NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA

SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COURSE CODE: POL 318

COURSE TITLE: POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR

MAIN CONTENT

POL 318
POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR

CourseWriter: Dr. KayodeEesuola Department of Political Science
 University of Lagos,Akoka

Editor:

NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA

Headquarters
14/16 Ahmadu Bello Way
Victoria Island
Headquarters
Lagos.Abuja Annex245 Samuel AdesujoAdemulegun Street Central Business District
Opposite Arewa Suites

COURSE DESCRIPTION

POL 318: POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR (3 Credit Units)

Political behaviour is the study of the way people think, feel, and act with regard to politics. This course is designed to touch on the primary areas of research in political behaviour, including public opinion, ideology, partisanship, political knowledge, participation, campaigns, the media, and polarisation.

CONTENTS   **PAGE**

Introduction

The modern study of political behaviour in this era did not focus on the study of behavior as it is in common believe as such, but primarily on political opinions, political attitudes, individual and group beliefs and values more profound, all of which are part of the study of political behaviour.The term "behaviour" is a bit wrong. We have a field of study that is much protracted than behaviour as such. This field also extends to opinions, beliefs, and values without necessarily transforming them into behaviour. It is not only behaviour and action, but also attitudes, opinions, beliefs and values that are behind it. We will become aware of the discipline and give some insight into what we are studying in political behaviour in this module.

COURSE AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The primary aim of this course is to provide students of political science with a comprehensive knowledge of political behaviuor. However, the course specific objectives include enabling the students:

o   have a working knowledge of political behaviour by understanding the concepts in political science;
o   familiarize with the factors that influence political behavior;
o   have understanding on the cross-current issues between politics, elections and current trends in political behavior.

The specific objectives of each study unit can be found at the beginning and you can make references to it while studying. It is necessary and helpful for you to check at the end of the unit, if your progress is consistent with the stated objectives and if you can conveniently answer the self-assessment exercises. The overall objectives of the course will be achieved, if you diligently study and complete all the units in this course.

WORKING THROUGH THE COURSE

To complete the course, you are required to read the study units and other related materials as stated in the references/further readings. You will also need to undertake practical exercises for which you need a pen, a note-book, and other materials that will be listed in this guide. The exercises are to aid you in understanding the concepts being presented. At the end of each unit, you will be required to submit written assignment for assessment purposes. In addition, at the end of the course, you will be expected to write a final examination

THE COURSE MATERIAL

In this course, as in all other courses, the major components you will find are as follows:

2   CourseGuide
3   StudyUnits
4   Textbooks
5   Assignments

STUDY UNITS

There are 25 study units in this course. They are:

MODULE 1: Definitions, origin, and main thrusts of political behaviour

Unit1 Definition of Political Behaviour.
Unit2 Origin of Political Behaviour
Unit3 Trusts of Political Behaviour
Unit4 The Study of Politics before Behaviour Revolution
Unit5 TheBehavioural Revolution

MODULE 2: Political Socialisation and Political Culture

Unit1 What is Political Socialisation?
Unit2 Political Culture
Unit3 Major Agents of Political Socialisation
Unit4 Effects of Political Socialisation on Political Behaviour
Unit 5 Functions of Political Socialisation

MODULE 3: Political Participation

Unit1 Definition and Scope of Political Participation
Unit2 Levels of Political Participation
Unit3 Factors affecting Political Participation
 Unit4 Dimension of Political Participation
Unit 5 Identify Politics, Political Participation and Democracy

MODULE 4: Elections

Unit1 Meaning and Characteristic of election
Unit2 Functions of Elections
Unit3 Approaches to the study of election
Unit4 Determinants of Electoral Behaviour
Unit 5 Elections and Party Politics in Nigeria

MODULE 5: Ethnicity and Electoral Behaviour

Unit 1: Participation in Emerging Democracies

Unit 2: Reasoning for Voters and Multi-Party Systems
Unit 3: Conventional Political Behaviour
Unit 4: Theories of Political Behaviour
Unit 5: Political Behaviour: Summary

As you can observe, the course begins with the basics and expands into a more elaborate, complex and detailed form. All you need to do is to follow the instructions as provided in each unit. In addition, some self-assessment exercises have been provided with which you can test your progress with the text and determine if your study is fulfilling the stated objectives. Tutor- marked assignments have also been provided to aid your study. All these will assist you to be able to fully grasp knowledge of political behaviour in political science.

TEXTBOOKS AND REFERENCES

At the end of each unit, you will find a list of relevant reference materials which you may yourself wish to consult as the need arises, even though we have made efforts to provide you with the most important information you need to pass this course. However, wewould encourage you, as a third-year student to cultivate the habit of consulting as many relevant materials as you are able to within the time available to you. In particular, be sure to consult whatever material you are advised to consult before attempting anyexercise.

ASSESSMENT

Two types of assessment are involved in the course: the Self-Assessment Exercises (SAEs), and the Tutor-Marked Assessment (TMAs) questions. Your answers to the SAEs are not meant to be submitted, but they are also important since they give you an opportunity to assess your own understanding of the course content. Tutor-Marked Assignments (TMAs) on the other hand are to be carefully answered and kept in your assignment file for submission and marking. This will count for 30% of your total score in the course.

TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

At the end of each unit, you will find tutor-marked assignments. There is an average of two tutor-marked assignments per unit. This will allow you to engage the course as robustly as possible. You need to submit at least four assignments of which the three with the highest marks will be recorded as part of your total course grade. This will account for 10 percent each, making a total of 30 percent. When you complete your assignments, send them including your form to your tutor for formal assessment on or before the deadline.

Self-assessment exercises are also provided in each unit. The exercises should help you to evaluate your understanding of the material so far.These are not to be submitted. You will find all answers to these within the units they are intended for.

FINAL EXAMINATION AND GRADING

There will be a final examination at the end of the course. The examination carries a total of 70 percent of the total course grade. The examination will reflect the contents of what you have learnt and the self-assessments and tutor-marked assignments. You therefore need to revise your course materials beforehand.

COURSE MARKING SCHEME

The following table sets out how the actual course marking is broken down.

ASSESSMENT	MARKS
Four assignments (the best four of all the assignments submitted for marking)	Four assignments, each marked outof 10%, but highest scoring three selected, thus totalling30%
Final Examination	70% of overall course score
Total	**100% of course score**

COURSE OVERVIEW PRESENTATION SCHEME

Units	Title of Work	Week Activity	Assignment (End-of-Unit)
Course Guide	**Political Behaviour**		
Module 1	**Definitions, Origin and Main Thrusts of Political Behaviour**		
Unit 1	Definitions of Political Behaviour	Week 1	Assignment 1
Unit 2	Origin of Political Behaviour	Week 2	Assignment 1
Unit 3	Thrusts of Political Behaviour	Week 3	Assignment 1
Unit 4	The study of Politics before Behavioural Revolution	Week 4	Assignment 1
Unit 5	The Behavioural Revolution	Week 5	Assignment 1
Module 2	**Political Socialisation and Political Culture**		
Unit 1	What is political socialization?	Week 6	Assignment 1
Unit 2	Political Culture	Week 7	Assignment 1
Unit 3	Major Agent of Political Socialisation	Week 8	Assignment 1
Unit 4	Effects of Political socialisation on Political Behaviour	Week 9	Assignment 1
Unit 5	Functions of Political socialization	Week 10	Assignment 1
Module 3	**POLITICAL PARTICIPATION**		
Unit 1	Definitions and Scope of Political Participation	Week 11	Assignment 1
Unit 2	Levels of Political Participation	Week 12	Assignment 1
Unit 3	Factors affecting Political Participation	Week 13	Assignment 1

Unit 4	Dimension of Political Participation	Week 14	Assignment 1
Unit 5	Identify politics, Political Participation and Democracy	Week 15	Assignment 1
Module 4	**ELECTIONS**		
Unit 1	Meaning and Characteristic of election	Week 16	Assignment 1
Unit 2	Functions of Elections	Week 17	Assignment 1
Unit 3	Approaches to the study of Elections	Week 18	Assignment 1
Unit 4	Determinants of Electoral Behaviour	Week 19	Assignment 1
Unit 5	Reasoning for voters and multi-party systems	Week 20	Assignment 1
Module 5	Ethnicity and Electoral Behaviour		
Unit 1	Participation in Emerging Democracies	Week 21	Assignment 1
Unit 2	Reasoning for Voters and Multi-Party Systems	Week 22	Assignment 1
Unit 3	Conventional Political Behaviour	Week 23	Assignment 1
Unit 4	Theories of Political Behaviour	Week 24	Assignment 1
Unit 5	Political Behaviour: Summary	Week 25	Assignment 1

WHAT YOU WILL NEED FOR THE COURSE

This course entails all you ought to know and learn in political behaviour at level three. It will be helpful if you try to review what you studied earlierin other courses in political science. In addition, you may need to procure recommended texts because these will enhance you to comprehend your mastery of the course content. You need quality time in a study friendly environment every week. If you are computer-literate (which ideally you should be), you should be prepared to visit recommended websites as stated in the references below. You should also cultivate the habit of visiting reputable national and universities libraries accessible toyou.

TUTORS AND TUTORIALS

There are 15 hours of tutorials provided in support of the course. You will be notified of the dates and location of these tutorials, together with the name and phone number of your tutor as soon as you are allocated a tutorial group. Your tutor will mark and comment on your assignments, and keep a close watch on your progress. Be sure to send in your tutor marked assignments promptly, and feel free to contact your tutor in case of any difficulty with your self- assessment exercise, tutor-marked assignment or the grading of an assignment. In any case, you are advised to attend the tutorials regularly and punctually. Always take a list of such prepared questions to the tutorials and participate actively in thediscussions.

ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

There are two aspects to the assessment of this course. First is the Tutor-Marked Assignments; second is a written examination. In handling these assignments, you are expected to apply the

information, knowledge and experience acquired during the course. The tutor-marked assignments are now being done online. Ensure that you register all your courses so that you can have easy access to the online assignments. Your score in the online assignments will account for30 per cent of your total coursework. At the end of the course, you will need to sit for a final examination. This examination will account for the other 70 per cent of your total course mark.

TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

Usually, there are four online tutor-marked assignments in this course. Each assignment will be marked over ten percent. The best three (that is the highest three of the 10 marks) will be counted. This implies that the total mark for the best three assignments will constitute 30% of your total course work. You will be able to complete your online assignments successfully from the information and materials contained in your references, reading and studyunits.

FINAL EXAMINATION AND GRADING

The final examination for POL 381: Political Behaviour will be of two hours duration and have a value of 70% of the total course grade. The examination will consist of multiple choice and fill-in-the-gaps questions which will reflect the practice exercises and tutor- marked assignments you have previously encountered. All areas of the course will be assessed. It is important that you use adequate time to revise the entire course. You may find it useful to review your tutor-marked assignments before the examination. The final examination covers information from all aspects of the course.

HOW TO GET THE MOST FROM THIS COURSE

1. There are 25 units in this course. You are to spend one week in each unit. In distance learning, the study units replace the university lecture. This is one of the great advantages of distance learning; you can read and work through specially designed study materials at your own pace, and at a time and place that suites you best. Think of it as reading the lecture instead of listening to the lecturer. In the same way a lecturer might give you some reading to do. The study units tell you when to read and which are your text materials or recommended books. You are provided exercises to do at appropriate points, just as a lecturer might give you in a classexercise.

2. Each of the study units follows a common format. The first item is an introduction to the subject matter of the unit, and how a particular unit is integrated with other units and the course as a whole. Next to this is a set of learning objectives. These objectives let you know what you should be able to do, by the time you have completed the unit. These learning objectives are meant to guide your study. The moment a unit is finished, you must go back and check whether you have achieved the objectives. If this is made a habit, then you will significantly improve your chance of passing thecourse.

3. The main body of the unit guides you through the required reading from other sources. This will usually be either from your reference or from a readingsection.

4. The following is a practical strategy for working through the course. If you run into any trouble, telephone your tutor or visit the study centre nearest to you. Remember that yourtutor's job is to help you. When you need assistance, do not hesitate to call and ask your tutor to provide it.

5. Read this course guide thoroughly. It is your firstassignment.

6. Organise a study schedule – Design a 'Course Overview' to guide you through the course. Note the time you are expected to spend on each unit and how the assignments relate to theunits.

7. Important information; e.g. details of your tutorials and the date of the first day of the semester is available at the studycentre.

8. You need to gather all the information into one place, such as your diary or a wall calendar. Whatever method you choose to use, you should decide on and write in your own dates and schedule of work for each unit.

9. Once you have created your own study schedule, do everything to stay faithful toit.

10. The major reason that students fail is that they get behind in their coursework. If you get into difficulties with your schedule, please let your tutor or course coordinator know before it is too late forhelp.

11. Turn to Unit 1, and read the introduction and the objectives for theunit.

12. Assemble the study materials. You will need your references for the unit you are studying at any point intime.

13. As you work through the unit, you will know what sources to consult for further information.

14. Visit your study centre whenever you need up-to-dateinformation.

15. Well before the relevant online TMA due dates, visit your study centre for relevant information and updates. Keep in mind that you will learn a lot by doing the assignment carefully. They have been designed to help you meet the objectives of the course and, therefore, will help you pass theexamination.

16. Review the objectives for each study unit to confirm that you have achieved them. If you feel unsure about any of the objectives, review the study materials or consult your tutor. When you are confident that you have achieved a unit's objectives, you can start on the next unit. Proceed unit by unit through the course and try to space your study so that you can keep yourself onschedule.

17. After completing the last unit, review the course and prepare yourself for thefinal examination. Check that you have achieved the unit objectives (listed at the beginning of each unit) and the course objectives (listed in the courseguide).

CONCLUSION

This is a theory course but you will get the best out of it if you cultivate the habit of relating it to political issues in domestic and international arenas.

SUMMARY

'Political Behaviour' introduces you to general understanding of the current dynamics surrounding politics, elections, politicians, and other actors' interactions within a country and to a greater extent in the international community. All the basic course materials that you need to successfully complete the course are provided. At the end, you will be ableto:

1   Explain the concept of Political Behaviour;
2   Evaluates the current trends in political behavior and politics as practice;
3   Total comprehension of political participation, elections and why politicians behave the way they do, and,
4   Familiarize with the current thrusts in international political behaviour relations such as globalisation and democratisation.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

- AG-Action Group

- APS-Agents of Political Socialization

- BR-Behavioural Revolution

- BYM-Bornu Youth Movement

- CE-Characteristic of Elections

- CHB-Complexity of Human Behaviour

- CPB-Conventional Political Behaviour

- EEB-Ethnicity and Electoral Behaviour

- FSES-Family Socio-Economic Status

- FPC-Forms of Political Culture

- FBA-Foundation ofBehavioural Approach

- IPC-Individual Political Culture

- MPC-Moral Political Culture

- MPS-Multi-Party System

- NCNC-National Council of Nigeria And Cameroons

- NNDP-Nigeria National Decmocratic Party

- NYM-Nigeria Youth Movement

- NEPU-Northern Elements Progressive Union

- NPC-Northern People's Congress

- PPC-Parochial of Political Culture

- PPC-Participant of Political Culture

- PP-Political Behaviour

- PP-Political Participation

- PSPC-Political Socializationand Political Culture

- PB-Post Behaviuorism

- SAE-Self Assessment Exercise

- TPB-Theories of Political Behaviour

- TPB-Thrust of Political Behaviour

- TPC-Traditional of Political Culture

- TMA-Tutor Marked Assignments

- UMBC-United Middle Belt Congress

REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Aarts, K., Blais, A., and Schmitt, H. (eds.) 2005. *Political Leaders and Democratic Elections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Adams, J., Merrill, S., and Grofman, B. 2005. *A Unified Theory of Party Competition: A Cross-National Analysis Integrating Spatial and Behavioral Factors*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Almond, G., and Verba, S. 1963. *The Civic Culture*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Anderson, C., et al. 2005. *Losers' Consent: Elections and Democratic Legitimacy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Babatola, J.E. T. 2014, Politics and Power Struggles in Nigeria (1945-1999), PhD. Thesis, Department of History and International Relations, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State.

Blais, A. (2000). *To Vote or Not to Vote: The Merits and Limits of Rational Choice Theory*. Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Booth, J. and Seligson, M. 2008. *The Legitimacy Puzzle: Democracy and Political Support in Eight Latin American Nations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bratton, M., Mattes, R., and Gyimah-Boadi, E. 2004. *Public Opinion, Democracy, and Market Reform in Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cain, B., Dalton, R., and Scarrow, S. (eds.) 2003. *Democracy Transformed? Expanding Political Opportunities in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Campbell, A.; Converse, P. E.; Miller, W. E.; and Stokes, D. E. 1960. The American Voter. New York: Wiley.

Chu, Y. (eds.) 2008. *Party Politics in East Asia: Citizens, Elections, and Democratic Development*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner.

Chu, Y., et al. (eds.) 2008. *How East Asians View Democracy*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Colton, T. 2000. *Transitional Citizens: Voters and What Influences Them in the New Russia*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Dahl, R. A. 1961. Who Governs? New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Dalton, R. 2004. *Democratic Challenges, Democratic Choices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eldersveld, S. J. 1964. Political Parties. Skokie, Ill.: Rand McNalley.

Eulau, H., and Prewitt, K. 1973. Labyrinths of Democracy. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill.

Finifter, A. W. 1974. The friendship group as a protective environment for political deviants. American

Political Science Review, 8: 607-25.

Franklin, M. 2004. *Voter Turnout and the Dynamics of Electoral Competition in Established Democracies since 1945*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fuchs, D. 2007. The political culture paradigm. In *Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*, ed. R. J.

Dalton and H.-D. Klingemann. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gurin, G.; and Miller, W. E. 1954. The Voter Decides. Evanston, Ill.: Row Peterson.

———— 1981. Generations and Politics. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Hayes, S. P., Jʀ . 1932. Voter's attitudes towards men and issues. Journal of Social Psychology, 2: 164-82.

Heath, A., Fisher, S., and Smith, S. 2005. The globalization of public opinion research. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8: 297–333.

Huckfeldt, R., and Sprague, J. 1995. Citizens, Politics, and Social Communications. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Huntington, S. 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Jennings, M. K., and Niemi, R. G. 1974. The Political Character of Adolescence. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

——2007. Perspectives on mass belief systems and communication. In *Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*, ed. Dalton, R. J. and H.-D. Klingemann. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kittilson, M. 2007. Research resources in comparative political behavior. Pp. 865–95 in *Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*, ed. R. J. Dalton and H.-D. Klingemann. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Klingemann, H. 2009 *The Comparative Study of Electoral Systems*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Klingemann, H. 2002. Eastward enlargement of the European Union and the identity of Europe. Pp. 58–80 in *The Enlarged European Union: Diversity and Adaptation*, ed. P. Mair and J. Zielonka. London: Frank Cass.

Knutsen, O. 2006. *Class Voting in Western Europe: A Comparative Longitudinal Study*. Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books.

Kriesi, Hanspeter, et al. (2008). West European politics in the Age of Globalization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kuklinski, J. H. and Peyton, B. 2007. Belief systems and political decision-making. Pp. 45–64 in *Oxford*

Handbook of Political Behavior, ed. R. J. Dalton and H.-D. Klingemann. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lau, R. and Redlawsk, D. 2006. *How Voters Decide: Information Processing during Election Campaigns*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lazarsfeld, P. F.; Berelson, B. R.; and Gaudet, H. 1948. The Peoples's Choice: How the Voter Makes Up His Mind in a Presidential Campaign. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lewis-Beck, M., Norpoth, H., Jacoby, W., and Weisberg, H. 2008. *The American Voter Revisited*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

McPhee, W. N. 1959. Voting. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Merriam, C. E., and Gosnell, H. F. 1924. Non-Voting. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Miller, W. E., and Shanks, J. M. 1996. The New American Voter. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Nie, N., Verba, S., and Petrocik, J. 1976. *The Changing American Voter*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Nieuwbeerta, P. 1995. *The Democratic Class Struggle in Twenty Countries, 1945–1990*. Amsterdam:

Nnabuihe, N. S. et al, (2014). Ethnicity and Electoral Behaviour in Nigeria. European Scientific Journal. Sept. 2014. Vol. 2 ISSN 1857-7881.

Pattie, C., Seyd, P., and Whiteley, P. 2004. *Citizenship in Britain: Values, Participation and Democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Pharr, S. and Putnam, R. (eds.) 2000. *Discontented Democracies: What's Wrong with the Trilateral Democracies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Poguntke, T. and Webb, P. (eds.) 2005. *The Presidentialization of Politics: A Comparative Study of Modern Democracies*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Powell, G. 2000. *Elections as Instruments of Democracy*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press

Prothro, J., and Matthews, R. 1966. Negroes and the New Southern Politics. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.

Remmer, K. 1991. The political economy of elections in Latin America. *American Political Science Review*, 87: 393–407.

Rhodes, R., Binder, S., and Rockman, B. 2006. *Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rice, S. 1928. Quantitative Methods in Politics. New York: Knopf.

Rokkan, S., and Lipset, S. M., eds. 1967. Party Systems and Voter Alignments. New York: Free Press.

Roller, E., and Zagórski, K. (eds.) 2006. The state of democracy in central and eastern Europe. Special issue of *International Journal of Sociology*, 36.

Soroka, S. and Wlezien, C. 2008. Degrees of democracy: government institutions and the opinion–policy link. Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, April 2017.

Stolle, D. and Howard, M. 2007. Symposium on civic engagement and civic attitudes in cross-national perspective. Special issue of *Political Studies*, 56: 1–259.

Tang, W. 2005. *Public Opinion and Political Change in China*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Tingsten, H. 1937. Political Behavior: Studies in Elections Statistics. Stockholm: Knopf. London: P. S. King.

vanBeek, U. 2005. *Democracy under Construction: Patterns from Four Continents*. Bloomfield Hills, Mich.: Barbara Budrich.

Van Deth, J., Montero, J., and Westholm, A. (eds.) 2006. *Citizenship and Involvement in Europe*. London: Routledge.

Verba, S., and Nie, N. H. 1972. Participation in America. New York: Harper and Row.

Wattenberg, M. (eds.) 2000. *Parties without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wessels, B. 2007. Political representation and democracy. Pp. 833–849 in *Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*, ed. R. J. Dalton and H.-D. Klingemann. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wlezien, C. and Soroka, S. N. 2007. The relationship between public opinion and policy. Pp. 799–817 in *Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*, ed. R. J. Dalton and H.-D. Klingemann. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zakaria, F. 2006. *The Future of Freedom: Illiberal Democracy at Home and Abroad*. New York: Norton

Zielonka, J. (eds.) 2006. *Democracy and Political Culture in Eastern Europe*. London: Routledge.

Zoco, E. 2007. The stabilization of interparty competition: electoral volatility in old and new democracies. *Party Politics*, 13: 155–78.

Zukin, C., Keeter, S., Andolina, M., Jenkins, K., and DelliCarpini, M. 2006. *A New Engagement? Political Participation, Civic Life, and the Changing American Citizen*. New York: Oxford University Press.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MODULE 1: DEFINITIONS, ORIGIN AND MAIN THRUSTS OF POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR

Unit1 Definition, Origin and Main Thrusts of Political Behaviour
Unit2 Foundations of the Behavioural Approach
Unit 3Thrusts of Political Behaviour
Unit 4 The study of Politics before Behavioural Revolution
Unit 5 TheBehavioural Revolution

MODULE 2: POLITICAL SOCIALISATION AND POLITICAL CULTURE

Unit1What is political socialisation
Unit2 Political Culture
Unit3 Major Agent of Political Socialisation
Unit 4 Effects of Political socialisation on Political Behaviour
Unit 5 Functions of Political Socialisation

MODULE 3: POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Unit1 Definitions and Scope of Political Participation
Unit 2 Levels of Political Participation
Unit 3 Factors affecting Political Participation
Unit 4 Dimension of Political Participation
Unit 5 Identify Politics, Political Participation and Democracy

MODULE 4: ELECTIONS

Unit1Meaning and Characteristic of election
Unit 2 Functions of Elections
Unit 3 Approaches to the study of Elections
Unit 4 Determinants of Electoral Behaviour
Unit 5 Election and Party Politics in Nigeria

MODULE 5: ETHNICITY AND ELECTORAL BEHAVIOUR

Unit 1: Participation in Emerging Democracies
Unit 2: Reasoning for voters and multi-party systems

Unit 3: Conventional Political Behaviour
Unit 4: Theories of Political Behaviour
Unit 5: Political Behaviour: Summary

MODULE 1: Political Behaviour at a Glance

Introduction

This module will examine the general character of political behaviour from 1900 to the contemporary time. It will further define the concept of political behaviuor, tracing its origin and the importance of studying the concept in the contemporary time to the students of political science and how the political behaviour evolves.This is very vital because of the patterns and processes which democracies are being practiced in the 21st century has taken new dimension. All these are cogent for students to know and understand in their study.

Unit1 Definition, Origin and Main Thrusts of Political Behaviour
Unit2Foundations of the Behavioural Approach
Unit 3Thrusts of Political Behaviour

Unit 4 The study of Politics before Behavioural Revolution

Unit 5 TheBehavioural Revolution

UNIT 1 Definition, Origin and Main Thrusts of Political Behaviour

CONTENT

1.0   Introduction

2.0   Objectives

3.0   MainContent

3.0   Some Definitions of PoliticalBehaviour

3.1   The Study of Politics before BehaviouralRevolution

3.2   The BehavioralRevolution

4.0   Conclusion

5.0   Summary

6.0   Tutor Marked Assignment

7.0   References/Further Reading

1.0   INTRODUCTION

In this unit, we shall examine the various scholarly definitions of political behaviour, how it originated in the discipline of political science, as well as the main thrusts it has been established. The unit also exposes you to intellectual developments since the behavioral revolution till the present dispensation. Attention would be given to the following terms: political behaviour, behaviouralism, behavioral approach and behavioral revolution and will be interchangeably used in thisunit.

2.0   OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, each studentshould be able to:

(i) Identify political behaviour from variousperspectives
(ii) State the development of political behaviour in the discipline of political science, and
(iii) Use the main thrusts of politicalbehaviuor among the actors.

3.0   MAINCONTENT

3.1   Definitions of PoliticalBehaviour

According to Eldersveld and Katz in 1961, political behaviour or behavioral approach to the study of politics is to:

Identifiy the behaviour of individuals or group of individuals as the primary unit of analysis". It "seeks to examine the behaviour, actions and acts of individuals, rather than characteristics of institutions such as legislature, executive and judiciary.

