

Public Opinion of Bureaucratic Performance in Uttar Pradesh (India) and Its Impact on Social Change and Modernization, 1966-1976

DHIRENDRA K. VAJPEYI*

The hypothesis that greater citizen satisfaction tends to create greater support for governmental programs was tested in Uttar Pradesh, India over the past decade (1966-1976) using the panel study technique. In general, the attitudes and perceptions of the Indian citizens regarding the bureaucracy between 1966 and 1976 did not change considerably. They do not expect equal treatment and serious consideration of their opinions, feel that wealthy and influential persons stand better chances, and are quite critical of the bureaucracy. But despite this, citizens who reported associations with bureaucrats are generally supportive of the political system. An important finding of the study is the high discontent of the urban sample. The successful resolutions of this urban cynicism and other problems would direct and influence India's campaign for social change and modernization through democratic means.

The social, economic, and political transformation of developing countries like India is inconceivable without massive and direct participation of government and an adequately functioning bureaucracy. As government takes on new responsibilities to bring about social change and modernization, the "managerial" role of bureaucracy becomes strategically crucial. Edward Weidner observes that deliberate development plans and policies are the principal independent variables in the process of moderniza-

tion.¹ The justification for the expanded role of the government in these development-oriented countries could be explained "in terms of the interaction of two basic characteristics of today's less developed nations: (1) ambitious, century-skipping social and economic aspirations, and (2) lack of private overhead capital sufficient to fulfill these designs."² Researches have demonstrated how unreal and impractical it would be to think of any type of national development in which bureaucracy, even if its role is

*Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Northern Iowa.

I am thankful to the American Institute of Indian Studies for awarding me a post-doctoral Senior Fellowship which enabled me to spend six months in India in 1976. The above data are part of a larger project. I am also grateful to Ms. Anita Bernard and Celeste Simoff for helping me on this manuscript.

¹E. Weidner, "Developmental Change and the Social Sciences: Conclusion," in A. Gallagher, Jr. (ed.), *Perspectives in Developmental Change* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1968).

²Lee Sigelman, *Modernization and the Political System: A Critique and Preliminary Empirical Analysis* (California: Sage Publications, 1971), p. 26.

limited, is excluded.³ Fainsod perceives the role of bureaucracy as a carrier or inhibitor of modernizing values.⁴ Chapel observes that "adequate administration is a condition for economic development in all countries."⁵ Tsantis' study of 72 nations concludes by supporting Kapp that "underdevelopment seems to go hand in hand with 'underadministration.'"⁶ Hence, it becomes pertinent for developing nations that the bureaucracy develop a potential capacity to sustain continuously changing and new types of political demands and organizations. In most of the developing countries in Asia and Africa, dissolution of colonialism brought changes in administrative environment requiring a new concept and image of bureaucracy. Depersonalized, unresponsive bureaucratic norms of pre-independence days needed to be replaced by responsive and personalized bureaucratic norms. A better relationship between the "rulers" and the "ruled" became crucial for the success of five-year plans, community development programs, and the implementa-

tion of a development-oriented political program. In a country like India which committed itself to the establishment of an egalitarian society through democratic process and socialist economy, the success in implementation of plans depended heavily on citizen interest, participation, and a cooperative relationship with the bureaucracy. Its long history of exploitation at the hands of outsiders has conditioned the villager to a hostile view of bureaucracy. In Indian villages, as Duke notes, "the relations between the common village people and government officials are characterized by considerable distance, reserve and distrust."⁷ Foster points out that the "villager has been victimized by persons more knowledgeable than he since the beginning of time."⁸ Levi writing about Italian peasants said:

The state is more distant than heaven and far more of a scourge, because it is always against them . . . Their only defense . . . is resignation, the same gloomy resignation, alleviated by no hope of paradise, that bows their shoulders under the scourges of nature.⁹

Bailey talking about Indian peasant attitudes and beliefs observed that:

One justifies cheating government agencies by saying that the officials concerned are cheating you. This perception is often so firm that even behavior which is patently not exploitative, but benevolent, is inter-

³F. Morstein Marx, "The Higher Civil Service as an Action Group in Western Political Development," in La Palombara (ed.), *Bureaucracy and Political Development* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1963), pp. 62-95.

⁴Merle Fainsod, "Bureaucracy and Modernization: The Russian and Soviet Case," in La Palombara (ed.), *Ibid.*, pp. 233-267.

⁵Yves Chapel, "Le Sous-développement administratif," (*International Review of Administrative Sciences*, Vol. XXII, No. 3 (1966)), pp. 211-218.

⁶Andreas C. Tsantis, "Political Factors in Economic Development," *Comparative Politics*, Vol. II, No. 1 (October 1969), pp. 63-78; and K. William Kapp, "Economic Development, National Planning and Public Administration," *Kyklos*, Vol. XIII (Fasc. 2) (1960), p. 202.

⁷S.C. Duke, *India's Changing Villages: Human Factor in Community Development* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1958), p. 82.

⁸George M. Foster, *Traditional Cultures and the Impact of Technological Change* (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), p. 48.

⁹Carlo Levi, *Christ Stopped at Eboli* (New York: Farrar, Strauss, 1947), p. 76.

preted as a hypocritical cover for some as yet undisclosed interest; by definition, all horses are Trojan.¹⁰

Indian officials have to overcome the legacies of the freedom movement which discredited not only British rule but inadvertently administration as such, and hence intensified the personal and social distance between citizens and official representatives of government, because

the difference between modern democratic, semi-democratic, and totalitarian political systems does not lie in the spread of power, for this is common to all of them. The difference lies in the ways in which the rulers react to this power. The spread of potential political power is a characteristic of all modern political systems.¹¹

The citizen's image of the government is shaped by the welcome treatment he is given by bureaucracy. Hegel assigned bureaucracy the role of the state's receptionist. He was very much concerned with making each contact between the citizen and agents of bureaucracy a mutually elevating experience. He saw each contact as an opportunity to reinforce the very idea of the state as an expression of its vitality. He feared that thrones could be lost through the arrogance of thoughtless underlings.¹² To avoid this and to understand the relationship between bureaucracy and citizen we have

to examine the nature of communicative and contact patterns between officials and citizens, with the particular goal of determining the relevance of bureaucratic contact for citizen perceptions, attitudes and orientations.¹³

Researchers have indicated citizen involvement as a precondition for an effective process in the modern polity. These administrative contacts help move the public toward greater knowledge of the system, greater optimism about the public's role in the system, greater attitudinal support for the system, and greater cooperation with the goals of the system.¹⁴ This understanding, according to Rourke, can be brought about in two ways: by creating a favorable attitude toward the agency in the public at large; and secondly, by building strength with "attentive" publics — groups which have a salient interest in the agency.¹⁵ According to Robson this is a two-way process where both administrators and citizens have to take a constructive view. He observes that

the achievement of good relations between the government and the public is a matter which does not by any means depend solely on the conduct of civil servants and politicians. It depends equally on the attitude of citizens, groups, corporations, associations of all kinds and indeed of all unofficial bodies to public authorities. If we want public servants to behave

¹⁰F. G. Bailey, "The Peasant View of the Bad Life," *Journal of British Association for the Advancement of Science*, Vol. XXIII (1966), pp. 399-409.

