systems Approach

The systems approach in Political Science and especially in Comparative Politics provides a broader and a clearer view of things that surround not only political activity but also politics as well. This is so because the systems approach takes political phenomena as one unit, a system in it, not merely the sum-total of its various parts, but all parts standing in interaction - with one another. To view any number of parts as a whole is to make the whole something artificial. To insist on the interactions among the parts as always continuing and in the process, building the system is to presume something already granted or given. The systems theorists have drawn much from biology and other natural sciences and have equated the organic system with social system. Indeed, there are similarities between the two systems, but analogies are only and always analogies. Any attempt to extend the argument amounts to falsification.^^ relate a hand to human body is not when we relate an individual to the society or a legislature to the executive organ of the government. "The systems theorists have only built an extended form of organic theory which the individualists had once argued. All the systems theorists have committed themselves to building and maintaining the system. Their concern has been only to explain the system as it exists. What they have, additionally, done is to state the causes which endanger its existence and factors which can strengthen it. They are, at best, the status-quoists who have little knowledge about past and perhaps no concern for the future. All the concepts that systems theorists have developed do not go beyond the explanation and understanding of the present. The entire approach is rooted in conservation and reaction. (Verma, Modern Political Theory, 1966). The systems theorists, in Political Science or in the field of Comparative Government and Politics,

have substituted political system in place of the state by arguing that the term political system explains much more than the term state. Indeed, the point is wide and clear. But when these theorists come to highlight the characteristics of political system, they do not say more than the political power or force with which the conventional word 'State' has been usually associated. , What the systems analysts have done is that they have condemned the traditionalists for leave made the political analysis descriptive, static and noncompetitive. What they have, instead, done is that they have introduced the numerous concepts in both natural and other social sciences in Political Science or Comparative Politics so as to make the discipline more inter-disciplinary. The claim that the systems theorists have evolved a scientific and empirical discipline is too tall.

4.5.2 Strength of the Systems Approach

If the idea behind the systems approach is to explain the concept of system as a key to understand the social web, the efforts of the systems theorists have not gone waste. It is important to state that the influence of the systems analysis has been so pervasive that most comparative politics research makers use of the systems concepts. It is also important to state that the systems approach has well addressed and well-directed itself to numerous meaningful questions - questions such as the relationship of systems to their environment, the persistence of the system itself overtime, stability of the system, function assigned to the structures as parts of the system, dynamics and machines of the system. Professor S.N. Ray has summed up the merits of the systems theory very aptly, saying, "It (the system theory) gives us an excellent opportunity for fusing microanalytically studies with macro-analytical ones. The concepts developed by this theory open up new questions and create new dimensions for investigation into the political processes. It often facilitates the communication of insights and ways of looking at things from other disciplines. It may be regarded as one of the most ambitious attempts to construct a theoretical framework from within political Sciences."

4.6 STRUCTURAL FUNCTIONALISM

The terms functional analysis and structural analysis have been applied to a great variety of approaches (Cancian, 1968; Merton, 1968). With their broad use in the social sciences has come discussion of the appropriateness of the use of structure and function and the type of analysis associated with the concepts (Levy, 1968). The functional approach is used more often than any of the method in the study of Western political science (Susseç 1992). The professional literature is full of references to the "functions" of political systems and to the relation between structure and function. Sometimes the terms are used without a clear understanding of the meaning of the functionalist position, more as linguistic fashion. This section deals with the theoretical implications of structural functionalism and its relationship to political science. Although structural functionalism predated systems theory it still presupposes a "systems" view of the political world. Similarities link functionalism to systems analysis. Susser (1992) writes that both focuses on input--output analysis, both see political systems as striving for homeostasis or equilibrium, and both consider feedback in their analysis. Yet functionalism is significantly different.

4.6.1 History of Structural Functionalism

Structural functionalism has a lengthy history in both the social sciences (Merton, 1968) and the biological sciences (Woodger, 1948). Functionalism's history goes back to Aristotle's study of ultimate causes in nature or of actions in relation to their ends, or utility. Developed in 19th-century France, Montesquieu's doctrine of sedation of powers is based on the notion of functions that are best undertaken separate from each other as a means of ensuring stability and security. Functionalism became important when Dawin's evolutionary theories began to influence thinking about human behavior. Darwin conceived of the idea of survival in functional terms. Each function was important to the survival of the whole system. Systems that could not adapt their functions ceased to exist. Other students of human behavior booked these ideas, applying

them to social affairs. Thus, social Darwinism imposed these same functionalist categories into social analysis. Social Darwinists claimed that society benefited from unstrained competition between units, that functional adaptability was required for survival, and that attempts to protect the weak hampered the functioning of society as a whole. These ideas first influenced anthropology and then sociology. Implicitly through the works of Émile Durkheim and explicitly through Parsons (1951) and Robert Merton (1968), these ideas became central to the social sciences. Almond's "Induction" to Politics of Developing Areas (Almond & Coleman, 1960), applied functionalist ideas to political life.

4.7 VARIETIES OF FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS

Most functional approaches share one common element: "an interest in relating one part of a society or social system to another part or to some aspect of the whole" (Cancian, 1968, p. 29). Three types of functionalism exist within this approach, and most functional analysis contains all that. The first is based on the concepts and assumptions of sociology; the second, on the supposition that social patterns maintain the larger social system; and the third, on "a model of self-regulating and equilibrating systems"). Francesca M. Cancian (1968) describes two distinctive types of functional analysis: traditional and formal. Traditional functional analysis is the most commonly used. It is based on the premise that all social patterns work to maintain the integration and adaptation of the larger system. Two attributes further distinguish traditional functional analysis from other forms of analysis. First, a social pattern is explained by the effects or consequences of that pattern, and, second, these results must be beneficial and necessary to the proper functioning of society. Researchers take one of two tacks when using traditional functional analysis. They may examine only a few aspects of society at a time and attempt to link one social pattern with one need and thus explain the pattern. Alternatively, they may deal with more complex systems, trying to show how these elements are interrelated so as to form an adaptive and consistent system.

4.7.1 Applying Functional Analysis to the Study of Politics

According to Michael G. Smith (1966), four approaches are useful in the comparative study of political systems: process, content function, and form. Studies based on process and content face huge obstacles. In developed countries, the processes of government are "elaborately differentiated, discrete and easy to identify," but in simpler societies, the same processes are "rarely differentiated and discrete" (p. 114). They occur within the context of institutional activities that are difficult to analyze for political processes. The more "differentiated and complex" the government processes, the "greater the range and complexity" (p. 114) of content. Since content and process are "interdependent and derivative," they require independent criteria for studying movement (p. 114).

Many of Almond and Coleman's (1960) categories have become unique fields of study. For example, Fisher's research on mass media's effect on political decision making drew on Almond and Coleman's categories and mass media functions to develop taxonomy of media functions in policy making (Fisher, 1991; Fisher & Soemarsono, 2008). Whereas systems view often refers to the nondescript conversion process" (Susser, 1992, p.206), the functionalist approach deals explicitly with the steps involved from articulating requirements to fulfilling political outputs.

4.8 TERMINOLOGY USED IN STRUCTURAL-FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS

4.8.1 Function and Structure

Another problem, according to Levy (1968), is that the general concept of structure has many different referents, in both the biological and the social sciences. Joseph Woodger (1948) in biology and Merton (1968) in the social sciences have pointed to the abundance of referents given to the term function. This has led a lot of confusion. Much of the literature

is preoccupied with function, whereas structure has been discussed less, Function may be defined as any condition or state of affairs resulting from an operation of a unit of the type under consideration in terms of structure. In the biological sense, the unit is an organism or subsystem of an organism. In the social sciences, the unit is usually a set of one or more persons (actors). Structure may be defined as pattern of observable uniformity in terms of the action or operation taking place. In the social sciences, the focus of analysis has been on the structure of societies and other social systems or the structures (patterns) of actions in general. Classification of functions depends partly on point of view. What is function from one point of view may be structure from another. Levy (1968) gave examples of this confusion. The manufacture of automobiles is production from the point of view of the automobile user but consumption from the point of view of the steelmaker. Functions in this sense are patterns or structure or have important structure patterned) aspects and all structure are the results of operations in terms of other structures, so they are in fact functions. The politeness of children may be considered a structure of their behavior or a function in terms of the structures (patterns) of parenting.

4.8.2 Requisites and Prerequisites

Functional and structural requisites are useful in the analysis of any unit. A functional requisite may be defined as "a generalized condition necessary for the maintenance of the type of unit under consideration" (Levy, 1968, p. 23). Functional requisites respond to the question: What must be done to maintain the system at the level under consideration? A functional requisite exists if its removal (or absence) results in the dissolution of the unit or the change of one of its structural elements.

4.8.3 Concrete and Analytic Structures

Failure to distinguish between concrete and analytic structures may result in the fallacy of reification (or misplaced concreteness). For example, the terms economy aid policy cannot occupy the same position in system

analysis as the term family. Family is an example of a concrete structure, as are business firms, governments, and societies. In concrete structure, the units are capable of physical separation from other units of the same sort, and membership is easily defined. In analytic structure, no concrete separation of is permissible. For example, no social system is without economic and political structures (Lery, 1968).

4.8.4 Institutions, additional Structures, and Utopian Structures

Although these terms are sometimes used interchangeably, they refer to different types of structures. Institutions are structures with normative patterns with which conformity is expected, and failure to conform is sanctioned or met with indignation. The structure becomes a requisite of the system. The structure does not change without destroying the structural requisite. For example, age and role are tied together in all societies. If the requisite age changes for certain roles or functions, the structure would also change.

4.8.5 Ideal and Actual Structures

Members of a society establish ideal structure to determine how they should behave, whereas actual structure is patterns of how they do behave. Although sometimes the ideal and the actual coincide, more often they do not fit perfectly. This difference in fit causes sheds in the social system. Only with perfect knowledge and perfect motivation would there be a perfect fit between the ideal and the actual structure.

4.9 CRITICISMS OF STRUCTURAL FUNCTIONALISM

Critics of structural functionalism view it as "a translation of Anglo-American political norms in methodological terminology" (Susser, 1992, p. 207). Structural functionalism may be in decline as a methodological approach for the study of politics; however, it leaves a set of terms that

are still used in political jargon. Some of those in the functionalist camp (Merton among them) rejected the notion of this decline. "Much of what was best in the political research of an entire generation was couched in its terms" (Susser, 1992, p. 207).

4.10 LET US SUM UP

Systems approach is one of the modern approaches which has been introduced in Political Science, especially in Comparative Government and Politics by scholars like Kaplan, Easton, Almond, Apter, and Deutsch. Accordingly, they have seen system as a set of interactions, interrelations, patterned behaviour among the individuals and institutions, a set of structures performing their respective functions and one that seeks to achieve certain goal and attempts to dynamic analysis of the system, remains confined to its maintenance. It claims to have undertaken an 'empirical research, but has failed to provide enough maintain it amidst vicissitudes. The systems approach though claims to provide a conceptual tools for investigation. It has not been able to project system, political system more than the state. The approach is, more or less, conservative in so far as it is status-quoist. Yet the systems approach is unique in many respects particularly. It has provided a wider scope in understanding and analyzing social behaviorism and social interactions. It has drawn a lot from natural sciences and has very successfully used their concepts in social sciences. It has been able to provide a degree of methodological sophistication to our discipline.

4.11 KEY WORDS

Analysis: An object of inquiry to study the various constituent parts so to know their nature and relationship of the parts to each other and to the whole.

Approach: A mode of analysis which provides a set of tools and develops concept for the study and comprehension of any political phenomena.

Concept: It is an abstraction to which a descriptive label is attached so to carry out an investigation and analysis.

Cybernetics: It is the science of communication and control.

Equilibrium: It is a state of balance ascribed usually to a political or any other system.

Feedback: It is the process by which information about the functioning of a system is communicated back to the system so that corrections and adjustment may be made.

Homeostasis: Homeostasis is the tendency toward maintenance of stability in a system through self-adjustments which provide responses to disruptive and/or testability influences.

Input: It is something that influences and affects the functioning in a system.

Inputs originate in the environment of the system and within the system itself.

Output: Outputs are the results which come in the form of governmental policies, decisions, and programs as well as implementing actions.

Paradigm: It is a model, pattern or say example that helps organise thought and give direction to research.

Political System: The persisting pattern of human relationship through which autoreactive decisions are made and carried out for a society.

Process: It is a sequence of related actions/operations. It denotes activity, 'movement' and relatively rapid change as distinguished from the more stable and slower elements in a situation.

Social System: It is an aggregation of two or more persons that interact with one another in some patterned way.

Stability: It is a condition of a system where components tend to remain in, or return to, some constant relationship with one another.

System: It is any set of elements that exist in some patterns relationship with one another.

4.12 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

- 1) Give any three characteristic features of Easton's input-output model.

- 2) State the strength and weakness of Easton's political system model.
- 3) State briefly the chief demerits of Deutsch's cybernetics theory.
- 4) Compare the Easton's, Almond's and Deutsch's derivatives of the Systems Approach.

4.13 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Almond, G.A. and Powell, GB; (1978) "Comparative Politics : A Development Approach ", Oxford
- Apter, David E., (1977) "Introduction to Political Analysis", Cambridge
- Clialsworth, J. (ed.), (1 967) " Comparative Political Analysis ", New York
- Dahl, Robert A., (1979) "Modern Political Analysis ", Englewood Cliffs
- Davies M.R. and Lewis, V.A., (1971) "Models of Political Systems", London
- Deutscli, Karl, (1963), "The Nerves of Governntent", Glencoe
- Easton, David, (1 965) "A System Analysis of Political Life", Chicago Approaches
- Macridis, R.C. and Ward, R.E., (1964) "Modern Political Systems" Englewood Cliffs
- Ray, S.N., (1 999) "Modern Comparative Politics " New Delhi
- Verma, S.P. (1 975) "Modern Political Theory", New Delhi
- World Encyclopaedia of Political Systems, London, 1983
- Young, Oran, R., (1966) "Systems of Political Science" Englewood Cliffs

4.14 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 1

- 1) Biology

Notes

- 2)
 - a) on the articulation of the system,
 - b) on the articulation of the components of the system;
 - c) on the behaviorism by means of which the system is able to maintain itself;
- 3) c)
 - 5) a) The traditional approach is historical and mostly descriptive;
 - b) It is parochial; c) It is more or less monographic.

Check Your Progress 2

- 1) a) The General Systems Theory has been rarely applied to the social sciences while the systems theory has been successfully applied;
- b) The General Systems Theory, developed as it is from natural sciences (biology particularly) treats the systems as more or less organically integrated from within while the systems theory lays emphasis on the interactions aspect of the elements of the system.
- 2) i) Inputs are demands made upon the system and those which usually originate from the environment.
- ii) Outputs are the results which come about when the inputs are subjected to a conversational process. They are in the form of policies, decisions and actions which are to be implemented.
- iii) Sub-system is a part of the system, a part of the whole.
- iv) Feedback occurs when outputs affect the environment so as to modify inputs.
- 3) The two characteristics of the systems theory are:
 - i) The system theory regards the social phenomenon as a unit, a living unit at that;
 - ii) It denotes the system as a set of interactions of various elements.
- 4) The systems approach is concerned with the following notions

- i) Order
- ii) Change
- iii) Goal-realisation.

Check Your Progress 3

1) a) System is regarded as a part of interactions; b) through the system, values are authoritatively allocated; and c) system is self-regulating one and is able, in itself, to change and correct and adjust in accordance with the environmental changes.

2) Easton's political system has provided an excellent technique for comparative politics. Its merit is that it has provided a set of concepts and categories which has helped in comprehending the system more clearly. The weakness of Easton's model is that it does little to explain the political system and more to establish it. Easton is coliceriied with the maintenance and regulation of the system; hence lie is a status-quoist.

3) b)

4) Deutsch's model is an engineering approach and has been unduly imposed another social system. He is concerned with decisions and not with that and why have these decisions been concluded. His model seeks to store information and ignores its importance.

5) The derivate of the systems approach, as have been developed by Easton, Almond and Deutscli, lay emphasis on different aspects of a system. Easton regards the interactions and inter relationships as characteristics of any system; Almond is concerned with the structure of the system and the functions they perform; Deutscli's derivative is, Inore or less, a device of communication, control and channels.