Traditionally, the study of politics was legalistic, normative and based on institutions, and this certainly made it challenging for the discipline to fully explain and understand the behaviour of people within their political environments. It was the need to overcome this shortcoming and achieve a better understanding of politics that gave birth to the "behavioral revolution". This was a banner under which sociologists, survey researchers and other empiricists gathered in the 1950s to distinguish themselves from those who studied constitutions, philosophy, or history, and prominent scholars who championed the revolution are Robert **Dahl (1961), and David Easton (1961).** The main aim of political behavior is to "explain behaviour with an unbiased, neutral point of view, using methods such as sampling, scaling statistical analysis and interviewing among others. The most practical way to do it is to focus on individuals and groups who are the actors inpolitics.

However, subsequent scholarly definitions of political behaviour seem to have expanded beyond the issue of method and approach. The current state ofpoliticalbehaviour, as some scholars presently claim, is typically concerned with individualbehaviour in the society. One of such scholars is Richard Rose who, in her 2007 work claims that political behaviour is the study of the behaviour of politicians and actors such as voters, lobbyists, andpoliticians.Thus, currently, discourses in political behaviour are devoted to provide a sound understanding of the relationship between the political actions of citizens and the political process in a democracy, and this is why the subject now covers issues such as political attitudes, extra electoral forms political participation such a protest, resistance, social movement, apathy, and extremism, as well as consequences for political representation and political systems.

From whichever angle it is defined, what you need to really grasp is that political behaviourexamines and studies the behaviour of individuals and groups towards politics and political institutions in their environment, and it attempts to use scientific methods to study them.

3.2   THE STUDY OF POLITICS BEFORE BEHAVIOURALREVOLUTION

From the early time before the study of political behaviour, specifically up to the period of 1900, the study of politics was dominated by two main methodological approaches: theNormative, Philosophical Approach and the Descriptive -Institutional Approach. In what follows we explain these two approaches in details.

3.2.1   The Normative - Philosophical Approach:

This was based on reflections on and interrogations of early philosophers towards political events and values across the globe. Socio political events such as justice, polity, legitimacy state, and power and

wealth distributions were the main subjects of interrogation and investigation because early philosophers regarded them as most essential to the understanding of politics and the peaceful co-existence of people and nations. Most questions the philosophers asked revolved around what justice is, how it is achieved and what importance it should be accorded it in human polity; what action or practice is legitimate, what the ideal role of the state is, and how power, wealth and other values are equitably distributed in the society to guarantee egalitarianism. Philosophers who engaged in these questioning include Plato, Aristotle, St Augustine, St Thomas Aquinas, Niccolo Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau.

3.2.2 The Descriptive – Institutional Approach

This approach basically described structures and institutions of politics and government. It originally focused on the discussion of the evolution and operation of legislatures, executives and judiciaries which are respectively the institutions for making, carrying out and interpreting the law. This later came to include bureaucracies, political parties, pressure groups, interest groups, constitutions, and other frameworks that are constantly interacted with in politics. Unlike the foregoing approach, the Descriptive - Institutional Approach is more interested in facts than values, seeking to provide fact-based information on structures and institutions such as constitution and its forms, parliament and its parliamentary supremacy, law making procedures, supremacy of the law, elections and other means of choosing and changing representatives.

Before the era of political behaviour, these two approaches dominated the study of politics. Socio political values were studied based on individual's subjectivity and perspectives, and then institutions of politics were described from historical antecedents and values emanating from philosophers' thoughts. In these two approaches however stands a gap: the individual or group that is the operators of political institutions and interpreters of political values are amiss! What about them? How do we understand the output of institutions and values without first understanding the people who man them, their values, attitudes, orientations, socializations and other things? All these determine, to a great extent, what they do in their political environments. The point at which political scientists began to ask these questions was the outset of the behavioural approach.

RemiAnifowose summarized the issues that provoked these questions as "low level of generalization or finding, untenable assumptions and premises that influence and sometimes distorted findings, mere value laden findings and assumptions, emphasis on the study of institutions to exclude political process, neglect of the findings of other social science disciplines, as well as accumulation of irrelevant facts".

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE
(i)   Evaluate the evolution of political behaviour from 1900 to 21st century.
(ii)   What are the motives that led to the development of political behaviour?

2.1   THE BEHAVIOURALREVOLUTION

The beginning of the behavioural revolution in political science may be traced to the publication in 1908 of *Human Nature in Politics* by Graham Wallas, and *The Process of Government* by Arthur Bentley. As earlier pointed out, the behavioral revolution in politics came as oppositional response to the normative –philosophical and descriptive- institutional orientations that were used for the study of politics in earlier periods. Proponents of the behavioral revolution not only emphasized facts over

values, as stated above, they also argued that it is the behaviour of individuals in political institutions, rather than the institutions themselves, that is the essence of politics. They proposed the use of rigorous scientific and empirical methods in political research, in a bid to make the discipline of political science as advanced and as generalizing as conventional sciences such as Chemistry and Physics. Behaviouralists also called for greater integration of political science with other social sciences such as Psychology, Sociology and economics.

Using psychological and sociological approaches to analyze the role of individuals and groups in day to day political conduct in the state, Wallas and Bentley in their respective books earlier mentioned focused on the behavioral and informal processes of political activities, rather than philosophical postulations, armchair theorizing, structures and institutions of government. This is a radical departure from the past.

By the 1920s, the behavioral revolution had got to its peak through the efforts of two major intellectual giants: Charles Merriam and his student, Harold Lasswell who both introduced it to the study of politics, such new and scientifically systematic concepts as power and political elites. The revolution progressed enormously, up to the period from 1925 up to the end of the Second World War (1937-45). It witnessed a tremendous revival and dominated the study of politics throughout the fifties. This was made possible through the relentless intellectual efforts of key behaviouralists such as David Easton, Robert Dahl, Karl Deutsch, Gabriel Almond, David Truman and others who later came to dominate the discipline.

By the late sixties however, some behaviouralists began to agitate for the revision of the behavioral approach to accommodate new developments in political phenomenon. Spearheaded by David Easton, this revisionist movement is known as post-behavioral movement and, will be discussed in another unit of this material.

4.0 CONCLUSION

In this section we have discussed the definitions of political behaviour, the state of the discipline of political science before it, and the emergence of the behavioural revolution. We revealed that there were two major traditional approaches to the study of politics, namely the Normative - Philosophical and Descriptive - Institutional approaches. The study of political behaviour arose from the behavioral revolution in political science which developed in opposition to those older Normative-Philosophical and Descriptive- Institutional approaches.

While the Normative - Philosophical Approach emphasized the discussion of universal political values, the Descriptive - Institutional Approach focused on the evolution and operation of important governmental institutions.

5.0 SUMMARY

Political behaviour focuses on individual and groups in the study of politics. It moves scholarly attention of politics away from the study of thoughts and institutions that earlier dominated it, fusing now on the real actors of politics, man. It also advocates the use of empirical and scientific methods for the study of politics. This is what in the discipline of political science is called behavioral revolution. It began in the 1900s and progressed as time went by. The whole essence of this revolution, in the words of RemiAnifowose, "is to make political science more scientific a discipline, one which analyses

politics scientifically, that is, using the scientific methods".

2.1   TUTOR MARKEDASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

(1)   Explain the concept of political behavior among the actors.

(2)   What are the setbacks encountered in the field at the beginning?
(3)   Discuss the evolutionof behavioral revolution in politics.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Ball, A.R. (1977) Modern Politics and Government*, London,* Macmillan.

Eldersveld, J. and Katz, D (1961) The Impact of Local Party Activities Upon Electorates,
    Public Opinion Quarterly, 25(1), 1-24.

Eulau, H. (1968) *Political Behaviour*. In, International Encyclopedia of The Social
    Sciences New York, Macmillan and Free Press.

Eulau, H. (1963). The Behavioral Persuasion in Politics New York, Random House.

Mishler, W. and Rose, R. (2005). Generations, Ageing and Time Patterns of Political Learning During
    Russia's Transformation

Rodee C., Anderson T., Christol C. and Greene T. (1976), Introduction toPolitical Science Tokyo,
    McGrawHill.

Ulmer, S.(1961)eds., Introductory Readings in Political Behaviour, Chicago, Rand McNally.

Varma S.P. (1975). Modern Political Theory, New Delhi, Vikas Publishing House. Walton, H. (1985)

    Invisible Politics, USA, SUNY Press.

UNIT 2:FOUNDATIONS OF THE BEHAVIOURAL APPROACH

CONTENTS

1.0.INTRODUCTION

We have discussed earlier in unit one that political behaviour shifted emphasis from institutions to individuals and groups in the society. It also changed approach and method from descriptivism to empiricism. These two are done under certain principles and foundations which a leading American behaviouralist has described as the eight intellectual foundation stones of behaviouralism. These foundations stones are what we will emphasis in this unit and examine in details.

2.0   OBJECTIVES

As a student of political science, not only are you expected to understand the foundations upon which behaviouralism stands, you also need to be able to discuss them in logical and sequential details. Specifically, the knowledge of this unit will enable you to:

(i)   Explain the key principles or assumptions of thebehavioral revolution inpolitics.
(ii)   Comprehend a deeper understanding of the nature of the behavioral revolution inpolitics.

3.0   MAINCONTENT

3.1   Regularity, Verification, Technique andVerification

(a)   Regularities

Behaviouralists argued that the political behaviour of individuals is governed by certain general

underlying assumptions and conditions which can be discovered through systematic study. In other words, the political behaviour of individuals is not arbitrary is governed by certain discoverable factors. For example, if a group of individuals may continue to vote for the same party over a long period of time. Through behavioral research we may be able to show, that the behaviour of these individuals is related to such factors as their socio-economic status, ethnic identity or ideological orientation. On the basis of this knowledge, the behaviouralist will not only be able to explain but also predict the political behaviour of these individuals and others. In short, therefore, behaviouralists argued that there are discoverable uniformities or regularities in political behaviour and that these can be expressed in systematic generalizations or theories with explanatory and predictivevalues.

(b) Verification

The behaviouralists emphasized the need to make the study of politics as factual, empirical and scientific as possible. They argued that just as the natural and physical sciences are based on actual and observable events, political science most also be based on factual or empirical processes. They, therefore, contended that all statements, generalizations or theories about political behaviour must be based on factual observation and must be testable or verifiable by reference to actual political conduct. This process of empirical verification is the most important criterion for assessing the validity, acceptability or utility of any generalizations or statements about political behaviour.

(c) Techniques The observation of political behaviour and the verification of statements and generalizations arising from the observation must be based on the use of reliable and sophisticated scientific techniques, including well-structured interviews, sample surveys, statistical measurements and mathematical models. In short, the behaviouralists argued that reliable and effective means must be developed for observing, recording and analyzing politicalbehaviour.

(d) Quantification

The use of statistical and mathematical measurements can help to achieve adequate precision or accuracy in observing, recording and analyzing political behaviour. There must, therefore, be a shift in methods from the qualitative judgments that dominated the Normative-Philosophical Approach, to the quantitative measurements that are usually associated with the natural and physical sciences. Behaviouralists however, resolved that quantitative methods must be used not for their own sake, but only where possible, relevant and meaningful in the light of other objectives. This is why David Truman asserted that the political scientist should perform his research in 'quantitative terms if he can, and in qualitative terms, if hemust'.

3.2 Value Freeness, Systematization, Pure Science andIntegration

(a) ValuesFreeness

Values or ethical evaluations are a feature of the Normative-Philosophical approach to the study of politics and must be deemphasized in the scientific behaviorral approach. The behavioral approach is not guided by ethical evaluations. Rather, it is based on empirical and scientific explanation. While the student of political behaviour may sometimes make ethical judgments or evaluations, he should for the sake of clarity not confuse them with empirical observations or generalizations. In other words, empirical political research must be kept analytically distinct from ethical or moral philosophy.

(b) Systematization

Any piece of empirical political research, or any attempt at the observation of political data, must not be seen as an end in itself but as a means to the development of a systematic theory or generalization. In other words, empirical research should be 'theory- oriented and theory-directed'. Indeed research and theory should be 'developed as mutually indispensable parts of the scientific study of political behaviour. As David Easton put it, 'research untutored by theory may prove trivial, and theory unsupported by data, futile'.

It is important to note that a theory is an empirically testable statement that is designed to explain certain events or facts. It is an important element of any scientific enterprise or endeavor. At the most basic level, a theory can take the form of such testable generalizations as: 'Issues do not have a significant influence on the party preferences of the electorate ethnic affiliation is the most important determinant of voting behavior'. 'An electoral system based on proportional representation encourages a multi- party system'. These are hypothetical mainly, but they are also theoreticaltoo.

In essence, systematization means that any research on political behaviour must be pursued not as an end in itself but as a means to prove or disprove the kind of generalizations indicated above.

(c) Pure Science

Applied research, or the application of scientific knowledge to the solution of social problems, is as much a part of the scientific enterprise as is theoretical understanding or explanation. However, the scientific explanation of political behaviour logically precedes and provides the basis for any efforts to utilize political knowledge to the solution of urgent socio-political problems. To the behaviouralists, this implies that greater importance should be attached to pure research or scientific explanation than applied research, policy formulation or 'political engineering'. Indeed, the behaviouralists argued that a political scientist should be contented with understanding and explaining political behaviour even if the resultant knowledge cannot be applied to solve specific socio-political problems.

(d) Integration

Finally, the behavioral approach seeks to promote the unity of the social sciences, namely political science, economics, sociology, psychology and geography. It expresses the hope that someday the walls which separate political sciences from the other social sciences will crumble. Behaviouralists argued that because the social sciences deal with the totality of social existence, political research can ignore the findings of other social science disciplines only at the risk of undermining the validity and relevance of its own results orgeneralizations.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Examine the individual principles of behaviouralism and justify their necessity in advancing the course of political studies.

4.0   CONCLUSION

The principles upon which the behavioral school stands can be summed up in eight places. As formulated by David Easton who refers to them as the foundation stones of behaviouralist, they include

regularities, verification, techniques, quantification, values, systematization, pure science and integration. The essence of standing on all these is to achieve objectivity and strong generalization in the study of politics in such a way that will make political science more modern and interactive towards other disciplines

5.0   SUMMARY

In the foregoing we stated and highlighted the eight pillars of behaviouralismviz a viz the ultimate aim that they are poised to achieve in the study of politics. These principles are values, systematization, pure science, integration, regularity, verification, techniques and quantification. They respectively emphasize the need to separate ethical evaluation from empirical explanation, to direct empirical research towards systematic theories or generalizations, to give autonomous importance to pure research and to integrate political science with the other social sciences.

6.0   TUTOR MARKEDASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

(a)   Enumerate and discuss the foundational stones of politicalbehaviour.
(b)   Discuss the value of using scientific method in the study ofpolitics?

7.0   REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Easton, D. (1967) "The Current Meaning of Behaviouralism", In Charlesworth. J. (ed.)
      Contemporary Political Analysis, New York, The Free Press.

Truman, D. (1955) "The Impact on Political Science of the Revolution in the Behavioral Sciences", In,
      Research *Frontiers in Politics and Government.* Washington, Brookings Institution.

Eulau, H. (1968) Political Behaviour, In *International Encyclopedia of The Social Sciences* New York:
      Macmillan and Free Press.

Varma, S.P (1975) Modern *Political Theory,* New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.

UNIT 3: CHALLENGES TO THE BEHAVIOURAL APPROACH

1.0   NTRODUCTION

The traditionalists have always picked loopholes in the principles of the behaviouralists, an act which have also led to academic discuss. Therefore, in this unit we shall highlight, identify and describe some of their criticisms, especially against those that David Easton described as the eight foundation stones of behaviouralism.

2.0   OBJECTIVES

This unit teaches you to:

(i)   Understand and appreciate the intellectual tradition of constructive criticism
(ii)   Identify the traditionalists' criticisms of the behavioral approach to the study of politics.
(iii)   Asses the relevance or merit of these criticisms
(iv)   Be familiar with methodological debates in the study ofpolitics.

3.0   MAINCONTENT

3.1   Complexity of Human Behaviour, Difficulty in Verification, Rigidity of Techniques and Over Glorification of Quantification

(a)   Complexity of Human Behaviour

Critics of the behavioral approach have questioned the argument that the political behaviour of individuals is characterized by certain uniformities and generalities which can be discovered through

systematic and scientific study. These critics argue that human behaviour is so complex and fluid in natureand cannot be subjected to rigorous scientific inquiry. They contend that there are so many uncontrollable,inexplicable, unique and changing factors guiding human behaviour that any theoretical generalizations are bound to be very weak or trivial. Under these circumstances, the critics or traditionalists argue that descriptive approach may in fact be more rewarding or successful than the so-called scientific approach which merely attempts to impose artificial and neat generalizations on very unique and complex patterns of political behaviour.

(b)   Difficulty in Verification

The behaviouralists, as we pointed out in the preceding unit, argued that all statements, generalizations or theories about political behaviour must be based on factual observation and must be testable by reference to actual political conduct. The traditionalists, however, maintain that only a small segment of political conduct can actually be observed in behavioral terms. They argue that there are so many institutional, normative and ideological variables that affect human political behaviour which cannot be observed or recorded even when the most sophisticated data gathering techniques in the social sciences are used. Any adequate, study of political life, the traditionalists conclude, must therefore accommodate the many forces and processes that are not directly, observable or empirically verifiable.

(c)   Rigidity of Techniques

According to critics, the emphasis of the behaviouralists on the use of sophisticated techniques has led to the glorification of technical methodologies at the expense of real knowledge and understanding. Thus, the traditionalists accuse the behaviouralists of neglecting or ignoring vital areas of political life which are not directly amenable to scientific techniques and focusing, instead, on relatively trivial and narrow issues that are hardly fundamental to politics.

(d)   Over glorification of Quantification

While the behaviouralists argued for the use of quantitative measurements and mathematical models in the study of political behaviour, the traditionalists argue that political life is essentially unquantifiable. The most important political questions, the critics argue, require description and ethical evaluation, rather than quantification and measurement. The critics contend that much of political life is so imprecise, complex and unpredictable that any attempt at quantification can only produce very limited and trivial results. To sum up, in this section of the lecture we have attempted to describe some ofthe criticisms of the behavioral approach to the study of politics. Specifically, we have focused on those criticisms relating to regularities, verification, techniques and quantification. Basically, the critics or traditionalists contend that political processes are too complex and unpredictable to permit any useful theoretical generalization, empirical verification, application of sophisticated scientific techniques or quantification. How would you assess the merit or validity of the aforementioned criticisms? To answer the question, you will need to refer to our discussion in lecture two on the principles of behaviouralism. However, for more discussion of these criticisms, as well as the various responses and counter - arguments of the behaviouralists, read chapter three of S.P Verma's very useful work, *Modern Political Theory*.

3.2   Inevitability of Values, Systematization, Politics is not and cannot be Science, Possible Loss of Identity

(a)   Inevitability of Values

Critics of the behavioral approach argue that the contempt of behaviouralists for value judgments is unjustified and misleading. The critics make two main points. In the first place, they argue that the most important political issues today are closely bound up with ethical and moral judgments. For instance, issues like racism, war, peace, justice, democracy, freedom and development, which dominates political debates in the world today, can only be studied and resolved within an ethical framework and not in a moral vacuum.

In the second place, the critics argue that the behaviouralists themselves have hardly been able to escape from making value judgments and preferences. Thus, in selecting a subject for investigation, the behaviouralist is guided by his personal or ideological biases and judgments rather than by any scientific criteria. Some critics have even gone further to argue that, in pretending to avoid value judgments, the behaviouralists have actually become conservative defenders of the status quo, steadfastly opposing any attempt to raise moral and critical questions about existing political arrangements.

(b)   Systematization

The behaviouralists, as we pointed out in the last lecture, argued that empirical research should lead systematically to the development of appropriate theories and generalizations about political behaviour. Critics, however, argue that the behaviouralists have not done much to develop systematic theories of political behaviour. The behaviouralists, the critics conclude, have hardly been able to move beyond the experimentation with, and proliferation of, basic concepts, hypotheses and techniques which cannot enhance the reliability and integrity of political studies.

(c)   Politics is not, and cannot be Pure Science

Critics of the behavioral approach have denounced any attempt to elevate pure science into an end itself. The critics argue that scientific research is useless unless it can be utilized in solving urgent socio-political problems. They accuse the behaviouralists of trying to abandon their social responsibilities as researchers. The critics or traditionalists contend that an adequate approach to the study of politics must recognize the need to use knowledge to increase the general level of welfare in the society.

(d)   Possible Loss of Identity

The critics of behaviouralism are not opposed to the suggestion that the study of politics can be enriched or enhanced by closer collaboration with the social sciences. They, however, argue that care must be taken not to jeopardize the identity, integrity and independence of politics as a discipline. Rather, politics, while borrowing from concepts and knowledge developed in the other disciplines, must be allowed to develop as a distinctive and respectable field of study.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Compare and contrast the criticisms of traditionalists against the realistic nature of behaviouralists' postulations to justify their claims.

4.0   CONCLUSION

RemiAnifowose observes that "there have been disagreements among the behaviouralists on a number of issues. Some of them were satisfied with political science as it had been practiced before behavioral revolution and saw no cogent reason for such drastic change proposed by the behaviouralists. Others were less complacent with the state of the discipline". In cogent terms the behavioral approach to the study of politics has been subjected to sharp criticisms. The traditionalists feel that the scientific goals of behaviouralism are premature and counter-productive. They argue that political life is too complex and unique to permit systematic generalizations, verification, quantification or the use of sophisticated scientific techniques. They also raise questions about the desirability, validity or feasibility of such principles of behaviouralism as value- neutrality, systematization, pure science and the integration of the social sciences. For instance, the traditionalists argue that value-neutrality is both undesirable and impossible, that relatively little has been achieved by behaviouralism regarding the development of general theories of political behaviour, that research that cannot be utilized to promote the greater interest of society is useless, and that the integration of political science with other social sciences should be pursued with the greatest caution.

5.0   Summary

In summary, this unit has made clear those criticisms of behaviuoraism school of thought relating to the complexity of human behaviour rigidity in techniques, difficulty of systematisation, non-scientific nature of political science, difficulty of integration among other things. All these were the argument raised by the traditionalists against the behavioural approach.

6.0   TUTOR MARKEDASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

(i)   Justify the traditionalists' assertion that human behaviour is complex and cannot be summarily systematized as the behaviouralists proposed.
(ii)   Integration of political science with other disciplines may lead to loss of the former's identity. Discuss.
(iii)   Briefly discuss how the excessive emphasis on quantification reduces the quality of political findings.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Christian, B (1969) "A Critical Evaluation of the Behavioral Literature", In James, **A.** and Vincent, T eds., *Contemporary Political Thought: Issues and Scope, Value and Direction,* New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston,

Subley, M. (1967) "The Limitations of Behaviouralism" In Charlesworth, J. ed., *Contemporary political analysis.* New York: The Free Press.

Hass, M. And Becker, L. "The Behavioural Revolution and After", in Haas, M. and Kariel, H. eds., *Approaches to the Study of Political Science,* Chandler Publishing Company.

Strauss, L. (1966) "An epilogue", in Storing, H. (ed.) *Essays in the scientific study of politics.* H New York: Rinehart and Winston

Varma, S.P. (1975). Modern Political Theory. New Delhi, Vikas Publishing House.

UNIT 4:POST BEHAVIOURALSIM

1.0   INTRODUCTION

In this unit, more attention will be given to the study of some behaviouralists who address and probably correct some of the shortcomings and limitations they perceived in behaviouralism. This is the attempt made by behaviouralists to reform behaviouralism based on their own perception and in response to criticism of the traditionalists. It is known as post-behaviouralism. There are seven principles of post-behaviouralism as will be discussed in what follows. Please note that the post behaviouralists are different from anti behaviouralists. The former are themselves behaviouralists while the latter are their critics.

2.0   OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, the students should:

(i)   Be more deeply familiar with the role of criticism and dialectics in intellectual tradition.
(ii)   Be able to describe the contribution of the post-behavioral movement to the study ofpolitics
(iii) Be able to distinguish the criticisms of the behavioral approach by the traditionalists from the criticisms of the approach by the post-behaviouralists themselves.

3.0   MAINCONTENT

3.1   Substance, Social Change, Realism andValues

The same David Easton, you will remember, the leading American political scientist who formulated

the eight foundation stones of behaviouralism is the very onewho started the post behavioral movement. The principles are seven, and what we do in this unit is to discuss them in turn.

(a)   Substance

The behaviouralists turned post-behaviouralists, acknowledged the need to receive greater primacy to the substance or subject of political investigation than the techniques of research and analysis. They argued that the use of scientific and sophisticated tools of research and analysis, while desirable and rewarding, is not the most important thing in the study of politics. A far more important consideration, the post-behaviouralists argued, should be the ability of these tools to contribute to the development of knowledge about the fundamental issues ofpolitics.

(b)   Social Change

The behaviouralists, as we pointed out in unit 3, have been accused of defending the existing social order or status quo under the guise of value-neutrality. The post-behaviouralists, on the other hand, argued that political science should transcend the social conservatism of the behavioral movement and, instead, help to achieve and sustain progressive and constructive change in the society.

(c)   Realism

The post-behaviouralists recognized that the one-sided quest for scientific sophistication in the heyday of behaviouralism had led to a political science that was hardly in touch with the crises and conflicts of actual political life. The post- behaviouralists argued that contemporary political science could not afford to ignore the grim or unfortunate realities of political existence. Instead, it must address these realities and contribute to their resolution.

(d)   Values

The behaviouralists tended to downgrade the role of values in the study of politics and often upheld the need for value-neutrality. The post-behaviouralists, on the other hand, argued that the study of politics must be guided by such positive and progressive values as justice, equality and freedom. The post-behaviouralists indeed argued that if knowledge was to be relevant in the solution of societal problems, then values had to be given a primary *or* central place in the scientific process. The idea of value - neutrality, they concluded, is not only a myth, but is also socially and politically undesirable.

3.2   Social Relevance, Actions,Politicization

(a)   Social Relevance

The post-behaviouralists argued that political scientists must be socially relevant by contributing to the solution of the major problems of society. In other words, the post- behaviouralists were of the opinion that it was the responsibility of political scientists to do their best to create and sustain a better society and to uphold such progressive and humane values as egalitarianism, freedom, welfarism andjustice.

(b)   Action

Following from the principle of social relevance discussed above, the post- behaviouralists argued that political scientists must act to reshape society for the better. In other words, the post-behaviouralistwere

of the view that political scientists must not only be guided by a sense of social commitment and relevance in executing their research agenda, but also take practical and immediate action to reform and improve the conditions of socio-politicalexistence.