¹¹S. N. Eisenstadt, "Bureaucracy and Political Development," in La Palombara (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 99.

¹²Morstein Marx in La Palombara (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 85.

¹³Samuel J. Eldersveld, V. Jagannadham, and A.P. Barnabas, *The Citizen and the Administrator, in a Developing Democracy* (Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1968), p. 7.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 13, and Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, *The Civic Culture* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., Inc., 1965).

¹⁵Francis E. Rourke, *Bureaucracy, Politics and Public Policy* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., Inc., 1969), p. 13.

well towards us, we must behave well towards them.¹⁶

With growing modernization came an increased impact of internal democratization and the development of new social, political and economic goals which caused bureaucracies not only to extend the scope of their activities, but also to be more responsive to the public. Hence, a study of citizen-government contact will lead us to understand how output affects the kind of expectations people have of treatment at the hands of government officials. In a modern society the attitudes and beliefs of citizens are positive and not based on suspicion, interpersonal distrust and hostility, as is the case in a traditional, non-participatory society. In a participatory and modern system the citizens are not treated as "dumb," and are not abandoned as serfs to landlords as Max Weber found in Egypt, Mesopotamia, and in the Hellenist and late Roman states.¹⁷

The research reported in this paper is based on data collected in Uttar Pradesh, India over the past decade (1966-1976). The panel study technique¹⁸ was employed to interview a sample of 456 citizens in 1966. In 1976 only 425 respondents from the original sample could be interviewed.

¹⁶William A. Robson (ed.), *The Civil Service in Britain and France* (London: The Hogart Press, 1956), p. 13.

¹⁷Max Weber, *Ancient Judaism* (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1952), p. 206.

¹⁸"Panel studies involve the collection of data over time from the same *sample* of respondents. The sample for such a study is called the *panel*. This is the most sophisticated survey design for most explanatory purposes." See Earl L. Babbie, *Survey Research Methods* (California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1973), pp. 64-65.

Thirty-one respondents had either moved, died, or could not be found. The first phase of the project was undertaken in June 1966 to find out the relationship between citizens and the administrators, and the citizen perception of administrative policies which are so essential in introducing social change and modernization.

The second and the third phases of the research were completed in 1972¹⁹ and 1976 respectively. The same questions about respondents' perceptions of the bureaucratic performance and governmental actions were asked.

The hypothesis in this paper is that greater satisfaction tends to create greater support to governmental programs of transforming and modernizing the society. The fewer contacts with the government, the less chance there is that citizens' law is put to the test.

Districts were used as primary sampling units because they are the largest administrative units and have identical administrative structure. Also the use of districts allowed us to take into account the geographical spread of a state. Thirdly, districts provided a convenient unit for stratifying the state into socio-economically developed and underdeveloped regions. Lastly, they helped us to cluster the interviews. For the purpose of this study I selected three districts on the basis of their socio-economic development²⁰ — one most developed, second medium developed, and the third least developed.

¹⁹The 1972 data were reported in *Asian Studies* (December 1972), pp. 361-377.

²⁰D.L. Sheth, "Socio-Economic Profiles of Districts of Four States in India," (New Delhi: Centre for the Study of Developing Societies, 1966), Mimeo.

Within districts, the community development blocks were used as sampling units because they automatically clustered the villages. As I was also interested in exposure to urbanization and the modern sectors of the community, these blocks were ranked with reference to the distance between block and district headquarters. In case of alternative routes the shortest route was taken into consideration. Using a median split, the blocks were stratified into proximal and distal blocks. Then from each stratum one block was selected — making two blocks from each district. The quota of interviews for each district was distributed between the two selected blocks according to the latter's population size.

In selecting the villages within each block no standard procedure was adopted. First, this was because any procedure favoring the selection of the larger villages would have deprived the study of the opportunity of studying small-size communities on a regular basis from district to district. Second, the presence in the sample of villages varying in size from below 200 to above 10,000 would assure the availability of adequate data on larger villages which in terms of size verged on smaller towns. The villages were, therefore, ranked in terms of their size; once again we used the median split to stratify them into large and small villages. Selecting then one village from each of the strata, the block-quota of interviews was dis-

tributed between the two villages proportionate to their size.

For the urban sample, the towns were classified in three categories:

- (1) industrial centers;
- (2) those which were in immediate or transitory stages of industrialization; and
- (3) those which overlapped the villages in terms of their traditional structure and low level of industrialization.

Three towns, one from each category, were selected for the study. The total number of urban interviews were distributed with reference to the proportion of state population in all towns of that size within the state.

At each sampling point, respondents were selected from the available voters' list. In the absence of an actual voters' list, use was made of lists of adult residents that were available with the village or town administration. The names of actual respondents were selected using a random table of numbers. Thus the following framework emerged:

- (1) 3 districts
- (2) 2 blocks from each district (total blocks, 6)
- (3) 2 villages from each block (total villages, 12)
- (4) 3 towns

The distribution of interviews in these three selected districts was as follows:

District	Rural Interviews		Towns	Urban Interviews		Total	
	1966	1976		1966	1976	1966	1976
Varanasi	92	87	Varanasi	56	51	148	138
Bacāun	91	88	Lucknow	36	29	127	117
Gozakhpur	101	94	Ghaziabad	80	76	181	170
Total	284	269		172	156	456	425

The original questionnaire was in English; I translated it into Hindi, the language spoken in the State.

The central variables selected for the study were public expectation of treatment, public contacts with government, and public evaluation of governmental performance.