UNIT 5: CULTURE-CENTRIC AND POLITICAL ECONOMY

STRUCTURE

- 5.0 Objectives
- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Development as Modernization
- 5.3 Development as Underdevelopment and Dependency
- 5.4 World System Analysis
- 5.5 Articulation of Modes of Production Approach
- 5.6 Class Analysis and Political Regimes
- 5.7 State Centred Approach
- 5.8 Globalisation and Neo-Liberal Approach
- 5.9 Let us sum up
- 5.10 Key Words
- 5.11 Questions for Review
- 5.12 Suggested readings and references
- 5.13 Answers to Check Your Progress

5.0 OBJECTIVES

Comparative politics seeks to study relationship among countries. It seeks also to find explanations for specific social and political phenomenon in these relationships. The political economy approach to the study of comparative politics is one way of looking at this relationship. It proposes that there exists a relationship between politics and economics and that this relationship works and makes itself manifest in several ways. It is the understanding of this relationship, and the manner in which it unfolds, which subscribes to this approach maintain, provides the clue to the study of relationships between and explanations of social and political phenomena. After reading this unit, you will be able to:

- understand various attributes of political economy as a concept;

- learn how the concept has become relevant for the study of comparative politics; and
- know historically, putting into context the various ways in which the political economy approach has formed the basis of studying relationship between countries and social and political phenomena over the past years.

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Political economy refers to a specific way of understanding social and political phenomena whereby, economics and politics are not seen as separate domains. It is premised (a) on a relationship between the two and (b) the assumption that this relationship unfolds in multifarious ways. These assumptions constitute important explanatory and analytical frameworks within which social and political phenomena can be studied. Having said this, it is important to point out that whereas the concept of political economy points at a relationship, there is no single meaning which can be attributed to the concept. The specific meaning the concept assumes depends on the theoretical ideological tradition. e.g., liberal or Marxist, within which it is placed, and depending on this positioning, the specific manner in which economics and politics themselves are understood. Interestingly, the appearance of economics and politics as separate domains is itself a modern phenomenon. From the time of Aristotle till the middle ages, the concept of economics as a self regulating separate sphere was unknown. The word 'economy' dates back to Aristotle and signified in Greek 'the art of Approaches household management'. It is derived from the Greek oikos meaning a house, and nomos ~neaning law. As the political evolution in Greece followed the sequence: household- village- city state, the study of the management of the household came under The study of 'politics', and Aristotle considered economic questions in the very first book of Iiis Politics. Among the classical political economist, Adam Smith considered political economy as 'a branch of the science of a statesman or legislator'. As far as the Marxist position is concerned, Marx (1818-1883) himself, generally spoke not of 'political economy' as such but of the 'critique of political economy,' where the expression was used mainly with reference

Notes

to the classical writers. Marx never defined political economy, but Engels did. Political economy, according to the latter, studies 'the laws governing the production and exchange of the material means of subsistence' (Marx - Engels, Anti-Duhring). The Soviet economic theorist and historian. Rubin suggested the following definition of political economy: 'Political economy deals with human working activity, not from the standpoint of its technical methods and instruments of labour, but from the standpoint of its social form. It deals with production relations which are established among people in the process of production'. (I.I.Rubin, Essays on Marx's Theory of Value, Black & Red, Detroit, 1928, 1972 reprint, P.X).

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your progress with the model answer given at the end of the unit.

- 1) What do you understand by the political-economy approach to the study of comparative politics?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

5.2 DEVELOPMENT AS MODERNIZATION

The theory of modernization was an attempt by mainly First world scholars to explain the social reality of the 'new states' of the third world. Modernisation theory is based upon separation or dualism between 'traditional' and 'modern' societies. The distinction between 'traditional' and 'modern' societies was derived from Max Weber via Talcott Parsons. A society in which most relationships were 'particularistic' rather than 'universalistic' (e.g. based on ties to particular people, such as kin, rather

than on general criteria designating whole classes of persons) in which birth ('ascription') rather than 'achievement' was the general ground for holding a job or an office; in which feelings rather than objectivity governed relationships of all sorts (the distinctions between 'affectivity' and 'neutrality'); and in which roles were not clearly separated - for instance, the royal household was also the state apparatus ('role diffuseness' vs. 'role specificity'), was called 'traditional'. A 'modern' society, on the other hand, was characterised by the opposite of all these. Other features generally seen as characteristic of traditional societies included things like a low level of division of labour, dependence on agriculture, low rates of growth of production, largely local networks of exchange and restricted administrative competence. Again modern societies were seen as displaying the opposite features. Following from this opposition of the two categories, 'modernisation' referred to the process of transition from traditional to modern principles of social organisation. This process of transition was not only seen as actually occurring in the newly independent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, the attainment of a modern society as it existed in the West, was seen as their strategic goal. A modern society was defined as a social system based on achievement, universalism and individualism, as a world of social mobility, equal opportunity, the rule of law and individual freedom. This was contrasted with traditional societies, based on ascribed status, hierarchy and personalised social relations. The purpose of modernisation theory was to explain, and promote, the transition from traditional to modern society. Modernisation theory argued that this transition should be regarded as a process of traditional societies 'catching up' with the modern world. The theory of modernisation was most clearly elaborated in the writings of W.W.Rostow (*The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1960), who argued that there were five stages of development through which all societies passed. These were: (i) the traditional stage; (ii) the preconditions for takeoff; (iii) take off; (iv) the drive toward maturity and (v) high mass consumption. Third World societies were regarded as traditional, and so needed to develop to the second stage, and thus establish the

Notes

preconditions for take-off. Rostow described these preconditions as the development of trade, the beginnings of rational, scientific ideas, and the emergence of elite that invests rather than squanders its wealth. The theory argued that this process could be speeded up by the encouragement and diffusion of Western investment and ideas. Scholars in this tradition also argued that industrialisation would promote western ideas of individualism, equality of opportunity and shared values, which in turn would reduce social unrest and class conflict. As we have mentioned earlier modernisation theory developed in the context of cold war and at times it is unclear whether (a) modernisation theory was an analytical or prescriptive device, (b) whether modernisation was actually occurring or whether it should occur and (c) whether the motives of those promoting modernisation was to relieve poverty or to provide a bulwark against communism? The two factors are obviously connected, but the subtitle of Rostow's book - 'a non-communist manifesto' - suggests that the latter may have been considered more important than the former. To conclude, we can say that modernisation theory was based on an evolutionary model of development, whereby all nation-states passed through broadly similar stages of development. In the context of the post-war world, it was considered imperative that the modern West should help to promote the transition to modernity in the traditional Third World.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your progress with the model answer given at the end of the unit.

- 1) What kind of development path did modernization theory suggest for the 'new states' of the third world?

.....
.....
.....

.....

.....

5.3 DEVELOPMENT AS UNDERDEVELOPMENT AND DEPENDENCY

Dependency theory arose in the late fifties and the sixties as an extended critique of the modernisation perspective. This school of thought is mainly associated with the work of Andre Gunder Frank, but the influence of Paul Baran's (*The Political Economy of Growth*, Monthly Review Press, 1957) work is also very important. Baran argued that the economic relationships that existed between western Europe (and later Japan and United States) and the rest of the world were based on conflict and exploitation. 'The former took part in 'outright plunder or in plunder thinly veiled as trade, seizing and removing tremendous wealth from the place of their penetration' (Baran 1957: Pp.141-2). The result was transfer of wealth from the latter to the former. Frank examined Third World countries at close hand, and criticised the dualist thesis (see in the above section), which isolated 'modern' and 'traditional' states, and argued that the two were closely linked (*Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*, Monthly Review Press, 1969; *Latin America: Underdevelopment or Revolution?*, Monthly Review Press, New York, 1969). He applied his critique to both modernisation theory and orthodox Marxism, replacing their dualism by a theory that argued that the world has been capitalist since the sixteenth century, with all sectors drawn into the world system based on production for market. The ties of dominance and dependence, Frank argues, run in a chain-like fashion throughout the global capitalist system, with metropolises appropriating surplus from satellites, their towns removing surplus from the hinterland and likewise. Frank's central argument is that creation of 'First' world (advanced capitalist societies) and the 'Third' world (satellites) is a result of the same process (worldwide capitalist expansion). According to the dependency perspective the contemporary developed capitalist countries (metropolises) were never underdeveloped as the Third world (satellites), but were rather undeveloped.

Underdevelopment, instead of being caused by the peculiar socio-economic structures of the Third World countries, is the historical product of the relations (relations of imperialism and colonialism) which have obtained between underdeveloped satellites and developed metropolises. In short, development and underdevelopment are two sides of the same coin, two poles of the same process - capitalist development on a world scale creates the 'development of underdevelopment' in the Third world. According to Frank, Latin America's most backward areas were precisely those areas which had once been most strongly linked to the metropole. Institutions such as plantations and haciendas, regardless of their internal appearance, leave since the conquest been capitalist forms of production linked to the metropolitan market.

Dependency theory, an approach to understanding economic underdevelopment that emphasizes the putative constraints imposed by the global political and economic order. First proposed in the late 1950s by the Argentine economist and statesman Raúl Prebisch, dependency theory gained prominence in the 1960s and '70s.

According to dependency theory, underdevelopment is mainly caused by the peripheral position of affected countries in the world economy. Typically, underdeveloped countries offer cheap labour and raw materials on the world market. These resources are sold to advanced economies, which have the means to transform them into finished goods. Underdeveloped countries end up purchasing the finished products at high prices, depleting the capital they might otherwise devote to upgrading their own productive capacity. The result is a vicious cycle that perpetuates the division of the world economy between a rich core and a poor periphery. While moderate dependency theorists, such as the Brazilian sociologist Fernando Henrique Cardoso (who served as the president of Brazil in 1995–2003), considered some level of development to be possible within this system, more-radical scholars, such as the German American economic historian Andre Gunder Frank, argued that

the only way out of dependency was the creation of a noncapitalist (socialist) national economy.

At the beginning of the 1970s, new concepts of development theory began increasingly to be articulated in English by writers inspired by the work of radical Latin American scholars. These concepts which have come to be known as dependency theories, have not only gained, in a short space of time, widespread acceptance by left wing intellectuals but have also permeated the thinking of LDC spokesmen who were instrumental in embodying within the 1974 U.N. Declaration of a new international economic order, the view that dependence was the central feature of the current international economic system. As of late, the issue has intruded into conventional economic journals and is “amongst the central questions being discussed” at the Sussex Institute of Development Studies, but nonetheless, it still remains true that a large proportion of mainstream economists are either entirely ignorant or only dimly aware of it. This ignorance is partly the result of the scant exposure of dependency theories in orthodox literature and partly due to the fact that the ‘theory’ has many versions, which in and among themselves are either contradictory or lack testable hypotheses. This paper attempts to provide a critical account of such theories from the perspective of a conventional economist; The views are not necessarily discussed in the order in which they chronologically appeared nor is every contribution included, the object being to present the main ingredients of the theory rather than a detailed literature review.

5.4 WORLD SYSTEM ANALYSIS

In *World-Systems Analysis*, Immanuel Wallerstein provides a concise and accessible introduction to the comprehensive approach that he pioneered thirty years ago to understanding the history and development of the modern world. Since Wallerstein first developed world-systems analysis, it has become a widely utilized methodology within the historical social sciences and a common point of reference in discussions of globalization. Now, for the first time in one volume, Wallerstein offers a succinct summary of world-systems analysis and a clear outline of the

Notes

modern world-system, describing the structures of knowledge upon which it is based, its mechanisms, and its future.

Wallerstein explains the defining characteristics of world-systems analysis: its emphasis on world-systems rather than nation-states, on the need to consider historical processes as they unfold over long periods of time, and on combining within single analytical framework bodies of knowledge usually viewed as distinct from one another—such as history, political science, economics, and sociology. He describes the world-system as a social reality comprised of interconnected nations, firms, households, classes, and identity groups of all kinds. He identifies and highlights the significance of the key moments in the evolution of the modern world-system: the development of a capitalist world-economy in the sixteenth-century, the beginning of two centuries of liberal centrism in the French Revolution of 1789, and the undermining of that centrism in the global revolts of 1968. Intended for general readers, students, and experienced practitioners alike, this book presents a complete overview of world-systems analysis by its original architect.

Immanuel Wallerstein has developed the best-known version of world-systems analysis, beginning in the 1970s. Wallerstein traces the rise of the capitalist world-economy from the "long" 16th century (c. 1450–1640). The rise of capitalism, in his view, was an accidental outcome of the protracted crisis of feudalism (c. 1290–1450). Europe (the West) used its advantages and gained control over most of the world economy and presided over the development and spread of industrialization and capitalist economy, indirectly resulting in unequal development.

Though other commentators refer to Wallerstein's project as world-systems "theory", he consistently rejects that term. For Wallerstein, world-systems analysis is a mode of analysis that aims to transcend the structures of knowledge inherited from the 19th century, especially the definition of capitalism, the divisions within the social sciences, and those between the social sciences and history. For Wallerstein, then, world-systems analysis is a "knowledge movement" that seeks to discern

the "totality of what has been paraded under the labels of the... human sciences and indeed well beyond". "We must invent a new language," Wallerstein insists, to transcend the illusions of the "three supposedly distinctive arenas" of society, economy and politics. The Trinitarian structure of knowledge is grounded in another, even grander, modernist architecture, the distinction of biophysical worlds (including those within bodies) from social ones: "One question, therefore, is whether we will be able to justify something called social science in the twenty-first century as a separate sphere of knowledge." Many other scholars have contributed significant work in this "knowledge movement".

Influences and major thinkers

World-systems theory traces emerged in the 1970s. Its roots can be found in sociology, but it has developed into a highly interdisciplinary field. World-systems theory was aiming to replace modernization theory, which Wallerstein criticised for three reasons:

1. its focus on the nation state as the only unit of analysis
2. its assumption that there is only a single path of evolutionary development for all countries
3. its disregard of transnational structures that constrain local and national development.

There are three major predecessors of world-systems theory: the Annales school, the Marxist tradition, and the dependence theory. The **Annales School** tradition (represented most notably by Fernand Braudel) influenced Wallerstein to focusing on long-term processes and geographical regions as unit of analysis. **Marxism** added a stress on social conflict, a focus on the capital accumulation process and competitive class struggles, a focus on a relevant totality, the transitory nature of social forms and a dialectical sense of motion through conflict and contradiction.

Notes

World-systems theory was also significantly influenced by **dependency theory**, a neo-Marxist explanation of development processes.

Other influences on the world-systems theory come from scholars such as Karl Polanyi, Nikolai Kondratiev and Joseph Schumpeter (particularly their research on business cycles and the concepts of three basic modes of economic organization: reciprocal, redistributive, and market modes, which Wallerstein reframed into a discussion of mini systems, world empires, and world economies).

Wallerstein sees the development of the capitalist world economy as detrimental to a large proportion of the world's population. Wallerstein views the period since the 1970s as an "age of transition" that will give way to a future world system (or world systems) whose configuration cannot be determined in advance.

World-systems thinkers include Oliver Cox, Samir Amin, Giovanni Arrighi, Andre Gunder Frank, and Immanuel Wallerstein, with major contributions by Christopher Chase-Dunn, Beverly Silver, Volker Bornschier, Janet Abu Lughod, Thomas D. Hall, Kunibert Raffer, Theotonio dos Santos, Dale Tomich, Jason W. Moore and others. In sociology, a primary alternative perspective is World Polity Theory, as formulated by John W. Meyer.

Dependency theory

World-systems analysis builds upon but also differs fundamentally from dependency theory. While accepting world inequality, the world market and imperialism as fundamental features of historical capitalism, Wallerstein broke with orthodox dependency theory's central proposition. For Wallerstein, core countries do not exploit poor countries for two basic reasons.

Firstly, core capitalists exploit workers in all zones of the capitalist world economy (not just the periphery) and therefore, the crucial redistribution between core and periphery is surplus value, not "wealth" or "resources"

abstractly conceived. Secondly, core states do not exploit poor states, as dependency theory proposes, because capitalism is organised around an inter-regional and transnational division of labor rather than an international division of labour.

During the Industrial Revolution, for example, English capitalists exploited slaves (unfree workers) in the cotton zones of the American South, a peripheral region within a semiperipheral country, United States.

From a largely Weberian perspective, Fernando Henrique Cardoso described the main tenets of dependency theory as follows:

- There is a financial and technological penetration of the periphery and semi-periphery countries by the developed capitalist core countries.
- That produces an unbalanced economic structure within the peripheral societies and between them and the central countries.
- That leads to limitations upon self-sustained growth in the periphery.
- That helps the appearance of specific patterns of class relations.
- They require modifications in the role of the state to guarantee the functioning of the economy and the political articulation of a society, which contains, within itself, foci of inarticulateness and structural imbalance.

Dependency and world system theory propose that the poverty and backwardness of poor countries are caused by their peripheral position in the international division of labor. Since the capitalist world system evolved, the distinction between the central and the peripheral nations has grown and diverged. In recognizing a tripartite pattern in division of labor, world-systems analysis criticized dependency theory with its bimodal system of only cores and peripheries.