(c)   Politicization

The post-behaviouralists conclude that political scientists not only have a responsibility to undertake socially relevant research, but that they must also take practical steps to improve society. The implication of this argument is that political science, and indeed any area of scientific and systematic knowledge, must be politicized or actively and closely involved in the society's politicalprocesses.

In essence, all seven principles of post-behaviouralism discussed in this unit basically revolve around the need to make the study of politics more socially relevant and politically active. It is important to add that the political behaviouralists, unlike the traditionalists, did not oppose the desirability, viability of a scientific approach to the study of politics. On the contrary, the post-behaviouralists argued for a *science* of politics that is more socially relevant. There is no doubt that the criticisms of behaviouralism by the traditionalists and post-behaviouralists overlap or coincide in some respect. Yet, as already indicated, the post-behaviouralists, many of who were fact former behaviouralists, were very committed to the scientific study of politics, while the traditionalists werenot.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What are thevalues of Post-behaviouralism?

4.0   CONCLUSION

The post behaviouralist movement arose from the acknowledgement of the limitations of behaviouralism by the behaviouralists themselves. To transcend these limitations, the behaviouralists turned post-behaviouralists proposed the following seven conceptual principles, namely, substance, social change, realism, values, social relevance, action and politicization. The post-behaviouralists differ from other criticsofbehaviouralism in the important sense that they (i.e. the post-behaviouralists) did not oppose the scientific aspirations of behavioral political science. Rather, they called for a science of politics that is more socially relevant and active.

5.0   SUMMARY

In this unit, we have identified and discussed the major principles of the post-behavioral movement and concluded that the post-behaviouralists did not oppose the scientific aspirations of behavioral political science. Rather, they called for a science of politics that is more socially relevant and active.

6.0   TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMAs)

1.   Justify the argument that post-behaviouralism is different from the earlier criticism of behaviouralism bytraditionalists.

2.   Critically appraise the similarities between the positions advanced by critics of behaviouralism andPost-behaviouralists.

7.0   REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Easton, D. (1963) "The Current Meaning of Behaviouralism", in James C. C. (ed.), *ContemporaryPoliticalAnalysis.New York:* The FreePress

Eulau, H (1968) *"Political Behavior"* in, *International Encyclopedia of Sciences.* New York: Macmillan and Free Press.

Varma, S.P. (1975). *Modern Political Theory,* Vikas Publishing House.

UNIT 5:MAIN THRUST OFPOLITICAL BEHAVIOUR

1.0   Introduction

2.0   Objectives

3.0   MainContent

3.1   Political Socialization

3.2   Political Culture

3.3   Political Participation

3.4   Political Communication

3.5   Elections and ElectoralBehaviour

4.0   Conclusion

5.0   Summary

6.0   Tutor Marked Assignments

7.0   References/Further Reading

1.0   INTRODUCTION

Furthermore, this units we shall define political behaviour, traced its origin, identified its limitations and challenges. It is quite important at this juncture to touch the major areas, or main thrust of the subject matter itself, political behaviour. However, what is done in this unit is to identify these main thrusts of political behaviour and discuss them in brief. Moreover, because they are the core issues that the subject of political behaviour focuses on, they shall be fully explored and discussed in latter units of this material.

2.0   OBJECTIVES

The student should, at the end of this unit:

(i)   Be able to identify the main issues that the study of political behaviourfocuses on; and
(ii)   Command understanding of all these issues: political socialization, political culture, political participation, political communication and Elections. Possess the understanding of how all these thrusts interact with one another.

3.0   MAINCONTENT

The main issues covered by political behaviour are political socialization, political culture, political participation, political communication; then, elections and electoral behavior.

3.1   Political Socialization (P.S.)

Political socialization is the process of transferring knowledge, beliefs, attitudes and general dispositions about politics from one generation to the other. It accumulates almost unconsciously through citizens and people's interactions with social institutions such as the family, the religious houses, the schools, the tertiary institutions, the media, and political parties and so on. These institutions through which people are socialized into political values are called agencies of political socialization. Social scientists, especially those favorably disposed towards social learning theories; believe strongly that whatever a man behaves like in the society and its politics- from activism to its other extreme of apathy- is primarily a function of how he or she was socialized by these agencies.

3.2   Political Culture (P.C.)

Political culture refers to the dominant state or situation of citizens' awareness of issues and stakes in the political system, their evaluation as well as acceptance or rejection (as the case may be) of the system, and, in the third part, their expectations about the relationship among actors and participants in the political system. Unlike political participation that is a process; political culture is a state, and the dominant state among various states. This means that when we say that a country has a particular political culture, the true situation is that that culture so identified is the major one among others that exist. Like political socialization, political culture also largely determines political behavior, and the method with which the behavioral school investigates political phenomena often focus onit.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (S. A. E.)

Discuss in full detailsthe concepts of Political Socialisation andPolitical Culture.

3.3   Political Participation

Political participation has to do with the involvement of the people or citizens of acountry in the political affair s of that country. People participate by influencing, directly
  or indirectly, the composition of government, the policies they make, and the practices they institute. Election is a major way of political participation. However, participation in politics also includes many other ways in which citizens try to influence governmental decisions. Such ways, apart from voting, include campaigning, attending meetings, funding political parties, lobbying, protesting, forming social movements, belonging to Non-governmental organizations of civil society groups, and, to mention but just a few,
 All the foregoing activities influence politics in one way or theother,
  so, they are aspects of political participation.

Political participation is a wide concept, and in the subsequent unit where it will be fully discussed, efforts will be made to highlight the several dimensions it takes as well as the factors that often determine it. In summary however, participation basically involves the attempts by private citizens to influence the composition and decisions of government, a process which goes beyond just voting or participating in electoral activities.

3.4   Political Communication

According to Rotimi Suberu, "Political communication is the dissemination of information, ideas and attitudes about government or public affairs". In other words, what is said, ideas that are shared and the attitudes that spreads about politics and government of a political community are what political communication concerns itself with. In the 21st century where citizens are becoming critical of political power and the way it is used, all governments, especially those operating under democratic dispensation, care very much about the information disseminated in their polity, and they often take certain steps to control it. Government often does this through the media (print, electrons, and social media that is). The main purpose of monitoring political communication, on the part of the government, is to control public opinion. Same goes for the members of the public, though with different stakes and interests.

3.5   Elections and Electoral Behaviour (E. E. B.)

This is the aspect that has so far commanded the highest level of attention from behavioural researchers, perhaps because it is often contained in the constitutions of democratic states, or it is a device instituted by the ruling class for peaceful and conservative transfer of political power, as against revolt and revolutions which are often not in their interest. Election refers to organization of voting and its allied activities such as party registration, candidates' background checks and campaigning. According to Nie and Verba in their 1975 work, elections are "one of those legal activities by private citizens which are more or less aimed at directly influencing the selection of government personnel and the actions they take". Today, as another scholar has observed, "there are more and more democratic elections all over the world in which candidates must decide not only which candidate they wish to support, but also, and perhaps more fundamentally, whether they wish to support anyone, that is, whether they wish to vote or not". These are the words of Blais in his 2007 article titled *Turnout in Elections.*

On the other hand, the ways people behave towards election as well as the various factors that affect or determine their behaviors under different circumstances are all issues of electoral behaviour.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (S.A.E.)

Explain how citizens of a country can influence the composition and decision of government decision making.

4.0 CONCLUSION

There are five major issues that are critical and central to political behaviour. They include political socialization, political culture and political participation, which, on its own can be regular and irregular, then, political communication as well as elections.

5.0   SUMMARY

What we have done in the foregoing is identify the main thrusts of political behaviour: political

socialization, political culture, political participation, political communication and elections. Each of these aspects is merely mentioned and briefly discussed. They have several factors that determine them and many dimensions they take. These wider issues will be covered in the subsequent units.

6.0 TUTOR MARKEDASSIGNMENTS(T.M.As)

(1)   Explain the main aspects or thrusts of political behavior.
(2)   Carefully examine why you think that behaviouralists may be interested in political participation.
(3)   Identify the difference between political culture and political participation.

7.0   REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Alan, B. (1965) *Modern' Politics and Government,* London, Macmillan Press. Almond, G. and

Verba, S. (1965) *The Civic Culture, Boston*, Little Brown.

Bowman, L. and Boyton, G.R. (1974) Political Behaviour and Public Opinion: Comparative Analysis. New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

Dalton, R.J and Klingemann, H.D. (2007) (eds.), Oxford Handbook of Political Behaviour. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

De Gracia, A. (1952) Political Behaviour, New York, The Free Press.

Easton D. and Dennis J. (1969), *Children and the Political System,* New York, McGraw- Hill.

Eric, R. (1969) Modern *Politics: An Introduction to Behaviour and Institutions,* London, Rout-ledge and Kegan.

Malbraith, L. (1972) Political *Participation,* Chicago, Rand McNally.

Norman, H. N. And Sidney, V. (1975) "Political Participation" in Fred Greenstein and Nelson Polsby (eds.) *Handbook of Political Science Vol. 4.* Massachusetts, Addison- Wesley.

Robert, E. D. And John, A. H. (1972) Political *Sociology,* London, John Wiley and Sons.

MODULE 2:Political Socialisation and Political Culture

Introduction

In module 2 of this course material, the students will understand what political socialisation and political culture mean in political behaviour. Furthermore, this module explained major/primary agents of political socialisation and how these agents in their nature influence election and parties. It will in addition, explain the functions of political socialisation at various levels among the classes of those who are actively involved in party politics in the contemporary time. In unit 4, the effects of political socilisation areexploited. This is very necessary because they would discover the roles which this aspect play in political socialisation.

Unit 1: What is Political Socialisation

Unit 2: Political Culture

Unit 3: Major Agents of Political Socialisation

Unit 4: Effects of Political Socialisation on Political Behaviour

Unit 5: Functions of Political Socialisation

UNIT ONE:POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION (P.S.)

1.0   Introduction

2.0   Objectives

3.0   MainContent

3.1   Definitions of PoliticalSocialization

3.2   Factors Affecting PoliticalSocialization

4.0   Conclusion

5.0   Summary

6.0   Tutor Marked Assignment

7.0   References/Further Reading

1.0   INTRODUCTION

Political Socializations positionshas been defined as the process of transferring knowledge, beliefs, attitudes and general dispositions about politics, from one generation to the other, and that accumulates almost unconsciously through citizens and people's interactions with social institutions such as the family, the religious houses, the schools, the tertiary institutions, the media, political parties and so on. These institutions through which political socialization accumulates and transfers are, in social sciences called agencies of political socialization. This definition is borne of various ones given by various scholars in this discipline.

2.0   OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit students should be able to:

(i)   Understand the meaning of political socialization from broaderperspectives.
(ii)   Explain the various factors that determine politicalsocialization.

3.0   MAINCONTENT

3.1   Factors Affecting Political Socialization (F. A.P.S.)

Foremost, we shall examine political socialization as it is defined by many scholarly perspectives and period and shall equally provide some factors that determine it.

Beginning from the earlier time, Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba define political socialization as a:

learning process by which the norms associated with the performance of political roles as well as fundamental political values and guiding standards of political behaviour are learned'. This is contained in their article entitled, 'The Comparative Study of Political Socialization.

Apart from this, Robert Levine asserts, the process of political socialization as involving the acquisition by an individual, of behavioral dispositions relevant to political groups, political systems and political processes. Let us put other definitions in more directforms from the purview of other scholars.

Eric Rowe (1969): define"political socialization as the process by which the values, beliefs and emotions of a political culture are passed on to succeeding generations".

Harry Eckstein: asserts that Political socialization is the "process through which operative social norms regarding politics are implanted, political roles institutionalised and political consensus created, either effectively or ineffectively".

Roberta Sigel (1972): also say that "Political socialization is the learning process by which the political norms and behaviors acceptable to an ongoing political system are transmitted from generation to generation".

Gerald Bender (1967): furthermore, states that "Political socialization is the process through which the individual internalizes politically relevant attitudes, beliefs, cognitions and values".

More recent definitions of political socialization include those of **Eric Siraev and Richard Sobel (1995)**: that says;

"Political socialization is a lifelong process by which individuals learn political attitudes and behaviors. It is part of the broader socialization process whereby an individual becomes a member of a particular society and takes on its values and behaviors. Social and cultural conditions mediate political socialization".

Powell & Cowart (2003):" Political socialization is the study of the developmental processes by which children of all ages (12 to 30), and adolescents acquire political cognition, attitudes, and behaviors".

In conclusion, it is believed that through the performance of the function of political socialization that individuals are inducted into the political culture and their orientations towards political objects are formed.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (S.A.E.)

Evaluate the definition of political socialization.

3.3   Definitions of PoliticalSocialization

Although political socialization is made possible through certain agencies (this is discussed in another unit), certain factors still determine whether or not a person will be socialized and in whatever direction. The factors are:

(A) **Strength of Socializing Agency**: It has been argued often that some socializing agents are stronger and more effective than others. The family for instance is the first agent of political socialization that a child is exposed to at a tender age when his or her personality is still being formed. This is followed by the Schools (elementary and secondary). These two agencies are more effective in socializing people compared to the media and the political party.

(B) **Proximity to and Interaction with Socialization Agency:** Agencies of socialization become effective in the lives of those who are close to as well as who interact with them. An atheist who has no religion is not, for instance likely to be socialized by the church or the shrine, while an illiterate introvert may miss the socializing opportunities offered by the school and the peergroup.

(C) **Reinforcement System**: Socialization patterns can sometimes depend on reinforcement system. An agent that has a system of positive reinforcement is more likely to be more effective in socializing people in certain directions; vice versa. This is particularly true in families and schools. If interest in politics is positively reinforced in the family and school, children in the two institutions have better chances of political socialization than where it isnot.

(D) **Period and Age of Socialization**: Although socialization is a continuous exercise in the life of man, social scientists agree that personalities, believes and attitudes of people are often fully formed when they are young, say below 20 years. The interpretation of this is that socialization tends to be more effective when it occurs to people of tender ages, and at the period of their lives during which their personalities are beingdeveloped.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (S.A.E)

(i)   Critically assess the factors that affect political socialization.
(ii)   How do they affect politicians in Nigeria today?

4.0 CONCLUSION

Political socialization refers to the processes and ways in which political values, beliefs and orientations are handed down from one generation to the other through structures and institutions that are called agents of socialization. This socialization depends on certain factors.

5.0 SUMMARY

In the foregoing we discussed the meanings of political socialization as given by scholars of the old and new traditions. Noting the dichotomies among them, we also highlighted the different factors that can determine or affect political socialization in thesociety.

6.0   TUTOR MARKEDASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

(1)   Discuss the concept political socialization and identify the one that appeals to you most.
(2)   Evaluate the effects of environment factors on political socializations?

7.0   REFERENCES/FURTEHR READING

Bender G.J. (1967) 'Political Socialization and Political Change. *Western Political Quarterly,* 390 - 407.

Easton D. and Dennis J. (1969). Children and the Political System. *New York:* McGraw- Hill.

Eric,S.andRichard,S.(1995). People and their opinion: Thinking Critically about public opinion. London:Pearson.

Powell, L., and Cowart, J. (2003). Political campaign communication: inside and out. London: Allyn and Bacon.

Rowe, E. (1969). Modern Politics: An Introduction to Behaviour and Institution*, London,*
Rout-ledge and Kegan Paul.

Varkey, K. (2003). Political Theory: A Philosophical Perspective, India, Indian

PublishersDistribution.

UNIT 2:**POLITICAL CULTURE (P.C.)**

1.0   INTRODUCTION

We earlier identified political culture as one of the main thrusts of political behaviour. Here we offer a host of definitions of the subject; we also compared it with political socialization, another main thrust of political behaviour earlier discussed. This comparison is necessary because both political culture and political socialization work together and they share determining relationship in the society, thus making them somewhat and somehow mistaken for each other.

2.0   OBJECTIVES

The objective of this unit is to help the students:

(i)   Understand the meaning of political culture as a main thrust of politicalbehaviour
(ii)   Appreciate the similarity of, and difference between political culture and political socialization.

3.0   MAINCONTENT

3.1   Meaning of PoliticalCulture (P.C.)

Let us look at political culture from the two words that make it up: 'political' and 'culture'. What is

political concerns itself with politics, and culture simply refers to a well-established way of life of a people in a particular community. (Please read the 1963 workof Clyde Kluckhohn titled "Mirror of Man" for further understanding of the nexus between culture and politics). In a simple sense therefore, the concept of political culture refers to the dominant political way of life of a people in a particular politicalcommunity. The following definitions will make your understanding clearer andricher.

Taylor (1924) defined political culture as;

> "the complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs, arts morals, laws, custom, and other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of the society".

Lucian Pye, (1962) defined political culture as;

> " …the set of attitudes, believes and sentiments which give order and meaning to a political process and which provides the underlying assumptions and rules that govern behaviour in the political system. It encompasses both the political ideals and the operating norms of a polity".

Some leading scholars of behavioral tradition, Gabriel Almond and S. Verba (1963) also defined political culture as;

> "the patterns of individual political orientations, the attitudes towards the political system and its various parts, and to the role of the self in the politicalsystem".

In the words of Sydney Verba, (1965) political culture can be defined as;

> "a system of empirical beliefs, expressive symbols and values which defines the situation in which political action takes place".

From the above definitions, the concept of political culture has such common characteristics as the attitudes and values of man towards politics in a particular environment. So apart from the first definition given in this unit (before citing the foregoing four), we may crown up with the description of political culture by the Encyclopedia Britannica as an "attempt to uncover deep-seated, long-held values characteristic of a society or group rather than ephemeral attitudestoward specific issues", of course issues that arepolitical.

3.2   Political Culture and PoliticalSocialization (P.C.P.S.)

Now that you have a broad, yet synergized understanding of political culture, let us compare it to its indispensable partner, political socialization. In an earlier unit we defined political socialization as the *process of transferring knowledge, beliefs, attitudes and general dispositions about politics from one generation to the other,* and that it *accumulates almost unconsciously through citizens and people's interactions with social institutions such as the family, the religious houses, the schools, the tertiary institutions, the media, political parties and so on.* The knowledge, values and beliefs that are

transferred, and that accumulate through agents mentioned above are nothing butpoliticalculture, because political culture is what political socialization transfers. So, while political socialization is a process, a culture is a state.

Furthermore, while political socialization refers to process, and a process is a means of achieving some end, culture as a state is not sacrosanct, it operates at different levels. So, as elementary sociology will assert that we have cultures and subcultures within a particular cultural community, when we say political culture what we also mean is the dominant political culture, as there will always be other cultures around dominant ones. So, you need to note that when we refer to political culture in any literature, what we mean is just the way of political life that is dominant among a people. There are other non-dominant ones.

Another thing you probably need to know is that while we say both political culture and political socialization refer to values and they are not empirical, method of studying them can be, and, as a matter of fact, empiric zed by way of information and data gathered through public opinion surveys and other methods.

3.3   FORMS OF POLITICAL CULTURE (F.P.C.)

Almond and Verba's Classification: Parochial, Subject and Participant

The earliest and most prominent attempt to categorize political culture was made by Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba (1963). They compared five democratic nations and surveyed 1,000 persons as samples in the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy, and Mexico, and they came out with three levels of political culture: Parochial, Subject and Participant. These three levels of political culture shall be discussed in what follows.

(a)   **Parochial Political Culture (P.P.C)**: A parochial political culture exists where there are no specialized political roles and people 's knowledge of politics does notgo beyond their immediate environment. In this kind of culture, religious and ethnic considerations are often put beyond general interest, and people participate in politics mainly because of them, not because of wider socio-economic reasons. Where parochial political culture is dominant, citizens hardly make demands from their governments either because of ignorance of what governance is all about, or because they lack trust for the political leaders. Parochial political culture is found among many poor and developing nations that are pre-disposed to contradictions such as ethnic rivalry, indigene settler dichotomy, and primordialsentiments.

(b)   **Subject Political Culture (S.P.C.)**: In a subject political culture, majority of people merely simply align with policies and practices of government almost as obedient servants. They hardly participate in making, amendment or implementation of those policies. This kind of political culture is common where the government expects absolute obedience from the people and they institutionalize means of achieving it. People therefore have little choice but to follow suit because they are justsubjects.

(c) Participant Political Culture (P.P.C.): In a participant political culture, people understand politics and governance and make several attempts to participate in it. Their participation ranges from voting, attending meetings, joining associations and forming organization. They also mobilize people to participate in protest, social movements where necessary, and they educate others around them on the roles of the government in their lives and how they can make government perform them. Tunde Babawale adds that where participant political culture is dominant, people "manifest attitudes of personal political competence and they participate in active political process. Advanced countries such as Britain and the United States are found in this category.

It is good to re-emphasize that these political culture levels are not sacrosanct in any society; they are the dominant one that have other forms at peripheral levels. In addition, it is possible to have a country that has more than one or even all of these political cultures in it, especially a country that is highly stratified along ethnicity and tribes. In Nigeria for instance has three major ethnic nationalities, and research has shown that political culture differs each of these ethnic nationalities to the others

There are other categorizations of political culture apart from the popular one made by Almond and Verba. A key one is that of Daniel Elazar who defines political culture as "what people believe and feel about government, and how they think people should act towards it" and, in another dimension, "the particular pattern of orientation to political action in which each political system is imbedded." In his 1970 work titled *the metropolitan frontier and American politics,* Daniel Elazar studied the states in the United States and came out with three categories of political culture there in: Moral political culture, individual political culture and traditional political culture. Let us again examine each of them.

(c)   **Moral Political Culture**: (M.P.C.)
Where this culture is dominant, people consider the entirety of their society more important than their individual self, and they allow this to guide them in all their dealings with the political authorities. Government tends to be seen as a positive force. The moral political culture, according to Eleazar's findings, was dominant in Upper New England, the Upper Middle West of the United States. This emphasizes the commonwealth conception as the basis for democratic government. Politics is considered one of the great activities of man in the search for common good of the society, and good government is measured by the degree to which it promotes the public good. In a moral political culture, actions and inactions are based on issues, not personal considerations, and politics is often engaged in for record setting and not personal profiteering.

(d)   **Individual Political Culture: (I.P.C.)**

This is the political culture that was dominant in the Middle-Atlantic States through Illinois, and to the West where government has a very practical orientation and is instituted for utilitarian reasons. Emphasis is not on the common good of the society, but on how to restrict the powers of the state in intervening with the private lives of the citizens. In other words, in an Individual political culture, government exists for the purpose of preserving and protecting private lives of citizens. This type of political culture is not unconnected to the political history of the federalist/anti federalist, abolitionist and anti-abolitionist movement in the United States.

(e)   **Traditional Political Culture. (T.P.C.)**

In this political culture, certain families run governmental activities and while others appear to be spectators, just like in a hierarchical and natural order system. Although government is seen as performing positive roles in the society, yet, people perceive the roles mainly in terms of maintaining social order and the general status quo. In this political culture, the ruling elite is indulged into mere conformism instead of innovation, and there is a strong interplay of class conspiracies. The Southern part of the United States was noted for this king of political culture.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (S.A.E.)

What are the differences between political culture and political socialization.

Finer's Classification: Minimal, Low, Developed and Mature
Another scholar, Finer, made invaluable contribution towards categorizing political culture. Unlike Almond &Verba and Daniel Elazar tripartite dimensions of political culture, Samuel Finer, in his book, *The man on the Horse Back*, written in 1962, identifies four levels of political culture: Minimal, Low, Developed and Mature, and like Almond and Verba, he situated the different levels in different socio political environments. Finer's typology of political culture is however based on political institutions, procedures and legitimacy of rulers. Detailed discussion of his categorization is as follows:

(a)   Mature Political Culture

This refers to a system in which institutions of government are very effective to the extent that majority follow appropriate procedures to recruit political leaders. In such a system, a political aberration such as military coup will not only be unwarrantable but also inconceivable. Countries such as Britain, Canada, United States and Australia are full of this political culture.

(b)   Developed Political Culture

In this kind of system, there is high level of administrative and bureaucratic stability. Institutions of government may also be very effective but people are not really concerned about the procedure of attaining governmental powers as well as how it is retained. Germany, Japan and the defunct Soviet Union rightly belong here.

(c)   Low Political Culture

A low political culture is that in which one may not confidently call people citizens because they are very poorly organized and are not proactive towards governmental activities. People do not also agree on bureaucratic and administrative position of the state, so, issues such as military coup, perverted revenue sharing and intra structural relations within the country may be subjected to prevailing pulse of

the people rather that legitimate or established procedures. According to Finer, Egypt, Syria, South Korea, Turkey and Iran belong here.

This is a system where the ruling class acts with impunity because they are brutal and more coercive than the unorganized and politically passive people. In this place military intervention in politics is perceived as normal, and leaders can fidget with public opinion at will. Nigeria belongs here. Note that at a time in Nigeria's history, intellectual and the political class proposed what they called diarchy, a system that enables cooperative operation of military and civilian rule. This shows how much the people hadbeen used to military rule. Many other countries of West Africa can also be put under this category.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (S.A.E.)

(i)   Evaluate the common trends of the three categorizations of political culture you have studied.

(ii)   Highlight the ones which are practice in Nigeria or your geo-political zone.

4.0   CONCLUSION

Political culture is another main thrust of political behaviour, just as political socialization. It means the totality of people's worldviews about political institution. It shares a dependent relationship with political socialization but still differs significantly from it. Let us conclude by making certain clarifications and assertions. First, from all written above you will notice that the issue of political culture categorization was much a discourse of the past, even though political culture itself has contemporary relevance. What this supposes is that what contemporary scholarship does is use dominant political behaviour in particular community to analyze issues there in because having subjected the early categorizations to empirical testing, it has slippery validity in many cases. It is therefore possible to identify new political culture categorization in each political community that is studied. In addition, you also need to note that the three categorizations used here, with the Almond and Verba's as the most widely used, are not the only ones in scholarship. There are a few other ones. Finally, what you should grasp firmly is that the ways people interact with politics differ from one cultural setting to another, so, political culture can be as many as these cultural settings if we want to categorize it across the globe.

5.0   SUMMARY

What we have done above is to define and describe political culture through a few scholarly perspectives that run from the 1900s down to recent period. We have also compared political culture with political socialization and concluded that though the two concepts share dependent relationship, they have their different identities. In summary, there are many ways scholars have categorized political culture. Almond and Verba has the parochial, subject and participant, Daniel Elazar has moral, individual and traditional, while Samuel Finer has mature, developed, low and minimal. There are other categorizations from other scholars. The most important point to grasp in this unit is that just as peoples' culture differs from one society to the other, political culture also differs from one political

community to another.