Expectation of Treatment

The image of government in the minds of citizens is built on the basis of treatment they receive from its functionaries. Their attitudes of support or hostility toward the government are shaped by these impressions. In this study, respondents were asked

about the kind of treatment they expected from various government officials at district, block and village, and from the police:

Do you expect (mention the officer's position) to treat all citizens equally?

Tables 1 and 2 show the expectation of treatment from the bureaucracy and the police by sex and residence, for 1966 and 1976. In 1966, data show that relatively few people expected equal treatment from the bureaucrats. The results varied by sex and residence; more males than females regardless of residence expected equal treatment. Generally, less people in rural than urban areas expected

Table 1. Expectation of Treatment from Bureaucracy and Police, Rural, by Year and Sex (in percent)

Expectation of Treatment	1966		1976	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
A. From Bureaucracy				
Expect Equal Treatment	13	3	17	6
Don't Expect Equal Treatment	63	67	59	66
Depends	17	20	19	21
No Opinion	7	10	5	7
Total	100	100	100	100
B. From Police				
Expect Equal Treatment	8	3	9	3
Don't Expect Equal Treatment	53	69	56	71
Depends	26	18	31	19
No Opinion	13	10	4	7
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 2. Expectation of Treatment from Bureaucracy and Police, Urban, by Year and Sex (in percent)

Expectation of Treatment	1966		1976	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
A. From Bureaucracy				
Expect Equal Treatment	21	5	26	9
Don't Expect Equal Treatment	65	69	53	57
Depends	11	22	17	29
No Opinion	3	4	4	5
Total	100	100	100	100
B. From Police				
Expect Equal Treatment	17	4	9	4
Don't Expect Equal Treatment	41	49	57	55
Depends	39	43	31	37
No Opinion	3	4	3	4
Total	100	100	100	100

similar treatment. Regardless of category, however, the proportion of those who expected equal treatment was rather low.

The data also demonstrate that citizens were not very hopeful about police behavior. In India, police have been traditionally associated with high-handed behavior and corruption. The proportion of both sexes and location which expected equal treatment from the police is lower than those expecting the same treatment from the bureaucracy. Twenty-six percent males and 18% females in the rural sample, and 39% males and 43% females in the urban areas felt that police treatment would depend on a variety of considerations.

In 1976, a slightly higher percentage expected equal treatment than in 1966. Also, the respondents reporting under the 'depends' category increased while respondents with 'no opinion' decreased in rural areas. Most of the respondents were not willing to express their opinions openly about the government in general and the police in particular. It is to be noted however, that the 1976 data collection was done during the national emergency and in an atmosphere of fear and suspicion. In both the 1966 and 1976 surveys, a greater number of females were more cynical and did not expect equal treatment from the bureaucracy and the police than their male counterparts. This may be due to very few contacts women have with govern-

ment; they could have formed their impressions by remembering what they heard from their husbands and neighbors.

The above findings do not speak very highly of the Indian government's efforts to establish an egalitarian society based on social justice and fairness, and of the kind of impressions its officers generate in the minds of the people. It seems that despite all efforts on the part of the political leadership, the administrative system has not kept pace and has not tried its best to allay the suspicions of the people of India.

It has been noted that effective authority depends upon cumulative, individual acts of compliance or confidence.²¹ In the absence of goodwill and citizen satisfaction about the treatment they get or expect to get from public authorities, this confidence is difficult to generate.

The question regarding expectation of equal treatment was followed by asking those respondents who did not expect equal treatment or said that treatment depended on a variety of factors the following question:

In your opinion what are the reasons that some citizens get better treatment than others?

A wide variety of explanatory factors were given by the respondents. They felt that persons with wealth and connections with state, district and local-level politicians and officials would get preferential treatment over those who did not have such advantages. The caste was not mentioned to be a

crucial factor. In a situation like India where caste has traditionally been one of the most pervasive and important factors influencing behavior, the low percentage of respondents who mention caste is an interesting indication of how new, nontraditional factors are replacing the old ones in social and political interaction, specially in urban areas where social class is a more important unit of interaction than the caste.

The 1966 and 1976 data (Tables 3 and 4) show that respondents think that wealthy people get better and preferential treatment than others. Relatives come next followed by politicians. In general there has not been much change in the perceptions and attitudes of respondents towards bureaucracy and police between 1966 and 1976. The data point out that the great majority of Indians do not feel that the ordinary citizen can get fair and equal treatment. This is more evident in the case of urban areas. This raises questions about the direction and the capability of a political system to create a sense of legitimacy among citizens. General elections in March 1977 and the repudiation of Mrs. Gandhi and her party could very well be due to the above factors. In the same series, respondents were asked about the extent of consideration they expect for their point of views and opinions from the bureaucracy and the police. Results are reported in Tables 5 and 6. The number of respondents who expected serious consideration from the bureaucracy is not high. In the rural sample the percentage of citizens expecting serious consideration rose slightly in 1976 compared to 1966 but in the urban sample the percentage decreased. In the category of "little attention," the

²¹ Reinhard Bendix, *Nation-Building and Citizenship: Studies of Our Changing Social Order* (New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1969), pp. 23-24.

Table 3. Egalitarianism in Administration
(Bureaucracy and Police), Rural,
by Year and Sex (in percent)

Perception Regarding Egalitarianism	1966		1976	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
A. By Bureaucracy				
All are treated equally	13	3	17	6
Preferential treatment is given:	80	87	78	87
(a) Wealthy	(35)	(40)	(37)	(40)
(b) Relatives	(23)	(30)	(19)	(26)
(c) High Castes	(10)	(8)	(8)	(11)
(d) Politicians	(12)	(9)	(14)	(10)
No Opinion	7	10	5	7
Total	100	100	100	100
B. By Police				
All are treated equally	8	3	9	3
Preferential treatment is given:	79	87	87	90
(a) Wealthy	(49)	(50)	(46)	(47)
(b) Relatives	(6)	(11)	(8)	(11)
(c) High Castes	(7)	(9)	(6)	(11)
(d) Politicians	(17)	(17)	(27)	(21)
No Opinion	13	10	4	7
Total	100	100	100	100

percentages, both rural and urban, increased in 1976. In 1966, 53% males and 67% females in the rural areas and 41% males and 59% females in the urban areas reported that bureaucrats would totally ignore them. In 1976, 36% rural males and 41% rural females and 47% urban males and 49% urban

females reported that their views and opinions would be ignored. In both years percentage of women respondents reporting that they would be ignored were higher than males.