Immanuel Wallerstein

Notes

The best-known version of the world-systems approach was developed by Immanuel Wallerstein. Wallerstein notes that world-systems analysis calls for an unidisciplinary historical social science and contends that the modern disciplines, products of the 19th century, are deeply flawed because they are not separate logics, as is manifest for example in the *de facto* overlap of analysis among scholars of the disciplines. Wallerstein offers several definitions of a world-system, defining it in 1974 briefly:

a system is defined as a unit with a single division of labor and multiple cultural systems.

He also offered a longer definition:

...a social system, one that has boundaries, structures, member groups, rules of legitimation, and coherence. Its life is made up of the conflicting forces which hold it together by tension and tear it apart as each group seeks eternally to remold it to its advantage. It has the characteristics of an organism, in that it has a life-span over which its characteristics change in some respects and remain stable in others. One can define its structures as being at different times strong or weak in terms of the internal logic of its functioning.

In 1987, Wallerstein again defined it:

... not the system of the world, but a system that is a world and which can be, most often has been, located in an area less than the entire globe. World-systems analysis argues that the units of social reality within which we operate, whose rules constrain us, are for the most part such world-systems (other than the now extinct, small minisystems that once existed on the earth). World-systems analysis argues that there have been thus far only two varieties of world-systems: world-economies and world empires. A world-empire (examples, the Roman Empire, Han China) are large bureaucratic structures with a single political center and an axial division of labor, but multiple cultures. A world-economy is a large axial division of labor with multiple political centers and multiple cultures. In

English, the hyphen is essential to indicate these concepts. "World system" without a hyphen suggests that there has been only one world-system in the history of the world.

—

Wallerstein characterises the world system as a set of mechanisms, which redistributes surplus value from the *periphery* to the *core*. In his terminology, the *core* is the developed, industrialized part of the world, and the *periphery* is the "underdeveloped", typically raw materials-exporting, poor part of the world; the *market* being the means by which the *core* exploits the *periphery*.

Apart from them, Wallerstein defines four temporal features of the world system. *Cyclical rhythms* represent the short-term fluctuation of economy, and *secular trends* mean deeper long run tendencies, such as general economic growth or decline. The term *contradiction* means a general controversy in the system, usually concerning some short term versus long term tradeoffs. For example, the problem of underconsumption, wherein the driving down of wages increases the profit for capitalists in the short term, but in the long term, the decreasing of wages may have a crucially harmful effect by reducing the demand for the product. The last temporal feature is the *crisis*: a crisis occurs if a constellation of circumstances brings about the end of the system.

In Wallerstein's view, there have been three kinds of historical systems across human history: "mini-systems" or what anthropologists call bands, tribes, and small chiefdoms, and two types of world systems, one that is politically unified and the other is not (single state world empires and multi-polity world economies). World systems are larger, and are ethnically diverse. Modernity is unique in being the first and only fully capitalist world economy to have emerged around 1450 to 1550 and to have geographically expanded across the entire planet, by about 1900. Not being political unified, many political units are included within the world system loosely tied together in an interstate system. Efficient division of labor is the unifying element of the different units, and it is also a function of capitalism, a system based on competition between

Notes

free producers using free labor with free commodities, 'free' meaning available for sale and purchase on a market. More specifically, it can be described as focusing on endless accumulation of capital; in other words, accumulation of capital in order to accumulate more capital. Such capitalism has a mutually dependent relationship with the world economy since it provides the efficient division of labour, the unifying element of the world economy, through the process of accumulating wealth. Likewise, such capitalism is dependent on the world economy since the latter provides a large market and a multiplicity of states, enabling capitalists to choose to work with states helping their interests.

Research questions

World-systems theory asks several key questions:

- How is the world system affected by changes in its components (e.g. nations, ethnic groups, social classes, etc.)?
- How does it affect its components?
- To what degree, if any, does the core need the periphery to be underdeveloped?
- What causes world systems to change?
- What system may replace capitalism?

Some questions are more specific to certain subfields; for example, Marxists would concern themselves whether world-systems theory is a useful or unhelpful development of Marxist theories.

Characteristics

World-systems analysis argues that capitalism, as a historical system, has always integrated a variety of labor forms within a functioning division of labor (world economy). Countries do not have economies but are part of the world economy. Far from being separate societies or worlds, the world economy manifests a tripartite division of labor, with core, semiperipheral and peripheral zones. In the core zones, businesses, with

the support of states they operate within, monopolise the most profitable activities of the division of labor.

There are many ways to attribute a specific country to the core, semi-periphery, or periphery. Using an empirically based sharp formal definition of "domination" in a two-country relationship, Piana in 2004 defined the "core" as made up of "free countries" dominating others without being dominated, the "semi-periphery" as the countries that are dominated (usually, but not necessarily, by core countries) but at the same time dominating others (usually in the periphery) and "periphery" as the countries dominated. Based on 1998 data, the full list of countries in the three regions, together with a discussion of methodology, can be found.

The late 18th and early 19th centuries marked a great turning point in the development of capitalism in that capitalists achieved state society power in the key states, which furthered the industrial revolution marking the rise of capitalism. World-systems analysis contends that capitalism as a historical system formed earlier and that countries do not "develop" in stages, but the system does, and events have a different meaning as a phase in the development of historical capitalism, the emergence of the three ideologies of the national developmental mythology (the idea that countries can develop through stages if they pursue the right set of policies): conservatism, liberalism, and radicalism.

Proponents of world-systems analysis see the world stratification system the same way Karl Marx viewed class (ownership versus nonownership of the means of production) and Max Weber viewed class (which, in addition to ownership, stressed occupational skill level in the production process). The core nations primarily own and control the major means of production in the world and perform the higher-level production tasks. The periphery nations own very little of the world's means of production (even when they are located in periphery nations) and provide less-skilled labour. Like a class system with a nation, class positions in the world economy result in an unequal distribution of rewards or

Notes

resources. The core nations receive the greatest share of surplus production, and periphery nations receive the smallest share. Furthermore, core nations are usually able to purchase raw materials and other goods from non-core nations at low prices and demand higher prices for their exports to non-core nations. Chirot (1986) lists the five most important benefits coming to core nations from their domination of periphery nations:

1. Access to a large quantity of raw material
2. Cheap labour
3. Enormous profits from direct capital investments
4. A market for exports
5. Skilled professional labor through migration of these people from the non-core to the core.

According to Wallerstein, the unique qualities of the modern world system include its capitalistic nature, its truly global nature, and the fact that it is a world economy that has not become politically unified into a world empire.

Core states

- Are the most economically diversified, wealthy, and powerful (economically and militarily)
- Have strong central governments, controlling extensive bureaucracies and powerful militaries
- Have stronger and more complex state institutions that help manage economic affairs internally and externally
- Have a sufficient tax base so state institutions can provide infrastructure for a strong economy
- Highly industrialised and produce manufactured goods rather than raw materials for export
- Increasingly tend to specialise in information, finance and service industries
- More often in the forefront of new technologies and new industries. Examples today include high-technology electronic

and biotechnology industries. Another example would be assembly-line auto production in the early 20th century.

- Has strong bourgeois and working classes
- Have significant means of influence over non-core nations
- Relatively independent of outside control

Throughout the history of the modern world system, there has been a group of core nations competing with one another for access to the world's resources, economic dominance and hegemony over periphery nations. Occasionally, there has been one core nation with clear dominance over others. According to Immanuel Wallerstein, a core nation is dominant over all the others when it has a lead in three forms of economic dominance over a period of time:

1. ***Productivity dominance*** allows a country to produce products of greater quality at a cheaper price, compared to other countries.
2. Productivity dominance may lead to ***trade dominance***. Now, there is a favorable balance of trade for the dominant nation since more countries are buying the products of the dominant country than buying from them.
3. Trade dominance may lead to ***financial dominance***. Now, more money is coming into the country than going out. Bankers of the dominant nation tend to receive more control of the world's financial resources.

Military dominance is also likely after a nation reaches these three rankings. However, it has been posited that throughout the modern world system, no nation has been able to use its military to gain economic dominance. Each of the past dominant nations became dominant with fairly small levels of military spending and began to lose economic dominance with military expansion later on. Historically, cores were found in Northwestern Europe (England, France, Netherlands) but were later in other parts of the world (such as the United States, Canada, and Australia).

Check Your Progress 3

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your progress with the model answer given at the end of the unit.

1) What is meant by underdevelopment? What kind of relationship exists between First world and The Third world countries according to dependency theory?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2) What do you understand by the concept of world system how are different parts of world interconnected according to the world system perspective?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

5.5 ARTICULATION OF MODES OF PRODUCTION APPROACH

From the late 1960s an attempt was made to resurrect a certain variant of Marxian approach to the transition process in the Third world in which mode of production was the determining concept. Theorists belonging to this school of development argued that Third world social formations encompass several modes of production and capitalism both dominates and articulates with pre-capitalist modes of production. These theorists made a distinction between social formation and mode of production. Social formation refers to a combination of economic, political and

ideological practices or 'levels'. Mode of production refers to the economic level that determines which of the different levels is dominant in the 'structured totality' that constitutes the social formation. The economic level sets limits on the other levels, that carry out functions which necessarily reproduce the (economic) mode of production. These non-economic levels therefore enjoy only a relative autonomy from the mode of production. The mode of production or 'economic' level is in turn, defined by its 'relations of production', i.e., the direct relation between the immediate producer of the surplus and its immediate appropriator. Each couplet, slave-master, serf-lord, free laborer-capitalist define a separate mode. The mode of production perspective, takes as its point of departure the production of the surplus product and is able, therefore to move to an explanation of The division of the world between core and periphery based on the modes of production rather than trade relations. The core therefore coincides with the capitalist regions of the world, which are largely based on free wage labor. The periphery on the other hand, was incorporated into the world economy on the basis of unequal relations of production (that is, non-capitalist modes of production), which prevented an unprecedented accumulation of capital. Unequal trade relations were therefore a reflection of unequal relations of production. It is for these reasons that the 'advanced' capitalist countries were able to dominate other areas of the world where non-capitalist modes of production existed. On the face of it, mode of production perspective appears to constitute at least a partial return to the sectoral (modern and traditional) analysis of modernization theory. The crucial difference, however, is that unlike dualist interpretations, the emphasis here is on the interrelatedness of modes of production. It is argued that the capitalist expansion of the West in the sixteenth century, encountered pre-capitalist modes of production in the Third World which it did not or could not totally transform or obliterate, but rather which it simultaneously co-opted or destroyed. The relationship between capitalist mode of production and the pre-capitalist modes of production, however, has not remained static and capitalist relations of production have emerged in the periphery. Capitalism in the periphery is of a specific kind, one that is qualitatively different from that in the core

countries. The marked feature of capitalism in the periphery is its combination with non-capitalist modes of production - in other words, capitalism coexists, or 'articulates', with non-capitalist modes. Non-capitalist production may be restructured by imperialist (that is, 'core-capitalist') penetration but it is also approaches subordinated by its very 'conservation'. The modes of production theory are, however, weakened by a functionalist methodological approach. This is because the theory explains social change as a product of the necessary logic of capitalism. This results in circular reasoning. If pre-capitalist modes of production survive then that is evidence of its functionality for capitalism and if pre-capitalist modes broke down then, that too is evidence of capitalism's functional requirement. This approach has also been criticized on the grounds that it subordinates human agency to structure, and assumes that social phenomena are explained by their functionality for capitalism, rather than by actions and struggles of human beings themselves.

5.6 CLASS ANALYSIS AND POLITICAL REGIMES

In The early 1970s yet another approach to explain The socio-political changes taking place in the Third world countries emerged from Marxist scholars. Prominent contributions came from Colin Leys (Underdevelopment in Kenya, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1975) and James Petras (Critical Perspectives on Social Classes in the Third World, Monthly Review Press, New York, 1978) who explained The transition process in the developing world not in term of world imperatives or articulation of modes of production, but in terms of classes as The prime movers of history. The focus here is not on development, i.e., growth, versus stagnation. The key question which surfaces in extras and Leys work is: development for whom? Petra's differs from the 'external' relations of world system analysis and the 'internal' relations of modes of production analysis. The salient feature of Third World societies, according to him, is precisely the manner in which external and internal class structure cross one another and the various combinations of class symbiosis, and interlock. Capitalist expansion on the world scale has engendered the existence of collaborative strata in Third World

which not only orient production outwardly but also exploit internally. Decolonization gave these strata access to the instrumentality of the indigenous state and the choice of several developmental strategies based on different internal and external class alliances. In order to explain different patterns of development strategies, Petras examines

(a) The conditions under which accumulation takes place, which includes:

- (i) the nature of state (and state policy),
- (ii) class relations (process of surplus extraction, intensity of exploitation, level of class struggle, concentration of work force), and

(b) the impact of capital accumulation on class structure, which includes understanding:

- (i) class formation/conversion (small proprietors to proletarians or kulaks, landlords to merchants, merchant to industrialist etc.,
- (ii) income distribution (concentration, redistribution, reconcentration of income), and
- (iii) social relations: labour market relations ('free' wage, trade union bargaining), semi-coercive (market and political/social controls), coercive (slave, debt peonage). Broadly speaking Petras suggests that post-independence national regimes in the developing world can choose among three strategies or types of class alliances for capital accumulation. First, there is the neocolonial strategy wherein the national regime participates with the core bourgeoisie in exploiting the indigenous labour force. Wealthier and power under the neocolonial regime is concentrated in the hands of foreign capital. Secondly, the national regime may undertake a national development strategy based on exploitation of the indigenous labour force and the limitation or elimination of the share going to imperial firms. In terms of the pattern of

income distribution the major share goes to the intermediate strata (in the form of the governing elite of the periphery). Thirdly, the regime may ally with the indigenous labour force, nationalize foreign or even indigenous enterprise, redistribute income, and generally undertake a national populist strategy as against core capital. Income distribution is more diversified, spreading downward. Although we cannot go into the details over here, Petras has much to say about the interrelations among these strategies and the role of the imperial state in slowing up neo-colonial regimes and undermining the others.

5.7 STATE CENTRED APPROACH

In the field of comparative political economy a backlash took place against developmentalism in the late 1960s and the early 1970s which concept of state and power were revived. The contribution to the theory of state can preliminarily from Marxist scholars. In Marx, Engels and Lenin the concept of state is premised on its relationship with the existing class divisions in society. It is the nature of this relationship, however, which has remained a matter of debate among Marxists. One tradition, prevalent in the United States of America (USA), emanated from community studies that identified power along the lines of position and reputation, is associated with works of G.W. Domhoff (Who Rules America, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1967; The Higher Circles, Rand House, New York, 1970; Who Really Rules?, Goodyear Publishing, Santa Monica, California, 1978; The Powers That Be, Random House, New York, 1979). Domhoff's main thesis is that there not only exists an upper class (corporate bourgeoisie) in USA, but also that this class, is a governing class. Domhoff's contributions have been seen as a part of industrialist tradition within Marxism in which state is seen as an instrument of the ruling or dominant class. This perspective is guided from Marx and Engels's concern expressed in The Communist Manifesto that the executive of the state "is but a committee for managing the

common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie". A careful reading of Domhoff's works, however, suggests that he does not subscribe to the industrialist viewpoint and the state in USA is seen as representing the interests of the corporate class while at the same time opposing the interests of individual capitals or fractions of the business elite. A second tradition revolved around what has been described as the structuralism view of the state and is found in the writings of French Marxists, notably Nicos Poulantzas. Poulantzas in his early work (*Political Power and Social Classes*, New Left Books, London) argued that functions of the state in capitalist are broadly determined by the structures of the society rather than by the people who occupy positions of the state. The state operates in a 'relatively autonomous' manner to counteract the combined threats of working class unity and capitalist disunity in order to reproduce capitalist structure. Poulantzas in his later work (*State, Power and Socialism*, New Left Books, Verso edition, London, 1980) argues that the capitalist state itself is an arena of class conflict and that whereas the state is shaped by social-class relations, it is also contested and is therefore the product of class struggle within state. Politics is not simply the organization of class power through the state by dominant capitalist class, and the use of that power to manipulate and repress subordinate groups, it is also the site, of organized conflict by mass social movement to influence state policies, and gain control of state apparatuses. An interesting debate on the state theory in the West figured in the pages of *New Left Review* in 1969-70, in the form of an exchange between Ralph Miliband and Poulantzas. As Poulantzas's view has already been discussed above, we shall briefly examine now the contribution of Ralph Miliband. The debate in *New Left Review* centered on Miliband's book *The State in Capitalist Society: An Analysis of the Western System of Power* (Basic Books, New York, 1969) in which he argued that while the state may act in Marxist terms, on behalf of the ruling class, it does not act at its behest. The state is a class state, but it must approach have a high degree of independence if it is to act as a class state. The key argument in Miliband's work is that state may act in the interests of capitalist, but not always at their command. While the above mentioned debates focused primarily on the nature of state in Western capitalist societies, a lively contribution to the

Notes

debate on the nature of state in the developing world followed. Hamza Alavi ('The State in Post-Colonial Societies: Pakistan and Bangladesh', *New Left Review*, No.72, 1972) characterizes the post-colonial state in Pakistan and Bangladesh as 'overdeveloped' (as it was creation of metropolitan powers lacking indigenous support) which remained relatively autonomous from the dominant classes. The state controlled by 'bureaucratic military oligarchy' mediates between the competing interests of three propertied classes, namely the metropolitan bourgeoisie, the indigenous bourgeoisie and the landed classes, while at the same time acting on behalf of them all to preserve the social order in which their interests are embedded, namely the institutional of private property and the capitalist mode as the dominant mode of production. This theme of relative autonomy was later taken by Pranab Bardhan (*The Political Economy of Development*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford 1986) in his analysis of the Indian state, where state is relatively autonomous of the dominant coalition constituted by capitalist, landlords and professionals. State, however, in Bardhan's formulation remains a prominent actor which exercises 'choice in goal formulation, agenda setting and policy execution'. The idea of overdeveloped postcolonial state and the concept of relative autonomy in the context of relationship between state and class in the context of African societies was carried in the work of John Saul ('The State in Post-Colonial Societies: Tanzania', *The Socialist Register*, London, 1974). Another perspective came in the work of Issa G. Shivji (*Class Struggle in Tanzania*, New York, 1976), who argued that the personnel of the state apparatus themselves emerge as the dominant class as they develop a specific class interest of their own and transform themselves into 'bureaucratic bourgeoisie'. The debate on the nature and role of the state have continued in journals like *Review of African Political Economy*, *Journal of Complementary Asia*, *Latin American Perspective* and the annual volumes of *Socialist Register* in light of changes taking place in the forms of economy, social classes and political forces.