6.0   TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

1.   What is political culture?Explain this in the light of how politicians demonstrate or practice it.

2.   Justify the difference between political culture and political socialization.

3.   Explain how Samuel Finer categorize political culture.

4.   Discuss the Almond and Verba's three types of political culture.

7.0   REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Almond, G. and Verba, S. (1965) The Civil Culture, Boston, Little Brown.

Babawale, T. (1999) "Political Socialization and Political Culture", In, RemiAnifowose and Francis Enemuo (eds). Element of Politics, Lagos, Sam Iroanusi.

Elazar, D. (1970). *Cities of The Prairie: The Metropolitan Frontier and American Politics*, New York, Basic.

Elazar, D. (1972) American *Federalism: A View From the States*,2nd ed. New York, Thomas Y. Crowell.

Kluckhohn, C. (1963) Mirror of Man, Greenwich, Primer Books.

Tylor, B. (1924) Primitive Culture, Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Pye, L. (1962). Politics, Personality and Nation Building, New Haven, Yale University.

Pye, L. and Verba, S. (1965) Political Culture and Political Development, Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Tylor, B. (1924), Primitive Culture, Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Unit 3: AGENTS OF POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION

1.0   INTRODUCTION

It has been previously discussed that there are many agents of political socialization which are not limited to Family, Media, Peers, Education, Religion, Race, Gender, Age and Geography, but in fact, at every point where man interacts with man, there are bond be or exist political socialization. Therefore, in this unit only a few major ones shall be discussed. The unit categorizes them into two: primary and secondary. The two categories shall be fullydiscussed.

2.0   OBJECTIVES

Knowledge acquire in this unit shall enable the student in:

(i)   Identifying the various agents ofsocialization.
(ii)   Distinguishing between the primary and the secondaryones.
(iii)   Understanding how they work to socialize people into politics.

3.0   MAINCONTENT

The primary goals of this content are to discuss the agents of political socialization. These agents refer to institutions and structures that socialize people into politics; the agents that people are introduced to as they grow up, and that affect their political views throughout the rest of their lives. In a sense we can divide the agents of political socialization into two broad categories: the primary and thesecondary.

3.1 Primary Agents of Political Socialization (P.A.P.S.)

The primary agents of political socialization are those that people first come across when they are children and they unavoidably interact with as they grow. Almost all human beings pass through these agents, though not necessarily on their will. The primary agents of political socialization in today's world include the family, the school, the peer group and the religious gatherings. In the contemporary world these socialization agencies can hardly be avoided, and they affect people's believes and attitudes towards politics. In what follows we shall discuss these agents one after theother.

(a) TheFamily:

The family is a principal agent of political socialization, or any other form of socialization at all. In fact, M. Kent Jennings in his 2007 work titled **Political Socialization** asserts that "from the early scholarly inquiries on through to the present time, the role of the family as a prime agent of socialization has occupied an imports in the literature". This is because the family is a relatively small and enduring institution that makes the processes of learning and imitation easier. Apart from this, the family is the first point of call of the individual, and, to that extent, it determines a lot about individual's behaviour; including the political. Above all, every human being, by no choice of theirs, is presumably born into a family, so, except in few cases, every human being passes through the socialization of thefamily.

(b) TheSchool

Formal educational system organized in forms of schools and colleges is a common phenomenon in the modern world. In fact, most advanced countries of the world are beginning to lay claim to zero percent illiteracy level in their society while third world countries are following suit. The implication of this is that everyone in the society will now have to pass through one form of school or the other. Thus, the school, like the family, is an agent of socialization that is almost impossible to escape. Some societies deliberately teach subjects such as civil education, political history and government to educate their citizens on politics. National anthems and other extra curriculum exercises are basically performed in schools to expose students to certain values about politics. What most people know and believe about politics is therefore, especially in today's world, a function of school attendance. The school then qualifies as a primary agency of political socialization.

(c) The Peer Group

Man, by nature, Aristotle has long insisted, is a political animal. What you get from this is that man is a gregarious being that love to live with, and around other men. In the process of this social interaction peer groups are formed. These groups consist of people of same or close age brackets, and members of the groups learn many things socially from one another through emulation and reciprocal determinism. If a person belongs to a peer group that is politically conscious for instance, the tendency of the person to become very active and interested in the politics of his nation is very high due to the kind of socialization received in the course of interacting with his or her peers. Peer group is also a primary agent of political socialization because it is difficult to escape in the process of existing in the society. An even school where the child is socialized is full of peer group influence, though many peer groups also exist outside theschool.

(c)   Religious Gatherings

Apart from the family and the school, organized religious gathering is another very strong agency of political socialization in the modern world. It is almost inescapable today. When people gather in the name of religion, they often inevitably discuss socio political issues that concern them directly or indirectly, politics being, according to David Easton, "authoritative allocation of values in the society". Values that may be authoritatively allocated to, or omitted from people's homes, families, streets, work places, states of residence, international relation and so on, often make people relate with politics even in religious gatherings where they are supposed to be worshiping. Today, religious associations sponsor candidates into elective positions in order to gain influence. Citizens of some countries consider the religious affiliation of a political candidate as determinant of his or her capacity to rule, and such beliefs color behaviour even in elections. The discussions and decision on these political issues are often taken in religious gatherings; hence, religion becomes a strong agent of political socialization.

In summary, take a look at your life today, the foregoing four structures family, school, peer groups- that is friends and colleagues- as well as your religious gathering are four structures that you constantly interact with almost on weekly basis, and in all of them, it is almost certain that politics is discussed either directly or indirectly. This makes the four of them primary agents of political socialization. Inwhat follows however, we shall discuss four more agents of socialization that are not as central to man as the ones considered as primary.

3.2   Subordinate Agents of PoliticalSocialization

Structures and institutions such as the media and political parties are not common to all men; they are optional, so they belong to the secondary political socialization agents. Other ones in this category are gender and age which are though common to all men, yet, do not command strong organizational political influence that, say, thechurchand the school may have. Let us examine these four agents of political socialization in details.

(a)   The Media

The media is a strong agent of political socialization. The print media produces newspapers and magazines while the electronic media comes in forms of radioand television. In all of these media politics and political issues are discussed in daily basis. In fact, it has been argued by Allan Smith that

the 21st century press media is a political media as majority of the news items are either completely political or are connected to politics. The most recent one is the social media: the Facebook and the Twitters that are fast penetrating the whole world. Issues discussed in all these media create values, attitudes and believes in people, and as such, stand as means of socializing them into politics as well as influencing their politicalbehaviour.

(b)   Political Party

A political party is an organized body of people who participate in political activities with the sole aim of getting political power. Membership of a political party automatically translates to discussion and practice of political activities, with all the pranks, and the intrigues. People who belong to political parties learn a great deal of their political tricks, values, orientations, opinions and believes from them, so, the political party is a very strong agent of political socialization. In specific terms, political parties have orientations and ideological divides. There are left wing parties, right wing parties, mass parties and so on, and the orientation that is dominant in each of these parties are systematically handed down to their members from one generation to another. In Britain you have the conservative (right wing) and the labour (left wing) political parties. In the United States it is between the Republican (right wing) and the Democrat (left wing) parties. Although Nigerian political parties have been unstable and episodic since independence, the current ideological divide still stands between the PDP and the APC.

(c)   Gender

Until recently when universal adult suffrage has permeated the whole world, gender was a very key issue in political socialization. In the earlier Athenian society in Greece, women were not allowed to participate in politics, and so it was in some other parts of the world. The implication is that men would be differently socialized to form different believes opinions and orientation of politics, compared to women. Now that the dichotomy is changing rapidly, and universal adult suffrage is gaining popularity around the world; women's socialization in politics is fast taking different dimension. Conversely, in the old Oyo kingdom where women were known to occupy important political positions such as

Iyalode, Iyaloja and Iyalaje, and where they exerted great influence in the politics of their people, there was a difference in gender relationship with politics, and this created egalitarian and democratic values among the people. You may wish to read Eesuola's*Using Indigenous Political Structures to Facilitate Democratic Ideals in Nigeria: Lessons from Pre-Colonial Yoruba Kingdom*, published in the University of Lagos, Nigeria, Sociological Review, Volume 9, 2011.

(d)   Age

Also unlike gender, age was and is still a strong factor in the politics of courtiers. Today, as a result of universal adult suffrage, most constitutions allow citizens of eighteen years to vote and be voted for. In some countries where gerontology is common in political activities, only old people take certain electoral positions in politics. These different practices in different societies often shape opinions and orientations of people towards politics, so, age is equally an agent of political socialization.

Let us also quickly add that socialization may involve an individual's formative years, or his mature years, or both. Political socialization through the primary agency is not only latent, but also tends to occur during the formative years of an individual. Political socialization through secondary agencies, on the other hand, tends to be manifest and to occur during an individual's relatively mature years.

Political socialization can produce either systemic or non-systemic change. Systemic change refers to a fundamental or far-reaching change in the distribution or exercise of authority in the political system. Non-systemic change, on the other hand, refers to relatively insignificant or incremental changes in the patterns of political participation and association which do not alter or upset the existing distribution of power and authority in the polity. Indeed, generally speaking, political socialization is essentially a stabilizing process and hardly produces systemic change. The political socialization process becomes destabilizing, or produces systemic change, only under conditions of rapid modernization or general societal crisis.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (S.A.E.)

(i)   Evaluate all the agents of political socialization.

(ii) Which of these agents can you say influence man in the society?

4.0   CONCLUSION
Socialization is driven by certain agents in the society which has been discussed above. Some of these agents are primary, and in this unit we also refer to them as super ordinate and principal. They arefamily, school, religious groups and peer groups. Others are secondary, otherwise referredtoassubordinate.Theyaremedia,age,genderandpolitical parties.

These agents are the channels through which people are socialized into politics from one generation to another, and they produce systematic and non-systematicchanges in people's behaviour.

5.0 SUMMARY

We have discussed agents or agencies of political socialization. We stress that these agencies are many, but some are more central than the others. The central ones we call the principal agent, while the less central one are called the subordinate agents. All these agents influence the opinions of citizens towards politics and policies in the state, so they are all regarded as agents of politicalsocialization.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

1.   What are the effects of agents of politicalsocialization in political behaivour?

7.0   REFERENCES/FURTEHR READING

Bender G.J. (1967) Political Socialization and Political Change, *Western Political Quar- terly,*   390 - 407.

Eric R. (1969), Modern *Politics: An Introduction to Behaviour and Institutions, London,* Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Easton D. and Dennis J. (1969) *Children and the Political System,* New York, McGraw- Hill.

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

Jennings M. Kent (2007) "Political Socialization", in, Dalton, R. and Klingemann, H. (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political behavior,* Oxford, Oxford University Press

Pye L. (1966). *Politics, Personality and Nation-Building* New Haven, Yale University Press.

Robert. D. and Hughes, J. *Political Sociology, London,* John Wiley and Sons,

UNIT 4:IMPACTS OF POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION ON POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR

1.0   Introduction

2.0   Objectives

3.0   Main Content: Major Agents of PoliticalSocialization

3.1   Family Socialization and PoliticalBehaviour

3.2   Socialization in the School and its Effects on PoliticalBehaviour

4.0   Conclusion

5.0   Summary

6.0   Tutor Marked Assignments

7.0   References/Further Reading

1.0   INTRODUCTION

We have come to unit 4 in this module and it is very important to discuss the impacts of political socialization on political behaviour. That is how people behave, the totality of their dominant attitudes, values and orientation in the day to day relationship of individuals and groups with their political environment. As asserted in the earlier units, the family and the school are the principal agents of political socialization in the modern world, and they are the ones specifically isolated for discussion and analysis in this unit. However, while using the socialization in the family and the school to assess political behaviour of individuals and groups, we do not underrate the other agents of socialization. School and family are just used as models, so, students should, in their personal studies, apply the peer group, religious institutions, age, race, etc for analysis, using similar methods.

2.0   OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit students are expected to comprehend:

(i)   The relationship between political socialisation and the behaviour of people towards politics.

(ii)   How the family and the school socialisation specifically affect people's political behaviour.

3.0 MAINCONTENT

3.1 Patterns of Socialisation in the Family (P.S.F.)

There are several ways in which patterns and processes of socialisation in the family can influence political behaviour exhibited by children who are raised in that family. Some four of these ways are authority patterns, Socio-Economic Status (SES), civic orientations or knowledge, and political participation patterns all in the family. In what follows we offer detailed discussion of these four factors.

(a)   Authority Patterns in the Family

The individual's predisposition to participate in, or withdraw from politics may be influenced by his early relationship with his parents. In a family situation where authority is dispersed, where there is warmth between the child and his parents, and where disciplinary control is more liberal, flexible and permissive, where children are encouraged to engage in debate and analysis of issues before important decisions are taken, offspring and other members of the family will ideally turn out active in politics. They are more likely to engage authorities, query facts, policies and decisions, and, in short, operate with a high sense of political efficacy: the degree to which an individual feels he can influence or determine political decisions. Children raised in a liberal family environment will tend to develop either transitional or gladiatorial participant attitudes (these shall be discussed under political participation.)

Conversely, however, a family setting where authority is concentrated in one person (usually the father), where there is no closeness or warmth between the child and his parents, and where disciplinary patterns are extremely severe, the child may become too subservient, too passive and too psychologically insecure in life. Scientifically speaking, such child is most likely to grow up as a conservative being. He or she sees whatever the people in authority do as final and may not have any effrontery to challenge it. His political participation is likely to expectationalhis ideology conservative and his attitude either docility or mere endorsement.

(b)   Family's' Socio-Economic Status (S.E.S.)
Family's Socio-Economic Status (SES)

The socio-economic condition of the family as a socializing agent contributes to children's ultimate political behaviour. People of high socio-economic status often tends to be more active and prominent in politics because in most cases they would have conquered hunger and most material deprivations, so, they have enough time to sit, theorize and query issues around them. The lower-status people, on the other hand, are often preoccupied with resolving material contradictions and other basic needs in their lives, so, they have little time to sit and think ablaut politics. Justin Labinjoh captures this class dimension to political behaviour when he declared that "socio economic circumstances always constrain members of various classes to relate differentially to the social structure," and that such has "implications for individual dramaturgical skills and therefore for the individual's perception of social reality"

Moreover, because children from higher status families are in a better position to benefit from other socializing institutions such as the mass media and elite schools which encourage civic or participant attitudes, at least compared to children of poorer parents, the political behaviour of the former tends to be proactive. In addition, socio economic condition greatly influences authority patterns in the family,

to the extent that liberal child-rearing practices tend to characterize higher status families, while authoritarian practices tend to typify lower-status families. As a result of this, people from higher status backgrounds may be better disposed psychologically and normatively to participate in politics than those from lower backgrounds.

(c)   Family's Civic Knowledge and Orientations

The dominant knowledge of politics or overall orientation towards socio political events in a family often carries serious weight in how offspring of the family are socialized. Politically conscious or ideologically deep parents are more likely to encourage the discussion of politics in their homes, and by so doing they increase the interests and understanding of politics in their children and other people living and around the family.

(d)   Family's Political Involvement or Participation

Biographical accounts of famous political leaders are full of instances of children who have followed in their parents' footsteps by becoming very active politicians because an intensely politicized family atmosphere stimulates activist tendencies or attitudes in the offspring in the family. Consequently, offspring in politically active families eventually turn out as activists themselves; a situation made possible through a principle of social learning called imitation. A good example is that of the Nigerian musician/political activist called FelaAnikulapoKuti whose counter cultural and anti-establishment political disposition was largely imitated from the activities of his mother and father. At this point you may want to read about social learning principles and theories, especially that of Albert Bandura. The 2011 University of Lagos doctoral dissertation of EesuolaOlukayode, as supervised by Professor RemiAnifowose alsopromises to be a useful source of how the family socializes people into certain pattern of political behaviour. So, this part of the unit has identified how socialization patterns in the family, especially the issues concerning authority patterns, socio-economic status, civic knowledge and political involvement influence political behaviour of people

3.2   Socialization in the School and its Effects on Political Behaviour

Apart from the family, the educational system of a country plays an important role in the inculcation of attitudes and values that can shape the nature and degree of people's political behaviour in the society. This is where the school comes in. The relationships between the school authorities and students, the pattern of relations among the students themselves, the content of civic courses and the general organization and administration of the school system all play significant roles in implanting or inhibiting certain attitudes and dispositions of people towards politics. In two specific ways this can be done:

(a)   Content of Curriculum

A school where civic education, politics, political history or subjects of revolution cuts across classes and levels of learning is likely to socialize students into a more active political behaviour.. In like manner, if, instead of the foregoing subjects, students are generally thought religiosity and doctrines under the guise of mission schools for instance, is not unlikely to socialize students into dogmatic and conservative political attitudes. Formal learning in schools, in the forms of cognitive engagement of students, affects the political behaviour of students who school there.

68

(b)   Dimensions of Extra Curricular Activities

Another major means by which the educational system can tangentially influence students' political behaviour is through involvement in school activities, particularly at the secondary and, or tertiary levels. Secondary schools that have organizations such as the press club, literary and debating society, as well as Para-military organizations such as 'Man o War' will often periodically discuss issues of and around politics. Selection of prefects in the school can also be made through free and fair elections. In tertiary institutions also, activities such as student's unionism, faculty and departmental associations as well as membership of special committees can also greatly combine to influence the political behaviour of students therein, compared to a university where all these are not permitted to occur. In essence, involvement in school activities can have an important influence on the individual's subsequent political behaviour at the larger strata of the society.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXECISE (S.A.E.)

Discuss how the environment can be an agent of political socialization.

4.0   CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it would be nice to recap other agents of political socialization discussed in this at this level, the mass media, religious groups, political parties, age andgender; as well as others not discussed: race, occupational groups and government agencies also play an important role in influencing an individual's dispositions attitudes and behaviour towards politics.

5.0   SUMMARY

Two principal agents of political socialization: the family and the school have been used in this unit to explain how they can influence the political behaviour and general disposition of people. At the family level, we highlighted authority patterns, socio- economic status, civic knowledge and political participation, while at the school level our focus is on content of curriculum and extracurricular activities. All these make or mar the political behaviour in the society.

6.0   TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

1.   Do you agree that school can socialize students into politics?

2.   Significantly appraise the role of the family as an agent of political socialization.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTEHR READING

Almond G. and Verba S. (1965) The Civic Culture, Boston, Little Brown Ball, A. (1977)

   Modern Politics and Government, London, Macmillan Press.

Beck,P.A.and   Jennings, M.K, (1982) Pathways to Participation, *American Political Science Review* 76(1).

Dowse, R. and Hughes, J. (1972) Political Sociology, London, John Wiley and SOT

Labinjoh, J. (1982) FelaAnikulapoKuti: Protest Music and Social Processes inNigeria. Journal of Black Studies, 13(1) Communication and Change in Sub Sahara Africa, 119- 134.

4. Nie, N.H and Verba, S. (1975) "Political Participation" In, Fred Greenstein and Nelson Polsby (eds.) *Handbook of political science volume 4Massachusetts,* Wesley.

Pye, l. (1966) Politics, Personality and Nation-Building, New Haven, Yale University Press.

Rowe, E. (1969). *Modern Polities: An Introduction to Behaviour and Institutions: London,* Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Unit 5:FUNCTIONS OF POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION

1.0   Introduction

2.0   Objectives

3.0   Main Content

3.1   Analysis of theFunctions

4.0   Conclusion

5.0   Summary

6.0   Tutor Marked Assignments

7.0   References/Further Reading

1.0   INTRODUCTION

We have come to the end of this module 2 in unit 5. And based on our discussion so far, about political socialization, it clearly suggests that political socialization performs certain roles in the socio-political development and continuity of a nation. It is very necessary to discuss the functions/roles of these in this unit.

2.0   OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, the students should be able to:

(i)   Evaluate the various functions of politicalsocialization.
(ii)   Appreciate the reasonswhy political socialization should be deliberately encouraged in the society.

MAINCONTENT

3.0   Analysis of the Functions

(a)   Intergenerational Transmission of Political Values (I.T.P.V.)

Political socialization assists every society in preserving political culture across time. It also helps to inculcate political values and orientation in people. This is the function we call intergenerational transmission of political norms, and, by extension, values, symbols and ideas. For instance, a person who attends the university, majors in engineering and later gets employment in an engineering firm may not at all understand the workings of law making and recall except he or she witnessed it at the level of students union which the school as an agent of political socialization offers. In an increasingly complicated world where politics is fast becoming everyone's business even though we do not all major in politics, agents of socialization serves the purpose of transmitting political values and norms from one generation to the other, and this helps in ensuring stability in the society.

(b)   Stability of Polity

By virtue of performing the foregoing function of intergenerational transmission of values and inculcation of political culture, political socialization helps to maintain continuity and stability in the society. Such stability is needed to advance the course of the society from all walks of life. To the extent that political socialization is a means of role-training therefore, it, at any time equips the members of a society with the basic skills necessary for political participation or the performance of important political roles.

(C)   Creation of Hegemonic Order

Political socialization helps the society to create hegemonic order. Every political environment needs hegemony to stabilize and develop, hegemony being a subtle, non-coerced assimilation of how things are done in a society. Political socialization helps a society to foster this, and every member of the society needs only little push or coercion to obey the law and promote good values.

(d)   National Discipline

National discipline is very important in political socialization. The reason is that it makes it easy to ensure some degree of discipline among members of a political community. In other words, political socialization curbs or controls disruptive political behaviour by ensuring that members of a society behave in a manner that is socially acceptable to the majority of the people, and especiallythe hegemonic class.

Furthermore, political socialization assists in promotion of patriotism and nationalism. People, who learn the political values, believe and orientations of their people and hand the same down from one generation to the other tend to become obsessed with it. They see themselves as being embedded in such values and ideas and are often willing to defend and promote it at any time necessary. This is called patriotism, and it is useful for the domestic and international aura of a state.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (S.A.E.)

How political socialization plays significance roles in the society?

4.0   CONCLUSION

Political socialization performs some functions in the polity. These functions are basically for continuity and stability among politicians and other actors that are involved in politics. Moreover, they affect not only the political, but also the economic and social strata of a political community.

5.0   SUMMARY

We have identified some functions of political socialization such as intergenerational transmission of political values, the maintenance of continuity in society, the regulation of the behaviour of members of a political community, creation of hegemonic order, role-training and patriotism and so on. This is based on the assumption that political socialization is a process and a continuum too. At every point in time in a society it transforms, and only that way it plays the roles ascribed to itabove.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

1.   In your words, explain how political socialisation creates hegemonic order.

2.   Identify ways political socialization aid in political development in our society.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Almond G. and Verba S. (1965) The Civic Culture, Boston, Little Brown Ball, A. (1977)

   Modern Politics and Government, London, Macmillan Press.

Beck,P.A.andJennings, M.K, (1982) Pathways to Participation, *American Political Science Review* 76(1).

Dowse, R. and Hughes, J. (1972) Political *Sociology, London,* John Wiley and SOT

Labinjoh, J. (1982) FelaAnikulapoKuti: Protest Music and Social Processes inNigeria. Journal of Black Studies, 13(1) Communication and Change in Sub Sahara Africa, 119- 134.

4. Nie, N.H and Verba, S. (1975) "Political Participation" In, Fred Greenstein and Nelson Polsby (eds.) *Handbook of political science volume 4Massachusetts,* Wesley.

Pye, l. (1966) Politics, Personality and Nation-Building, New Haven, Yale University Press.

Rowe, E. (1969). *Modern Polities: An Introduction to Behaviour and Institutions: London,* Routledge and Kegan Paul.

MODULE 3: POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Introduction

In this module, the aim and objective is to examine the scope of political participation at various levels, the factors affecting this concept and how the actors can manage the involvement of those who are in it. Lastly, dimensions of the concepts are fully or profoundly explained in unit 4. Also, in unit 5, a careful examination is alsocarried to explain the democracy in political participation, and how party affiliations can influence political participation in democracy.

Unit1: Definitions and Scope of Political Participation

Unit 2: Levels of Political Participation

Unit 3: Factors Affecting Political Participation

Unit 4: Dimensions of Political Participation

Unit 5 Identity Politics: Political Participation and Democracy

UNIT 1:

DEFINITIONS AND SCOPE OF POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

UNIT 1: DEFINITIONS AND SCOPE OF POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

1.0   INTRODUCTION

In addition to that we had discussed above, it is very important to bring to mind that in the preceding units we asserted that political socialization of a people determines their attitudes and values towards politics, that is, whether they participate at all or not, the proportions of their participation, the degree and the period. This is what we generally defined as political behaviour of people. Here we now center on political participation per se. The unit is divided into two parts, the first covering a collection of definitions of political participation by known scholars, while the second addresses its major scope.

2.0   OBJECTIVES

After studying this unit 1, students should be able to:

(i)   Comprehend political participation from various scholarly viewpoints
(ii)   Analysis the extent of political participation

3.0   MAINCONTENT

3.1   Definitions of Political Participation

Political scientists also aim to understand what drives individuals to participate in the democratic process, either by voting, volunteering for campaigns, signing petitions or protesting. Participation cannot always be explained by rational behavior. The voting paradox for example, points out that it cannot be in a citizen's self-interest to vote because the effort it takes to vote will almost always outweigh the benefits of voting, particularly considering a single vote is unlikely to change an electoral outcome. Political

scientists instead propose that citizens vote for psychological or social reasons. Studies show, for example, that individuals are more likely to vote if they see their friends have votedor if someone in their household has received a nudge to vote.

Furthermore,like most political science concepts, political participation has attracted several definitions and meanings from several scholars. Some of these definitions are generic, that is, they try as much as possible to capture all aspects and dimensions in which people can participate in politics. Some are however limited, in that they discriminate against some aspects of participation as irregular or abnormal. We consider a few of them in what follows. While the following definition is seemingly restrictive:

(a)   Norman H. Nie and Sidney Verba assert that, 'Political participation refers to those legal activities by private citizens which are more or directly aimed at influencing the selection of government personnel and/or the actions they take.'

Let us take a briefdefinition of how some scholars view the meaning of political participation:

(a)   Samuel Huntington and Jorge Dominguez define it as 'The activity of private citizens designed to influence government decision making.'
(b)   H. McClosky further says that 'those voluntary activities by which members of society share in the selection of rulers and, directly or indirectly, in the formation of public policy.'
(c)   Also, the popular definition is that 'Political participation derives from the freedom to speak out, assemble and associate; the ability to take part in the conduct of public affairs; and the opportunity to register as a candidate, to campaign, to be elected and to hold office at all levels ofgovernment.'

What is of utmost important to contemporary study of political behaviour is that political participation can include both legal and illegal attempts to influence governmental decisions. It is concerned with influencing the composition and conduct, or personnel and policies. It is not limited to voting at elections but includes many other ways in which citizens try to influence governmental decisions. It is based on this that we discuss in what follows, the various dimensions that political participation can take in human society.