The extent of consideration respondents expected from the police official

Table 4. Egalitarianism in Administration
(Bureaucracy and Police), Urban,
by Year and Sex (in percent)

Perception Regarding Egalitarianism	1966		1976	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
A. By Bureaucracy				
All are treated equally	21	5	26	9
Preferential treatment is given to:	76	91	70	86
(a) Wealthy	(43)	(51)	(32)	(36)
(b) Relatives	(19)	(23)	(13)	(11)
(c) High Castes	(6)	(8)	(7)	(12)
(d) Politicians	(8)	(9)	(18)	(27)
No Opinion	3	4	4	5
Total	100	100	100	100
B. By Police				
All are treated equally	17	4	9	4
Preferential treatment is given to:	80	92	88	92
(a) Wealthy	(46)	(57)	(49)	(51)
(b) Relatives	(5)	(11)	(4)	(8)
(c) High Castes	(5)	(7)	(5)	(5)
(d) Politicians	(24)	(17)	(30)	(28)
No Opinion	3	4	3	4
Total	100	100	100	100

was significantly lower than in the bureaucratic category. In 1966 only 3% rural males and 1% rural females and 3% urban males and no urban females reported high/serious consideration from the police. In 1976 the percentages were 5%, 2%, 4% and 2%, respectively. In 1966, 13% males, 6% females in the rural areas, 5% males and 5% females in the urban areas felt

that they would get little attention. In 1976 the rural sample registered a slight decrease (11% males, 5% females, a decrease of 2% males and 1% females) while in the urban sample 9% males and 7% females expected a little attention. The percentage of respondents who felt that their opinions and views would be ignored were quite high both in 1966 and 1976.

Table 5. Extent of Consideration Expected for Point of View/Opinions from Bureaucracy and Police, Rural, by Year and Sex (in percent)

Extent of Consideration Expected	1966		1976	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
A. From Bureaucracy				
Serious Consideration	9	2	11	3
A little attention	13	6	27	9
To be ignored	53	67	36	41
Depends	19	8	18	36
No Opinions	6	17	8	11
Total	100	100	100	100
B. From Police				
Serious Consideration	3	1	5	2
A little attention	13	6	11	5
To be ignored	47	53	41	44
Depends	31	33	36	40
No Opinion	6	7	7	9
Total	100	100	100	100

Studies have shown that high education, greater mass media exposure, and serious consideration of opinions and expectations of equal treatment by government officials are positively correlated.²² The Indian data reported on Tables 7, 8 and 9 point out that the percentage of respondents, both in rural and urban areas, who were highly exposed to mass media channels had high expectations of equal treatment and serious consideration of their opinions and viewpoints from the

bureaucrats and police. With less media exposure the expectations go down. The data also indicate that the lower the mass media exposure and education, the lower is the expectation of being treated equally and getting serious consideration of their opinions. The noteworthy differences are between urban respondents in 1966 and 1976 on treatment by the police. In 1966, 23% of males and 20% of females with high exposure to media and 39% of males and 32% of females with high education had high expectation of equal treatment from the bureaucracy and the police, respectively. In 1976 the higher media ex-

²² Lucian Pye (ed.), *Communications and Political Development* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1963).

Table 6. Extent of Consideration Expected for Point of View/
Opinions from Bureaucracy and Police, Urban,
by Year and Sex (in percent)

Extent of Consideration Expected	1966		1976	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
A. From Bureaucracy				
Serious Consideration	17	3	14	3
A little attention	21	14	31	11
To be ignored	41	59	47	49
Depends	8	11	8	28
No Opinion	13	13	-	9
Total	100	100	100	100
B. From Police				
Serious Consideration	3	-	4	2
A little attention	5	5	9	7
To be ignored	42	47	31	34
Depends	46	42	45	36
No Opinion	4	6	11	21
Total	100	100	100	100

posed percentage increased to 24% males and 24% females expecting equal treatment from the bureaucracy, but it decreased to 19% males and 13% females with high education expecting equal treatment from the police. The same pattern is seen among rural respondents. As mentioned earlier, the 1976 data was collected during the national emergency imposed by Mrs. Gandhi in June 1975. Later developments and the March 1976 general elections in India, support the idea that police excesses had created an atmosphere of fear and pessimism among Indian citizens. Both in 1966 and 1976 the percentage of respondents reporting that they would

be ignored is quite high, especially for females. Higher suspiciousness of female respondents may be due to fewer female contacts and knowledge about administration. Similar findings have been reported by other researchers who concluded as follows:

Administrative contacts can move the public toward greater knowledge of the system, greater optimism about the public's role in the system, greater attitudinal support for the system. . . . This depends, however, on the strength and non-facilitative nature of the traditional social and individual orientations as well as the extent and nature of bureaucratic contacts.²³

²³Eldersveld *et al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

Table 7. Media Exposure, Level of Education and High Expectation of Equal Treatment from Bureaucracy and Police, by Residence, Year and Sex (in percent)

I. Media Exposure	High Expectation of Equal Treatment							
	Rural				Urban			
	1966		1976		1986		1976	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
A. From Bureaucracy:								
High	19	13	21	12	23	20	24	24
Medium	15	11	13	9	18	14	16	13
Low	9	7	6	3	11	10	6	6
B. From Police:								
High	17	11	14	11	14	6	12	8
Medium	9	6	11	9	8	9	14	7
Low	2	-	5	3	1	-	7	4
II. Level of Education								
A. From Bureaucracy:								
High	21	20	17	15	36	33	23	21
Medium	18	18	11	8	20	21	20	17
Low	7	7	7	6	8	5	7	6
B. From Police:								
High	21	19	17	15	39	32	19	13
Medium	17	14	10	8	29	23	9	9
Low	9	5	3	20	7	5	-	-

Table 8. Media Exposure, Level of Education and Expectation of Serious Consideration of Opinion from Bureaucracy and Police, by Residence, Year and Sex (in percent).