Check Your Progress 4

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your progress with the model answer given at the end of the unit.

1) What is meant by mode of production? What is the nature of socio-economic, reality in the Third world according to the articulation of mode of production theory?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2) The state centred approach revived the concept of state and power in the study of comparative politics. Discuss.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

5.8 GLOBALISATION AND NEO-LIBERAL APPROACH

In the context of globalisation, the 'neoliberal' modernisation approach has emerged as a dominant paradigm giving explanations for and prescribing remedies for underdevelopment in peripheral states. The neoliberal paradigm proposes that the underdevelopment of peripheral states of the 'Third World' is primarily because of the failure of state-led development strategies particularly import-substitution industrialisation. It believes that these countries can, however, develop and obtain competitive advantage in an open world economy by rolling back state-control. At the heart of the neoliberal perspective lies thus the notion of 'separation' or dichotomy between The state and the market. The paradigm limits the role of the state to providing 'enabling' conditions of 'good governance' in which market forces can flourish unhindered. This

Notes

enabling role involves the preservation of law and order, the guarantee of private property and contract, and the provision of 'public goods'. Criticising this assumption of a natural dichotomy between the state and market, Ray Kiely (*Sociology and Development: The impasse and Beyond*, UCL Press, London, 1995, p. 128) points out that The separation between the two cannot be taken as natural but historically and socially constituted. The appearance of separate political and economic spaces, he pills out, is unique to the capitalist social relations which emerged in England and cannot therefore be generalized to the rest of 'advanced' capitalist world nor to the developing world international institutions like the World Bank and IMF have, however, proceeded to implement this ahistorical neoliberal model onto The developing world, with its accompanying prescriptions regarding structural adjustment and 'good governance'. The World Bank, for example, asserts that the economic problems of The developing world can be attributed to 'too much government' and a subsequent failure of market forces to operate freely. The proposed remedy is therefore, the encouragement of the private sector and the liberalisation of 'national economies'. In order to achieve these objectives, three key policy proposals are recommended: (i) currency devaluation, (ii) limited government and incentives to The private sector and, (iii) the liberalisation of international trade. These structural adjustment programmes, however, overlook the socio-economic realities of specific countries and the role played by the state in providing social justice. The withdrawal of the state from this role, so as to unfetter market forces, means that the state is no longer expected to play a role in balancing unequal resources. This then leads to an increase in the vulnerability of the weaker sections, particularly women and/of the working class, deepening already existing hierarchies within countries. Similarly, the notion of 'good governance' within The neoliberal agenda of international aid giving institutions, as providing The enabling conditions within which market forces can flourish, has been viewed within skepticism. Kiley, for example, points out that the World Bank's explanations of the failure of structural adjustment programmes in Sub Saharan Africa, as lack of good governance, fails to specify how 'public accountability', 'pluralism' and the 'rule of law', all of which are cited by

the World Bank (Governance and Development, World Development, Washington, DC, 1992) as important constituents of good governance, can be achieved without the participation of the lower classes of society. The concept of good governance within the neoliberal agenda, envisages a condition where democracy and freedom are seen as antagonistic. Freedom involves preservation of private property, free market, and provision of negative freedoms like the right to speech, associate and move freely, conditions, in other words, which preserve market economy. Democracy, on the other hand, is seen with suspicion, as belonging to the political realm where demands for participation and distribution of resources are made. The latter, it is feared needed to be the freedoms essential for the strength of the economic realm to the prioritization of approach freedom over democracy, as prescribed by the neoliberal paradigm, fails thus to meet the developmental needs of the people.

Check Your Progress 5

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answer with the model answers given at the end of the unit.

1) What are the key elements of the neo-liberal approach?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

5.9 LET US SUM UP

The political economy approach emerged in the wake of decolonization to understand and explain the relationship among nations and socio-political phenomena. At the basis of this approach was the assumption of

a relationship between the domains of politics and economics. The modernization, underdevelopment and dependency, world systems, articulation of the modes of production, class analysis, state-centred analysis and the neoliberal analysis are dominant among the various explanatory frameworks which have emerged in the last few decades. While, the analytical tools of all these frameworks have varied, almost all have 'development' as their key problem the process of exploring this problem willing a comparative perspective, they have, inevitably seen the world in terms of a characteristics whole. They do, however, provide important insights into the intricacies of economic forces and the in a symbiosis of economy and polity works within and in connection with external forces.

5.10 KEY WORDS

Globalisation: A process of bringing world together in terms of economic and social interactions of countries and people. In other words the world is supposed to be a global society with global issues and problems which are to be tackled with global efforts and cooperation.

Class State: A state that works to protect the interests of a particular class. In Marxian terminology it is used to describe the present liberal states as protecting the interests of capitalist class.

Structural Adjustments: Reforms in Economics like currency devaluation, incentives to private sector, liberalisation of international trade etc.

Third World: States which emerged independent after Second World as a process of decolonization and economically and industrially non-developed.

5.11 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

- 1) What is meant by underdevelopment? What kind of relationship exists between First world and The Third world countries according to dependency theory?

- 2) What do you understand by the concept of world system how are different parts of world interconnected according to the world system perspective?
- 3) What are the key elements of the neo-liberal approach?

5.12 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Wallerstein, Immanuel Maurice (2004). *World-systems analysis: An introduction*. Duke University Press. pp. 23–24.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (1974). *The Modern World-System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press.
- Paul Halsall *Modern History Sourcebook: Summary of Wallerstein on World System Theory*, August 1997
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (1992). "The West, Capitalism, and the Modern World-System", *Review* 15 (4), 561-619; also Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System I*, chapter one; Moore, Jason W. (2003) "The Modern World-System as Environmental History? Ecology and the rise of Capitalism," *Theory & Society* 32(3), 307–377.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2004. *The Uncertainties of Knowledge*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- So, Alvin Y. (1990). *Social Change and Development: Modernization, Dependency, and World-Systems Theory*. Newbury Park, London and New Delhi: Sage Publications. pp. 169–199.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2004. 2004a. "World-Systems Analysis." In *World System History: Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems*, edited by George Modelski. Oxford: UNESCO/EOLSS Publishers, <http://www.eolss.net>.
- Wallerstein, *The Uncertainties of Knowledge*, p. 62.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1991. "Beyond Annales," *Radical History Review*, no. 49, p. 14.

Notes

- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1995. "What Are We Bounding, and Whom, When We Bound Social Research?" *Social Research* 62(4):839–856.
- Moore, Jason W. 2011. "Ecology, Capital, and the Nature of Our Times: Accumulation & Crisis in the Capitalist World-Ecology," *Journal of World-Systems Analysis* 17(1), 108-147, "Archived copy". Archived from the original on 2011-05-10. Retrieved 2011-02-11..
- Carlos A. Martínez-Vela, World Systems Theory, paper prepared for the Research Seminar in Engineering Systems, November 2003
- Kondratieff Waves in the World System Perspective. Kondratieff Waves. Dimensions and Perspectives at the Dawn of the 21st Century / Ed. by Leonid E. Grinin, Tessaleno C. Devezas, and Andrey V. Korotayev. Volgograd: Uchitel, 2012. P. 23–64.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (1983). *Historical Capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Hopkins, Terence K., and Immanuel Wallerstein, coordinators (1996). *The Age of Transition*. London: Zed Books.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (1989). *The Modern World-System III*. San Diego: Academic Press
- Cardoso, F. H. (1979). *Development under Fire*. Mexico D.F.: Instituto Latinoamericano de Estudios Transnacionales, DEE/D/24 i, Mayo (Mexico 20 D.F., Apartado 85 - 025). Cited after Arno Tausch, Almas Heshmati, Re-Orient? MNC Penetration and Contemporary Shifts in the Global Political Economy, September 2009, IZA Discussion Paper No. 4393
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (Sep 1974). "Wallerstein. 1974. "The Rise and Future Demise of the World-Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis" (PDF). *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. 16 (4): 390. Cited after
- Immanuel Wallerstein (1974) *The Modern World-System*, New York, Academic Press, pp. 347-57.

- Wallerstein, Immanuel Maurice. "The Modern World System as a Capitalist World-Economy." *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction*. Durham: Duke UP, 2004. 23-30. Print.
- Chiot, Daniel. 1986. *Social Change in the Modern Era*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1980. *The Modern World System II: Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World-Economy, 1600-1750*. New York: Academic Press.
- Kennedy, Paul. 1987. *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict From 1500 to 2000*. New York: Random House.

5.13 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 1

1) Political Economy Approach is promised on the assumption that politics and economy are interrelated. To understand political processes it is necessary to, look that in economic context like means of production and production relations.

Check Your Progress 2

1) Purpose of modernization is process of traditional societies capturing up with the third world. The steps suggested for that are: i). Traditional stage ii) the pre-conditions for takeoff; iii) take off; iv) the drive towards maturity and v) high mass consumption. For elaboration see section 5.2.

Check Your Progress 3

1) See Section 5.3

2) See Section 5.4

Check Your Progress 4

Notes

- 1) Mode of Production means how in a society goods are produced and distributed. It also refers to the economic level which determines which of the different levels is dominant in the structured totality that constitute the social formation. In the third world countries generally pre-capitalist mode coexists with the capitalist mode of production.
- 2) See Section 5.7

Check Your Progress 5

- 1) Neo-liberal approach is based on the study and evaluation of concepts like good governance, structural adjustments, withdrawal of the State, globalization etc.

UNIT 6: NEW INSTITUTIONALISM AND COMPARATIVE METHODS; ADVANTAGE AND PROBLEMS OF COMPARISON

STRUCTURE

- 6.0 Objectives
- 6.1 Introduction
- 6.2 New Institutionalism
- 6.3 Emergence of the New Institutional Approach
- 6.4 Old and New Institutional Approach: A Comparison
- 6.5 New Institutionalism and the Developing World
- 6.6 Historical Institutionalism
- 6.7 Rational-Choice Institutionalism
- 6.8 Sociological Institutionalism
- 6.9 Comparative Study of Politics: Advantages
 - 6.9.1 Comparing for Theoretical Formulation
 - 6.9.2 Comparisons for Scientific Rigour
 - 6.9.3 Comparisons Leading to Explanations in Relationships
- 6.10 Problems of Comparisons
- 6.11 Let us sum up
- 6.12 Key Words
- 6.13 Questions for Review
- 6.14 Suggested readings and references
- 6.15 Answers to Check Your Progress

6.0 OBJECTIVES

The unit is divided into two main sectors which take up in some detail the above we outlined themes. Each section is followed by questions based on the section. Towards the end of the unit is provided a list of readings which can be used to supplement this unit. A set of questions follow the readings which will help you assess your understanding. All terms which have specific meanings in comparative political analysis have been explained in the section on keywords.

- To know about New Institutionalism;
- To discuss the Emergence of the New Institutional Approach;
- To discuss Old and New Institutional Approach: A Comparison;
- To know the details about New Institutionalism and the Developing World;
- To discuss the Historical Institutionalism;
- To know Rational-Choice Institutionalism;
- To understand Sociological Institutionalism;
- To discuss the advantages of Comparative Study of Politics;
- To know about Problems of Comparisons.

6.1 INTRODUCTION

By the 1970s and 1980s, comparative politics scholars increasingly became concerned with the shortcomings of the behavioural approaches of the post- World-War II era, namely the political systems and political culture approaches. This resulted in a resurgence of interest, in comparing politics of various countries through a study of their institutions. Within the discipline of Political Science, the new institutional approach was brought to the focus by works of James G. March and Johan P. Olsen. This institutional study, while retained some characteristics of the old Institutional approach, however, was different from it in several counts, which made it acceptable to a wider section of scholars.

New institutionalism or neo-institutionalism is a school of thought focused on developing a sociological view of institutions—the way they interact and how they affect society. It provides a way of viewing institutions outside of the traditional views of economics by explaining why and how institutions emerge in a certain way within a given context. This institutional view argues that institutions have developed to become similar (showing an isomorphism) across organizations even though they evolved in different ways, and has studied how institutions shape the behavior of actors (i.e. people, organizations, and governments).[1]

Sociological new institutionalism is distinguished from, though related to, the new institutional economics and new institutionalism in political science.

New institutionalism posits that institutions operate in an open environment consisting of other institutions, called the institutional environment. Every institution is influenced by the broader environment (or institutional peer pressure). In this environment the main goal of organizations is to survive and gain legitimacy. In order to do so, they need to do more than succeed economically; they need to establish legitimacy within the world of institutions.

Much of the research within new institutionalism deals with the pervasive influence of institutions on human behavior through rules, norms, and other frameworks. Previous theories held that institutions can influence individuals to act in one of two ways: they can cause individuals within institutions to maximize benefits (regulative institutions, also called rational choice institutionalism), similar to rational choice theory or to act out of duty or an awareness of what one is "supposed" to do (normative institutions, also called historical institutionalism). An important contribution of new institutionalism was to add a cognitive influence. This perspective adds that, instead of acting under rules or based on obligation, individuals act because of conceptions.

According to prominent organisational sociologist Richard Scott, "Compliance occurs in many circumstances because other types of behavior are inconceivable; routines are followed because they are taken for granted as 'the way we do these things'" (p. 57) —also called social institutionalism. Individuals make certain choices or perform certain actions not because they fear punishment or attempt to conform; neither do they do so because an action is appropriate or the individual feels some sort of social obligation. Instead, the cognitive element of new institutionalism suggests that individuals make certain choices because they can conceive of no alternative.

Notes

In a 1990 article Terry Karl portrays institutions as constraining the preferences and policy choices of elite actors' during transition. The focus upon economics in this article is misleading; institutions are politics: they are the substance of which politics is constructed and the vehicle through which the practice of politics is transmitted.[according to whom?] New institutionalism was born out of a reaction to the behavioural revolution. In viewing institutions more widely as social constructs, and by taking into account the influence that institutions have on individual preferences and actions, new institutionalism has moved away from its institutional (formal legal descriptive historical)[vague] roots and become a more explanatory discipline within politics.

More-recent work has begun to emphasize multiple competing logics, focusing on the more-heterogeneous sources of diversity within fields and the institutional embeddedness of technical considerations. The concept of logic generally refers to broader cultural beliefs and rules that structure cognition and guide decision-making in a field. At the organization level, logic can focus the attention of key decision-makers on a delimited set of issues and solutions, leading to logic-consistent decisions that reinforce extant organizational identities and strategies. In line with the new institutionalism, social rule system theory stresses that particular institutions and their organizational instantiations are deeply embedded in cultural, social, and political environments and that particular structures and practices are often reflections of as well as responses to rules, laws, conventions, paradigms built into the wider environment.