3.2   Scope of PoliticalParticipation

By scope of political participation, we mean those broad activities that political participation covers, or that can be regarded as forms of political participation. When people campaign for candidates during elections, or they attend constituency meetings or cast their ballot during voting period, we often consider their actions as political participation. Remember however, that not doing all these, or doing them for certain reasons are also forms of participation in politics. A renowned professor of philosophy, Jim Una once wrote that "even nothing is nothing" and a very popular slogan in party electioneering politics is that "failure to vote for a candidate is a ballot cast for the opponent of the candidate". Based on this logic, the scope of political participation shall be bi patterned: direct or action based, as well as indirect or attitude based political activities.

(a)   Direct or action based PoliticalActivities:

These activities refer to those that people deliberately engage in as standards of participation in politics. They include voting, attendance of meetings, campaigning, sponsorship of candidates, money and

material donation, attending rallies and committee meetings, etc. These actions are clear cut, and need no further interpretation before they are recognized as a form of political participation. Those who participate in them often defined political goals, even when they are not disclosed.

(b)   Indirect or Attitude Based Political Participation:

These refer to people's attitudes and dispositions that indirectly influence politics around them. This form of political participation is not necessarily clear cur, and it is often unclear if those who display them are aware of their impact as political participation. These attitudes include but are not limited to agitation, resistance, apathy, endorsement, docility, skepticism, cynicism, etc. Those who display résistance attitude towards politics for instance complement chance of leadership in extra electoral forms, while apathetic persons allow other citizens have field days fielding and electing their own candidates. If the apathetical person had voted, his vote only could make any difference in number, and he or she refuses to vote, the attitude displayed increases the chances of a candidate in opposition. This aspect is also covered by political participation.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (S.A.E.)

Discuss the possibility of political participation in view of party politics in Nigeria.

4.0   CONCLUSION

In conclusion, political participation is a concrete activity or behaviour, and not simply a psychological orientation or disposition as political culture and socialization. It refers to the totality of ways and means through which people react to and relate with issues in governance and politics. It is neither sacrosanct nor immutable, but its scope covers both direct (action based), and indirect (attitude based) participation.

5.0   SUMMARY

We have, in the above discussion, defined political participation from the legalist and liberal perspectives. We asserted that political participation covers both legal and anti-legal activities. After this we explored the scope of political participation. In specific terms, we identified two scopes: Please note that these are dimensions not levels or categories. Political participation still has dimensions and levels, and they will be addressed in other units.

6.0   TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

1.   Political participation is a concrete activity or behaviour.Do you agree?

2.   Explain the roles of socialisation in politicalparticipation.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Dowse, R and Hughes, J. (1972) Political Sociology, London, John Wiley.

Eesuola, O. (2011) Behavioral Approach to Political Protest: Analysis of FelaAnikulapoKuti, University of Lagos, Ph.D. Dissertation.

Lam, W. (2003) "Alternative Understanding of Political Participation: Challenging the Myth of Political Indifference in Hong Kong", International Journal of Public Administration, Vol. 26

Malbraith L. (1965) Political Participation, Chicago, Rand McNally.

McClosky H., (1968) "Political Participation", in International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, New York, Macmillan.

Nie, N. H. and Verba, S. (1975) "Political Participation", in Greenstein, F. and Polsby,
N. (eds.) Handbook of Political Science, Vol.4, Massachusetts, *Addison*-Wesley.

UNIT 2:LEVELS OF POLITICAL PARTICIPATION AND THEIR CORRESPONDING ACTIVITIES

1.0   Introduction

2.0   Objectives

3.0   MainContent

3.1   Gladiatorial politicalparticipation

3.2   Transitorily PoliticalParticipation

3.3   Spectatorial PoliticalParticipation

4.0   Conclusion

5.0   Summary

6.0   Tutor Marked Assignments

7.0   References/Further Reading

1.0   INTRODUCTION

Apart from the forms which center on the elucidation of attitudes as participating in politics, political participation can also transpire at various levels. Getting involved in political participation entails costs in time, energy and resources, yet individuals and groups differ in the amount of assets that they are able or willing to dedicate to political participation. Thus, while most people connect in one kind of political participation or another, not all persons are able to participate in politics to the same degree. In other words, participation of some people can be more holistic than others. Therefore, we shall focus on these levels of participation in this unit.

2.0   OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit students should be able to:

(i)   Understand that political participation occurs at differentlevels.
(ii)   Identify the different level of politicalparticipation.

3.0   MAINCONTENT

Lester Malbraith, (1965) categorized political participation at the spectator-level, the transitional level and the gladiatorial level. This unit shall use this categorisation in anti-climax, and will also attempt certain activities that are corresponding tothem.

3.1 Gladiatorial politicalparticipation

This is the highest level of political participation a man can attain in a society. People who participate at this level engage in activities such as presenting themselves as candidates for political offices, or holding the offices at particular times, getting financial grants from political parties for the purpose of elections, and politicking through caucus formations, faction formation or kitchen cabinet. Political participation at this level takes so much time and resources that those engaged in them hardly do other things aside politics. So, if you look around you today, those people like your country's president, governors, senators, presidential and gubernatorial aspirants as well as other very active political figures even at the local government levels, can be considered participants of politics at gladiatorial level. They can also be called members of the political class, and they constitute about 5 percent of the population of any political community.

3.2 Transitorial PoliticalParticipation

Transitorial political participation is next in hierarchy to the gladiatorial. Participants at this level often engage in activities that mostly facilitate ground forgladiatorial participants most likely with the hope of getting political appointment after their candidates are successful. People who participate at transitorial level are often very charismatic as much as gladiatorial participants, but due to lack of other political logistics such as money, zoning, godfathers' preferences (where they play active roles in politics), and such people may choose to work behind the scene. Major activities at the level of transitorial participation are meeting organization and attendance, communication, advocacy and campaigns, liaising with incumbent power, as well as making of monetary donations to candidates at the gladiatorial level.

3.3 Spectatorial PoliticalParticipation

Spectatorial political participation includes but is not limited to voting, attending campaign rallies, displaying party symbols and influencing friends and family to vote in certain direction. These are activities that every citizen is expected to engage in as civil responsibility, aside from those having some things at stake. This kind of participation is quite common amongst people. It is relatively less expensive in terms of time and resources, so, it a majoritarian kind of political participation.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (S.A.E.)

Explain the three levels of political participation as highlighted in this unit.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Our conclusion is that political participation is a diverse and complex process which embraces a wide range of activities. Lester Malbraith classified these activities into spectatorial, transitional and gladiatorial, each one unique to the population and class that are likely to engage in it. Specifically, majority of people participate at the spectatorial level because it is cheaper and less time demanding, then it flows up like that.

5.0 SUMMARY

Participation in politics comes at different levels. There are the spectatorial, transitorial and gladiatorial levels of political participation in every society, and each of the levels comes with its cost and

capabilities.

6.0   TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

1.   Use Lester Malbraith'sanalysis of categorization to explain the levels of politicalparticipation in United Kingdom and Nigeria.

7.0   REFERENCES/FURTHR READING

Dowse, R and Hughes, J. (1972) Political Sociology, London, John Wiley.

Lam, W. (2003) "Alternative Understanding of Political Participation: Challenging the Myth of Political Indifference in Hong Kong", International Journal of Public Administration, Vol. 26

Malbraith L. (1965) Political Participation, Chicago, Rand McNally.

McClosky H., (1968) "Political Participation", in International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, New York, Macmillan.

Nie, N. H. and Verba, S. (1975) "Political Participation", in Greenstein, F. and Polsby, N. (eds.) Handbook of Political Science, Vol.4, Massachusetts, *Addison*-Wesley.

UNIT 3:FACTORS AFFECTING POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

1.0   INTRODUCTION

In the previous unit we discussed profoundly on the issue of political participation and identified the different level scholars have made of it. Political participation however, does not just vary from level to level and dimension to dimension, certain factors determine these differences, and suchfactors are what provide explanation for why some people and countries engage in politics at different levels. More particularly, third world countries do not have the same number of people participating at transitorial level for instance, as one may get in advanced countries. The factors that determine this difference are what this unit will dwell upon.

2.0   OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit students will be able to:

(i)   Identify and analyze the factors behind variation in political participation across nations and among social groups within nations.
(ii)   Assess, in a more detailed and competent manner, the nature, sources and conditions of political participation in various politicalsystems.

3.0   MAINCONTENT
3.1   Factors Affecting PoliticalParticipation

The aim of this unit is to explain the five determinants of political participation, which are as follow:(i) political culture, (ii) institutional and electoral arrangement; (iii) party system, (iv) political leadershipand, (v) socio-economicstatus.

(a) Political Culture

Political culture includes 'the state of attitudes, beliefs emotions and values of society that relate to the political system and to political issues. Writers like Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba have attempted to explain participation and apathy in terms of national differences in political culture. Some countries are said to have participatory or participant cultures, and others subject or non-participatory cultures. Where cultures are participatory, citizens display great enthusiasm for politics, exhibit a high degree of pride in national political institutions and have a high sense of political efficacy and civic duty. Non-participatory or subject political cultures, on the other hand, foster attitudes of passivity, isolation, deference and citizen-withdrawal.

In their book, *The Civic Culture,* for example, Almond and Verba describe the United States of America and Britain as having participant culture, and Germany and Italy as having a largely non-participant or subject culture. It is, however, significant to note that a higher percentage of the electorate participate in voting in Italy, where voter turnout in the seventies was about 94 per cent, than in the United States, which had an average voter turnout of 54 percent in the same period. This suggests that there may be other factors, apart from political culture, which influence politicalparticipation.

(b) Institutional and ElectoralArrangements (I. E. A.)

Institutional and electoral arrangements have a significant impact on political participation, particularly voter turnout. An electoral system based on proportional representation, whereby all parties are represented in parliament in proportion to the number of votes they receive, encourages parties and candidates to mobilize voters everywhere and, therefore, increases voter turnout. On the other hand, however, the use of the majority or first -past - the - post system - which is based on single-member constituencies, with the party with the highest votes in a constituency winning the seat for that constituency - leads to an imbalance in the translation of votes into legislative seats and creates a disincentive to voting and Voterturnout.

A multi-party system, by encouraging coalition governments, gives elections a less decisive role in government formation and, consequently, depresses voter turnout. By the same token, a two-party system will tend to encourage voter participation. Unicameral legislative system, by providing a clearer link between electorates and legislation, encourages citizen participation. And because this link is relatively less visible in bicameral systems, participation in elections tends to be lower in such systems

Finally, mandatory voting laws induce increased voter turnout, while difficult eligibility or voting registration requirements dampen voter turnout. For example, countries like Australia, Belgium and Italy have laws that compel voting, as did the Netherlands until 1970. In the United States of America, on the other hand, electoral regulations requiring relatively stringent residency and other eligibility requirements have inhibited voter differently.

In other words, we have identified the impact of political culture and institutional and electoral arrangements on political participation. Participant political cultures tend to encourage greater citizen participation than subject cultures. Similarly, the proportional representation principle, two-party system, unicameralism and mandatory voting laws encourage the participation of citizens in voting. The first-past-the-post electoral system, multi-party system, bicameralism and difficult voting registration or eligibility requirements, on the other hand, discourage voterturnout.

3.2   Party System, Political Leadership and Socio-economic Status

(c)   The PartySystem

Political parties are extremely important in encouraging citizens to become politically active. In some countries, the party system presents rather drastic choices of policy, ideology and group benefits. In other countries, however, the parties do not offer sharply contrasting alternatives to voters. Where choices are sharply divergent and parties are clearly linked to particular groups, the stakes of participation are very high, and citizens are more likely to get politically involved.

Furthermore, some parties do make considerable efforts to get citizens to vote. In India and Mexico, for example, political parties, especially the governing parties, have often sent out trucks to round up voters in the rural areas. In many other nations, party officials make elaborate efforts to contact voters and to ensure that they actually vote. Because these party mobilization strategies are well developed in some nations, such as Austria and Netherlands, moderately developed in others, such as Western Germany and France, and quite weak in others, including most parts of Nigeria and the United States, voting turnout is shaped accordingly.

(d)   Political Leadership

Leaders or candidates with a particularly strong personal appeal can bring many apathetic or apolitical people into political activity. Dwight D. Eisenhower, a hero of the Second World War (1937-45), enjoyed such personal popularity or appeal in the United States in the 1950s. Julius Nyerere in Tanzania and Fidel Castro in Cuba are two charismatic leaders of developing countries who have mobilized their respective citizens into often intermittent, and sometimes sustained, political activity.

(e)   Socio-Economic Status(SES)

Studies have repeatedly shown that better-educated, wealthier and occupationally- skilled citizens are more likely, on the average, to develop participant attitudes. These citizens invariably tend to be more politically enlightened, more attentive to political information, more politically efficacious and better able to make use of opportunities for participation, than less socio-economically privileged citizens. In short, better off citizens tend to be the most active in politics. This tendency is, however, less pronounced in voting participation and far more visible in the forming of pressure groups to influence governmental decisions. This lecture has, however, concentrated more on voting participation than any other form of political participation because voting is the simplest and most common form of participation in virtually all political systems.

In conclusion, we should note that there are many factors, other than the five discussed in this lecture, that affect political participation. Some of these other factors can be stated as follows: sex (men are more likely to participate in politics than women), residence (the longer a person resides in a given community, the greater the likelihood of his participation in politics), location (urban dwellers tend to be more active in politics than rural dwellers) and social involvement (those who participate in trade-union or voluntary activities are more likely to participate in politics than those who do not take part in such activities).

SELF ASSESMENT EXERCISE (SAE)

Write notes on all these and state their relevant tothe development of political institutions in Africa. (i)

The Party System (ii) Political Leadership (iii) Socio-Economic Status (SES)

4.0   CONCLUSION

There are many factors affecting political participation. This unit has focused on five of these factors, namely political culture, institutional and electoral arrangements, the party system, political leadership and socio-economic status. Essentially, political participation will be higher in political systems where a participant, as distinct from subject, political culture prevails, where institutional and electoral arrangements compel or induce participation, where parties make efforts to mobilize voters and are ideologically and socially differentiated, and where the political leadership is charismatic. Furthermore, participation tends to be higher among higher-status than lower-status groups. A number of other factors, apart from the five enunciated above, which also affect levels of participation, particularly among social groups, can include: sex, residence location and social involvement.

5.0   SUMMARY

This unit has attempted to show the impact of the party system, political leadership and socio-economic status on political participation. It has also very briefly identified the role of such other factors as sex, residence, location, and social involvement. Apart from the relevant sections of Almond and Powell's book referred to in the last section, you will also find a useful and exhaustive discussion of the factors affecting political participation in chapter nine of *Political Sociology* by Dowse and Hughes.

6.0   TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)
1.   Assess how party systems and political leadership determine politicalparticipation.

2.   Discuss the major factors that affect politicalparticipation in Nigeria.

7.0   REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Almond. G, and Verba, S. (1965) The Civic Culture, Boston, Little Brown.

Almond, G. andBinghamPowellG.Jr.(1984) (eds.)ComparativePoliticsToday:AWorld View, Boston, LittleBrown.

Lam, W (2003) "Alternative Understanding of Political Participation: Challenging the Myth of Political Indifference in Hong Kong", in International Journal of Public Administration, Vol. 26.

Malbraith L. (1965) Political Participation, Chicago, Rand McNally.

McClosky, (1968) "Political Participation", in, International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, New York, Macmillan.

Nie, N. H. and Verba, S. (1975) "Political Participation", In, Greenstein, F. and Polsby,
N. (eds.) Handbook of Political Science, *Vol.4.* Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley.

Robert W. J. (1987) "Political Institutions and Voter Turnout in The industrial Democracies" American Political Science Review, Vol. 81.

UNIT 4:DIMENSIONS OF POLITICAL PARTICIPATION (DPP)

1.0   INTRODUCTION

Discussions in unit 3 above led us to the topic to be learnt in this unit 4. Therefore, it is very vital to recall that you have learnt the definition, scope as well as factors that determine political participation among the actors or participants from the grassroots to the apex. This having being done, it is also important to discuss the dimensions that political participation can take in human societies. Political participation is another way of expressing human relations with politics. Take note that these dimensions are not to be taken as type of political participation, rather, whether at the level of gladiator or spectator that basically typifies political participation, any of the dimensions to be discussed here can be dominant.

2.0   OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit students should be able to do the following:

(i)   Distinguish between forms and dimensions of politicalparticipation;
(ii)   Identify and explain dimensions of politicalparticipation;
(iii)   Compare and contrast each dimension of political participation; and
(iv)   Be able to explain the dimension of political participation between you and your colleagues.

3.0   MAIN CONTENT

In the past, behaviouralists regard political participation mostly as those legal activities that are permitted by the state for the citizens to use in influencing leadership, governance and politics within the states. They even seem to assert, almost sacrosanct, that political participation only occurs in a democratic setting. But Lam, W. (2003) has asserted that "Political participation refers to lawful and unlawful activities of supports, making demands, debates and other forms of expression communicated verbally or through the media, and targeted at the rulers. He adds that it also includes "activities that are designed to pose challenges to existing rules, norms and practices"

Examining it from the issues which we have been discussing from the previous modules and units, political participation is not necessarily those actions that are legal, violent or non-violent, electoral or not electoral, as some scholars attempted to confine it. Rather, it is a variety of attitudes that an individual or some groups decide to use to act or react to politics and policies. Methods of political participation are unlimited, and they often depend on several factors on ground. This is probably why KayodeEesuola's study of the political protest of FelaAnikulapoKuti of Nigeria concludes that

Actions of political protest may take several dimensions, ranging from street march, strike, writing, law suite, song, self-immolation, suicide bombing and so on; all depending on the socialization, ideological worldview, exposure and skills of the protester, as well as the prevailing socio-political environment.

To address this complex issue of political participation and its dimensions, we shall, in this unit, have three radically opposingclassifications.

However, one main concern is whether people can have two or more, or even mixed dimension. While it is true that we cannot box human beings to a particular sacrosanct description, what we often do is identify the dimension that is dominant, or that constantly occurs in a man, and then identify the man with it. In other words, the dimension of a man's political participation is nothing from the dominant one among other that may be traceable to theman.

Furthermore, the following shall be examined briefly:Conservative versus Radical PoliticalParticipation and Active/Passive PoliticalParticipation.

3.1   Conservative versus Radical PoliticalParticipation

We can perceive political participation from these two opposing dimensions. Conservative participation has to do with adhering strictly and unquestionably to the laws and the way it prescribes that people should participate, often with very poor or no understanding on the part of the participant. It has been constantly argued that law and rules in any society are often crafted in the interest of the dominant class though, yet, a conservative participant follows them almost with malice aforethought. For instance, some countries' constitutions make voting a compulsory civic responsibility, a norm which demands that people support the policies of government because they are made in the interest of all: and it is patriotic to mount national flag and sing national anthem, and so on. In the reverse however, radical political participation is what you get where participants do not accept laws and abide by rules without deliberately querying them. In this case, voting is a civic responsibility but radical participant will not

vote where he perceives something wrong. Policies of government may only be respected to the extent that they serve public interests, national flags and national anthems may be turned down where political circumstances so demand. This dimension of political participation is radical.

3.2   Active/Passive PoliticalParticipation

By active political participation we mean deliberate participation in political activities with vested interest. Attending a campaign rally to support a candidate or gain political knowledge, campaigning and voting for the purpose of ensuring victory for a candidate, attending town and constituency meetings and other forms of involvement in political activities can all be regarded as active political participation. Passive political participation, in the reverse, will refer to withdrawal from all active participations as highlighted above, getting to the stage of skepticism, cynicism and apathy due to political disappointment, refusing to act politically in time, and, in the extreme, becoming apolitical. This is based on the philosophy that even nothing is something, that is, not participating at all, or participating in ways not active are still dimensions of participation.

3.3   Aggressive versus Non AgressivePoliticalParticipation

This is the third dimension in which we can perceive political participation. Some people are, due to socialization and other factors, often more quickly disposed to aggressive attitude to politics, than others. Such people believe that actions such as riots, demonstration rallies, arson, terrorism and even revolution are the best ways of handling political issues. The self-immolation of Benzuazi of Tunisia in 2010 was an extreme example of aggressive political participation. In the contrary, some people prefer non-aggressive ways such as campaigning, street talks, writing letters, debates, sit-ins, hunger strike and so on. Gandhi of India and King Junior of the United States are revered as advocates of non-violentnon-aggressive political participation, especially protest. GaniFawehinmi and FelaAnikulapoKuti also are.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (SAE)

Narrate the core argument of conservative versus radical political participation.

4.0   CONCLUSION

Finally, political participation does not only refer to concrete human activities, but also to their psychological orientation or disposition. It refers to the totality of ways and means through which people react to and relate with issues in governance and politics. It is neither sacrosanct nor immutable. Rather, it flows in different dimensions depending of several factors that colour the personality of participant.

5.0   SUMMARY

We have, in the above discussion, asserted that political participation comes in three radically opposing dimensions namely, the Conservative versus Radical Political Participation, the Active versus Passive Political Participation, and Aggressive versus non-Aggressive Political Participation. Please note that these are dimensions, not levels or categories ofparticipation.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

1. 'Some people are, due to socialization and other factors, often more quickly disposed to aggressive attitude to politics, than others.' Discuss.
2. What are the three dimensions to political participation? Discuss two of them.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Lam, W. (2003) "Alternative Understanding of Political Participation: Challenging the Myth of Political Indifference in Hong Kong" in International Journal of Public Administration, Vol.26.

Eesuola, O. (2011) Behavioral Approach to Political Protest: Analysis of FelaAnikulapoKuti University of Lagos Ph.D. Dissertation.

Malbraith L. (1965) Political Participation, Chicago, Rand McNally.

McClosky, H. (1968) "Political Participation", In, International Encyclopedia of the social sciences, New York Macmillan.

UNIT 5: Political Participation and Democracy (PPD)

CONTENT
1.0 Introduction

3.0 Objectives

3.3 Main Content

3.4 The Meaning and Nature of Political Participation Concept

3.5 Types of Political Participation

3.6 Determination of Political Participation

3.7 Level of Political Participations in Nigeria

3.8 Political Culture, Socialization and Political Participation as a Major Attribute to Effective Democratic Culture in Nigeria

4.0 Conclusion

5.0 Summary

6.0 Tutor Marked Assignment

7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0. INTRODUCTION

Political participation and democratic culture in Nigeria as an idea is one thatridden with grievances and terror of seclusion, hence, the resist for fundamental power by diverse ethnic groups. This resist affects electoral activities negatively in the area of mismanagement for example, rigging, vote buying and other political electoral violence, which can be seen in party politics in Nigeria. Democratic culture in Nigeria or in other countries to a large extent determines their political participation. Thus, the development culture is dependent in the existence of a modern state that can protect the right of its citizens and extract duties from them. A culture of democracy must reflect the norms and values that place the best on the freedom of individuals from state abuse and infringement of right by the law as well as providing opportunity for all citizens to have equal right to the material and cultural resources that guarantee their basic livelihood. The essence of democracy is that citizens must be able to show their views through unrestrained debates from the lower level and smallest units and that there should be active citizen participation in government and the governed.

2.0. OBJECTIVES
At the end of the unit, the students should be able to:

(i)   Understand meaning and nature of political participation in Nigeria.
(ii)   Evaluate types of political participation

3.0.   MAIN CONTENT

3.1 The Meaning and Nature of Political Participation Concept

Political participation is defined as those political activities of citizens, either as individuals or group intended or designed to influence the political process in the country. It is the real involvement of the citizens to either influence directly or indirectly the ways and method of governance or more specifically the output or outcomes of the political process. Thus, Ikelegbe asserts that political participation is firstly all political activities. The activity is directed as selecting rules influencing the decisions of government and the ways government governs, secondly, characters of political participation is that, it is voluntary. Therefore, Political participation refers to the voluntary activities by which members of a political community share in leadership selection and policy formation. Alakpi posits that political apathy refers to a state of withdrawal from or in different political action or activities.

According to Okafor political participation are activities of the citizens aimed at influencing the political processes, such participation could be either in an individual or group basis. Milbrath further put it that political participation are those activities or actions by private individuals by which they seek to influence and support the government and politics. They went further to add that political participation observed in an individual can be seen as a result of different reasons or influenced by different factors. Political participation could be referred to those voluntary activities by which members of a society have a share in the selection of rulers and directly or indirectly have a role in the formation of public policy.

These activities usually include voting, seeking information, discussing and propelling, attending meeting, contributing financially and communication with representative on the view, that active forms of participation include formal enrolment in a party, canvassing and registering voter's speed writing and working in campaigns and also competing for public and party offices. Political participation as an ingredient of every polity whether large or small whether the society is an oligarchy or democracy someone must make political decision and appoint, uphold and move leaders. In the ultimate analysis, political participation means a process of influencing the authoritative allocation of values for a society, which may not take place through governmental decision. Political participation can be analyzed from both the broader and narrower angles. In its broad conception we are interested in a variety of way in which citizens participate in relation to varied issued. In particular we do not limit our concern to citizen's participation in electoral process through voting and campaigns. It is because political participation does not take place only during election time, nor is participation at election time, the most effective way of major means of the citizen's control over government officials; they are rather blunt instrument of control. For an individual or for a particular group of citizens the most important political activities may be those in the period between, when citizen try to influence government decision in relation of specific problem that concern them. Political participation in modern democratic society like Nigeria should have well-established legal opportunities for political activities. They include the right to vote in meaningful election. The right to associate with political parties and other politically relevant groups, the right to petition government and the general auxiliary right of freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and

freedom of press. Participation when and if effectively has a particular crucial relation to all other social and political goals. It represents a process by which goals. Choosing priorities and deciding the process of the goal attainment. It not only communicates the need and desire of the citizen to the government; but also has other more direct benefits. Participation has also been viewed as an educational device through which civic virtues are learnt. Thus, Ikelegbe points that, where the scope and intensity of voluntary participation is high, inputs into the highly participatory citizenry could vote out such government because alienated and resort to non- conventional models of participation. Political participation is underscored by the values which most political system, regime and ideologies place on it. In any liberal democracy wide spread participation is a prized value.