I. Media Exposure	High Expectation of Serious Consideration of Opinion							
	Rural				Urban			
	1966		1976		1986		1976	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
A. From Bureaucracy:								
High	18	9	21	9	23	21	21	19
Medium	17	11	8	6	16	16	16	16
Low	7	6	3	3	11	10	4	2
B. From Police:								
High	13	8	14	11	16	6	12	8
Medium	8	6	10	10	9	9	12	9
Low	2	-	5	3	-	-	7	4
II. Level of Education								
A. From Bureaucracy:								
High	23	23	17	13	36	33	23	23
Medium	20	17	11	7	20	21	21	17
Low	5	3	7	6	8	5	7	6
B. From Police:								
High	21	20	17	11	39	30	19	13
Medium	17	14	10	8	27	23	9	7
Low	6	5	3	-	7	5	-	-

Table 9. Media Exposure, Level of Education and Expectation from Bureaucracy and Police that Opinions Will Be Ignored, by Residence, Year and Sex (in percent)

I. Media Exposure		Expectation that Opinion Will Be Ignored							
		Rural				Urban			
		1966		1976		1966		1976	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
A. From Bureaucracy:									
High	17	21	24	27	22	24	20	22	
Medium	23	27	31	34	26	29	23	26	
Low	28	33	41	47	28	31	27	31	
B. From Police:									
High	21	26	27	31	22	25	24	27	
Medium	29	31	34	37	24	27	26	29	
Low	41	36	46	51	31	34	31	35	
II. Level of Education									
A. From Bureaucracy:									
High	17	19	26	28	11	13	30	32	
Medium	23	26	29	31	19	21	33	36	
Low	29	32	30	33	3	7	39	44	
B. From Police:									
High	23	26	36	39	20	23	41	43	
Medium	29	31	38	41	25	27	44	47	
Low	38	41	40	43	35	37	48	52	

Public Contact With Government and Its Support to Governmental Programs

As suggested earlier, public beliefs and attitudes towards government are formed by the treatment given by the agents of administration. In the absence of any meaningful communication and contacts between the public and the bureaucracy, there are greater chances of misunderstanding, distrust, and suspicion about each other. Frequent contacts, theoretically, help in changing these attitudes and create goodwill, understanding, and feeling of cooperation so essential for a successful administration and a democratic and participatory society. El-

dersveld *et al.*, in their study of the citizen and his relationship with the administrator in India have observed that

empirical examination of elite-citizen contacts and communication will hopefully lead us to an understanding of the Indian prospects for achievement with new and transformed political institutions, and for public participation in social and economic developmental innovation.²⁴

The respondents were asked a series of questions about their contacts with bureaucracy which helped us in developing an administrative contact in-

²⁴*Ibid.*, p. 97.

dex for each respondent. These officers about whom contact questions were asked included block development officers, district officers, such as Tehsildar, Police Superintendent, Zila Adhikaris, and village level workers. For the urban area, respondents were municipal and district officials. Both urban and rural respondents were asked about their contacts with state officers, and the frequency and nature of such contacts.

Table 10 shows that those respondents who had very high contact scores were also the ones who believed that government officials at different levels were doing a good/very good job. The data also indicated, comparatively, that a high percentage of respondents was more satisfied by the performance of their local officials than by district and state officials. This may be due to few contacts made by an average citizen with state officials.

The findings are sustained in both rural and urban areas. For instance, in the 1966 rural sample, 67% males and 53% females with very high administrative contact score reported that village officials were doing a good job. Fifty-nine percent males and 53% females were highly satisfied with the block development officials, while only 52% males and 49% females were highly satisfied with the way district officials were doing their jobs. This percentage further dropped down to 44% rural males and 39% females as regards the job performance of state officials. The same general pattern was found in the urban sample. The decrease in the contact score was found to be positively correlated with respondents' decreased beliefs about job performance by government officials.

Both urban and rural respondents who scored very high on administrative contact score were also the ones who had greater faith that government officials were doing a good job. However, respondents who never had any contacts with the bureaucracy were also the ones who thought that the government officers were not doing a good job. Thus administrative contact score was found to be positively correlated with citizen's faith in the bureaucracy.

By 1976 the percentage of respondents both in the urban and rural samples with very high administrative contact score and satisfaction from civil servants fell drastically: forty-seven percent males and 33% females (compared to 67% and 53%, respectively in 1966) reported having very high contact and satisfaction about the way village officials were doing their jobs. In the urban sample the percentage decrease is even higher in 1976. In 1966, 71% males and 66% females with very high contact score were satisfied with municipal officials, 63% males and 59% females with district officials, and 55% males and 53% females with state officials. By 1976 the percentages fell to 49%, 46%, 46%, 45%, 41%, and 41% respectively. The pattern although less striking was continued vis-a-vis state officials by respondents from rural areas: 40% males and 26% females (compared to 44% and 39% in 1966) both had very high contacts and felt that state officials were doing a good job. Decreases also occurred in the other categories of administrative contact score and citizens' perception of bureaucracy's job performance. But despite these, data reported in 1976 indicate positive correlation between the administrative contact score and the perception of citizens toward government officials

Table 10. The Role of Administrative Contacts in Developing Belief in and Support for Governmental Programs, by Residence and Sex (in percent)

Believe government officials are doing good job/very good job	1966 Administrative Contact Score*									
	Very High		High		Average		Occasional		Never	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Rural Sample										
Village officials	67	53	57	50	43	37	41	38	21	17
Block officials	59	53	54	51	46	37	40	38	18	13
District officials	52	49	47	43	41	29	33	27	15	11
State officials	44	39	37	40	39	35	31	23	14	11
Urban Sample										
Municipal officials	71	66	68	66	59	51	47	43	39	31
District officials	63	59	58	53	55	53	46	43	32	27
State officials	55	53	50	50	46	40	41	37	29	23
1976 Administrative Contact Score*										
	Very High		High		Average		Occasional		Never	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
	Rural Sample									
Village officials	47	33	45	30	42	30	36	30	19	17
Block officials	46	40	41	40	39	32	33	26	13	11
District officials	34	29	31	29	27	23	31	21	10	10
State officials	40	26	28	21	29	23	23	19	7	4
Urban Sample										
Municipal officials	49	46	47	43	44	41	40	37	20	13
District officials	46	45	45	45	33	31	29	25	18	16
State officials	41	41	37	29	26	23	21	19	14	12
*Very High	- More than three times									
High	- Three times									
Average	- Two times									
Occasional	- Once									
Never	-									

job performance. Respondents who never had any contacts with the bureaucracy were also the ones who thought that the government officers were not doing a good job.

