BPSC-109: POLITICAL PROCESSES AND INSTITUTIONS IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

(TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT)

Course Code: BPSC-109
Assignment Code: BPSC-109/ASST/TMA/2026-27
Marks: 100
Note: Answer all questions. All questions carry equal weightage.

Assignment – I

Answer the following questions in about 500 words each. (2 × 20 = 40 marks)

1. Distinguish between political modernisation and political development. Explain their significance for comparative politics.

2. Compare the nature and working of federalism in Canada, Australia and India.

Assignment – II

Answer the following questions in about 250 words each. (3 × 10 = 30 marks)

3. Explain the concept and major components of political culture.

4. Discuss the major types and political consequences of electoral systems.

5. Compare the processes of decentralisation in Brazil, India and Britain.

Assignment – III

Answer the following questions in about 100 words each. (5 × 6 = 30 marks)

6. Functioning of political parties

7. Party systems

8. Pressure groups

9. Post-colonial state

10. Democratisation in post-authoritarian and post-communist countries

1. Distinguish between political modernisation and political development. Explain their significance for comparative politics.

Answer

Political modernisation and political development are related but not identical concepts used to understand political change. Modernisation refers principally to the transformation of a society's traditional institutions, attitudes and patterns of authority under the influence of industrialisation, urbanisation, mass education, communications and social mobility. Political development is a broader assessment of how political institutions acquire the capacity, legitimacy and responsiveness necessary to govern an increasingly complex society. A society can experience modernisation without achieving stable, inclusive or democratic political development.

Meaning of political modernisation. Modernisation theory became influential after the Second World War, when scholars tried to explain the transformation of new and existing states. Political modernisation describes a movement from locally based, personal and inherited authority towards larger, differentiated, specialised and generally secular political institutions. Growing literacy and mass media expand political awareness; urban life and occupational differentiation create new interests; parties, bureaucracies and legislatures begin to link wider populations to the state. The process is associated with rational-legal authority, more specialised administration and increasing political participation. It does not mean that every society must reproduce a single Western political model.

For example, a community may move from the dominance of hereditary notables to elected representatives and professional public officials. Citizens may increasingly address public demands to state institutions rather than only to family, caste or customary leaders. These are indicators of modernisation even when public institutions remain unequal or ineffective. Modernisation also creates pressure: education and communication can raise expectations faster than governing institutions can respond.

Meaning of political development. Political development focuses on the quality and capacity of a political order. Lucian Pye emphasised equality, capacity and differentiation as major dimensions: citizens should have more equal political standing, institutions should perform demanding collective tasks, and specialised organisations should carry out distinct functions. Samuel Huntington, meanwhile, stressed institutionalisation: stable, adaptable, complex and coherent organisations must develop alongside expanding political participation. Development therefore concerns effective rule-making, orderly competition,