3.3   Types of Political Participation:
Ikelebgbe argued that political participation is classified into election related and non-election related. Election related political participation involved the electoral process or activities which provided enormous opportunities for political participation to great number of the citizenry, electoral participation involves registration voting campaign meeting, party meeting, party funding and contest for elective office. In this view electoral relation effectively been carried out. Non-election related participatory activities include contacting political leaders, expressing politics, opinion and demands, community development activities. In a political society some individual involvement in political matters are autonomous while in others it could be induced. Politics in many developing nation likeNigeria is usually mobilized or induced. In other society, political participation is usually autonomous. Autonomous participation refers to those action or activities that are generated by the actors themselves, which aimed to influence governmental action and authoritative allocation of values. Induced or mobilized participation are those activities or actions that are initiated by a different person or group of persons than the actors, which are aimed at influencing decisions of government. Alternatively, induced or mobilized participation are those activities that are initiated outside the person or group of persons that would actually act in order to influence government decisions.

3.4   Determination of Political Participation
The socio-economic characteristics of an individual assumption is that the better off economically and socially a man is the more likely he will possess the skills, opportunities and motivation necessary for an active movement in the political process in the society. It has been observed that participation tends to be higher among the best-educated members of thehigher occupational and income groups, the middle aged, the dominant ethnic and religious group, men (as compared to women), urban dwellers and members of the voluntary association. Education offers high and reliable correlation with participation-party because it helps develop a sense of civic duty, political competence, interest and responsibility as well as personality traits of self-confidence, articulateness and dominance. The educational institutions themselves serve as the setting in which the skills of participation are acquired.

Political participation is purely determined by education, because political participation is closely related but conceptually different. Some people who have very little schooling are never knowledgeable about politics. Having said that, the point being made is that educated people generally have politically relevant knowledge and skills, they are more conscious and interested in politics and have opinion on issue and public officials, more importantly, they have more confidence in their ability to participate or influence decision making. In many cases, poverty effect political participation.

Among poor people in many countries, it creates a sort of apathy to politics. But if people are pre-occupied with meeting their basic needs, of shelter and clothing, it is difficult to expect them to organize

effectively for political action. In the view of Davis, he asserted that, the person who must concentrate all his energy merely on staying alive is in no passively with politics, policy decision or their implementation. Social and economic factors are fundamental to political participation, socio-economic variables account for differences in political activities formed in the following assumption that "the higher of a person's social state, the more likely he will be an active participant. In political life, people in the upper class tend to be more interested and involved in public affairs than the middle- and lower-class individuals on the other hand, people in the lower class tend to be more apathetic to political activities. Though it does not mean that poor people are politically different and rich persons are politically active. To see why social stains and politics are related in the foregoing manner, let us consider the components of a person social class. Conventional class position is determined by factors such as income, education, occupation and place of residence among others. Each of these factors effects a person's political participation. For instance, the higher a person's income, the more likely he will be interested and involve in politics. Having money, for instance, usually gives a person free time, bags of information in the form of magazines and newspapers, broader ones experience through participation in organization and club accords status and runoff offices. Raynolds supplied the requisites for an active political life and why lower-class people participate less than upper class. Social status of people determines the process in which political participation took place, thus their states facilities social and political interaction.

Psychological Factor: Character of individual's participation survives by virtue of its capacity to provide for those who are engaged in it. Political observers have variously attributed man's political activities to his need to power competition, achievements, affiliation, aggression, money, prestige, status, recognitions, approval, manipulation sympathy and responsibility. In addition to active versus passive distinction, participation may be classified in terms of its goals i.e, instrumental political activities are primarily oriented towards concrete goals such as party victory, enhancement of one's own state, influence or income on the other hand consummator rather than an instrumental act for those who are careless about the outcome of election. Milbrath agreed that personality tracts, which particularly influenced by social learning (such as positively associated with political participation). It is possible to distinguish participant from non-participants by such cognitive variable as belief in an individual's own adequately and in the amenability of the social order to change. Thus, the psychological variables accounted for political participation by individual in the society in psychological characteristics determined the level of participation.

3.4   Level of Political Participations in Nigeria: In Nigeria because of the nature of political system, only a few proportions gave attention to or display interest while majority are indifferent none opining and not interested. Most of them may participate only in election, lapsing into activity in believing in election mostly because of non-proper education of the people politically and also lack of critical information on political issues not reached to the people and therefore little or no interest in many issues, only few proportion gives attention to or display interest while larger majority are apathy to political participation.

Thus, majority of the citizenry are not effectively represented in terms of the contribution of their aspirations, demands, preference and orientations. For instance, one would believe that if people start writing on newspapers and commenting on radio asking their representatives like governors, senators' members of house and others what they are doing to and how are they representing them. It is important to state that there will be a change and the response to the people demand will be higher.

Consequently, government may not be responsive to the preferences of the majority of the citizenry, particularly the poor disadvantaged lower social status and young women etc. Although, public may tend

to unduly favour the rich and the middle class.

3.5 Political Culture and Political Participation as a most important feature to successful Democratic Culture in Nigeria: The component of the state comprises of the government, territory and citizenry. These are the most important component and itcontributes to the state social context. The citizen's behaviour determines to a large extent the nature of the state, its survival, the nature of government and the political, economic and social process in the state. The citizenry makes inputs, objections,preferences, change, information, reaction to information, values, judgment and compliances among others. These inputs disposethe outputs of government. The nature of the citizen's inputs, responds and reaction is determined by the political culture,the effectiveness of political socialization agent and political participation. The political culture determines the politicalbehaviour, patterns, standard and values that the citizenry in the political process and the nature of the citizens politicalactivities and responses. Participation is again conditional by political culture and socialization.

Political Culture: Political culture refers to attitude, beliefs, values and affections that are consciously held or implicit in a society in relation to its political process. Political culture refers to a people's dominant orientation towards politics. The orientation refers to the attitude beliefs and values held in relation to seats, structures, the political authority, major politics and issues. The way the citizens related to the state in terms of level of participation, political activities and efficiency or lyricism, level of trust or mistrust of leadership, level of compliance loyalty allegiance, patriotism etc are all elements of and are governed by the political culture. In other words, political culture determines the political culture ethos of what is acceptable, prohibited and sanctioned in a nation's political process.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (SAE)
What are the roles of citizens in political participation in Nigeria in recent time?

4.0. Conclusion:

Democratic culture of any country determines their political participation. Thus, the development of culture is dependent on the existence of a modern state that can protect the right of its citizen. A culture of democracy must reflect on norms and values that place a premium on the freedom of individuals.

5.0. SUMMARY

In this unit, we have examined the role of citizens in political participation in Nigeria and the factors that galvanise them to be active during elections and non-election process in Nigeria and elsewhere. We have also studied political culture, level of participation in elections and to sum it up, the determination of political participation among the citizens in Nigeria in the 21st century.

6.0. TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMAs)
(1)   Discuss the roles of culture in political participation in Nigeria.
(2)   Explain what you understand by election and non-election political participation.

7.0.   References/Further Readings.

Alapiki, A.E., 2000. Politics and Government in Nigeria Published by Co-operative Impression Owerri.

Almond, A.G. and P.J. Bingham, 1996. Coparative politics a Development Approach Borton Brown and Co.

Almond and Verbas, 1963. The Civic Culture, Princeton University press.

Cokey, 1987. Report of Political Bureau, Lagos.

Coleman, J.S., 1985. Nigeria Background to Nationalism Berkley University of California Press.

Dudley, B.J., 1973. Instability and political order and Crisis in Nigeria. Ibadan University.

Edike, T., 1999. AV/APP Protest in Anambra State Vanguard March 1st.

Horns, A.S., 1995. Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary of Current English Now Delhi Oxford University Press.

Ikelegbe, A.O., 1995. Politics and Government: An Introduction and Comparative Perspective Curf Publishing Limited Edo State.

Ikeku, E.U., 1981. Self-Reliance: African Survival, Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publisher.

Mba, C.C., 2001. Government and Politics and Modern Nigeria First Published Nigeria Limited Enugu.

Nnamani, L.I., 2005. Fundamental Political Science, Enugu:

Nwankwo, A.A. Can Nigeria Survive, Enugu Fourth Dimension Publishers.

Offiong, D., 1986. Imperialism and Dependency, Enugu Fourth Dimension.

Okafor, C.U. and M.I. Okeke, 2002. Political Culture inNigeria Perspective Academic Publishing Company Enugu.

Olu, B., 1966-1970. The Tragic Years, Nigeria in Crisis Published by the Cape Cooperation Benin City (1973).

Reynolds, H.T., 1974. Politics and Common Man. Home wood Union Dorsey Emergent Africa Nation, Princeton University Press.

MODULE 4: Characteristic of Elections

Introduction
This module is as important as the other ones in the sense that it examines the characteristics of election and the role which elections play in politics. It also provides details of elections and its approaches. The determinants of electoral election are not left out in order to make it robot for better understanding for the students of political science. Lastly, in unit 5, elections and party politics in Nigeria are profoundly re-examined from the first republic. How parties were formed and the roles of the first nationalists in Nigeria, to the period when the minority groups began to form and took active roles in the middle belt and south-south of Nigeria.

Unit 1: Meanings and Characteristics of Election

Unit 2: Functions of Elections

Unit 3: Approaches to the Study ofElections

Unit 4: Determinants of Electoral Behaviour

Unit 5: Elections and Party Politics in Nigeria

UNIT 1:ELECTION: DEFINITIONS AND CHARACTERISTICS

1.0   Introduction

2.0   Objectives

3.0   Main Content

3.1   Definitions of Elections

3.2   Characteristics of Election

4.0   Conclusion

5.0   Summary

6.0   Tutor Marked Assignments

7.0   References/Further Reading

1.0   INTRODUCTION

The central concern of this unit is to acquaint the student with the concept of election and some other basic issues that surround it. The unit is divided into meanings and characteristics. Under meanings we examine some definitions of the concept in order to provide you with broad views. Under the characteristics we discuss the political circumstances and situations that can produce elections

2.0   OBJECTIVES

The students should be able to do the following at the end of thisunit:

(i)   have an adequate insight into the meaning ofelections; and
(ii)   have good knowledge of the kind of political process used inelection

3.0   MAINCONTENT

3.1   Definitions ofElections

Although elections are fundamental and very common in modern political discourse and there is hardly any dispute about their meaning. They have, like many other social science concepts, been discussed from several perspectives. In what follows we shall consider some of the definitions as stated by scholars.

A good one to begin with is the definition by R. Dowse and J. Hughes (1972) who assert that:

> Elections are one type of social mechanism, amongst others, for aggregating preferences of a particular kind. An election is, therefore, a procedure recognized by the rules of an organization, be it a state, a club, a voluntary organization or whatever, where all, or some, of the members choose a smaller number of persons to hold an office, or offices, of authority within that organization.

By analysis, this definition assumes that every political organization is democratic, and goes through the mechanism of elections in arriving at the smaller number of leaders that hold her offices. It is quite easy to describe this definition as impressionistic and hastily generalizing, considering the fact that it was given in 1972 when only about forty two percent of world's nations were democratic and produced their leaders through elections.

Ball, A. (1977) can be accused of similar thing based on his definition that:

> elections are the means by which the people choose and exercise some degree of control over their representatives.

This simply suggests that wherever people are chosen to lead other people, the mechanism used is election.

3.2   Characteristics ofElections

It is quite important for the behavioral scientist to clarify that to the extent that there are many forms of political system, ranging from monarchy, to totalitarianism, election is not, and cannot be the only way of choosing political leaders. The work however, is made easier as it limits the scope of elections to government at the level of the state. We shall discuss the circumstances of election in government in the following part.

Electoral System: Elections often hold under clearly defined electoral system.

Suffrage: The electorate does not generally include the entire population; for example, many countries prohibit those judged mentallyincompetent from voting, and all jurisdictions require a minimum age for voting. While in Nigeria the voting age is 18, in other countries it is sixteen.

Used in Democracy: Because democracy is often regarded as government of the people by the people and for the people, election is often the main mechanism used to endure that leadership is arrived at based on the wish of the people. Under democracy, election often means majority, mostly in number and sometimes in agreed forms of representation. In democratic systems, elections are based on certain electoral systems that are products of the evolution and history of the society. In the electoral system voting pattern, vote counting and winner declaration are the main issue. While we can have major electoral systems as proportional and majoritarian, other ones include party-listproportional representation, additional member system, First Past the Post (otherwisecalled relative majority) and absolutemajority.

Used in Constitutional Monarchy: Elections are also used in constitutional monarchies where leadership is not arrived at through voting, but heredity, but, at the same time, operations of leaders are subjected to certain constitutional provisions. Elections in this type of political arrangement may not therefore necessarily follow any of the identified electoral systems

Periodicity Elections come periodically. While in certain countries they are held every four years as in the United States and Nigeria, other countries use five or six years. Nigeria at present is proposing six years single term for political office holders. Whatever it is, the period of elections is often also contained in a government's constitution.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (SAE)

(i)   Define elections from your understanding in this unit.

(ii)   What are the roles of election in politics?

4.0   CONCLUSION

Whichever way it is defined, what is certain is that elections are the means by which a wider body of persons chooses a smaller group of representatives to undertake specified tasks, and though it takes place in a wide array of human organizations governmental and non-governmental, elections are used mainly in democratic system and constitutional democracies. It also has certain characteristics, some of which are suffrage and electoralsystem.

5.0   SUMMARY

We have discussed the concept of elections, highlighted some definitions and restricted our scope to the governmental aspect. We also identified certain characteristics and conditions under which elections operate.

6.0   TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

1.   Compare and contrast two of the definitions of elections providedabove.

2.   Evaluate some characteristics and conditions surroundingelections.

7.0   REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Ball, A. (1977) Modern Politics and Government, London, Macmillan.

Denis, L. C. (1983) "Elections and Election Studies in Africa", in YolamuBarongo (ed.) Political Science in Africa: A Critical Review, London, Zed.

Dowse, R. and Hughes, J. (1972) Political Sociology, London, John Wiley and Sons. Mueller, D. (1996)

Constitutional Democracy, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Nie, N. and Verba, S. (1975) "Political Participation", in Greenstein, F. and Polsby, N (eds.) Handbook of Political Science Vol.4. Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley.

UNIT 2: FUNCTIONS OF ELECTION

1.0   Introduction

2.0   Objectives

3.0   MainContent
3.1   Functions of Elections

4.0   Conclusion

5.0   Summary

6.0   Tutor Marked Assignments

7.0   References/Further Reading

1.0   INTRODUCTION

As it been clearly seen from the definitions and characteristics given in the past units, it is quite obvious that elections play a number of consistent roles in the political systems. We shall discuss some of these roles in this unit, doing so under the assumption that a political system is a democratic political system.

2.0   OBJECTIVES

The students are expected in this unit to do the following:

(a)   Understand the various functions of election in a politicalsystem;
(b)   Understand why democratic systems work with fewer contradictions compared to non democraticones.

3.0   MAINCONTENT

3.1   Functions ofElections

(a)   Political Recruitment

Elections provide people of a political community with the opportunity to vote and be voted for in the process of choosing representatives in government. This process is systematized, and it provides, at least in theory, platform for fair participation of many people. Perhaps without elections, only one family or clique will dominate political offices in a political community.

(b)   Peaceful Transfer ofPower

This systematization of recruitment process in elections is open and competitive, and therefore promises to eliminate unwarranted grudges and agitation. This means thatelections provide the basis for the orderly

and peaceful transfer of power in a political system. It facilitates crisis free political succession if the rules guiding it are followed.

(c)   InterestArticulation

During elections people are able to articulate their political interest either as individual candidates were allowed by the constitution, or as representative of a political party. Interest articulation is a very vital aspect of the workings of a political system.

(d)   InterestAggregation

As political interests and preferences differ in politics, elections help to aggregate them in political communities. It is through elections that the views and opinions of people are organized, translated and consolidated into definitive electoral choices and mandates that will eventually produce leaders and representatives at different levels.

(e)   Enhancement of PoliticalEquality.

Elections are very good means of bringing together the rich and the poor before the ballot box, making them equal at least for that moment, in their duties of politics. But for a mechanism like elections, the poor may never have any opportunity to mix up with the rich at all, especially in highly stratified societies.

(f)   Citizens' Control ofGovernment

The major role which elections play is to provide means and mechanisms through which the people who are governed can influence the ways those who govern them conduct themselves. It is one sure way among "violence, in the form of riots and political assassination, and the exercise of pressure groups influence" through which, as Dowse and Hughes (1972) puts it, "the governors arecontrolled".

(g)   Sense of PoliticalCommunity

Elections help to integrate people into a strong sense of community spirit through the interaction it provides. This can assist people in ameliorating contradictions such as ethnicity, religious dichotomy and indigene settler rivalry as we have in Nigeria and other parts of the world.

(i)   Extra Party-PoliticalParticipation

Elections often provide the opportunity for people outside political parties to participate in the political system, while enabling the government to lay claim to some degree of popular support or legitimacy. This is particularly so in one-party states where competitionforelectiveoffices are dominatedandevencontrolledbytheonlypoliticalparty, and where the people merely support candidates chosen, or reject him or her if they like. They alone do not have direct choice.

(j)   Political Communication

Conduct of elections also ensures political communication between the citizens and those who govern them. People of a country, during electioneering campaigns have ample opportunities to ask their leaders how they have governed them over years. Without this kind of opportunity, governance will be

esoteric and surreptitious, and democracy will be reduced to conspiracy.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (SAE)

(i)   Have you ever cast your vote in any political elections conducted in Nigeria? Why did you voted or not voted?

(ii)   Elections in Nigeria have lived up to its functions and expectations. Do you agree?

4.0 CONCLUSION

Elections play all sorts of roles in development of a people and their nation. People are developed by means of interaction within themselves and their leaders, and as a result of this, there is likely to be strong national bond that may translate to political and even economic development of thesystem.

5.0 SUMMARY

Elections as a means by which representatives are chosen to perform specified tasks by, and on behalf of a wider body of persons has some functions in the political society of man. These functions include intra people development and people- government relation as detailed in the above highlights.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

1.   Discusstheroles elections play in developing political attitudes of   people in any society.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Ball, A. (1977) Modern Politics and Government, London, Macmillan.

Denis, L. C. (1983) "Elections and Election Studies in Africa", in YolamuBarongo (ed.) Political Science in Africa: A Critical Review, London, Zed.

Dowse, R. and Hughes, J. (1972) Political Sociology, London, John Wiley and Sons. Mueller, D. (1996)

Constitutional Democracy, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Nie, N. and Verba, S. (1975) "Political Participation", in Greenstein, F. and Polsby, N (eds.) Handbook of Political Science Vol.4. Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley.

UNIT 3: APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF ELECTIONS

1.0   INTRODUCTION

There is a wide variety of approaches to the study of election. The following ones, however, identified by Denis Cohen postulation have been quite dominantly used by many behavioral scientists.Therefore; in this unit variety of election approaches shall be examined.

2.0   OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit students should be able to, among other things:

(i)   Understand some popular methodological approaches to the study ofelections;
(ii)   Compare and contrast these methodological approaches for use in practical political analysis

3.0   MAINCONTENT

3.1   The Case-StudyApproach

This methodological approach 'relies on intensive case studies of small areas - a single constituency, town or district - in order to obtain a clearer picture of mass reaction to, and participation in the elections'. This approach is quite popular in electoral studies but because it studies particular case in

time, it often focuses on a single constituency of region, and the researcher may, in the process, gloss over important linkages between the case studied and the wider system. The case study approach is also susceptible to excessive emphasis on the cultural history and ecology of the local arena, rendering the electoral contest itself downgraded. In addition, conclusions reached from the case study approach may suffer adequate capacity for general applicability since they are often not generated from empirical premises.

3.2   The NuffieldApproach

Named in line with the Oxford University' Nuffield College which has played an important role in encouraging research into elections in Britain as well as in Africa, this approach focuses on the wider national political and historical contexts of elections, making attempt to examine key issues in elections, number and nature of the political parties in elections, nature of electioneering campaigns, as well as background peculiarities of the parties, constituencies, and candidates involved in elections. This approach however tends to overlook developments, events and sentiments below the national centre of government, such as in single constituencies, towns or rural areas where elections are held. The case study approach is not known to have such limitation orchallenge.

3.3   The SystemApproach

The main distinction of this approach is that it is primarily concerned with the functional impact of the election on the wider political system than with the election itself. In other words, the System Approach focuses essentially on the structural unction-such as political legitimacy, recruitment and communication - which an electoral event may perform for a given political system, rather than on the autonomous importance of the electoral evenitself.

3.4   The Sample SurveyApproach

This approach relies heavily on quantitative techniques and is based on the use of sample surveys or the collection and analysis of electoral data derived from a small, but very representative sector of a wider population. Taking its roots from the behavioral revolution in the United States of America, the sample survey approach is highly scientific and in terms of generating reliable generalizations, compared to, say, the Nuffield or the Case-Study approach. This is because sample survey is based on empirical values. The approach however requires quite enormous material and human resources that may be luxury to many poor countries. This has been widely considered as its mainweakness.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (SAE)

Discuss the strengths and limitations of the four election approaches in Nigeria political system from 1999 to 2018.

4.0   CONCLUSION

We can conclude that although many approaches to electoral studies there are**,** the Case Study, Nuffield, System and Sample Survey as identified by Denis Cohen, are quite common. Each of these four approaches has it strengths and limitations and researchers should consider ecology and other contextual factors before choosing any of them. Student may particularly read Denis Cohen's

contribution on 'Elections and Election Studies in Africa for detailed understanding of these issues. Details of the book are given in the references below.

5.0   SUMMARY

We have discussed four major approaches to electoral studies in this unit. They are the Case Study Approach, the Nuffield Approach, the System Approach and Sample Survey Approach. These four approaches emphasize respectively the national political and historical context of an election, the intensive investigation and analysis of elections in small areas, the use of quantitative techniques for collecting and analyzing electoral data, and the examination of the functional consequences of an electoral event for the total political system.

6.0   TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

1.   Critically discuss the four methodological approaches to electoral studies as identifiedby DenisCohen.

7.0   REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Alan R. Ball, (1977) Modern Politics and Government, London, Macmillan.

Denis L. C. (1983). "Elections and Election Studies in Africa", in YolamuBarongo (ed.) Political Science in Africa: A Critical Review, London, Zed

Dowse, R. and Hughes, J. (1972) Political Sociology, London, John Wiley and Sons.

Rowe, E. (1969) Modern Politics: An Introduction to Behaviour and Institutions, London, Rout-ledge and Kegan Paul.

Mueller, D. (1996) Constitutional Democracy, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Nie, N. and Verba, S. (1975). "Political participation", in Greenstein, and Polsby, N (eds.) Handbook of Political Science Volume 4. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesl

UNIT 4:DETERMINANT OF ELECTORAL BEHAVIOUR

1.0   Introduction

2.0   Objectives

3.0   MainContent

3.1   Issues and PartyIdentification

3.2   Ethnicity andClass

4.0   Conclusion

5.0   Summary

6.0   Tutor Marked Assignments

7.0   References/Further Reading

1.0   INTRODUCTION

We are, in this unit, mainly concerned with the factors which affect or determine electoral behaviour, and the question we shall attempt to answer is why people vote in particular pattern or manner. The unit has two consistent segments that attempt to answer these questions.

2. OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, it is expected that the students are able to do the following:

(i)   Discuss the various factors that determine how people vote and in what manner.
(ii)   Put these factors in particular contexts, especially in the politics of their own country.

3.0   MAIN CONTENT

3.1   Issues and Party Identification (IPI)

(a)   Issues

The predominant viewpoint in the literature on electoral behaviour today is that issues are of relative insignificance in determining the way people vote. The majority of the electorate, according to this view, is, not attentive to, or motivated by, substantive policy issues. The parties themselves do not present clear policy positions or issue preferences to the electorate. Consequently, therefore, issue orientations are relegated to the background in the electoral process, with only a very small proportion of the electorate devoting any attention to whatever programmes or policies may be canvassed by the parties.

This position has, however, been attacked by some political scientists. For example, V.O. Key in his work, *The Responsible Electorate,* argued that the electorate has been more responsible, rational and issue-oriented than earlier accounts had implied. He observed that between 1936 and 1960 there was a degree of correspondence between the American voter's stated policy or issue preference and his reported presidential vote.

Other writers have argued that issue-voting is always very high among those citizens or groups for whom a particular issue is salient - i.e., the issue motivated public - and that it is unrealistic to expect all citizens to be interested in, and informed about, all the issues in a campaign.

Quite obviously, more empirically based research and more precise and widely accepted criteria are needed before we can arrive at a definitive conclusion regarding the relative weight of issue" orientation in voting behaviour.

Nonetheless, most behavioral researchers tend to support the conclusion that this orientation is not an important factor in the voting behaviour of the majority of the electorate.

(b)   PartyIdentification

Party identification has continued to receive considerable attention as probably the single most important determinant of voting behaviour. A great deal of research has shown that once formed, a voter's party identification becomes a very stable psychological attitude. Thus, it has been shown that the majority of the electorate consistently vote for the same party over time, with newer voters simply inheriting party loyalties from their families. The initial source of party identification may be class, religion, race or any other factor. However, over time, this identification tends to acquire an autonomous importance of its own and to become the principal determinant of voting decision. In essence, party identification is a politically decisive emotional, psychological and traditional attachment, rather than a choice based on policypreferences.

Recently, however, some behaviouralists have contended that the use of party identification as an independent factor in electoral analysis has tended to exaggerate its impact. These behaviouralists also contend that party identification merely provides a psychological or non-political explanation for political phenomena. Nonetheless, party identification is still widely used.

Some advanced democracies: the Britain and the United States for instance, have always had their electoral behaviourcoloured by political parties. In the United States people cast vote mainly for either the Republican or the Democrats while in Britain, the struggle for votes is mainly between Labour and the conservative parties.

3.2   Ethnicity and Class as Determinants of Voting Behaviour

(a)   Ethnicity

The feeling of attachment to a racial, national or tribal group is often regarded as ethnicity. Ethnicity is an important factor in voting behaviour, particularly in plural or ethnically divided societies. An individual's ethnic identification influences much of his life. It influences his self-conception and the manner in which

other people respond to him. According to some researchers, nothing is as important to the electorate of an ethnic community as the involvement of a member of the community in an electoral contest. Indeed, otherwise inactive citizens may become enthusiastic voters when a member of their community is contesting. Many politicians have also found that whipping up ethnic sentiments and resentments are an effective strategy for mobilizing electoral support and loyalty, especially in societies where these factors are quite strong in political consideration.

In most multi-ethnic and plural polities such as Nigeria, political parties invariably come to be perceived by the electorate in ethnic or communal terms, regardless of theideological or programmatic orientations of such parties. A good illustration of this tendency is provided by the electoral performance of the Unity Party of Nigeria (UPN) during the Second Republic (1979-83). Despite the party's coherent and attractive programmes, and the vigorous efforts made by its leaders to sell these programmes to *all* Nigerians, the UPN was virtually unable to win any significant electoral support outside its core base in the Yoruba - dominated Western Region.