Daniel Lerner and other researchers in the area of modernization²⁵ have found that the presence of a large number of self-confident participants and empathic citizens is a very important factor in transforming the society. If the perception of the possibility of self-help is low, dependence upon the government is high, and the chances of frustrations greater. In a traditional, peasant society the "help me" philosophy is more firmly embedded in citizens' minds than is the "self-help" approach.²⁶ The self-confident citizen tends to be a participative and modern citizen. The feelings of self-confidence emanate from the individual's self-evaluation.

Self-evaluation is basically a positive or negative attitude toward the self. It is made up of the individual's reactions to, and his judgment of, the opinions that others have of him. The self-evaluation... is the individual's awareness of his degree of success or failure in

²⁵Daniel Lerner, *The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East* (Illinois: Free Press, 1958); Lucian W. Pye and Sidney Verba (eds.), *Political Culture and Political Development* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965); and Dharendra Vajpeyi, *Social Change and Modernization in India: A Case Study of Uttar Pradesh, 1966-1976* (Delhi: Manohar Publishers, forthcoming).

²⁶Y.V. Lakshmana Rao, *Communication and Development: A Study of Two Indian Villages* (Ph.D. thesis, University of Minnesota Press, 1963), p. 60, and MIT Center for International Studies, *Rural Development Research Report: Preliminary Report* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT, CIS, 1964), p. 9.

carrying out those social roles which he identifies as his.²⁷

In the light of the above theoretical concerns, respondents were asked a series of questions to measure the concept of self-confidence. An adjective list was provided to each respondent as to how he perceived himself. The respondent indicated, in terms of twenty adjectives or phrases, whether he was usually or not very often this kind of person. The ten positive and ten negative words and phrases were as follows:

Positive

- (1) Smart
- (2) Not afraid/Popular
- (3) Can handle problems himself
- (4) Friendly
- (5) Dependable
- (6) Honest
- (7) Takes initiative
- (8) Knowledgeable
- (9) Resourceful
- (10) Empathic

Negative

- (1) Not smart
- (2) Afraid/Not popular
- (3) Cannot handle problems himself
- (4) Not friendly
- (5) Not dependable
- (6) Selfish/Dishonest
- (7) Lacks initiative
- (8) Lacks knowledge
- (9) Not resourceful
- (10) Not empathic

The respondents were also asked how much support they give to the bureaucracy, their dealings with officials,

²⁷Alex Inkeles, "Participant Citizenship in Six Developing Countries," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. XIII, No. 4 (1969), p. 1129.

whether they felt they could act if there was a problem, and how much influence they had on government officials. Their answers to whether the public officials really cared about people like them, respect their opinions and point of views were also taken into consideration in developing the self-confidence index.

The 1966 data point out a definite high correlation between the levels of self-confidence and support for government in both the rural and urban samples. (See Tables 11 and 12.)

In 1976 the support level for the government takes a steep plunge in the urban areas, and also shows a downward trend among the rural citizens. This is quite a change from 1966.

Both 1966 and 1976 data indicate that urban respondents with greater confidence were not as supportive of the government as their rural counterparts. In 1976 the high confidence and high support did not go hand in hand. The presence of national emergency and the unusual circumstances associated with it had made citizens less supportive of government. Urban cynicism, though, is a phenomenon widely reported in other countries and by other researchers in India. Myron Weiner in his study of Indian citizens found a similar general pattern, partly because "India's urban constituencies are electorally more politicized than the Indian countryside. . ."²⁸ and generate more radical politics than rural India, being more exposed to national issues and pressures of modernization.

²⁸Myron Weiner and John Osgood Field, "India's Urban Constituencies," *Comparative Politics*, Vol. VIII, No. 2 (1976), p. 187.

The self-confidence series of questions continued, and respondents were asked:

If something went wrong, or if you were faced with negligent behavior of officers, could you complain to some higher officers in the administration or could you take your grievances to some political leader?

The 1966 data reported in Table 13 show that 41% rural males and 51% urban males could complain to higher officials or other political leaders while about one-fifth of them (21% rural males and 15% urban males) felt that nothing could be done. The percentage of females who reported that they can complain to higher officials or other leaders is lower both in the rural (33%) and the urban (39%) samples. The data indicate that urban respondents, both males and females, show greater confidence than rural respondents and feel that they can do something if they have a grievance. A similar pattern was found in 1976. Thirty-eight percent rural males and 29% rural females could complain to higher officials or leaders. Again the urban respondents showed a greater streak of cynicism than their rural counterparts. It showed a decrease in the percentage of those who stated they could complain to higher officials.

The impact of administrative contact on the level of confidence is quite noticeable in Tables 14 and 15. The data show that those respondents who had very high contact score were the ones who reported that officials treat all citizens fairly. Close to 40% of males and females in both the 1966 and 1976 rural sample felt that citizens could act if officials were negligent and were not doing their jobs properly.

Table 11. Relationship Between Level of Support and Level of Self-Confidence in Citizen Relationship Toward Government Officials in the Rural Areas, by Year (in percent)

Levels of Self-Confidence	Levels of Support for Government					
	1966			1976		
	High Support	Moderate Support	Low Support	High Support	Moderate Support	Low Support
High Self-Confidence	54	46	17	49	40	53
Moderate Self-Confidence	29	33	13	19	26	11
Low Self-Confidence	17	19	70	6	27	32
Not Ascertained	-	2	-	26	7	4
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 12. Relationship Between Level of Support and Level of Self-Confidence in Citizen Relationship Toward Government Officials in the Urban Areas, by Year (in percent)

Levels of Self-Confidence	Levels of Support for Government					
	1966			1976		
	High Support	Moderate Support	Low Support	High Support	Moderate Support	Low Support
High Self-Confidence	49	41	11	29	33	61
Moderate Self-Confidence	33	34	16	24	32	13
Low Self-Confidence	9	14	73	37	25	21
Not Ascertained	9	11	-	10	10	5
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 13. Sense of Personal Confidence or Efficacy in Contacting Government Officials, by Residence and Sex (in percent)

Respondents who report that	1966				1976			
	Rural		Urban		Rural		Urban	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
They could complain to higher officials or other leaders	41	33	51	39	38	29	41	36
They don't know if they could complain or to whom	35	39	33	41	41	46	33	27
Nothing could be done	21	27	15	19	19	23	24	29
No opinion	3	1	1	1	2	2	2	8
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