Political science has its roots in the study of institutions. Aristotle's discussion of good and bad forms of government was essentially a discussion of institutions. Much of the traditional, formal/legal political science also was about institutions. In this traditional version of the discipline the assumption was that formal constitutional structures would indeed determine outcomes. With the behavioral "revolution" in political science, followed by the emphasis on rational choice models, the

emphasis shifted from institutions to individuals but, to some extent, has now shifted back to consider the importance of institutions. This review attempts to cover the principal approaches to institutions utilized in political science. As well as considering the theoretical and analytical approaches, this review also demonstrates how the approaches have been applied to attempt to explain policy outcomes and political processes. Further, this review considers some of the principal challenges to institutional theories, notably the difficulties of integrating change into theories that are more concerned with stability. The majority of the items included in the bibliography are from political science, but some also are drawn from sociology, economics, and management. The advocacy of the return to institutional analysis is a claim that we can better understand politics as a function of the interaction of institutions and organizations, rather the product of more or less atomistic individual behaviors. Thus, institutionalism represents a fundamental claim about the nature of politics and also constitutes an alternative paradigm for political analysis. That said, however, to understand institutions we may also need to understand the behavior of the individuals who comprise those institutions. This linkage of structural and individual elements in institutional theories represents one of the most abiding challenges to the approach and also one of the major strengths. The emphasis is clearly on the role of structure, but at the same time individuals influence the behavior and very nature of institutions, and institutions may shape individuals. This linkage is one factor helping to make institutional theory a possible contender for a paradigm for political science

6.2 NEW INSTITUTIONALISM

New Institutional Approach is explicitly theoretical. New Institutionalism not only focuses on the organisational and formal structures of institutions and laws like – parliament, executive, judiciary etc., it also takes into account the norms and informal practices like Trade Unions, pressure groups etc, that shapes the functioning and evolutions of institutions in various ways. New Institutional Approach is more interested in analysing the dynamic process of institutional change. New Institutionalism is not a well-defined and unitary body of thought.

Notes

Its scope of study is quite broad. The term 'institution' that is used here can mean a number of things from formal structure like parliament and judiciary to entities like social class or groups etc. However, for analytical purpose we can find three major models of New Institutionalism:

1. Historical Institutionalism
2. Rational-Choice Institutionalism
3. Sociological Institutionalism

According to Hall and Taylor each of these approaches paints different pictures of the social and political world and their links to institutions. Now, we will see the strengths and weaknesses of historical institutionalism in explaining social and political realities.

The study of institutions and their interactions has been a focus of academic research for many years. In the late 19th and early 20th century, social theorists began to systematize this body of literature. One of the most prominent examples of this was the work of German economist and social theorist Max Weber; Weber focused on the organizational structure (i.e. bureaucracy) within society, and the institutionalization created by means of the iron cage which organizational bureaucracies create. In Britain and the United States, the study of political institutions dominated political science until the 1950s. This approach, sometimes called 'old' institutionalism, focused on analyzing the formal institutions of government and the state in comparative perspective. It was followed by a behavioral revolution which brought new perspectives to analyzing politics, such as positivism, rational choice theory, and behavioralism, and the narrow focus on institutions was discarded as the focus moved to analyzing individuals rather than the institutions which surrounded them.

Institutionalism experienced a significant revival in 1977 with an influential paper published by John W. Meyer of Stanford University and his Ph.D. student at the time, Brian Rowan. The revised formulation of institutionalism proposed in this paper prompted a significant shift in the

way institutional analysis was conducted. Research that followed became known as "new" institutionalism, a concept that is generally referred to as "neo-institutionalism" in academic literature.

Another significant reformulation occurred in the early 1980s when Paul DiMaggio and Walter W. Powell consciously revisited Weber's iron cage. The following decade saw an explosion of literature on the topic across many disciplines, including those outside of the social sciences. Examples of the body of work in the decade which followed can be found in DiMaggio and Powell's 1991 anthology in the field of sociology; in economics, the Nobel Prize-winning work of Douglass North is a noted example.

There are several general overviews that address institutional theory and its application in political science. Two of these overviews are in the form of written books that ask a number of theoretical questions about institutionalism as an approach to political science (and to a lesser extent the social sciences more generally), while the other is a major handbook on political institutions. One of the written books is Peters 2011, cited under One Approach or Many?). The other, Lowndes and Roberts 2010, considers the approaches together and asks a series of questions about their status as theory. The other general overview of institutional theory is the Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions, edited by R. A. W. Rhodes, Sarah Binder, and Bert Rockman. This comprehensive handbook examines institutional questions in political science from a variety of directions, including looking a number of strands of theoretical analysis and also discussing theoretical and analytical approaches to specific institutions. Because institutionalism is a rather varied approach that comes from and is used in a number of areas of political science, it is difficult to identify specific journals that are likely to have articles in this field more readily than are others. That said, institutional theories tend to be employed more commonly by scholars working in public administration and public policy than by other segments of the discipline. Therefore, institutionalist articles are more likely to be found in these journals than in others.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answer with the model answers given at the end of the unit.

1. How do you know about New Institutionalism?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

6.3 EMERGENCE OF THE NEW INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH

Certain factors contributed to the emergence of the new institutional approach in the later part of the twentieth century. Let us briefly look at some of them in the following.

Contextual factors: With decolonization and emergence of newer states in erstwhile colonies, it appeared that the role of the state could be very crucial in shaping political behaviour. In the third world, the state – both in terms of the government and the coercive forces – was seen as the prime locus of all kinds of development. Further, in the developed world too, the emergence of the ‘welfare state’ changed the focus of academic studies. The emergence and working of centralized command economies in the communist world and some of the postcolonial countries offered a further push to take states seriously within the discipline of politics. The sweeping wave of democratization between the mid-1980s and mid-1990s also boosted the interest in institutions. Requirements of stable and effective democracy brought in a number of new political institutions, leading to further interest in studying them. The international politics of the time also contributed to this increasing interest in the institutions. The politics of Cold War showed that states and institutions are important

actors, and a study of politics cannot be complete without adequate focus on them.

Debates within the discipline: Within the discipline of political science, the state has occupied an elusive space. While the study of politics began with a study of the state, a later generation of political scientists like Easton and Almond, perceived the state to be a too vague concept to be employed in attempts to understand real political operations of society. Due to this reason, they talked of replacing the concept of the state with that of the concept of political system. While the 'systems analysis' talked of institutions as components of the political system, they focused more on the behaviour of various actors and the interaction between actors and institutions, to explain political phenomena. The historical developments however, made the political scientists rethink the place of the state and other political institutions in organizing political societies. A strand of thought that emerged in the late 1970s and 1980s talked of the state as an autonomous actor. Another strand of literature, which we can trace to writing of JP Nettl in 1968 and Abrams in 1977, and in more recent times, to that of Timothy Mitchell in the 1990s, argued that while the state may be an elusive concept that does not mean that it is any less an important concept. Instead, due to this very reason, we need to study the state very carefully, to understand how it influences and gets influenced by the various operations of society. Such a conceptual orientation towards the state has also led to increased interest in institutions as a key to understand political processes.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answer with the model answers given at the end of the unit.

1. Discuss the Emergence of the New Institutional Approach.

.....

.....
.....
.....

6.4 OLD AND NEW INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH: A COMPARISON

Although there are much in common between the Old and New Institutional Approach, yet we can broadly make the following differences between the two:

First, unlike the Old Institutional Approach, New Institutional Approach no longer focuses only on the organisational and formal structures of institutions and laws. It also takes into account the norms and informal practices that shapes the functioning and evolutions of institutions in various ways.

Second, the focus of Old Institutional Approach was on formal institutions like – parliament, executive, judiciary etc. However, New Institutional Approach also takes into account the informal institutions like Trade Unions, pressure groups etc.

Third, broadly we can see Old Institutional Approach more as descriptive while New Institutional Approach is explicitly theoretical.

Fourth, we can also find Old Institutional Approach more as static while New Institutional Approach is more interested in analysing the dynamic process of institutional change.

6.5 NEW INSTITUTIONALISM AND THE DEVELOPING WORLD

The new Institutionalism is also applied in understanding and analysing the politics in the developing world. We have seen that how the international bodies like World Bank or International Monetary Fund

have emphasised on the institutions in the developing world while allocating the funds for development purposes. In the analysis of these international bodies sound, effective and the institutions of good governance are prerequisites for the development. It is believed that sound and effective institutions can bring about the desired results.

However, the major problems in such understanding of institutions was that it ignored the uneasy relationship between externally assisted and designed formal institutions on the one hand and deeply embedded local institutions on the other. Some scholars, like Sangmpan, are suspicious of the institutional analysis of politics in the developing world. He maintains that 'empirical evidence reveals that outcomes in developing countries consistently defy institutions as explanation and prescription'.⁶ Sangmpan wants to distinguish three aspects of the political system – politics, institution and the state. And he argues that in developing countries it is society rooted politics the influence and even determines the other two aspects of political system. He is of the opinion that an institutional approach marginalises such factors like competition for property, power, goods and services which actually determine the politics.

However, Lisa Rakner and Vicky Randall believes that Sangmpan is deliberately ignoring one of the key features of new Institutionalism, that is, it focuses on the informal institutions and its interactions with the formal institutions. In conclusion we can say that new institutionalism offers insightful analysis of how some institutions function and guide political behaviour in the developing world while others do not. It could also help us answer questions like why and under what circumstances informal norms and practices dominate the practices of formal institutions.

Check Your Progress 3

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answer with the model answers given at the end of the unit.

1. Discuss Old and New Institutional Approach: A Comparison.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2. How do you know the details about New Institutionalism and the Developing World?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

6.6 HISTORICAL INSTITUTIONALISM

Historical Institutionalism as an approach developed in response to the group theorists like pluralists on the one hand and the structural-functional theorist on the other. While it has borrowed from these two theories it also tries to go beyond them. Thus, the Historical Institutionalism model places the state at a crucial explanatory role. The state here is seen not as a single body but as a complex set of institutions. This set of institutions is capable of shaping the character and outcomes of group conflicts. Further, they also tried to explore how other social and political institutions of society, apart from those of the state, also shape institutional and group interactions. So, Historical Institutionalists count a range of things as institutions. This includes formal and informal procedures, routines, norms and conventions. According to Hall and Taylor there are three distinctive characteristics of the Historical Institutionalism approach. These are:

(a) Relatively broad conceptualisation of the relation between institutions and individual behaviours.

If institutions are so central, then in what ways do institutions affect the behaviour of the individuals? This question, according to the Hall and Taylor, is central to any institutional analysis. The new institutionalists broadly provide two kinds of answers – coming from two different approaches – the calculus approach and the cultural approach. Hall and Taylor differentiate between these two approaches – Calculus and Cultural, by looking at how they give slightly different answers to three kinds of questions. The first question is about the behaviour of actors: how do they behave? The second question is about institutions and their role. The third one asks the reason behind the persistence of institutions over time.

(i) Behaviour of actors: how do they behave? - According to the calculus approach, Individuals actions are based on strategic calculations. Its assumptions are that individuals seek to maximize their benefits by reasoning out all possible options, to select the one which could confer maximum benefit.

However, according to the cultural approach, the behaviour of an actor is not completely strategic, but it is affected by an individual's worldview. It does not deny that human behaviour is rational or goal oriented. So, according to the cultural approach Individuals are not merely 'utility maximizers' but also 'satisfiers'.

(ii) Institutions and their role- The calculus approach holds that Institutions affect behaviour, through their role of providing information to actors. According to cultural approach institutions provide moral or cognitive format for interpretations and actions. According to this approach, institutions affect the very identities, self images and preferred course of action for the individuals.

(iii) Why do institutions persist over time? - According to the calculus approach, institutions persist because people adhere to these institutions or laws, as any deviation from it will make them worse off. However, for

according to the cultural approach institution persist, because people get used to institutions so much that they tend to take the institutions for granted and they do not scrutinize the institutions.

(b) Historical Institutionalists emphasise on the uneven distribution and operation of power, influenced by the operation and development of institutions.

Historical Institutionalists are especially attentive to the fact that institutions distribute power unevenly across various social groups rather than assuming freely contracting individuals. They argue that in the real world institutions give some groups substantially more access to the decision making process than others.

(c) Hold a view of institutional development which is ‘path dependent’ and is marked by unintended consequences.

The Historical Institutionalists reject the traditional understanding that the same cause leading to same result everywhere. Rather, they believe that effects of specific causes would be mediated by the features of a given situation. Therefore, the outcome of the same course of action may vary depending upon the path that was undertaken and also it may lead to many unintended consequences depending upon the socio-economic conditions of the given situation.

6.7 RATIONAL-CHOICE INSTITUTIONALISM

Rational-Choice Institutionalism views actors as maximizer of their self interest.

It also believes that the political actors engage in highly sophisticated calculus and institutions as the product of this rational thinking. Although, the Rational Choice Institutionalism is not something which is completely different from Historical Institutionalism, in fact they have a lot of similarities, but these two schools of institutionalism developed

independently of each other. There have been no intellectual exchanges between the two.

The Rational-Choice Institutionalism was initially inspired by the observation of

a phenomenon in the context of American Congressional behaviour which could not be explained by the assumptions of conventional rational-choice. There are four notable characteristics of the Rational-choice Institutionalism approach –

a) Rational-choice Institutionalism employs a characteristic set of behavioural assumptions such as, that actors have a fixed set of preferences or tasks. It believes that these actors behave entirely so as to maximise the attainment of those preferences and they do so in a highly strategic manner with extensive calculations.

b) Rational-choice Institutionalism views politics as a series of collective action dilemmas. It is an instance where rational self-interested individuals, while acting to maximize their own preferences, likely produce an outcome that is collectively sub-optimal. Presence of such institutions can thus solve the problems.

c) The contribution of the Rational-choice Institutionalism is to show the role that strategic interaction has in determining political outcomes. The major arguments are: *i)* an actor's behaviour is likely to be guided but by strategic calculus; and *ii)* this calculus is deeply influenced by the actor's expectations about how others are likely to behave.

d) Rational-choice Institutionalists explain the origin of the institutions in a distinctive way. They explain the existence of the institution by reference to the value the functions of the institutions have, for the affected actors. They assume that actors create the institution because of the value of the functions performed by the institution. Thus, process of institutional creation is based on the voluntary agreement by relevant actors.

6.8 SOCIOLOGICAL INSTITUTIONALISM

Sociologic Institutionalism develops as independent of the other two models of new institutionalism. But, nonetheless it is contemporary to those other two models. It developed in the field of sociology within the subfield of organization theory. Roughly, by the end of 1970s, some sociologists began to challenge a dichotomy traditionally drawn between the two parts of the social world – first, the formal-means end rationality of the modern forms of organisation and bureaucracy. Second, the practices associated with ‘culture’ which is displayed in other parts of the social world.

Traditionally, within sociology, the bureaucratic structures were seen as the most rational and efficient, and the apparent similarity in form of diverse organisations is said to be resulted by this need to be rational-efficient in functioning.

The New Institutionalists in sociology began to argue against such a view. It rather argued that, many of the forms and procedures used by modern organisations cannot be explained by logics of rationality and efficiency, and that they are adopted because they are culturally specific practices. Thus, they argue that even the most formal bureaucratic practices require to be examined for a cultural explanation.

Features of Sociological Institutionalism:

a) It defines institutions very broadly, anything that provides ‘frames of meaning’ guiding human action is considered as institution. It breaks down the conceptual divide between ‘institutions’ and ‘cultures’. Thus, it challenges the distinction that many political scientists draw between ‘institutional explanations’ based on organisational structures and ‘cultural explanations’ based on understanding of culture and shared attitudes or values.

b) Following the ‘cultural approach’ of it, they have a distinctive understanding of the relations between institutions and individuals action. Institutions influence behaviour not merely by specifying their ideal course of action. Rather, individual behaviour is influenced also by shaping what one can imagine oneself doing in a given context. So, institutions affect the most basic preferences and very identity of the actors or the people. It does not mean that actions of individuals are without a purposive or goal. But what individuals will think as ‘rational or goal oriented action’ itself is socially and culturally constructed.

c) Origin of institutional practices and how they change? Sociological Institutionalism has a distinctive way of understanding this. The sociological institutionalists argue that organisation often adopt new institutional practices, not because such practices are more efficient in terms of leading to desired ends, but because such new practice enhances the acceptance or legitimacy of the organisations or its participants in the eyes of the public. Such attempts at adopting practices that are valued in the society rather than the ones which are efficient, may in some cases, actually lead to negative effects in terms of achieving the organisation’s formal goals.

Check Your Progress 4

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answer with the model answers given at the end of the unit.

1. Discuss the Historical Institutionalism.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2. How do you know Rational-Choice Institutionalism?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3. What do you understand Sociological Institutionalism?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

6.9 COMPARATIVE STUDY OF POLITICS: ADVANTAGES

The question of advantages of comparative politics is concerned with its usefulness and relevance for enhancing our understanding of political reality. It seeks to know how a comparative study helps us understand this reality better. First and foremost, we must bear in mind that political behaviour is common to all human beings and manifests itself in diverse ways and under diverse social and institutional set ups all over the world. It may be said that an understanding of these related and at the same time different political behaviours and patterns is an integral part of our understanding of politics itself. A sound and comprehensive understanding would commonly take the form of comparisons.