In plural societies, therefore, ethnicity would appear to be a far more important factor than issues in determining voting behaviour. Ethnicity would also appear in these societies to be the most important factor in the development of an individual's party identification.

(b)   Class

Defined loosely in terms of occupation, income and education, class is also widely regarded as a significant factor in voting behaviour. In Britain in particular, class is regarded as the most important factor influencing party identification and voting behaviour. Here working class elements tend to identify politically with the Labour Party, while the middle and upper sectors of the society usually identify with the Conservative party. Even in America, where class is a less significant element in the electoral process than in Europe, the lower income class tends to support the Democratic Party, while the more privileged groups tend to back the Republican Party.

Class has, however, been a relatively insignificant factor in multi-ethnic Third World countries like Nigeria. Events in these countries do not appear to lend credence to the argument that with Western education, modernization and urbanization, class would replace ethnicity or tribalism as the basis of political cleavage. On the contrary, the modernization process has led to the intensification of ethnic or tribal differences. This situation has arisen from the fact that socio-economic competition in these countries have tended to be organized along communal, rather than class lines. Thus, ethnic and tribal groups have become interest groups competing for scare economic resources, with political leaders finding it increasingly necessary to speak and act as the protectors and promoters of the interests of their respective groups. In essence, class has not yet become a significant determinant of party identification or electoral behaviour in Nigeria and other multi-ethnic countries of the ThirdWorld.

Class and ethnicity may therefore contribute to the shaping of electoral behaviour. In some industrialized or developed countries, class may provide the basis for party identification. In many multi-ethnic or plural societies, however, ethnicity is a relatively more important determinant of voting behaviour or party identification.

It is important to add that we have not exhausted the list of possible determinants of electoral behaviour in this unit. Other factors that may influence the behaviour of votersincludereligionandcharisma.Finally, it is importantthatyoushouldbeabletorelate the discussion in this lecture to the Nigerian experience. Chapter six

of Billy Dudley's *An Introduction to Nigerian Government and Politics* will be useful for this purpose.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (SAE)

Critically discuss the four major factors affecting electoral behaviour and make cases for which of them will be dominant in making people vote in Nigeria and the United States.

4.0   CONCLUSION

Politics being a game of who gets what where and when must have values and sentiments in many of its processes. Election is one of these. Voters consider a whole lot of factors before they vote, and these factors, which include ethnicity, class, issues and party identification as indicated in the foregoing, are generally considered as those affecting electoral behaviour.

The dominant position in the literature on electoral behaviour is that issues do not constitute a significant influence on the way people vote. Although this position has been attacked by V.O. Key, among others, it is still widely held by behavioral researchers. Party identification is generally regarded as probably the single most important influence on electoral behaviour. Studies have repeatedly shown that most people vote for the same party over time, and that this traditional and psychological attachment to a specific party is the most reliable factor for explaining and predicting voting behaviour. However, while party identification has often been portrayed as an independent psychological factor, there can be little doubt that this identification is ultimately or partly rooted in other factors. In many countries, class and ethnicity may provide the basis for party identification and voting behaviour. Specifically, class may be of some importance in industrialized societies, while ethnicity is usually decisive elector ally in culturally divided societies of the Third World, includingNigeria.

5.0   SUMMARY

Four main factors have been specifically identified and discussed in this unit as those that affect electoral behaviour, that is, those that determine whether people will vote at all or will not, as well as the pattern or dimensions which their voting will take. These factors are issues, party identification, ethnicity and class.

6.0   TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

(i) What are the four major factors that voters often consider before theyvote?

(ii) Narrate the effects of ethnicity as a primary factor and as a strong determining factor of voting in Nigeria.

7.0 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

Alan R. B. (1977) Modern Politics and Government, (2nd ed.) London, Macmillan.

Converse, P. (1975) "Public Opinion and Voting Behaviour", in Greenstein, F. and Polsby N. (ed.) Handbook of Political Science Vol.4, Massachusetts, Addison –Wesley.

Dowse, R. and Hughes, J. (1972) Political Sociology, London, John Wiley and Son.

Dudley, B (1982) An Introduction to Nigerian Government and Politics, London, Macmillan.

Rowe, E (1969) Modern Politics: An Introduction to Behaviour and Institution, London, Rout-ledge and Kegan UNIT 5: Election and Party Politics in Nigeria

Unit 5: Election and Political Party in Nigeria (EPPN)

1.0   Introduction

2.0   Objectives

3.0   Main Content

3.1   The modern development of politics

3.2   Initial methods of elections

3.3   Factors inhibitive to free and fair elections

4.0   Conclusion

5.0   Summary

6.0   Tutor Marked Assignments

7.0   References/Further Reading

1.0.   Introduction
The issue of elections in Nigeria politics has been established before the country became independent in 1960 from the British colonial masters. One can conclude that the patterns and processes in which elections and politics is been played in Nigeria was inherited from the colonialists. Because tracing the history of elections and party politics in Nigeria has been on the same track; where there has been two parties dominating the scene while the third party is seen as being a party in the political field. Nigeria population of about 80 million (1980) is multi ethnic. Among the principal ethnic groups are the Hausa/Fulani, Igbo, Yoruba, Edo, Ijaw, Tiv, NupeIgala, Urhobo etc. There are over 300 other linguistics groups. The population of 80 million is projected from the 1965 population census which gave the country's population as 55,670,055, a figure accepted by some and disputed by others.

2.0.   OBJECTIVES
At the end of this unit, the students should be able to:
(i)   Evaluate the election and party politics in Nigeria.

3.0.   MAIN CONTENT

3.1.   The modern development of politics

Although its roots can be traced much farther back, the modern development of politics in Nigeria dates essentially from the later of world war ll and the reactions to the enactment of the Richard's constitution. The earliest political organisations grew up in Lagos where the Nigeria National Democratic Party (NNDP) was formed under the leadership of Herbert Macaulay to contest the 1922 elections. This was followed in 1937 by the Nigerian Youth Movement (NYM), a largely Yoruba organisation which succeeded an earlier Lagos Youth Movement leadership , under the leadership of H.O. Davies, which successfully contested the Lagos

Municipal Elections of 1938 against the Nigeria National Democratic Party. A Legislative Council bye election in 1941 produced dissensions within the NYM and in the Lagos Town Council elections of 1943, the Democratic Party resumed control. In 1944 under the impetus of Nigerians who returned from abroad an attempt was made to create a national front and the National Council of Nigeria and Cameroons (NCNC) was founded in August 1944 under the leadership of Herbert Macaulay and Dr Nnamdi Azikiwe. Its aim was to set up a broadly-based political movement to promote Nigeria self-government within the British Commonwealth. The NCNC attacked the new constitution because of the constitution's failure to enlarge the electorate and extend the principle of direct elections, apart from its other defects. An undertaking had been given that the constitution would be reviewed after nine years but in 1948 the new Governor, Sir John Macpherson, agreed that changes be introduced in three years. One of the principal complaints against the Richard's constitution was that it was not the outcome of consultation with the leaders of Nigerian opinion. Special arrangements for ascertaining the view of all sections of the population were, therefore, accordingly proposed and these took place throughout 1949 and much of 1950.

The new constitution enacted in 1951 established Legislatures in each of the three Regions which were empowered to legislate on specified subjects. Members of the Central Legislature were elected form their own members by the Regional Legislature (sixty-eight from North and thirty-four by each of the two Southern Regions). The proportion of nominated and unofficial members both in the Central and Regional Legislatives was reduced. In each Region and at the Central there were African Ministers who formed the majority of the appropriate executive councils; but the governor continued to preside. At the Centre each Region was represented by an equal number of three ministers and one for Southern Cameroons.

3.2.   Initial methods of elections

Methods of election to the new legislatures varied, but, except in Lagos where direct election by secret ballot continued, they were in the form of primary elections to a series of election colleges. In the two Southern Regions all male tax-payers were entitled to vote in electing the lowest level of the pyramid of electoral colleges. In the Northern Region there was an elaborate system of indirect election, through five stages, based on the Native Authorities. But even these indirect elections (and perhaps also the system of nationwide consultations preceding the Macpherson constitution) helped tp promote the development of political parties. In the Northern Region, those elected representatives subsequently formed the Northern Peoples' Congress (NPC), the dominant party at the first direct elections in November 1956. In the South those chosen were mainly the leaders of the agitation for a new constitution. In the Eastern Region the elected leaders were organised in the NCNC, to which there was at first no opposition in the new legislature except for a few independents. In the Western Region a new body, the Action Group (AG), had now taken shape under the leadership of Chief Awolowo who had been one to the leading members of NYM. The Action Group obtained a majority in the Western Legislature in 1951, partly by gaining adherents after the election and partly by astute management of the second stage of the election.

The NCNC and AG continued to press for more effective powers for African Ministers and in May 1953, in opposition to the NPC members of the central legislature, both parties joined in supporting a demand for self-government in 1956. This resulted in a force constitutional conference held in London in June which eventually led to a new constitutional settlement which came into force from November 1 1954. The Regions now assumed the aspect of state within a Federation; the Lieutenant-Governor of each region ceased to presided in the legislatures and there were no longer any ex-officio or nominated member except north in the North. The members of the executive councils became responsible Minister headed by a Premier (though the Governor remained President of the Executive Council) and separate Regional judiciaries and public services were created. At the centre was a council of ministers, three from each Region and one from Cameroon. The

Council also include three ex-officio and there was no Premier. After some controversy Lagos was excised from the Western Region to serve as Federal Territory and Capital.

The first ever Federal Elections were held in 1954 under different arrangements prescribed in regulations made separately for each Region by the Governor- General (under Paragraph 8 of the Order-in-Council). Those in the North were indirect while in the Eastern region have direct and based on universal adult suffrage. In the Western Region the rule was that men aged 21 or over might vote if they were natives of the Division in which they sought to vote or resident and taxpayers for the period of 12 months at the qualifying date; women could qualify on the same basis provided that they had themselves paid a tax of over two naira.

In the Northern Region the NPC won the election with eighty-four out of ninety-two seats; in the Eastern Region, the NCNC thirty, the AG in alliance with the United National Independent Party (UNIP) won seven and others won five seats. In the Western Region, AG has favourable circumstances and better organisation, won 23 seats. The first federal cabinet consisted of six NCNC Ministers and three NPC ministers, together with three official members (civil servants) and a member from the Southern Cameroon.

The 1959 Federal Election was not the first such nationwide election that had been held in Nigeria. Federal Elections were held under the Lyttelton Constitution of 1954 under which representation in the House of Representative was based on 50-50 formula between the North on the one hand and the south (East and South) on the other, with a few seats allocated to the Lagos Federal Territory and the Southern Cameroons. However, the pervious Federal elections had been run on behalf of the Federation by the three Regional Governments under separate sets of electoral regulations. This arrangement was considered unsatisfactory by those attending the Nigerian Constitutional Conference of 1956-7 who decided that federal elections in future should be conducted in accordance with uniform principles and methods, under the supervision of an imperial body free from any suspicion of political bias, a body which would not naturally attach to a Regional Government dominated by a political party. The conference's decision was given legal effect by the 'Nigerian Electoral Provisions Order-in-Council, 1958' which provided for the appointment of an Electoral Commission by His Excellency the Governor- General 'from amongst persons of netural views' and by 'Elections (House of Representatives) Regulative, 1958', which defined the task of the Commission as being 'the general supervision of the preparation of a Register of Electors and of the conduct of an Election.'

Thus in 1959, the Federation consisted of three big Regions, namely the Northern (the biggest), Eastern and Western Regions, with Lagos serving as the Federal Capital Territory. As stated earlier on, this tripartite administrative structure began to emerge in 1951 with the introduction of the MacPherson Constitution of that year. With subsequent amendment made at various constitutional conferences held in London and Nigeria, the 1954 Federal Constitution emerged, under the auspices of the various regional governments which naturally ensured the perpetuation of their control of their respective regions. The Northern People's Congress (NPC) won in the North, the Action Group (AG) in the West and the National Council of Nigeria and Cameroons (NCNC) won in the Eastern Region.

The three major parties could not possibly be sufficient to cater for all the diverse ethnic and cultural groups which made up Nigeria. The years following 1951 saw the emergence of many local parties representing one minority interest or another and most of them had little influence outside their town or district. However, in 1959, thirteen minority parties managed to contest the federal election for that year. They included the Northern Elements Progressive Union (NEPU), United Middle Belt Congress (UMBC), Bornu Youth Movement (BYM), all in the Northern Region; also the Mabolaje Grand Alliance and Otu Edo in the West and United National Independence Party and the Democratic Party of Nigeria and Cameroons in the East.

3.3. Factors inhibiting free and fair elections

The factors inhibiting free and fair elections not only peculiar to Nigeria, include bribery and corruption, intimidation, physical violence, and moral and spiritual pressure on individual voters. Other factors include violation of freedom of expression and right of free assembly, and a host of other such impediments. These inhibitions are present in all societies in one form or another either in crude or a subtle way, depending on the degree of sophistication of the society which practices them. In Nigeria and other countries of the world with relatively underdeveloped political culture, the inhibitions might manifest themselves in crude forms such as physical combat, feasting voters or denial of permits for holding meetings or staging political rallies; others include threat of, or infliction of moral force on a voter by a village priest or imam, or imaginary oracle or juju – all intended to influence the voters in the way he casts his or her ballots.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXECISE (SAE)

Discuss theelection challenges in Nigeria in the 21st century.

4.0. CONCLUSION

The major causes of Nigeria political behaviour and problems in the 21st century could betraced to the laying of the foundation of election and party politics before the country gained independent in 1960. These problems persist and the politicians and those in government have not found a lasting solution to them. It can be summed up that the culmination of these problems has made the country to remain underdeveloped.

5.0. SUMMARY

In this unit, we have discussed extensively the patterns and processes of election and party politics in Nigeria from the first republic. How parties were formed based on the demands of the minority groups when the first five major political parties could not fulfill the aspirations of those groups. This unit has equally exposed the students to the foundational problems in Nigerian political system and elections.

6.0. TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMAs)

(1) Discuss the factors that led to the formation of additional political parties in Nigeria in the first republic.
(2) Evaluate the factors that hindered free and fair elections in Nigeria.

7.0. References/Further Readings.

KurfiAmadu (1983), The Nigerian General Elections 1959 and 1979 and the aftermath. Macmillan Nigeria.

"INEC Nigeria". INEC website. Independent National Electoral Commission. Retrieved 2007-03-19.

"INEC History – INEC Nigeria". www.inecnigeria.org. Retrieved 2020-05-24.

"OBSERVING THE 1998-99 NIGERIA ELECTIONS"(PDF). Carter Center, NDI. Summer 1999. Retrieved 2010-02-14.

"Abel Guobadia Takes Helm in Nigeria"(PDF). Elections Today. Archived from the original(PDF) on 2008-11-28. Retrieved 2020-05-13.

"Nigeria's 2003 Elections - The Unacknowledged Violence". Human Rights Watch. June 1, 2004. Retrieved 2020-05-14.

"Nigeria: Five Key Figures to Watch in Nigeria Election". allAfrica.com: Vanguard. 2015-03-23. Retrieved 2015-03-27.

Polgreen, Lydia 2007. "Nigeria Frets Over How to Give Voters a Real Say". The New York Times. p. A3. Retrieved 2020-05-20.

Thisday Newspapers. "NBA Accuses INEC Officials of Aiding Election Rigging"

MODULE 5: Ethnicity and Electoral Behaviour (EEB)

Introduction

This is the last module of the course material for political behaviour. A lot has been taught and learnt on the concept. Therefore, other factors such as ethnicity and how it affects the electorate cum the conventional and non-conventional, and how it influences the outcome of elections are fully examined. This course cannot be comprehensive if the theories are not stated. And this is what this module did in unit 4 and conclusively, the overview of the concept is wrapped up in unit 5.

Unit 1: Ethnicity and Electoral Behaviour in Nigeria
Unit 2: Electoral Behaviour
Unit 3: Conventional Political Behaviour
Unit 4: Theories of Political Behaviour
Unit 5: Political Behaviour: Overview

UNIT 1: Participation in Emerging Democracies

1.0   INTRODUCTION

In the last unit of this module, we shall study the patterns and processes of political participation which are obviously different in emerging democracies and non-democratic around the globe. In new democracies the challenge is to engage the citizenry in meaningful participation after years of ritualized action or prohibitions. In some cases, this yields a mirror-image of old democracies: In old democracies, citizens are moving from conventional to unconventional politics, in new democracies citizens often toppled autocratic regimes by revolutionary upheavals and now have to learn the routines of conventional participation. Therefore, at the end of this unit, students should be able to discuss and understand the new trends in political participation.

2.0   OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit students should be able to:

(i)   Describe the political participation in emerging democracies in other nations.
(ii)   Understand the trends in the current democracy around the world.

3. O MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Election turnout was often fairly high in the immediate post-transition elections in Eastern Europe, but has subsequently declined in most nations. Similarly, party activity has atrophied as democratic institutions have developed. And while there was a popular lore claiming that a robust underground civil society prompted the democratization trend in Eastern Europe, post-transition research finds that social engagement is now limited. Many East Europeans protested during the democratic transitions of the late 1980s and early 1990s, but these forms of action diminished after the transition in a kind of "post-honeymoon" effects. Consequently, Eastern Europe still faces the challenge of integrating citizens into democratic politics and nurturing an understanding of the democratic process.

The challenges of citizen participation are, of course, even greater in nondemocratic nations. The advance of survey research has provided some unique insights into participation patterns in these nations. Shi's study of political participation in Beijing (1997), for example, found much more extensive public involvement than expected. Furthermore, political participation can occur in alternative forms in political systems where citizen input is not tolerated and encouraged through institutionalized channels. Similarly, Mattes et al (2007), found a surprisingly large range of political activity across a set of African nations. If this occurs in these two settings, then we might expect citizens to be somewhat engaged even in transitional political systems.

The desire to participate in the decisions affecting one's life is common across the globe, but political institutions can shape whether these desires are expressed and how. Possessing the skills and resources to be politically active is an equally important factor. Research is now identifying how these two forces combine to shape the patterns of citizen action.

The global wave of democratization in the 1990s has dramatically increased the role of the citizenry in many of the new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe, Asia, Latin America, and Africa. This latter development makes our task as scholars of the citizen more relevant than ever before, but also more difficult. Even as our research skills and empirical evidence have expanded, the phenomena we study have been evolving—something that physicists and chemists do not have to deal with. These changes produce uncertainty about what new styles of political decision-making, or what new forms of political participation are developing. In addition, the nature of citizen politics is becoming more complex—or through our research we are now realizing that greater complexity exists. This produces a real irony: Even though we have greater scientific knowledge, our ability to predict and explain political behavior may actually be decreasing in some areas. For instance, we know much more about electoral behavior than we did in the 1950s, but simple socio-demographic models that were successful in predicting electoral behavior in the 1960s are much less potent in explaining contemporary voting behavior. So we have gained greater certainty about the uncertainty of voter decisions.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (SAE)

What are the challenges of citizen participation in an election?

4.0   CONCLUSION

Our discussion in this unit has focused on the new trends in emerging democracies and on how these challenges could be overcome in order to engage on the positive side of better democracy. Normally we study democratic systems that are roughly at equilibrium and speculate on how this equilibrium was created (or how it changes in minor ways). Moreover, during the earlier waves of democratic transition the tools of empirical social science were not available to study political behavior directly. The current democratization wave thus provides a virtually unique opportunity to address questions on identity formation, the creation of political cultures (and possibly how cultural inheritances are changed), the establishment of an initial calculus of voting, and the dynamic processes linking political norms and behavior. These questions represent some of the fundamental research issues of our time. The answers will not only explain what has occurred during this democratization wave, but may aid us in better understanding the basic principles of how citizens function within the political process. There has never been a richer opportunity to study the choices of citizens across regime forms and between old and new democracies. The conditions to arrive at a theory of how citizens come to political choices depending on different political settings, and how these choices affect the settings, have never been better than they are today.

5.0.   SUMMARY

In summary, this unit has explained the importance of political participation in democratic regime of any government where democracy is practiced. It also shed light on the positive side of democracy because it allows free participation of citizens without any discrimination for the betterment of the growth and development of the country.

6.0   TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMAs)

(i) What are the patterns and processes of political participation in emerging democracies?

(ii) How can political violence be maintain or control in African elections?

7.0   REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Aarts, K., Blais, A., and Schmitt, H. (eds.) 2005. *Political Leaders and Democratic Elections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chu, Y., et al. (eds.) 2008. *How East Asians View Democracy*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gunther, R., Ramón Montero, J., and Puhle, H. (eds.) 2006. *Electoral Intermediation, Values, and Political Support in Old and New Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dalton, R. 2004. *Democratic Challenges, Democratic Choices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Almond, G. and Verba, S. 1963. *The Civic Culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

M. 2004. *Voter Turnout and the Dynamics of Electoral Competition in Established Democracies since 1945*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cain, B., Dalton, R., and Scarrow, S. (eds.) 2003. *Democracy Transformed? Expanding Political Opportunities in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

UNIT 2: Reasoning Voters and Multi-Party Systems Elections and Party Politics in Nigeria

1.0   INTRODUCTION

It is very important to study the aspect of voters and the role of multi-party systems in this unit 5. This is because without the involvement of the voters, no election can be irrefutable and there will not be a viable government to be in control of the affair of the state. Especially in the multi-party systems in democracy, the voters cannot be taken with levity. Therefore, this unit will examine view of other scholars when it comes to voting and the positivity of multi-party systems within a state.

2.0   OBJECTIVES
At the end of this unit, each student should be able to:
(i) Discuss and understand the link between voters and multi-party systems.
(ii) Explain the roles on voters and multi-party systems in a state.

2.0   MAIN CONTENT

2.1   Reasoning Voters and Multi-Party System

Studying political behaviour at the level of the general electorate has changed considerably from the early days, characterized by the predominance of the Michigan model in the 1960s, and the juxtaposition of this social-psychological approach with the rational choice approach of Downs (1957). Beginning with revisionist arguments in favour of issue voting, and continuing through both traditional and rational choice ideas about retrospective voting (Fiorina 1981), a concept of the "reasoning voter" has emerged.

This concept functions as a bridge between political psychologists and "realist" versions of the rational choice approach—versions which try to predict actual voting behavior, instead of focusing exclusively on equilibrium conditions for the demand and supply of policy packages. Reasoning voters are approximately rational, trying to come to terms with a decision situation

about which they are only vaguely informed. Judgmental heuristics are used to solve "Simon's puzzle" of how to decide rationally "with limited information and processing capacity".

Within a rational choice framework, Popkin adopts the term "reasoning voter" to describe a similar situation in which "voters actually do reason about parties, candidates, and issues" "investing" their vote in collective goods on the basis of "costly and imperfect information under conditions of uncertainty". As contrasted with private investors, these "public investors" have less incentive to gather costly information. Hence Popkin characterizes this choice situation as one of low-cost rationality, where the premium is on gathering inexpensive information from friends and using informational and calculative short-cuts.

The general insight contained in the concept of the reasoning voter is not new. Since the original homo economic was gradually turned into a utility maximiser, subjectively calculating the probabilities of outcomes, it was only a small step to realize that the acquisition of perfect information is often too expensive. What is new is that cognitive psychology can now offer a set of experimentally tested results: about "schemata" for acquiring, processing and retrieving information; about dominant "frames" simplifying the goal structure; and about habits as quick decision rules in frequently recurring decision situations.

These theories enable the cognitive psychologist to model individual decision-making. But in political science in general, and in voting research in particular, it is also necessary to consider the interface between the choices of individuals and the world of party politics and government policy. This unit focuses on problems of preference formation and party choices of reasoning voters in multi-party systems. This is a necessary and separate task, in a field where the research agenda focuses heavily on the American two-party system and its presidential elections.

Rational choice is behaviour which is consistent with one's preferences, the preferences themselves having to fulfill minimal conditions of consistency such as transitivity and so on. Thus, we will first consider problems of party preferences of voters in multi-party systems. Second, the forces influencing these preferences are taken into account. Building on the concept of the reasoning voter, we shall consider how variables like issue proximities, retrospective evaluations of government performance and party identification can be interpreted in a model of preference formation in multi-party systems. The final task will be to analyze the decision problem itself, taking into account future expectations about possible government coalitions, incentives for sophisticated voting and instrumental versus expressive or symbolic voting.

The overall model of this unit is built on the assumption that, in multi-party systems, voters' party preference profiles are the crucial link between the factors influencing reasoning about parties and the final voting decision. In this sense, "party preference" has an analogous causal status as "comparative candidate evaluations" in the revised Michigan model. From among possible influences on party preference, issue proximities and retrospective evaluations are identified as factors most proximate to the process of preference formation in the assumed funnel of causality. Issue proximities constitute a substantive prospective measure, while retrospective evaluations pertain to the past performance of the present government.

The first and second sections of this unit touch upon what Huckfeldt and Carmines call the

"economists' challenge" to sociological and social psychological approaches to the study of voting behaviour. Purposeful, rational action has as its pre-condition clear preferences and reasoning about the consequences of one's action. This latter task is complicated when the outcome which counts is the aggregate of all people's votes rather than the result of one individual's action alone.

3.2   Party Preferences in Multi-Party Systems

In a two-party system, the relation between party preference and party choice is rather simple, once the voter has decided to participate in an upcoming election at all. A voter prefers party or candidate A, in which case s/he will choose this alternative; or else she or he prefers party or candidate B and will, therefore, choose that alternative; or indifference should lead to abstention. It would be irrational, in a two-party setting, to vote for a party which is not one's first choice.

The choice problem in a three-party system is not a straightforward extrapolation of the two-party case. There, it may be rational to vote strategically for one's second most preferred party if one expects one's most preferred party to lose and one's least preferred party otherwise to win. The strict preference order between three parties contains $3! = 6$ logical possibilities, and even more if ties of two or all three parties are contemplated. With three possible answers to every paired comparison between three parties (counting pairs for the same parties only once, not twice as ordered pairs), there exist 27 different possible preference orderings; among the 13 consistent individual rank orders, one profile has all three parties tied, six preference profiles have two-parties tied at either the first or last rank, and another six constitute strict rank orders. From three parties upward, it is no longer self-evident that voters have consistent preferences (contrary to the assumptions built into frequently used measurement devices such as "feeling thermometers").

Ideally, one would hope that the preferences of individual voters are consistent enough for them to be expressed in a precise utility function which is not just the trivial outcome of measurement by fiat. Using paired comparisons between German parties, it can be shown that the minimal condition for rational voters—transitivity of strict preferences—is fulfilled for over 90 percent of the electorate. Brady and Ansolabehere (1989) report similarly that only 2 to 10 percent of American respondents had intransitive candidate orderings over candidates in presidential primaries.