In the urban sample 47% males and 43% females with very high contact score in 1966, and 43% males and 39% females in 1976 were confident of citizen initiative. The respondents' confidence in government and the bureaucracy, and in themselves, decreases as the administrative contact score goes down. It is to be noted that despite the fact that a high percentage of respondents reported that they would be treated fairly and can take initiative individually and collectively, very high percentages still report that political contacts and pulls are quite important. In 1966 and 1976 this is true whether rural and urban respondents had very high contact score or not. Eldersveld *et al.* report similar findings in their study. They observe that:

The relatively high confidence in both administrative behavior and in the capacity of the citizen to act effectively in contacts with administrators is

noticeable in the response patterns of the rural sample. But the peasant's perspectives appear to be somewhat inconsistent, if not naive. For he feels that officials are impartial but that political pull is also important, and despite this he is more likely to attempt direct contact with administrators than is his much more cynical urban counterpart.²⁹

Our data are not completely consistent on this matter. But in general, they show that administrative contact is functional to the achievement of greater realism about administrative behavior and greater self-confidence.

General Evaluation of Governmental Performance

Modern democratic systems are very sensitive to public opinion and the

²⁹Eldersveld, *et al.*, *op. cit.*, pp. 110-112.

Table 14. The Relevance of Administrative Contact to Citizen Confidence in the Political System for 1966, by Residence and Sex (in percent)

Perception of Citizen Confidence	Administrative Contact Score									
	Very High		High		Average		Occasional		Never	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
A. Rural										
Officials treat all citizens fairly	55	49	48	43	39	37	26	23	19	13
Citizens can act if officials are not doing their jobs properly	43	41	40	36	31	28	21	18	11	11
Citizens would act by themselves if they have problems with the government	40	37	33	30	24	23	14	11	7	6
Political pull is important	69	74	73	74	76	76	80	81	86	89
B. Urban										
Officials treat all citizens fairly	51	47	41	38	40	40	33	31	27	20
Citizens can act if officials are not doing their jobs properly	47	43	43	36	39	36	29	27	23	17
Citizens would act by themselves if they have problems with the government	49	46	38	37	29	27	23	19	16	11
Political pull is important	70	73	76	79	81	83	83	83	86	89

public evaluation of governmental performance. Public support and evaluation of administration is favorable and positive if the public is satisfied in terms of material rewards, and there exist adequate psycho-political chan-

nels for the public to ventilate its grievances and participate in policy making. Theoretically an active citizen possesses knowledge about the social and political systems, is willing and ready to take initiative, has a positive

Table 15. The Relevance of Administrative Contact to Citizen Confidence in the Political System in 1976, by Residence and Sex (in percent)

Perception of Citizen Confidence	Administrative Contact Score									
	Very High		High		Average		Occasional		Never	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
A. Rural										
Officials treat all citizens fairly	57	43	54	41	50	39	36	30	2	1
Citizens can act if officials are not doing their jobs properly	40	37	38	37	38	30	29	26	1	1
Citizens would act by themselves if they have problems with the government	38	31	29	28	29	23	21	17	-	-
Political pull is important	71	74	73	76	76	76	80	83	90	93
B. Urban										
Officials treat all citizens fairly	53	49	48	48	41	39	21	17	1	-
Citizens can act if officials are not doing their jobs properly	43	39	45	39	34	30	14	11	1	-
Citizens would act by themselves if they have problems with the government	44	31	47	40	23	20	11	11	-	-
Political pull is important	74	77	77	77	77	81	83	87	90	92

attitude towards the government, and contributes in building a modern society. The respondents in this study were asked to evaluate the overall performance of different levels of government officers. The data in Tables 16 and 17 show that a high percentage of respondents reported that the government officials were doing a poor job. It is to be noted that the higher the level of officials, the higher is the percentage of respondents who felt that the officials were not doing a good job. The data do not speak very highly of general performance of the administration in India at different levels.

In 1976 fewer rural respondents reported that government officials were doing a poorer job than in 1966. Similar responses were given by the urban respondents. Thirty-nine percent males and 48% females in 1976 in contrast to 50% and 57% respectively in 1966 felt that block officials were doing a poor job. For district level officials the percentage in 1976 was 38% males, 54% females, while in 1966 the percentage reported was 60% males and 71% females. There were also significant response changes on the performance of the state officials: 40% males and 66% females from the rural areas in 1976 compared

Table 16. General Evaluation of Governmental Performance for 1966, by Residence and Sex (in percent)

Evaluation of Governmental Performance	Village Officials		Block Officials		District Officials		State Officials	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
A. Rural								
Very good job	11	7	8	6	8	3	4	2
Good job	13	10	14	11	6	3	7	3
Fair job	13	8	17	9	9	4	7	3
Poor job	53	58	50	57	60	71	70	78
No opinion	10	17	11	17	17	19	12	14
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
B. Urban								
			Municipal Officials		District Officials		State Officials	
			M	F	M	F	M	F
Very good job			16	13	14	13	9	6
Good job			19	13	21	17	17	13
Fair job			26	17	26	17	29	21
Poor job			22	38	28	42	32	46
No opinion			17	19	11	11	13	14
Total			100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 17. General Evaluation of Governmental Performance for 1976, by Residence and Sex (in percent)

Evaluation of Governmental Performance	Village Officials		Block Officials		District Officials		State Officials	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
A. Rural								
Very good job	9	3	8	7	8	3	6	-
Good job	12	13	17	9	11	3	13	2
Fair job	17	15	21	13	17	2	21	5
Poor job	50	48	39	48	38	54	40	66
No opinion	12	21	15	23	26	38	20	27
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
B. Urban								
			Municipal Officials		District Officials		State Officials	
			M	F	M	F	M	F
Very good job			8	8	6	6	7	7
Good job			13	11	17	14	13	11
Fair job			31	37	23	27	21	24
Poor job			36	27	31	26	28	21
No opinion			12	17	23	27	31	37
Total			100	100	100	100	100	100

to 70% males and 78% females in 1966 felt that the state officials were doing a poor job. A similar pattern was found in urban responses. One possible explanation could be the unusual conditions in 1976 when the study was conducted. Due to national emergency and the repressive measures, citizens may have been afraid to voice their opinions about the government.