6.9.1 Comparing for Theoretical Formulation

While comparisons form an implicit part of all our reasoning and thinking, most comparativists would argue that a comparative study of politics seeks to make comparisons consciously to arrive at conclusions which can be generalised i.e. held true for a number of cases. To be able to make such generalisations with a degree of confidence, it is not sufficient to just collect information about countries. The stated in comparative political analysis, is on theory-building and theory testing

with the countries acting units or cases. A lot of emphasis is therefore laid, and energies spent, on developing rules and standards about how comparative research should be carried out. A comparative study ensures that all generalisations are based on the observation of more than one or observation of relationship between several phenomena. The broader the observed universe, the greater is the confidence in statements about relationship and sounder the theories.

6.9.2 Comparisons for Scientific Rigour

As will be explained in the next unit, the comparative method gives these theories scientific basis and rigour. Social scientists that emphasize scientific precision, validity and reliability, see comparisons as indispensable in the social sciences because they offer the unique opportunity of 'control' in the study of social phenomena. (Giovanni Sartori, 'compare, Why and How' in Mattei Dogan and , Ali Kazancigil eds., *Comparing Nations, Concepts, Strategies, Substance*, -1 Blackwell, Oxford, 1994.).

6.9.3 Comparisons Leading to Explanations in Relationships

For a long time comparative politics appeared merely to look for similarities and differences, and directed this towards classifying, dichotomising or polarising political phenomena. Comparative political analysis is however, not simply about identifying similarities and differences. The purpose of using comparisons, it is felt by several scholars, is going beyond 'identifying similarities and differences' or the 'compare and contrast approach' as it is called, to ultimately study political phenomena in a larger framework of relationships. This, it is felt, would help 'deepen our understanding and broaden the levels of answering and explaining political phenomena. (See Manoranjan Mohanty, 'Comparative Political Theory and Third World Sensitivity', *Teaching Politics*, Nos.1 & 2, 1975).

6.10 PROBLEMS OF COMPARISONS

The opportunities for research of socio-economic differences in mortality are best in countries where a system of personal identification numbers makes the computerized linkage of census and death records possible. The first part of this study is an example of the use of such linked records. It presents results on the development of mortality differences by level of education and occupational class in Finland in the period 1971-1985. Socio-economic mortality differences among middle-aged and elderly men increased in Finland during the study period. The increase was mainly due to the rapid decline of mortality from cardiovascular diseases among upper white-collar employees and men with more than secondary education. Relative socio-economic mortality differences were smaller among women than among men and remained unchanged in 1971-1985. The second part of the article discusses the problems in international comparisons of socio-economic mortality differences and summarizes results from two comparative studies. The results are inconsistent: differences by level of education among men were found to be similar in six countries included in the comparison, whereas marked variation was found in the ratios of the mortality of manual workers to the mortality of non-manual workers.

Difficulty # 1. Inter-Connection between Norms, Institutions and Behaviour:

In the first instance, there are difficulties arising from the inter-connection between norms, institutions and behaviour which stem from the fact that some governments exist naturally and others are imposed. Traditionally, this question was examined through the study of gap between constitution and 'real' political life, this gap is important, as no constitution will ever be fully implemented.

But the problem is more general. Constitutions are only one type of normative arrangement under which countries can be organized. Constitution-makers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries attempted to modify societies in a certain way, generally in order to increase the liberal content of government.

To that extent, they tried to impose rules Constitutional rule is therefore, a form of imposed system of government. But other types of impositions also occur, though by different means and in the name of different principles. The distinction between natural and imposed arrangements is thus a problem for all political systems.

Difficulty # 2. Range of Variables:

The analysis can become precise only when it is possible to list and weigh the numerous variables which enter into the 'definition' of a political system. The list of variables is impressive and the task is impossible to calculate as many of these variables lack quantitative formalization.

Economic conditions, social conditions, the climate, physical geography and some others, all seem to be a part of the 'explanation' of political system and all have been used at one period or another by political scientists anxious to explain 'the norms, institutions and behaviours of nations. Since the range of variables of politics is very large it is not possible to empirically and comprehensively analyse all these.

Difficulty # 3. Paucity of Information:

Cross-national analysis is made particularly difficult because in several countries, particularly where the system is 'imposed', information is often lacking. Totalitarian countries refuse access to much information. Admittedly, even the most 'open' country does operate limited and indirect censorship on numerous processes.

In many circumstances, lack of information poses a serious hindrance in the way of comparative politics. Many governments are not willing to let the political scientists have a look into their records and files.

Difficulty # 4. Problems in the Way of Using Scientific Method are also Problems of Comparative Politics:

Hindrances in the way of application of Scientific Methods to Social Science Research are also hindrances in the way of Comparative Politics.

These are:

- (a) The problem resulting from complexity of social data.
- (b) The problem of using empirical methods in the study of human political relations and interactions.
- (c) The problem of verification and prediction making in politics.
- (d) The issue of explanation and prediction in politics.
- (e) The problem arising from dynamic nature of the social phenomena.
- (f) The problem of applying the scientific method to a highly complex and dynamic political phenomena.

All these hindrances combine to create a big hindrance in the use of the scientific method in Comparative Politics studies. However, gradually political scientists have been overcoming these difficulties. Comparative Politics studies are now becoming quite well-organised and systematic.

Difficulty # 5. Problem of Empirical Study:

Comparative Politics stands for scientific and empirical study of all phenomena of politics. It gives rise to the problems associated with the observation and collection of facts. In particular, this problem becomes bigger when one is to collect facts about the operation of authoritarian and totalitarian political systems.

Difficulty # 6. Dynamic Nature of Politics:

Politics is an aspect of human behaviour and like all other aspects of human behaviour, it is also highly dynamic. Further, a big gap is always

present in the theory and practice of all political systems. This always acts as a big hindrance in the way of every realistic study of politics.

Difficulty # 7. The Problem of Objectivity:

Scientific and empirical study of Politics demands objectivity in the observation, collection and analyse of the facts of the processes under study. It demands an ability to keep ones values and biases away from the universe of the study. For this, the researcher has to maintain a high level of alertness and commitment to maintain, objectivity.

This requirement also acts as a source of big hindrance in the way of Comparative Politics studies.

Thus there have been present several problems and hindrances in the way of Comparative Politics studies. However, these are being gradually overcome through conscious efforts on the part of modern political scientists.

Check Your Progress 5

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answer with the model answers given at the end of the unit.

1. Discuss the advantages of Comparative Study of Politics.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2. What do you know about Problems of Comparisons?

.....
.....

.....
.....
.....

6.11 LET US SUM UP

Now, instead of one we have three models of new Institutionalism – Historical, rational-choice and sociological. The challenge before us is to figure out not which of these one are most appropriate model in the studies of politics, but to find out the common ground between the three.

One of the major challenges that are levelled against the institutionalism and new institutionalism approach to the politics is that it tends to overemphasize the role of institutions – formal or informal, and give lesser importance to the conflicts and interests that are in many ways the basis of politics in many societies. However, new institutionalism and its three models taken together can provide insights into the functioning of politics in any societies. So, the need of the hour is more open and intense interchange between each of the three models of new Institutionalism.

The concept of 'systems' and 'structures-functions' came in vogue. These frameworks were used by western scholars particularly those in the United States to study phenomena like developmentalism, modernisation etc. While the political elite of the newly independent countries found concepts like development, nation-building and state building attractive, in many cases they evolved their own ideological stances and chose to remain non-aligned to either ideological blocs. In the late 1980s focus on studying politics comparatively within an overarching framework of 'system' declined and regional systemic studies assumed significance. The focus on state in these studies marked a resurgence of the study of power structures within civil society and its political forms, which had suffered a setback with; the arrival of systems and structures-functions into comparative politics. The petering out of Soviet Union in the same period, provoked western scholars to proclaim the 'end of history'

marking the triumph of liberalism and capitalism. Globalisation of capital, a significant feature of the late

6.12 KEY WORDS

New Institutionalism: New institutionalism or neo-institutionalism is a school of thought focused on developing a sociological view of institutions—the way they interact and how they affect society.

Comparison: a consideration or estimate of the similarities or dissimilarities between two things or people.

Behaviouralism: The belief that social theories should be constructed only on the basis of observable behaviour, providing quantifiable data for research.

Civil society: The term has contested meanings. By and large it is understood as the realm of autonomous groups and associations,-a private sphere

6.13 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

3. How do you know about New Institutionalism?
4. Discuss the Emergence of the New Institutional Approach.
5. Discuss Old and New Institutional Approach: A Comparison.
6. How do you know the details about New Institutionalism and the Developing World?
7. Discuss the Historical Institutionalism.
8. How do you know Rational-Choice Institutionalism?
9. What do you understand Sociological Institutionalism?
10. Discuss the advantages of Comparative Study of Politics.
11. What do you know about Problems of Comparisons?

6.14 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Berger, Peter L.; Luckmann (1966), *The Social Construction of Reality*, New York: Doubleday.
- Chappell, Louise (June 2006). "Comparing political institutions: revealing the gendered 'logic of appropriateness'".

- Politics & Gender. 2 (2): 223–35. doi:10.1017/S1743923X06221044.
- DiMaggio, Paul J.; Powell, Walter W. (April 1983). "The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields". *American Sociological Review*. 48 (2): 147–60. doi:10.2307/2095101. JSTOR 2095101.
 - ———; Powell, Walter W., eds. (1991), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 1–38.
 - Friedland, Roger; Alford, Robert R. (1991). Powell, Walter W.; DiMaggio, Paul J. (eds.). "Bringing Society Back In: Symbols, Practices, and Institutional Contradictions". *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*: 232–63.
 - Jepperson, Ronald L. (1991), "Institutions, Institutional Effects, and Institutionalism", in Powell, Walter W.; DiMaggio, Paul J. (eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 143–63.
 - Krücken, Georg; Drori, Gili S., eds. (2009), *World Society: The Writings of John W. Meyer*, Oxford: University Press, ISBN 9780199593439.
 - Krücken, Georg; Mazza, Carmelo; Meyer, Renate; Walgenbach, Peter, eds. (2017), *New Themes in Institutional Analysis. Topics and Issues from European Research*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, ISBN 9781784716868.
 - Lounsbury, Michael (2001). "Institutional Sources of Practice Variation: Staffing College and University Recycling Programs". *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 46 (1): 29–56. doi:10.2307/2667124. JSTOR 2667124.
 - ——— (April 2007). "A tale of two cities: competing logics and practice variation in the professionalizing of mutual funds". *Academy of Management Journal*. 50 (2): 289–307. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2007.24634436.

- March, James G.; Olsen, Johan P. (1989). *Rediscovering Institutions. The Organizational Basis of Politics*. New York: The Free Press (also Italian, Japanese, Polish and Spanish (Mexico) editions).
- Meyer, Heinz-Dieter and Brian Rowan, 2006. *The New Institutionalism in Education*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Meyer, John W.; Rowan, Brian (1991), "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony", in Powell, W.; DiMaggio, P. (eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- ———; Rowan, Brian (September 1977). "Institutionalized organizations: formal structure as myth and ceremony". *American Journal of Sociology*. 83 (2): 340–63. doi:10.1086/226550. JSTOR 2778293.
- Nicita, Antonio; Vatiello, Massimiliano (July 2007). "The contract and the market: towards a broader notion of transaction?" (PDF). *Studi e Note di Economia*. 12 (1): 7–22. doi:10.2139/ssrn.2473437. Archived from the original (PDF) on 2011-09-27.
- Ocasio, William (July 1997). "Towards An Attention- Based View of The Firm". *Strategic Management Journal*. 18 (S1): 187–206. doi:10.1002/(sici)1097-0266(199707)18:1+<187::aid-smj936>3.3.co;2-b. ISSN 0143-2095.
- Parto, Saeed. 2003. *Economic Activity and Institutions*, Economics Working Paper Archive at WUSTL.
- Powell, W.W. (2007). "The New Institutionalism". *The International Encyclopedia of Organization Studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scott, Richard W. 2001. *Institutions and Organizations*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- ———; Ruef, M.; Mendel, P.; Caronna, C. (2000). *Institutional change and healthcare organizations : from professional dominance to managed care*. Chicago: University

of Chicago Press. ISBN 978-0-22674309-7. OCLC 42689995.

- Thornton, Patricia H. (February 2002). "The rise of the corporation in a craft industry: conflict and conformity in institutional logics". *Academy of Management Journal*. 45 (1): 81–101. doi:10.2307/3069286. JSTOR 3069286.
- ——— (2004). *Markets from culture: institutional logics and organizational decisions in higher education publishing*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Business Books. ISBN 978-0-80474021-0. OCLC 53483582.

6.15 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 1

1. See Section 6.2

Check Your Progress 2

1. See Section 6.3

Check Your Progress 3

1. We can also find Old Institutional Approach more as static while New Institutional Approach is more interested in analyzing the vibrant process of institutional change. See Section 6.4
2. See Section 6.5

Check Your Progress 4

1. See Section 6.6
2. See Section 6.7
3. See Section 6.8

Check Your Progress 5

1. See Section 6.9
2. The increase was mainly due to the rapid decline of mortality from cardiovascular diseases among upper white-collar employees and men with more than secondary education. Relative socio-economic mortality differences were smaller among women than among men and remained unchanged in 1971-1985. The second part of the article discusses the problems in international comparisons of socio-economic mortality differences and summarizes results from two comparative studies. The results are inconsistent: differences by level of education among men were found to be similar in six countries included in the comparison, whereas marked variation was found in the ratios of the mortality of manual workers to the mortality of non-manual workers. Also see section 6.10

UNIT 7: DEVELOPMENT: THEORIES OF MODERNIZATION

STRUCTURE

- 7.0 Objectives
- 7.1 Introduction
- 7.2 Approaches to Modernisation
- 7.3 Implication of Modernisation Theories
- 7.4 Phases in Modernisation Processes
- 7.5 Modernisation : The Asian Syndrome
- 7.6 Modernisation Process as a Whole
- 7.7 The Phenomena of Modernity
- 7.8 Approaches to Modernity
- 7.9 Let us sum up
- 7.10 Key Words
- 7.11 Questions for Review
- 7.12 Suggested readings and references
- 7.13 Answers to Check Your Progress

7.0 OBJECTIVES

After having read this unit you will be able to,

- To define Modernisation;
- To outline approaches, implications, and phases of Modernisation;
- To discuss Modernisation in India;
- To describe the phenomena of modernity;
- To outline the approaches to modernity.

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The theories of Modernisation inform us about how the various parts of the world developed into industrial powers. The approaches/theories that describe and analyse how and why this happened are the subject of the initial part of this unit. Thereafter we will turn to modernity and see how

a presentation and analysis of the same helps our understanding of modern western society as also the social processes witnessed in some Asian societies. Thus Modernisation is an outcome of various social processes. The major events in this historical development began after the IInd world war and these include the emergence of America (US) as a superpower in the globe which had the result of trying to stymie the rise of communism. To bring about this aim of ‘containment ‘ the US invested greatly in the strengthening of the economic base of certain countries including Western Europe, South Korea and Japan. Modernisation also stems from the growth of the communist movements in China Vietnam, Soviet Union (now no longer existing as a communist bloc) and Cuba. The third of these processes include the factors of decolonialisation in Asia and Africa and the termination of colonies controlled by European powers. At this point of time the former colonies had to face the challenge of adopting some appropriate model of growth. In this they were assisted and helped by the US which sent vast teams of social scientists to stud ground situation in the new nation’s states. The idea behind this move of the US was to see how capitalist ideologies could be used in the economic growth of these nations most of whom were poor due to the long period of colonisation which had greatly debilitated their resources and has been deeply exploited. This included the export of raw materials which were turned into products and commodities and reexported to the colonies so as to make great economic profits. This strategy of supplanting capitalism and capitalist ideologies was no doubt also an attempt to the influence of communist ideology and to destroy it over a period of time. There is thus a great dimension of political maneuvers and ideology which is involved in the process of Modernisation. Thus the scholars in all fields of social science studied these societies and their findings began to be published soon after the IInd world war. The main tools of analysis and of subsequent published included primarily the evolutionary theory and secondly the functionalist theory. Let us describe these approaches now so that the overall process of Modernisation begins to be clear. Thus evolutionary theory and theorists pointed out the several factors which comprised the view point of this approach found social charge in these societies to be in

a linear progression going from primitive to complex society. This was held to be so in all societies. Again this theory and the theorists associated with it held that such linear progress of societies was leading to a better world and represented the good of humanity and civilization at large. Further social change was envisioned as a gradual occurrence and was dissociated from any sudden and violent chain of events eg revolution. Change was slow and steady and not sudden and violent as the communist ideology upheld. This slow change considering the situation of modern societies was felt to take enormous spans of time running in to centuries, not just decades. Thus the functionalist theorists, foremost of whom was Parsons, built up various tenets to promote its view point the main ones being the analogy of society as being an organism which had various interrelated segments in societal institutions. In this organismic entity (society) each of the various institutions performed a particular part which contributed to the whole. This theory propagated that there were four main functions which the institutions performed. These were the functions of - (a) adaptation to the environment performed by the capitalist economic system. Then was the function of. (b) Goal attainment which was a government function a function which encompassed liberal aims (Rojas 1996: p1). Next time it came the function of integration performed by legal and religious institutions, specifically the Christian religion. Finally there is the latency function performed by the family and by educational institutions.