In normal election studies, the data which one would need for the valid construction of utility functions over a set of parties are not available. But in many European election studies, "feeling thermometer" or "sympathy scalometer" questions are asked for all parties competing for seats in parliament; and it is possible to exploit this type of data for a construction of the party preference profiles of voters. Before discussing different types of measurements, though, we have first to clarify the theoretical status of the concept of "party preference."

I propose to treat "party preference" as the central intervening variable between the reasoning about and evaluations of parties, on the one hand, and voting behaviour, on the other. The status of this variable is, as I have said, similar to that of "comparative candidate evaluations" in American models of the presidential vote. But to make it strictly equivalent parties would have to be presented as concrete options in the specific upcoming election. That is to say, one would have to ask voters about their party preferences concerning one specific election: for a federal election, for example, one would have to ask, "Which party do you prefer most in federal politics for the upcoming legislative period?"; and when two elections (a federal and a state election, for example)

are held simultaneously, one would have to ask two election-specific party preference questions.

The alternative is to conceptualize parties as consistent players in different games and to assume that voters (especially in multi-party systems) develop general party preferences. In most democracies, the different government levels are not of equal importance, so that, empirically, parties are evaluated overwhelmingly with respect to their national role.

The degree of election- or situation-specificity is one-dimension characterizing party preference. A second is the time dimension. Should "party preference" just tap the momentary feelings towards parties, or should it measure a more permanent attitude? Theoretically, it seems that one's present party preference profile must be influenced by the profile of an earlier period: there has to be some continuity in these preferences. Alternatively, though, we might ask the question in a way which stresses the momentary character of preference, to the detriment of its permanent aspects. Thus, on the "time" dimension, party preferences might represent either a more permanent or a more momentary attitude, just as on the first dimension party preferences might be either situation- or election-specific or not.

The concept of "party preference" is, of course, related to the concept of "party identification." In its original Michigan version, party identification is conceptualized as a permanent positive identification with a party as a general (not situation-specific) attitude object. For European multi-party systems, party identification questions have the shortcoming that a certain degree of identification with one party cannot be interpreted as the inverse of the identification with the other parties. An American-style seven-point scale (running from strong to weak Democrats through Democratic leaders and independents to strong Republicans) cannot be constructed for multi-party systems. Dutch authors have proposed an alternative measure of permanent party preference profiles which avoids concentration on the most-preferred party. The proposed question is supposed to measure general electoral utility of parties by asking respondents, for each party, how probable it is that they "will ever vote" for it. Since "will ever vote" transcends the momentary aspect of preference, focusing on elections in general and not on any specific election, answers to this question can be interpreted equivalent to expressions of party identification in multi-party systems.

The more conventional "sympathy" ratings of parties stress more the momentary (though not, it is thought, election-specific) character of these attitudes. Monthly time series do show many ups and downs for the different parties. But these movements are normally not decomposed into their different components, such as the overall mean for the established parties, the variance of the respondents' ratings or the relative party ranks; and the latter may remain relatively stable, even if the mean level of sympathy or the size of the distances between parties changes. What may look on the surface like a clear candidate for a "momentary general party preference" may thus contain information on more permanent aspects of party preference, measuring an attitude somewhere in between a momentary and a permanent preference. This interpretation comes close to party identification as "a running tally of retrospective evaluations" (Fiorina 1981: 89) for every party a voter perceives as relevant, where s/he continually adds positive evaluations for each party and subtracts negative ones depending on experiences during legislative periods.

Let us now briefly consider the other two possible conjunctions of the situation- or election-specificity and time dimensions. Pre-election polls sometimes ask situation-specific, momentary party rankings. The only combination of the two dimensions that might seem empirically empty is

permanent election-specificity. But even there, one can imagine voters who have different, but relatively stable, party preferences for different types or levels of elections. For example, they would never vote for a post-communist party at the national level, but they consider the respective local party as an option for a first or middle rank. Since voting research normally focuses on national elections, election-specificity is a neglected variable.

Different devices exist for assembling data on party preference profiles: paired comparisons, rankings or ratings. The latter two methods impose consistent profiles by their very design, whereas paired comparison data allow empirical tests of consistency. Conventional ranking or rating scales are frequently analyzed in search of a simple spatial representation of party preference profiles. In those studies, the results of factor analysis (or of unfolding techniques applied to preference or dominance data) are interpreted as the joint decision space of the electorate, summarizing the rankings or distances of the voters from the parties in the statistically best possible way. Numerous analyses of this type have been performed for multi-party systems, including Converse's early study for Finland and Nannestad's sophisticated recent study for Denmark. Unfolding analysis allows us to test hypotheses about the one-dimensionality of a party space. Factor analysis, in contrast, is more often applied for explanatory than for confirmatory purposes; and the interpretations of the resulting solutions do not always appear plausible, especially where more than one dimension is identified.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (SAE)

Examine the various ways in which voters' decision can be justified in multi-party systems in a state.

4.0   CONCLUSION

The reasoning voter in multi-party systems will, as we have shown, develop a "party preference profile" as a summary measure of his or her experiences and information about the performance and policy offers of the parties. Among the factors influencing preference formation are performance evaluations of governments and issue proximities. But this short list could be easily supplemented: by future expectations; by competence evaluations of party leaders and candidates for government offices; and so on. These factors are substantively linked to the utility that a citizen can associate with a party as a possible provider of collective goods.

5.0   SUMMARY

In summary, our discussion in this unit center on reasoning voters and multi-party systems in that once citizens have formed consistent preferences for the parties, the major problem is then predicting their voting behavior, taking into account the election-specific coalition expectations as an additional factor influencing the causal path from party preference to voting behaviour. But since the single voter is not decisive, public investors differ from private investors and expressive considerations gain an importance in their own right as instrumental rationality is downgraded for voters in mass electorates. It is not that voters are irrational but, rather, that the voting mechanism

(for instance, proportional voting in parliamentary multi-party systems) is a less-than-perfect mechanism for revealing the electorate's policy preferences.

6.0   TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMAs)

(1)The concept of "party preference" is, of course, related to the concept of "party identification." Discuss.

(2) Within a rational choice framework, Popkin adopts the term "reasoning voter" to describe a similar situation in which "voters actually do reason about parties, candidates, and issues". Do you agree with this assertion?

7.0   REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Barry, B. 1978. Sociologists, Economists and Democracy. Rev edn. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Eijk, C. van der; Niemöller, B.; and Tillie, J. N. 1986. The two faces of 'future vote': voter utility and party potential. Mimeo.: University of Amsterdam.

Laver, M., and Hunt, B. W. 1992. Policy and Party Competition. London: Routledge.

Popkin, S. L. 1991. The Reasoning Voter. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sani, G. 1974. A test of the least distance model of voting choice, Italy 1972. Comparative Political Studies, 7: 193-208.

Weber, M. 1965. Social action and its types. Pp. 173-9 in Theories of Society, ed. T. Parsons, et al. New York: Free Press; one-volume edition.

UNIT 3: CONVENTIONAL AND NON-CONVENTION POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR (CPB)

CONTENT

1.0. Introduction

2.0. Objectives

4.0 Main Content

4.1 Conventional political behaviour.

4.2 Non-conventional political behaviour.

4.0 Conclusion

5.0 Summary

6.0 Tutor Marked Assignment

7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0. INTRODUCTION

Two main areas of study

There are two main areas of study in political behaviour that can be summarized by saying that there is conventional political behaviour on the one hand and unconventional political behaviour on the other. That is the major aspect to be considered in this unit.

2.0. OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, students should be able to:

(i)   Define Conventional and non-Conventional political behavior.
(ii)   Identify sources of Conventional and non-Conventional political behavior.
(iii) Mention the importance of the concepts stated above.

3.0. MAIN CONTENT
3.1. Conventional Political Behaviour.

Conventional political behaviour can also be defined aselectoral behaviour. The aim is to study the behaviour of electors/voters whenever there are elections. First, to study political participation, that is, who participates and who abstains for what reason; and second, who votes and how. It is possible to simplify this field of political behaviour by saying that there are three fundamental questions, namely who votes, how and why. We observe who votes, what people vote, and then we try to explain why people vote and why they voted for this or that party.

In Switzerland, as a case study, it is necessary to broaden the notion of electoral behaviour a little, because, as its name suggests, electoral behaviour refers to elections, so we study electoral behaviour, who votes, for which party and for which candidate, but in Switzerland, there is an important direct democracy which means that we do not only vote for elections, but also on concrete objects, public policies, proposals, political reforms among others, and therefore, we can also apply the study of electoral behaviour to behaviour in popular voting, namely the study of behaviour in direct democracy votes. So, all the questions we ask ourselves about electoral behaviour can also be asked when we study voting behaviour in direct democracy votes, i.e. popular votes in Switzerland.

3.2. Non-conventional political behaviour

On the other side, non-conventional political behaviour makes it possible to invoke two types of collective action: protest politics and the new social movements that belong to this field. Collective action is the field that encompasses the whole. Collective action refers to the collective mobilization to defend common interests. A group of citizens is mobilizing to defend common interests. This field of political behaviour studies how these behaviours are formed. Within collective action, we can define a little more specifically what is called the protest policy. The protest policy is a set of actions by groups that wish to make a claim and therefore make demands to the government, parliament or other types of decision-makers. It is, therefore, a group that wishes to make a claim and therefore alert the authorities.

The protest policy can take different forms. It can take the form of social movements, but also of revolt, civil war, terrorism; all means aimed at bringing these demands to the attention of the general public and, if possible, at influencing policies.

The third level within political action and protest politics is the so-called new social movements. We say "new social movements" in distinction with "classical social movements" such as trade unions. These new social movements are, for example, the ecologist movement, the pacifist movement, the gay movement; these are movements that are created to defend the interests of a specific segment of the electorate or to defend a cause such as the environment in the case of the ecologist movement.

This mobilization through social movements takes unconventional forms and that is why it has been distinguished from conventional political behaviour. This is, for example, the demonstration, the strike, the boycott, therefore forms of collective actions that differ from the institutional channels of voting, the collection of signatures to launch referendums or initiatives.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXECISE (SAE)

What is conventional and non-conventional political behavior?

4.0. CONCLUSION

It is very important to study these concepts: conventional and non-conventional political behaviour in this unit. They are quite different from electoral behaviour in the sense that it examines political behaviour from another perspective. And they aid political scientist to profoundly comprehend the objectives and motives of political actors from different countries.

5.0. SUMMARY

In summary, institutional channels will lead to conventional political behaviours such as signing petitions, signatures in order to launch initiatives or referendums. This is distinguished from non-conventional behaviours such as strikes, demonstrations or boycotts.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMAs)

Examine the differences between conventional and non-conventional political behaviour.

7.0 REFERENCE/FURTHER READINGS

Thomassen, J. 1994. Empirical research into political representation. Pp. 237–64 in *Elections at Home and Abroad*, ed. M. K. Jennings and T. Mann. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Zakaria, F. 2006. *The Future of Freedom: Illiberal Democracy at Home and Abroad*. New York: Norton.

Iverson, T. 1994. The logics of electoral politics: spatial, directional and mobilization effects. *Comparative Political Studies*, 27: 155–89.

Manza, J. and Brooks, C. 1999. *Social Cleavages and Political Change: Voter Alignments and U.S. Party Coalitions*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schmitt, H. and Thomassen, J. (eds.) 1999. *Political Representation and Legitimacy in the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aarts, K., Blais, A., and Schmitt, H. (eds.) 2005. *Political Leaders and Democratic Elections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Unit 4: Theories of Political Behaviour (TPB)

CONTENT

1.0   Introduction

8.0   Objectives

3.0   Main Content

3.1.   Long-term influences on political orientation

3.2   Short-term influences on political orientation

3.3.   The influence of social groups on political outcomes

3.4   Biology and political science

3.5   Political participation

4.0   Conclusion

5.0   Summary

6.0   Tutor Marked Assignment

7.0   References/Further Reading

1.0.   INTRODUCTION

Theories of political behaviour, as an aspect of political science attempt to quantify and explain the influences that define a person's political views, ideology and levels of political participation. Broadly speaking, behaviour is political whenever individuals or groups try to influence or escape the influence of others. Political behaviour is the subset of human behaviour that involves politics and powers. Theorists which have had an influence on this field are the focus in this unit.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of the unit, students should be able to:

(i)   State the theories of political behaviour.
(ii)   Identify and understand the impact of theories in political behaviour.

3.0   MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Long-term influences on political orientation

Looking at the political views of parental information is often thought of as the major long-term influence on political trend to take part in the political system. Experts and other scholars are also often thought to have a vital impact on political course. During the 2003-2004 school years, in the United States, it was estimated that students spent an average of 180.4 days in primary and secondary education each year, with a school day being defined as approximately 6.7 class hours. This means that on average a student will spend around 1,208.68 hours in class each year. Post secondary education appears to have an impact on both voting rates and political identification; as a study of 9,784,931 college students found that they voted at a rate of 68.5% in the 2016 presidential election compared to the average of 46.1% for citizens aged 18-29 who voted.

Peers also affect political course. Peers often, but not necessarily, have the advantage of being part of the same generation, which collectively develops a unique set of societal issues; Eric L. Dey asserts that:

Socialisation is the process through which individuals acquire knowledge, habits, and value orientations that will be useful in the future.

The ability to relate on this common level is what fuels and enables future ideological development.

Sociologists and political scientists agreed on the relationship between period and the formation of political attitude. Therefore, the impressionable year hypothesis postulates that political point of reference is became stronger during early adulthood. To compare, the "increasing persistence hypothesis" posits that attitudes become less likely to change as individuals become older, while the "life-long openness hypothesis" proposes that the attitudes of individuals remain bendy despite of age.

3.2 Short-term influences on political orientation

Short-term factors also affect voting behaviour, the media and the impact of individual election issues are among these factors. These factors differ from the long-term factors as they are often short-lived. They can however, be just as crucial in modifying political orientation. The ways in which these two sources are interpreted often relies on the individual's specific political ideology formed by the long-term factors.

Most political scientist agreed that the mass media have a profound impact on voting behaviour. One expert asserts that:

Few would argue with the notion that the institutions of the mass media are important to contemporary politics …in the transition to liberal democratic politics in Eastern Europe and Africa in the media was a key battleground.

Second, there are election issues. These include campaign issues, debates and commercials. Election years and political campaigns can shift certain political behaviours based on the candidates involved, which have different degrees of effectiveness in influencing voters.

3.3. The influence of social groups on political outcomes

In the recent time, some political scientists have developed interest in other area of studies which aimed to analyze the relation between the behaviour of social groups and the political outcomes. Some of the social groups included in their studies have been age demographics, gender and ethnic groups. This can be understood through the lenses of pluralism or social identity theory.

For example, in USA politics, it has been discovered that the effect of ethnic groups and gender has a great influence on the political outcomes. Hispanic Americans have a profound social impact on the political outcome of their vote and are emerging as a strong up-and-coming political force. The most noticeable increase in Hispanic American voting was in the 2000 presidential election, although the votes did not share a socially common political view at that time. In the 2006 election, the Hispanic American vote aided tremendously in the election of Florida Senator Mel Martinez, although in the 2004 presidential election, about 44% of Latin Americans voted for Republican President George W. Bush. However, Hispanic Americans have the lowest voting rate in the United States, with only 47.6% voting in the 2016 Presidential Election in the United States. Currently illegal immigration has been claiming the most attention and Hispanic Americans, although not completely unanimous, are concerned with the education, employment and deportation of illegal immigrants in the United States. Although the majority of Hispanic Americans vote for Democratic candidates, Cuban Americans are likely the most conservative of Latinos, with 54% of Cuban American voters casting ballots for Donald Trump in the 2016 Presidential Election, compared to an average of 35% of all Latinos who voted. Although this represents a net decrease in support for the Republican Party among Cuban Americans, it continues a trend created by the exile of many Cubans after the Cuban Revolution.

African Americans have the second highest voting rates in the United States and even surpassed white voters in the 2008 Presidential Election, although this has declined in the 2016 Presidential Election. In the 2008 Presidential Election and 2012 Presidential election, African Americans voted overwhelmingly for Democratic candidate, Barack Obama.This trend of African Americans voting for candidates of the Democratic Party continued into the 2016 Presidential Election.

Women in the United States have, in the past 30 years, surpassed male voting rates, with the 2016 Presidential Election having a ratio between females and males of 52 to 48. This development is often referred to as the Gender Gap and when combined with the tendency of women to vote for Democratic candidates, their effect on political outcomes is extremely important.

3.4 Biology and political science

Interdisciplinary studies aim to identify and correlates of political behaviour with biological aspects, for example the linkage of biology and political orientation but also with other aspects like partnership and voting behaviour. This field of study is typically referred to geopolitics although it is sometimes referred to as bio-politics although the term also has other meanings originating from the work of Foucault Michel.

The study of possible inherited bases of political behaviour has grown since the 1980s. The term geopolitics was coined by political scientist Fowler James in the early-2000s to describe research into identifying specific transporter/receptor genes liable for ideological orientation beyond the socio-psychological sphere of political socialisation.

3.5. Political participation

Political scientists also aim to understand what drives individuals to participate in the democratic process, either by voting, volunteering for campaigns, signing petitions or protesting. Participation cannot always be explained by rational behaviour. The voting paradox, for example, points out that it cannot be in a citizen's self-interest to vote because the effort it takes to vote will almost always outweigh the benefits of voting, particularly considering a single vote is unlikely to change an electoral outcome. Political scientists instead propose that citizens vote for psychological or social reasons. Studies show, for example, that individuals are more likely to vote if they see their friends have voted or if someone in their household has received a nudge to vote.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (SAE)

Write short notes on all the following concepts.

(a) Long-term influences on political orientation

 (b) Short-term influences on political orientation

(c) The influence of social groups on political outcomes

(d) Biology and political science, (e) Political participation.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The theories explained above profoundly bring us to a closer view on the principles that influence political behavior. It is very important to study these theories because of their roles. And the light they shed on the understanding either in long-term or short-term influences in the voters.

5.0 SUMMARY

This unit has explicitly discussed the theories that explain political behaviour based on the concepts which have been discussed above. This is necessary because it enlighten the readers to comprehend the principles on the course is founded and rooted in the study.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMAs)

1.   What are the importances of theories in understanding voters' political behaviour?

7.0   REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Clark, William Roberts, Matt Golder, and Sona N. Golder. 2013. "Power and politics: insights from an exit, voice, and loyalty game."

Gidengil, Elisabeth; Wass, Hanna; Valaste, Maria (June 2016). "Political Socialization and Voting: The Parent-Child Link in Turnout". Political Research Quarterly.

Dey, Eric L., *Undergraduate Political Attitudes: Peer Influence in Changing Social Contexts*, Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 68, 1997

Krosnick, Jon A.; Alwin, Duane F. (1989)."Aging and Susceptibility to Attitude change" (PDF). Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.

Albert Somit; Steven A. Peterson (2011). Biology and Political Behavior: The Brain, Genes and Politics - The Cutting Edge. Emerald Group Publishing.

Nickerson, David (February 2008). "Is Voting Contagious? Evidence from Two Field Experiments". American Political Science Review.

Unit: 5 Political Behaviour: An Overview

CONTENT

1.0   Introduction.

2.0   Objectives

3.0   Main Content

3.1   Political Behaviour: An Overview

4.0   Conclusion

5.0   Summary

6.0   Tutor Marked Assignment

7.0   References/Further Reading

1.0   INTRODUCTION

Finally, we look at the overview of what political behavior connote in this unit and bring to summary how other experts in the field postulated in the international community. The fiftieth anniversary of the modern era in political behaviour research was celebrated in 1994.

The first anniversary took off in 1944 at the beginning of the new epoch because in that year, Paul Lazarsfeld and his colleagues from the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University who are experts in the field published the first academically inspired study of an election that based majorly on individual voters. In their analysis, which focused on fieldwork carried out in the 1940 presidential campaign in New York, was quite outdated in some area and while some advanced. Moreover, it established an enduring intellectual paradigm in political behaviour research—an intellectual paradigm that we will consider more extensively as we proceed in this unit. But the fundamental significance of their study for the modern era was that it focused on individual voters, and in so doing it helped transform the study of citizenship and democratic politics.

3.0   OBJECTIVES
At the end of this last unit of the module, the students should be able to:
(i)   Philosophizer political behaviour.
(ii)   Evaluate and define the points in the concept of political science.

4.0   MAIN CONTENT

3.1   POLITICAL BEHAVIUOR-AN OVERVIEW

The sociologists in Columbia were not the only scholars during this general period that turned their focus to the individual citizen. Let us examine two other streams of intellectual research, both of which comprehended democratic politics in the context of individual voters, locate their origins in the same post-war period. The American National Election Study series and the work of Campbell, Converse, Miller and Stokes (1960) trace their origins to fieldwork conducted in the 1948 election. And economic theories of democracy have a genesis which dates, perhaps most notably, to the work of Anthony Downs (1957). Taken together, these efforts have established three schools of research:

1.   the political sociology tradition that flowed from the work of the Bureau of Applied Research at Columbia,
2.   the political psychology tradition with origins at the University of Michigan's Center for Survey Research and,
3.   the political economy tradition which seriously began to apply concepts of rationality and self-interest to the study of citizen behaviour. The danger in identifying these separate traditions is that we ignore their commonalities to focus on their differences, thereby missing the forest for the trees. The aim of this unit is that each of the three traditions addressed a distinct challenge to democratic theory. Each tradition has made substantial progress in formulating a response to these end linked to a process of social or political conflict, and in general when a more sophisticated mechanism of contextual influence is specified. Therefore, let us examine each of these in turn.

First, consider the size of the aggregation unit. In a fascinating study, Erikson, Wright, and McIver (1993) have demonstrated the importance of state-level political cultures for the structure of political coalitions and the behaviour of individual voters. There are a great many other reasons for rejecting self-selection arguments in their work, but at the most basic level, would we really expect that people locate themselves in states (or provinces or counties) for politically relevant reasons? As the units of aggregation become larger, the plausibility of self-selection as an account of contextual effects grows smaller.

Second, an increasing number of studies have turned toward the demonstration of contextual effects in time. Huckfeldt and Sprague (1990; 1995) show that political campaigns enhance contextual effects—the effects are larger at the end of the campaign—and that the magnitude of the enhancement varies in systematic ways across different groups defined in terms of individual characteristics. Grofman et al. (1993) and Carmines et al. (1995) show that the previously documented "Key effect" can be demonstrated in time. Both efforts show that the white exodus from the Democratic Party has been accelerated by events of the 1960s in counties where black populations are most concentrated. Dynamic formulations such as these are quite difficult to recast in terms of a self-selection argument: do people relocate themselves between observations in a way that produces the spurious appearance of a time-structured effect?

Third, the "Key effect" is insulated from the self-selection argument on another basis as well. When a contextual effect is rooted in social or political hostility, self-selection once again lacks plausibility. If southern whites who live in black counties were racially hostile toward blacks, how can we lay the blame on self-selection? Do racially hostile whites locate in black counties in order to be near the objects of their hostility? In such an instance, the political behaviour is quite clearly predicated, in perhaps complex ways, on the surrounding social context.

Finally, more sophisticated specifications of contextual influence tend in general to undermine the self-selection argument. One of the most important contributions in this regard was made by Erbring and Young (1979), who argued that contextual effects should be seen as the endogenous feedbacks of behavioural interdependence. In this same regard, Przeworski (1974), Sprague and Westefield(1979), Huckfeldt (1983; 1984; 1986), and Przeworski and Sprague (1986) produced arguments that generally moved the contextual effects literature toward behavioural and informational interdependence as opposed to arguments rooted in shared social characteristics. By focusing on socially communicated information and interdependent behaviour as the medium of contextual influence, the contextual effects literature has moved away from social reference group explanations for contextual influence. Consider Langton and Rapoport's (1975) explanation of support for Allende in 1964 among Santiago workers: workers who lived among other workers came to identify with these workers and hence to support Allende.

In spite of its attractiveness, such an explanation is vulnerable to the self-selection counter explanation: only workers who identify as workers choose to live among workers.

As these more recent efforts suggest, there is more to the self-selection dispute than simple issues of temporal precedence. More fundamentally, these are debates regarding the role of individual purpose, the erogeneity of individual preferences, and the form of independent structural effects on individual behaviour. More complete specifications of contextual influence allow reconciliation between individual purpose and the independent exogenous effect of social structure. But such an explanation typically involves a marriage between social contexts, social networks, and interdependent citizens who act purposefully on the basis of political goals.

SELF ASSESSMENT EXERCISE (SAE)

Evaluate the concept of political behaviour from the perspective of political scientist.

4.0   CONCLUSION

Finally, self-selection is not a repudiation of environmental influence. If people decide against joining the local Sierra Club chapter because it is full of knee-jerk environmentalists, it becomes difficult to suggest that political choice is independent of the social context. People choose to be part of some environments, and they avoid others, but neither choice is readily interpreted apart from the intersection of the individual and the environment.

5.0   SUMMARY

The discourse in this unit centered on the overview of political behaviour and the summary of the concept by various experts. It is very important to examine this because of its relevant in the course outline. Furthermore, in this unit we have looked at the core of the course from the beginning to the modern era and the new ideas and other reformation which cut across the scope of discourse of the subject.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMAs)

(i)   Is political behaviour evolutionary or revolutionary?
(ii) What is the relevanceof studying political behaviour in contemporary political science?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Aarts, K., Blais, A., and Schmitt, H. (eds.) 2005. *Political Leaders and Democratic Elections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.Find this resource:

Adams, J., Merrill, S., and Grofman, B. 2005. *A Unified Theory of Party Competition: A Cross-National Analysis Integrating Spatial and Behavioral Factors*. New York: Cambridge University Press.Find this resource:

Bartolini, S. and Mair, P. 1990. *Identity, Competition, and Electoral Availability: The Stability of European Electorates, 1885–1985*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Evans, G. (ed.) 1999. *The End of Class Politics? Class Voting in Comparative Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Iverson, T. 1994. The logics of electoral politics: spatial, directional and mobilization effects. *Comparative Political Studies*, 27: 155–89.

Kittilson, M. 2007. Research resources in comparative political behavior. Pp. 865–95 in *Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*, ed. R. J. Dalton and H.-D. Klingemann. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Merrill, S. and Grofman, B. 1999. *A Unified Theory of Voting: Directional and Proximity Spatial Models*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zukin, C., Keeter, S., Andolina, M., Jenkins, K., and DelliCarpini, M. 2006. *A New Engagement? Political Participation, Civic Life, and the Changing American Citizen*. New York: Oxford University Press.