It hardly requires exhaustive documentation to observe that corruption and graft are rampant among officials specially at middle and lower levels of developing societies. It not only hampers the development and transformation of the society but also

produces a very negative, not too flattering image of the bureaucracy in the public mind which in turn becomes less supportive, more cynical and hostile toward government as such. It has both long-range and short-range implications for the political system. Most of the researchers feel that rampant corruption "seems to be most prevalent during the most intense phases of modernization."³⁰ There is

³⁰Samuel P. Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1968), pp. 59-71, and McMullan, "A Theory of Corruption," *The Sociological Review* (July 9, 1961), p. 196.

widespread disagreement as to the role and nature of corruption. Is it functional or dysfunctional to the political development and growth? Jose Abueva feels that corruption is "tonic" for economic and political growth of transitional societies:

Not only are rampant nepotism, spoils and graft unavoidable, under the circumstances of most developing countries, but they may have positive, unanticipated consequences for political development . . . In the early stages of politico-administrative development, particularly where a democratic political system is consciously desired, nepotism, spoils and graft may actually promote national unification and stability, nationwide participation in public affairs, the formation of a viable party system and bureaucratic accountability to political institutions.³¹

Riggs in his "sala model" of bureaucracy maintains that graft and corruption perform "requisite functions" in the development of stable and political institutions in the beginning stages of nation and state building.³²

At the other end of the argument are scholars who contend that corruption is "toxic" to economic and political growth. Gunnar Myrdal observed that "the prevalence of corruption provides strong inhibitions and obstacles to development."³³

³¹ Jose V. Abueva, "The Contribution of Nepotism, Spoils, and Graft to Political Development," *East-West Center Review*, Vol. III (1966), pp. 45-54.

³² Fred W. Riggs, "Bureaucrats and Political Development: A Paradoxical View," in La Palombara (ed.) *op. cit.*, p. 130.

³³ Gunnar Myrdal, "Corruption — Its Causes and Effects," in *Asian Drama: An Inquiry into the Poverty of Nations*, Vol. II (New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1968), pp. 951-958.

For this study the respondents were asked about their perception of corruption in bureaucracy. Corruption, somehow, is considered as part of the game. The word commonly used for bribe in India is "Haq" (the right). A large number of respondents while reporting rampant corruption in India also maintained that it was quite natural and that they were ready to go along with it. (See Table 18.) The 1966 data show that about half of all types of respondents felt that majority of officials are corrupt. The 1976 data show an increase in these percentages. The data also point out differences in perception on residence and sex bases. Urban respondents were more cynical. Females, both urban and rural, were also more cynical than their male counterparts.

Nevertheless, the data in Table 19 indicate that, by and large, the Indian respondents, both rural and urban, were not very critical of the government activities. In 1966 only 12% males and 26% females in the rural areas, and 34% males and 34% females in the urban areas were very critical. While the percentage of very critical respondents in 1976 in urban areas did not change significantly there was a perceptible drop among the rural respondents in that category. The general elections of March 1977 did not reflect the above data. It may be that in 1976, during the national emergency, the respondents particularly those from the rural areas, were not letting their real feelings come out to researchers or outsiders. Fear of police and other officials was very much there, hence 1976 data had some "problems."

Concluding Remarks

In general the attitudinal changes

Table 18. Perceptions of Corruption in the Public Service, by Residence and Sex (in percent)

Perceptions of Corruption	1966			
	Rural		Urban	
	M	F	M	F
Majority are corrupt	46	49	51	53
About half are corrupt	24	26	28	27
Just a few are corrupt	16	12	11	13
None are corrupt	4	3	5	4
No opinion	10	10	5	3
Total	100	100	100	100

Perceptions of Corruption	1976			
	Rural		Urban	
	M	F	M	F
Majority are corrupt	53	57	61	59
About half are corrupt	27	31	18	14
Just a few are corrupt	9	6	10	8
None are corrupt	8	3	4	6
No opinion	3	3	7	13
Total	100	100	100	100

between 1966 and 1976 were not startling. The Indian citizens do not expect equal treatment and serious consideration for their opinions. They feel that wealthy and influential persons with connections and pull stand better chances with the bureaucracy. The frequency of administrative contacts did affect their attitudes toward the administration. The data revealed paradoxical patterns of support and hostility, of consensus and criticism. On the balance, respondents were more supportive of the administration, despite being quite critical of the bureaucracy. The data also indicated that hostile reactions could

increase, particularly in the urban areas, as a result of bureaucratic contacts and probably of the not very cordial treatment received by urban citizens. But despite this, citizens who reported association with bureaucrats at different levels reveal attitudes and orientations which are supportive and not rejective of the political system in general. The higher urban discontent in India has been reported by other studies and is reflective of greater awareness of urban citizens. Studies have demonstrated that greater mass media exposure, and the absence of simple, understandable communication channels are some of the frustrating

Table 19. Index of Attitudinal Support for Official and Programs, by Residence and Sex (in percent)

Index of attitudinal support for officials and programs	1966			
	Rural		Urban	
	M	F	M	F
Very Supportive	21	18	16	13
Moderately Supportive	36	24	19	17
Moderately Critical	31	32	31	36
Very Critical	12	26	34	34
Total	100	100	100	100

Index of attitudinal support for officials and programs	1976			
	Rural		Urban	
	M	F	M	F
Very Supportive	27	24	11	14
Moderately Supportive	41	21	21	13
Moderately Critical	26	41	36	38
Very Critical	6	14	32	35
Total	100	100	100	100

factors in urban India. A great number of citizens, even if they are aware of the channels, are unable to approach such "access" points. In Uttar Pradesh the urban-rural cleavage is found in other political spheres such as voter participation and political protest. Many factors could be presented for the higher urban cynicism: (1) the discontent of the urban unemployed, (2) the social and economic frustrations of voters, (3) the increasing dissatisfaction of the middle class with the slow pace of economic and social growth.³⁴ The rural-urban gap in terms of perception of politics, issues,

bureaucracy, and nation-building objectives poses great obstacles in the path of Indian elites who are committed to massive social change and the implementation of modernization programs through democratic means. The acceptance or rejection would largely depend on knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, feelings, and opinions of individuals towards the political system, its inputs, outputs, and the personnel. It would depend on the kind of expectations people have of treatment at the hands of government officials. The successful resolutions of these dilemmas and problems would direct and influence India's quest for legitimacy and public-supported programs of social change.

³⁴Weiner and Osgood Field, *op. cit.*, pp. 207-208.