7.2 APPROACHES TO MODERNISATION

Thus Modernisation approaches distinguished between traditional societies and modern societies. Thus the traditional societies were such that they tended to have a large personal, face to face nature which was felt to be inferior in terms of market relations. On the other hand modern societies tended to be neutral and therefore much more capable of dealing with and exploiting the market and the environment. One of the key institutions in the society is the family and the nature of this differed again in traditional and modern societies. Thus the family in traditional societies was responsible for many functions. That is to say it is multifunctional and covered issues of religion, welfare, education,

reproduction also emotional scaffolding. On the other hand the modern family which the functions of the family are now the domain of the state. In this theory social disturbances occur when any of the parts of society begin to malfunction or to fail to deliver what was expected of it to maintain the status quo. Disturbances include peaceful / violent agitation, revolution, guerilla warfare and now terrorism. However there is a disturbing side to these activities because any individual / institution that provokes the state and the status quo is deliberately and often violently desisted and resisted for doing so. These actions are deliberately viewed as action which is humanitarian. The question of human rights is a recent phenomena and organisations have be instituted to ensure that democracy is not violated at the cost of middle level disturbances whether by groups or by institutions.

Box 7.1: Mc Donaldization If we equate formal rationality with modernity, then the success and spread of the fast food restaurant, as well as to the degree to which it is serving as a model for much of the rest of society, indicate that we continue to live in a modern world... While there may be other changes in the economy which support the idea of a post industrial society, the fast food restaurant and the many other elements that are modeled after it do not. (Ritzer 1996, sociological theory. P:579).

Smelser's point of view differed somewhat from what we have been pointing out. He took as his point of attention the effect of the economy and related institutions on the overall social structure. He pointed out that in Modernisation process society developed from simple technology to complex ideology. Further this was a movement away from subsistence to cash crops so far as agriculture is concerned. Again Smelser indicated that machine power begins to dominate pushing aside simply human (physical) labour. Finally there is an emphasis on urbanisation and urban structures rather than development of the rural areas. Smelser however was realistic enough to realise that these developments were not simple and linear but that these processes took place at the same time (together) but not at the same rate (Smesler, 1969). Also such changes would occur

Notes

at a different pace at different social structure and societies. In other words there was not one single trajectory towards social change because the traditions were varied in different societies. They therefore provided different kinds of challenges. Similarly Rostow published a theory of Modernisation which took the terminology of aviation and proposed various stages of development. This theory talks of a primitive society moving on to get preconditions for the pre “take – off” onto the “take-off stage”, the drive to maturity and finally to a mass consumption society. Thus for Rostow (Rostow, 1960) economic development goes through various stages and that this is universal to all societies, and that Modernisation is a process of homogenisation, of Europeanization, irreversible progressive, evolutionary and transformative. This theory has some questionable implications. Thus following this theory it is implied that the nations which are traditional have as their ultimate model western advanced societies which they must emulate in every way to themselves reach an advanced state/modern state. This in itself implies that the capitalist state and ideology is the path to be followed by the under developed states. Thus Modernisation and theories explaining it accept without hesitation that American policies of trade and foreign policy, and that of international relations have to be accepted and subscribed to because they are at the core of the modernising process.

Globalization can be defined as the integration of economic, political and social cultures. It is argued that globalization is related to the spreading of modernization across borders.

Global trade has grown continuously since the European discovery of new continents in the early modern period; it increased particularly as a result of the Industrial Revolution and the mid-20th century adoption of the shipping container.

Annual trans-border tourist arrivals rose to 456 million by 1990 and almost tripled since, reaching a total of over 1.2 billion in 2016. Communication is another major area that has grown due to modernization. Communication industries have enabled capitalism to

spread throughout the world. Telephony, television broadcasts, news services and online service providers have played a crucial part in globalization. Former U.S president Lyndon B. Johnson was a supporter of the modernization theory and believed that television had potential to provide educational tools in development.

With the many apparent positive attributes to globalization there are also negative consequences. The dominant, neoliberal model of globalization often increases disparities between a society's rich and its poor. In major cities of developing countries there exist pockets where technologies of the modernised world, computers, cell phones and satellite television, exist alongside stark poverty. Globalists are globalization modernization theorists and argue that globalization is positive for everyone, as its benefits must eventually extend to all members of society, including vulnerable groups such as women and children.

Democratization and modernization

The relationship between modernization and democracy is one of the most researched studies in comparative politics. There is academic debate over the drivers of democracy because there are theories that support economic growth as both a cause and effect of the institution of democracy. "Lipset's observation that democracy is related to economic development, first advanced in 1959, has generated the largest body of research on any topic in comparative politics,"

Larry Diamond and Juan Linz, who worked with Lipset in the book, *Democracy in Developing Countries: Latin America*, argue that economic performance affects the development of democracy in at least three ways. First, they argue that economic growth is more important for democracy than given levels of socioeconomic development. Second, socioeconomic development generates social changes that can potentially facilitate democratization. Third, socioeconomic development promotes other changes, like organization of the middle class, which is conducive to democracy.

Notes

As Seymour Martin Lipset put it, "All the various aspects of economic development—industrialization, urbanization, wealth and education—are so closely interrelated as to form one major factor which has the political correlate of democracy". The argument also appears in Walt W. Rostow, *Politics and the Stages of Growth* (1971); A. F. K. Organski, *The Stages of Political Development* (1965); and David Apter, *The Politics of Modernization* (1965). In the 1960s, some critics argued that the link between modernization and democracy was based too much on the example of European history and neglected the Third World. Recent demonstrations of the emergence of democracy in South Korea, Taiwan and South Africa have been cited as support for Lipset's thesis.

One historical problem with that argument has always been Germany whose economic modernization in the 19th century came long before the democratization after 1918. Berman, however, concludes that a process of democratization was underway in Imperial Germany, for "during these years Germans developed many of the habits and mores that are now thought by political scientists to augur healthy political development".[

Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel contend that the realization of democracy is not based solely on an expressed desire for that form of government, but democracies are born as a result of the admixture of certain social and cultural factors. They argue the ideal social and cultural conditions for the foundation of a democracy are born of significant modernization and economic development that result in mass political participation.

Peerenboom explores the relationships among democracy, the rule of law and their relationship to wealth by pointing to examples of Asian countries, such as Taiwan and South Korea, which have successfully democratized only after economic growth reached relatively high levels and to examples of countries such as the Philippines, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Thailand, Indonesia and India, which sought to democratize at lower levels of wealth but have not done as well.

Adam Przeworski and others have challenged Lipset's argument. They say political regimes do not transition to democracy as per capita incomes rise. Rather, democratic transitions occur randomly, but once there, countries with higher levels of gross domestic product per capita remain democratic. Epstein et al. (2006) retest the modernization hypothesis using new data, new techniques, and a three-way, rather than dichotomous, classification of regimes. Contrary to Przeworski, this study finds that the modernization hypothesis stands up well. Partial democracies emerge as among the most important and least understood regime types.

Highly contentious is the idea that modernization implies more human rights, with China in the 21st century being a major test case.

7.3 IMPLICATION OF MODERNISATION THEORIES

As you will have noticed that there is a heavy western bias in these theories and their implications. Modernisation theory itself is mostly a western product and sets up these societies as an ideal that the less developed countries must follow without hesitation including capitalist ideology because this “works” and works best. However dependency theory takes a wider global perspective. It points out that the problems faced in development are not just those of social structure in traditional societies but in large part due to world wide structures imposed by the Western world, or the North.

Thus Andre Gunder Frank has pointed out that relations between North and South are arranged as a chain described by him as “metropolis – satellite” relationships. Thus we can see that there is an underlying hierarchy in world relations (Foster-Coster, 1985). At the top of the chain is the metropolis (US) that has no strong dependence on other regions. We then go on to the strong dependencies but are dependent on the USA (or other well developed Western societies) for aid or any other kind of help. The downward chain continues and culminates right down to states

Notes

(nations) which are very highly or even totally dependent on the nations higher up in the hierarchy of dependencies for almost everything in food, fertilizers, clothes, automobiles, machines etc. According to Frank such dependencies become a problem when a State wants to develop itself economically and socially. Thus such moves often call for sanctions against the satellite states by the metropolises on which the satellite is dependent. This means also that dependency of this sort stems the freedom to chose by the satellite states, and to try and evolve in their own way because whatever they have by way of economic wealth is consumed by the nations higher in the hierarchy. This theory is readily witnessed in international relations and the aid to the third world by the North have the most exploitative terms and conditions, which ensure that the satellite states can never be free of the donor in economic terms. Frank opines that the dismantling of such relations can alone lead to development along the lines that the third world nations want. Thus dependency theory is opposed to Modernisation theory, but it is definitely an alternative explanation. Further such an explanation exposes some harsh realities of contemporary societies across the globe. Modernisation theory is more of an ideology whereas dependency theories exposes the harsh economic international realities. Neither of them has produced any specific development just attributable to them. It may be noted however that Modernisation has since the 17th century has had an affect, beginning with the Western countries, impacted all over the globe. To give an example let us turn to the field of communication. Thus Modernisation theories shed light on how the media is affected by these relatively recent changes both in relatively traditional and postmodern societies we may note that the Modernisation theories we have been discussing can be seen to have evolved in three relatively distinct phases. The first phase of these theories began in the 1950s and 1960s and tried to explain how Western styles of living gradually spread all over the globe (world). These was also a spread of technological innovations and the ideology of individualism.

7.4 PHASES IN MODERNISATION PROCESSES

- The economic aspect where the mass media helped to spread technological innovations that was at the core of Modernisation.
- Cultural development including education and literacy rates. This too was aided by the mass media which can promote modernity.
- Identify development especially a rational identity was also helped by the media including the process of nation building and election.

However a basic shortcoming of these approaches to Modernisation was their Western bias. Now the second phase of Modernisation was linked to critical theory that held away in the 1980s. These theories are in fact a critique of the western impact of Modernisation. Thus according to the media dependency theory there was a dependence of the developing countries on the mass media of the western world. That is to say the peripheral countries depended upon the core. Now we come to the third phase of the development of Modernisation theory beginning in the 1990s. These theories attempted to be neutral in their approach. Thus according to Giddens modern society (Giddens, A. 1991) and culture is marked by time space instantiation and disembodied features or characteristics. Thus while traditional society involves much face to face interaction by those living in proximity to each other in modern cultures and societies the space across which interaction occurs using mass media. Thus the disembodied process such as currency, symbols, the internet and English language all help bring the North and South into a clearer focus. We now turn to another area of Modernisation which has its presentation and analysis based on work in India.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of this unit.

1. Define Modernisation.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2. Give an outline approaches, implications, and phases of Modernisation.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

7.5 MODERNISATION: THE ASIAN SYNDROME

Yogendra Singh points out at the beginning of his analysis that prior to Modernisation the traditions of India were based on the various principles of hierarchy, holism, continuity and transcendence. These were the basic aspects of tradition. These factors to some extent existed also in the traditional west. However as Singh notes Indian and Western tradition were in fact divergent to each other. This arose specifically from their own differing historical background their specific social and cultural heritage and overall social situation. Singh asks whether despite these differences it would lead to a universal model of Modernization? Singh distinguishes between social change parse and Modernisation. Social change as such need not necessarily imply Modernisation. However the changes which were ortho-genetic and hetero- genetic were pre-modern. Thus the Islamic tradition in India was heterogenetic and was established by conquest. Thus endogenous change in Hinduism was confined to Sanskritisation. This in itself was based on a historical process which took many generations and was positional alone not structural. Modernisation in India commenced with its contact with the west which brought about vast changes in the Indian social structure. However it cannot be said that all contacts led to Modernisation.

In fact Singh notes that in the process of contact with the west certain traditional institute also got further strengthened. Thus as Singh notes it would be misleading to think of a clear polarity between tradition and modernity, and he feels this is more theoretical than actual.

Box 7.2: Changes in Traditional India The changes which thus occurred were confined to differentiation within the framework of traditional social structure and values; structural changes were way few, and those which took place were limited in respect of the type of rolesSimilar development in religious role structure and organisations partially followed the emergence of other traditions. But these changes by no means could be called structural, since differentiation of roles was segmental and did not alter the system as a whole. (Yogendra Singh, 1986, The Modernisation Of Indian Tradition: p:193).

During the British period Modernisation was selective and sequential. It was not in synchronization with family caste and village. These areas were not of much concern by the British, more so after the revolt of 1857. British administration felt that these structures were not dynamic and were autonomous, especially the village and caste system. Caste was considered in the army and beurocrasy, and in the national movement of a communal electorate was introduced. Singh feels these factors influenced the post-colonial Modernisation process. The process of Modernisation found expression and ground in the freedom struggle of India led by Mahatma Gandhi whose actions and mobilisation of the masses led to what Singh calls a new political culture of Modernisation. However, Gandhi was not able to avert the partition of the nation into two because the historical background of Islam and Hinduism was different. Singh asks how Modernisation can lead to an integrative pattern which is rather a complicated one whether this is overt or covert. How can a society avert a structural breakdown? From here on in the answer we are on familiar ground (discussed earlier in this unit) as Singh turns to the main theories of Modernisation, that is the structural and the evolutionary theories of Modernisation. These approaches have been

adequately discussed earlier and we will not repeat them again. The student can at this point go back to the beginning of the unit before reading further.

7.6 MODERNISATION PROCESS AS A WHOLE

In this analysis Singh now turns towards a discussion of Modernisation as a whole. He points out that Modernisation did not lead to institutional and structural breakdown because of the characteristics of society in India. One of these characteristics was the political structures. Further the caste system itself was also independent of the political system. Thus the various village areas had their own councils (panchayat) through which they attempted to solve village level problems. This type of inter structural independence was a great facilitator of Modernisation, but as pointed out earlier did not lead to societal breakdown. Thus Singh notes that modernity developed as a sub-structure and sub-culture rather an over arching entity. Over time however this segmental presence of Modernisation became 'encompassing' and the structural autonomy was no longer the prime 'shockabsorber'. Again changes in political systems made this pervade on society and stratification cultures. In its wake there are stresses on the entire cultural system. However it is clear that Modernisation requires adaptive changes in value systems which are nontraditional in terms of values and norms. Singh gives the example of the process of secularism and untouchability which are definitely part of the Modernisation process in present day India which is resisted by the traditional value system (Singh, 1986).

Singh asks again whether society in India be able to avoid "structural breakdown" in what he refers to as the "second phase" of Modernization. Further the absence of the structural autonomy creates serious problems or "bottlenecks" for the transition to modernity? Thus Singh opines that in the cultural area legislations have altered the overall landscape since they have been made with a view to terminate social inequality and its attendant exploitation and alienation, and pave the way towards democratic rights and other commitments made in the constitution of

India. Such processes have pushed society in India away from the positional changes of Srinivas's theory of Sanskritisation. In place of this process there have been a creation of new identifies caste associations and tribes. This process in itself is speeded up by the Great Traditions of Modernisation e.g. education, industrialisation and urbanisation. Further Singh notes that traditional structures are being mobilised for modern objectives and protest movements. Paradoxically tradition itself is strengthened because media and transport processes spread ritual structures, and help organise further the various religious groups and activities. Again religious sects and other religious groupings employ the bureaucratic approach and this is in part responsible towards the integration of sects from the overarching religious order. However Singh is careful to point out that in the post-colonial period of Modernisation there have been several structural changes. Thus caste, family, village, and community retained their traditional identity. Caste especially has been witnessed to be extreme fluid and adaptive to new situations and has in no way been abolished so far as the ground reality is concerned. Further caste has adapted to the modern era in India by involving itself in many different areas such as democratic participation, politics and trade unionism, and is tenacious in its persistence more so in the area of joint family groups. Modernisation in the colonial era was relatively homogenous in the elite structures. Thus the elite from industry, military and politics came from a background in caste and class stratum. These elite had access to modern education and had similar ideologies. It is clear then that the base for such elites was fairly delimited. In the post-independence era this narrow base has increased. The result of this that there is a differentiation between the elites themselves, broadly the political and the nonpolitical elite. Singh points out that the political elite is less Westernized and identify much more with traditionalism and symbols related to it. Singh also notes that the federal structure of a one party system has given way to a multiparty system, with the subsequent divergence in ideologies. Further the income created by the various FYPs has mainly benefited those who are already rich rather than the poor, especially rural masses. Thus the attempt to plan has accentuated the divide between the rich and the poor. Again the fast rate of growth in

Notes

population has itself created structural tensions. Thus till recently the industrialisation process India remained what Singh calls a 'rural-peasant' type of society, except for pockets such as the metropolitans of India of which there are few in India. These structural inconsistencies arise therefore from a variety of sources; these are:

- Democratisation without appropriate civic culture
- Bureaucratisation without universalistic norms
- Growth of the mass media.
- Aspiration growth without increased resources and distributive justice.
- Stress on welfare ideology only at the verbal level.
- Over urbanisation without inadequate and proper charges in the social strata.

Singh cites Gunnar Myrdal according to whom nationalism and democracy have grown in an uneven way in Asia. In western societies an independent state, effective government and adequate law enforcement preceded nationalism and democracy. In contrast in South Asia this was not the case and therefore this imbalance also created a economic dependence on developed countries. It also meant slow economic development and extremely tardy changes in institutions. In India especially with a larger percentage of intellectuals and middle classes which are important for a real democracy, Modernisation did not proceed unimpeded. As Myrdal notes the "soft-state" approach meant a serious blow for social change which can be "circular" or "cumulative". Myrdal does not subscribe to evolutionary stages of growth which he feels is a teleological and conservative ideology. Thus the Modernisation process in India is moving towards a critical phase. However Singh is of the view that these stresses and contradictions will not lead to institutional breakdown. He feels that a 'constant coordination of Modernisation' is absolutely essential for a democracy based Modernisation in India. He is also of the view that Modernisation is not a single monolithic process and can and does differ from one society to another.

7.7 THE PHENOMENA OF MODERNITY

Let us now turn to a related concept and a related process to Modernisation viz. the phenomena of modernity. Thus the term modernity is a term employed to discuss the stage of a society that is more developed than another society. This term is usually employed to describe a society that uses worldwide capitalism as the model to overall world development. Thus when a society is has the characteristics of modernity it is named a modern society. On the other hand the process of becoming a modern society is called Modernisation (as we have seen earlier). The defining features of such modern society are:

- Emergence of nation state
- Industrialisation and capitalism
- Rise of democracy
- Heavier dependence on technological innovation
- Attendant urbanisation
- The overall development in mass media.

In Western Europe some of the defining features include:

- Reformation and counter reformation
- French Revolution and American Revolution
- The Industrial Revolution.

Many attempts have been made in sociology to try and define modernity.

Some of the factors used to define modernity include:

- Disenchantment of the world
- Rationalisation
- Mass society
- Secularisation
- Democratization, and so on.

Notes

Thus modernity is often contextualized by comparing modern societies to pre or postmodern societies. This in itself creates some problems in terms of being able to define modernity. This is especially difficult when we try to construct a three stage model from pre modern to modern, and then onto post modernity. The features we have noted is a movement from somewhat isolated communities to more large scale integrated societies. In this sense Modernisation could be understood as a process which is not unique to Europe alone.

Box 7.3: Cultural Crystallisation One of Germay's leading social philosophers in the Adenauer period following the second world war, Gehlen (1963) proposed the theory of "cultural crystallisation" to describe the modern situation. According to Gehlen in a famous phrase, "the premises of the Enlightenment are dead, only their consequences remain". In his view the institutional complexes of modern society have separated themselves from cultural modernity which can now be discarded... cultural ideas are no longer able to produce the "new" that was central to modernity (Genard Delanty 2000, Modernity and Postmodernity,p:73.

Thus large scale integration implies that there is a vibrant economy which reaches out to all parts of a nation state. This in itself is possible when mobility in the society has increased. Further these developments imply specialisation with is a society and linking up of sectors. However these processes can sometimes appear to be paradoxical. Thus a unique local culture loses its identity by these increasingly powerful influences of cultural factors e.g. Folktales, popular music and homogenization of cultures, food recipes. These factors are found to exist in a greater or lesser extent in all local cultures, and helps to diversify them. This is found to a greater extent in the metropolitan towns where mobility is higher. Thus bureaucracy and hierarchical aspect of governments and the industrial sector are the areas which grow in power in an unprecedented manner. However the role of the individual still exist in such a society where there is dynamic competition and individualism, both exist side by side. This is then quite different from societies where the role of the

individual is inscriptive. That is to say the individual in modern societies is influenced by more than family background and family preoccupations. Now it is necessary to point out that such social changes are found at different levels of social integration, and are not simply the features of European society at any particular point of time. These changes can happen when two communities merge together.

Thus when two individuals develop a relationship the division of roles also tends to merge. Again in the process of globalisation we find the international flows of capital change the ground situation. Thus while it can be said that modernity has some apparently contradictory elements in reality these can be reduced to several simple concepts related to social change. How then does this view of modernity explain the world wide influences of West European and American societies since the Renaissance? Initially, we can say that the internal factor is that only in Europe, that rational thinking began to substitute intellectual activities that were shrouded in superstition and religion. Secondly, there was an external element as well, and this was the factor of colonisation, which created an exploitation nexus between these societies, which were exploited and others which exploited the societies. However we find that there are many traces of ancient societies which coexist within the umbrella of modernity. This includes joint families, small scale enterprise, and vast income diversity and so on. It has however been argued that features many in fact be regarded as aspects of modernity itself rather than any threat to it. Modernisation was very beneficial to society in many ways, especially in the field of health and in the field of nutrition. Thus fatal diseases were controlled or eliminated, and the values of egalitarianism began manifesting themselves. However some drawbacks are also there and the picture is not just positive. This not only did technological advantages breed greater economic wealth but also developed nuclear bombs two of which were dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima. Nuclear technology still evokes negative responses, when it is proposed to be used for military purposes. Similarly the degradation of environment and overall pollution are well known. However decreasing biodiversity, climate change all result from a hyper individual society.

Psychological problems and laxity of morals also create problems of modernity.

7.8 APPROACHES TO MODERNITY

Thus as Taylor points out there are at least two approaches for the comprehension of how modernity came into being. These are ways of comprehending what makes the existing society so very different from that which enveloped man before modernity arose. One method looks at the differences in contemporary western society and culture and medieval Europe as similar to the difference between medieval Europe and medieval India. So we can think about and analyse difference between civilizations, and their attendant culture. On the other hand the situation can be looked at from the viewpoint of change involving the end of one type of traditional society and the coming into being of modern societies. The latter perspective is the more influential one and it provides an analysis that gives a different perspective. The approach mentioned first is a cultural approach and the second an a-cultural approach. In the cultural approach there are many cultures, which have in them language and cultural practices that help us to understand the self the other psychological sets, religion, morality and so on. These factors are specific to a culture and are often non comparable. Keeping the above in view a cultural theory of modernity outlines first and then analyses the transformation into the new culture. The present day world can be seen as a culture with specific comprehension of the self and morality. Thus this model of modernity can be seen and used analytically to contrast with the earlier aspects of civilization (Taylor, 2004). On the other hand, an acultural theory describes the entire process in terms of some culture neutral analysis. This implies that the entire process is not analysed in terms of culture that existed and then transformed into modernity. Rather it is considered too general an approach that can be seen as the process any traditional society would undergo. Thus acultural theory conceives of modernity as the rise of reason in different ways such as the growth of scientific consciousness, development of secular thought ways, instrumental rationality, fact finding and evolution. Modernity can also

be explained and accounted for in socio-cultural terms and also intellectual shifts. Thus transformation social, cultural, individual can be seen to arise from increased mobility, demographic changes, and industrialisation and so on. In such cases as mentioned above modernity is conceived of as transformations which all cultures can go through and will undergo in due course of time. Such changes are not defined in terms of individualism, morality, good and evil. They are instead talking of cultures and civilizations as a whole.

Box 29.4: Explanations of Modernity ...Explanations of modernity in terms of reason seem to be the most popular. Even social explanations tend to invoke reason. Social transformations, like mobility and industrialisation are thought to bring about intellectual and spiritual changes because they shake people loose from old habits and beliefs — religion or traditional morality — which then become unsustainable because they lack the kind of independent rational grounding that the beliefs of modernity — such as individualism or instrumental reason — are assumed to have (Charles Taylor, 2004, Two Theories of Modernity).

Thus any culture would be impacted by the increase in scientific consciousness, secularisation of religion and the growth of instrumental thinking. Modernity then, in this approach/theory issues from rationality which is culture-neutral. This is despite the fact that the theory can account for why modernity arose in one society rather than another; or why it arose in some societies first and other later. In fact the theory does not lay down specific points or stages into modernity but as something general that can take any particular culture as its input. So this operation/transformation is not to be seen as a perspective about human values or shared meanings. In the case of social explanations, causality is assigned to developments like industrialisation that do impact on values. Considering then the explanations in terms of rationality, this is thought to be the exercise of a “general capacity” which was ripe for maturing and unfolding. Given specific conditions, people see scientific thinking as having a place in society. They will also see that instrumental rationality is beneficial. Again religious beliefs are by no means

Notes

universal or undisputed, and require a leap of faith. Finally facts and values are separated.

Now these transformations are facilitated by the presence of certain values and understandings and are hindered by other types of cultural values if they happen to be the dominant ones. These transformations are defined by the whole social and cultural context existing at any point of time. We can see then that the dominant theories of modernity over the last few centuries have been of the a cultural type. Modernity also involves a shift in the individual and community perspective. This is because until the viewpoint changes the society concerned cannot move from a pre-modern to modern and onto post modernity. On the other hand Weber paradoxically argues that the rationalisation (an important aspect of modernity) is a steady process, which was cultural general rather than culture specific. Similarly the process of pre- modern to modern in society was explained by Durkheim in terms of the transformation from mechanical to organised forms of social solidarity. This is an also the aspect of Tocqueville’s concept of “creeping democracy” in which there was a move towards greater sense and actualization of equality among the various strata of society. These are all different but at the same time related activities.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of this unit.

1. Discuss Modernisation in India.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2. Describe the phenomena of modernity.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

- 3. Discuss the outline of the approaches to modernity.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

7.9 LET US SUM UP

Given all these types of explanations Taylor still feels that explanations and analyses of modernity focusing on reason are the most accepted ones. Explanations focusing on the social still tend to talk of reason transformations that are social. Thus the factors of mobility and industrialisation are felt to bring about intellectual and spiritual changes since they tend to create new layers of conditioning which bypass the old layers. That is they loosen old habits and beliefs, whether religion or the old morality including individualism and instrumental reason. There is however the question of negative theories of modernity which do not have the positive or beneficial view of modern developments and see society going into a decline with the onset and the maturing of modernity.

Thus rather than seeing modernity as having unleashed many capacities in different directions, negative theories see it as a dangerous development. These too are essentially cultural theories. Thus modernity is characterized by a loss of perspective, an erasure of roots, dependence on history or even God. Thus the negative theories of modernity see it as a loss of the previous state of overall wellbeing. That is to say that the arrival of modernity and all its various facets has to be seen as a mixed blessing. On one side are the positive socially relevant areas and

Notes

technological development. On the other are the problems associated with the arrival of and settling down of modernity. Here the negatively oriented theorists' point of that modernity has its own problems created by a fast developing technology that has its impact on the overall life of the people. Thus while modernity began in the sixteenth century at the time of Enlightenment, it continued to develop until the beginning of the 20th century. In other words modernity has its "discontents" as well. Let us briefly mention what these are. Firstly we must realize that modernity does have problems as we pointed out. The belief in development and progress, forward looking attitude, the dependence on rationality and reason have also given rise to optimism that was betrayed by doubts raised by post traditional thought. However we must note that modernity achieved a lot of social structural changes. Thus the routine behavior on day to day basis alters and changes as technology develops.

This is because technological innovations and inventions since Enlightenment have altered the entire fabrics of the world, restricting itself to large well developed towns, cities, and metropolitans. It is capitalism which has basically been the power behind the innovations and inventions. The airplane and motor car have from an initial slow start become integral parts of daily life the world over. Thus time and space have conceptually receded and nothing can be done in the modern world with precise timing and adequate space. Thus mechanical solidarity has given way to organic solidarity to use the terms coined by Durkheim. Weber's concept of rationalisation has pervaded the modern world and given rise to precise type of thinking. Further urbanism saw large scale migrations. Discipline, secularity, alienation, anomic and the iron cage of bureaucracy are all parts of the organic structure of bureaucratic organisation in the modern world.

Modernization theory both attempts to identify the social variables that contribute to social progress and development of societies and seeks to explain the process of social evolution. Modernization theory is subject to criticism originating among socialist and free-market ideologies, world-systems theorists, globalization theorists and dependency theorists

among others. Modernization theory stresses not only the process of change but also the responses to that change. It also looks at internal dynamics while referring to social and cultural structures and the adaptation of new technologies. Modernization theory maintains that traditional societies will develop as they adopt more modern practices. Proponents of modernization theory claim that modern states are wealthier and more powerful and that their citizens are freer to enjoy a higher standard of living. Developments such as new data technology and the need to update traditional methods in transport, communication and production, it is argued, make modernization necessary or at least preferable to the status quo. That view makes critique difficult since it implies that such developments control the limits of human interaction, not vice versa. And yet, seemingly paradoxically, it also implies that human agency controls the speed and severity of modernization. Supposedly, instead of being dominated by tradition, societies undergoing the process of modernization typically arrive at forms of governance dictated by abstract principles. Traditional religious beliefs and cultural traits, according to the theory, usually become less important as modernization takes hold.

Historians link modernization to the processes of urbanization and industrialization and the spread of education. As Kendall (2007) notes, "Urbanization accompanied modernization and the rapid process of industrialization." In sociological critical theory, modernization is linked to an overarching process of rationalisation. When modernization increases within a society, the individual becomes increasingly important, eventually replacing the family or community as the fundamental unit of society.

7.10 KEY WORDS

Bureaucratic: Bureaucracy refers to both a body of non-elected government officials and an administrative policy-making group. Historically, a bureaucracy was a government administration managed by departments staffed with non-elected officials.

Industrialization: Industrialisation is the period of social and economic change that transforms a human group from an agrarian society into an industrial society, involving the extensive re-organisation of an economy for the purpose of manufacturing.

7.11 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Define Modernisation.
2. Give an outline approaches, implications, and phases of Modernisation.
3. Discuss Modernisation in India.
4. Describe the phenomena of modernity.
5. Discuss the outline of the approaches to modernity.

7.12 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Delanty Gerard 2000, *Modernity and Postmodernity: Knowledge, Power and The Self*. London, Sage
- Lyon, David, 1999, *Postmodernity*. Bnckingham: Open University Press
- Singh Yogendra, 1986, *Modernisation of Indian Tradition*. Jaipur , Rawat Publications
- Wagner, Peter 2001, *Theorizing Modernity; Inescapability and Attainability in Social Theory*. London, Sage.
- Giddens, A (1991) *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford : California.
- Foster-Carter, Aidan 1985, *The Sociology of Development*. Canseway Press, California
- Rostow W.W. 1960, *The Stages of Economic Growth : A Non Communist*
- Manifesto. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sendlser N.1969, "Mechanisms of and Adjustment to Change" in T.Buns (ed) "Industrial Man", Perguin 1969.

- Rojas Robinson, 2004, Modernisation Theory and The Law of Change Retrieved From <http://www.Rrojasatabank.org/Capital8.html>.
- Singh Yogendra 1986, The Modernisation of Indian Tradition. Jaipur Rawat .
- Taylor Charles 2004, Two Theories of Modernity. Retrieved :Taylor X. html.

7.13 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 1

1. Modernisation refers to a model of a progressive transition from a 'pre-modern' or 'traditional' to a 'modern' society. The theory looks at the internal factors of a country while assuming that, with assistance, "traditional" countries can be brought to development in the same manner more developed countries have.
2. Modernisation theory itself is mostly a western product and sets up these societies as an ideal that the less developed countries must follow without hesitation including capitalist ideology because this “works” and works best. However dependency theory takes a wider global perspective. It points out that the problems faced in development are not just those of social structure in traditional societies but in large part due to worldwide structures imposed by the Western world, or the North. And also see section 7.4

Check Your Progress 2

1. These were the basic aspects of tradition. These factors to some extent existed also in the traditional west. However as Singh notes Indian and Western tradition were in fact divergent to each other. This arose specifically from their own

Notes

differing historical background their specific social and cultural heritage and overall social situation. See Section 7.6.

2. See Section 7.7
3. See Section 7.8