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3.0 OBJECTIVES

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

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

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

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The institutional approach to comparative political analysis, simply put, is a comparative study of institutions. The nature (comparative) and subject matter (institutions) of study are thus quite evident. If, for example, one were to study the relative significance of the upper houses in parliamentary democracies, one would study the upper houses in several parliamentary democracies (e.g., the Rajya Sabha in India and the House of Lords in United Kingdom) and assess their relative significance in each case. One could then, on the basis of this comparative study of such institutions, arrive at generalised conclusions and explanations pertaining to their relevance or even utility in parliamentary democracies e.g. the constitution of upper houses of parliament lacks
representative character or the hereditary character of upper houses erodes the democratic character of legislatures. One could also, for example, look at the upper houses of parliaments to study the historical contexts which shape the evolution of a particular upper house. One could, for example, examine the contexts (social and economic) of the evolution of the two houses of Parliament in United Kingdom to see why the House of Lords retained a hereditary character. One could also then understand the contexts in which the current initiatives to end its hereditary character emerged.

For a long time, comparative political analysis was associated primarily with a comparative study of institutions. Comparative political analysis may in fact be said to have begun with a study of institutions. Thus if one were to trace the evolution of comparative politics as a discipline of study, one can see the study of institutions as marking the point where the comparative method first began to be used. The study of institutions, however, not only marked the beginning of comparative study, it remained more or less the predominant approach in comparative politics up to the nineteen fifties. Thus one can propose that traditionally comparative political analysis was confined to the study of institutions and the various ways in which these institutions manifested themselves in the distribution of power and the relationships between the various layers and organs of government.

3.2 THE INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH

The study of institutions has a long history beginning perhaps with the philosophical explorations of the ideal state in Plato’s Republic. In the section which follows we shall attempt an overview of the manner in which the institutional approach has evolved historically. We shall also, because we are primarily concerned with studying the approach within the field of comparative political analysis, concern ourselves especially with the historical moment at which the institutional approach assumed a comparative character. We may, however, as a matter of introduction, describe here characteristic features of the institutional approach which differentiate it from other approaches viz., the political systems approach, the political economy approach etc.

It is generally agreed that any approach or enquiry into a problem displays certain characteristics pertaining to (a) subject matter (i.e. what is being studied) (b) vocabulary (the tools or the language) and (c) the choice of political perspective (which determines the vantage point and indicates the direction from and to what purposes enquiry is directed at). If the features of the institutional approach were considered against each of these three counts, it may be seen as marked out by (a) its concern with studying institutions of government and the nature of distribution of power, viz., constitutions, legal-formal institutions of government (b) its largely legalistic and frequently speculative and prescriptive/normative vocabulary, in so far as it has historically shown a preoccupation with abstract terms and conditions like ‘the ideal state’ and ‘good order’ (c) a philosophical, historical or legalistic perspective.

A characteristic feature of this approach has also been its ethnocentrism. The major works which are seen as representing the institutional approach in comparative politics, have concerned themselves only with governments and institutions in western countries. Implicit in this approach is thus a belief in the primacy of western liberal democratic institutions. This belief not only sees western liberal democracy as the best form of government, it gives it also a ‘universal’ and ‘normative’ character. The ‘universal’ character of western liberal democracy assumes that this form of government is not only the best, it is also universally applicable. The ‘normativity’ of western liberal democracies follows
from this assumption. If it is the best form of governance which is also universally applicable, liberal democracies is the form of government which should be adopted everywhere. This prescribed norm i.e. liberal democracy, however, also gave scope to an important exception. This exception unfolded in the practices of rule in the colonies and in the implications (a) that the institutions of liberal democracy were specifically western in their origin and contexts and, (b) that non-western countries were not fit for democratic self-rule until such time as they could be trained for the same under western imperialist rule.

In the sections which follow we shall study in some detail, the origins of the Institutional approach from antiquity to the first quarter of the present century when it became a predominant approach facilitating comparative study.

3.2.1 The Institutional Approach: A Historical Overview

Perhaps the oldest comparative study of governments was made by Aristotle who studied constitutions and practices in Greek city-states. Contrasting them with politics in the so called ‘barbarian’ states, Aristotle made a typology of governments distinguishing between monarchies, oligarchies and democracy and between these ‘ideal’ governments and their ‘perverted’ forms. The study of comparative politics at this stage was marked by what may be called an interrelation between facts and values. At this stage of its origins, a study of institutions did not attempt to ‘analyse’ the ‘theory and practice’ of government as emphasised by James Bryce in the late nineteenth century, to which we will come later in the course of this section. There was instead an overwhelming desire to explore ‘ideal’ states and forms of governments. In other words there was more emphasis on speculations i.e on questions about what ‘ought’ to be, rather than an analysis seeking explanations of what ‘is’ or what actually existed.

With Machiavelli (The Prince) in the sixteenth century and Montesquieu (The Spirit of Laws) in the middle of the eighteenth century, the emphasis on empirical details and facts about existing state of affairs came to be established. Montesquieu was, however, followed mainly by constitutional lawyers, whose vocation determined that they concentrate more on the contents i.e., the theoretical (legal-constitutional) framework of governments rather than the manner in which these frameworks unfolded in practice. Tocqueville, in many ways, was the forbearer of the study of ‘theory and practice’ of governments, which became the essence of the institutional approach in comparative political analysis in later years. (Refer to Tocqueville’s studies of American and French democracies in Unit 2: Comparative Method and Strategies of Comparison). Bagehot (The English Constitution, 1867) made another significant contribution to the development of this element of the institutional approach in his study of the British Cabinet drawing important points of comparison with the American Executive. It was, however, Bryce, Lowell and Ostrogorski, who in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, made important contributions to comparative study of institutions and by implication to the evolution of comparative governments as a distinct branch of study.

3.2.2 The Institutional Approach and the Emergence of Comparative Government

The Contributions of Bryce, Lowell and Ostrogorski

Bryce, Lowell and Ostrogorski’s works towards the end of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century changed radically the contents of the institutional approach and thereby the nature and scope of comparative politics. Assessing their contributions Jean Blondel asserts that Bryce and Lowell were in fact the
true founders of comparative governments as it developed as a distinct branch of study in the last quarter of the nineteenth century (see Jean Blondel, *The Discipline of Politics, Chapter 7: Middle Level Comparisons*). The *American Commonwealth* (1888) and *Modern Democracies* (1921) were two significant works of Bryce. In *Modern Democracies* Bryce focusses on the theory of democracy and examined the working of the legislatures and their decline. Lowell's works *Governments and Parties in Continental Europe* (1896) and *Public Opinion and Popular Government* (1913) where he undertakes separate studies of France, Germany, Switzerland etc. and a comparative study of referendums and its impacts respectively were equally important. Similarly, Ostrogorski's study *Democracy and the Organisation of Political Parties* (1902) which aimed to test the hypothesis, so to speak, of the 'democratic' or 'oligarchical' character of political parties was a pioneering work of the time. It is important now to see exactly how these works augmented and in fact changed the manner in which institutions were so far being studied.

i) ‘Theory and Practice of governments’: We mentioned in the earlier section that comparative study of governments tended to be philosophical-speculative or largely legal-constitutional i.e., they were either concerned with abstract notions like the 'ideal state' or with facts regarding the legal-constitutional frameworks and structures of governments. Based on liberal constitutional theory they studied the formal institutional structures with emphasis on their legal powers and functions. The works formed part of studies on ‘Comparative Government’ or ‘Foreign Constitutions’. These works were seen to be relevant to the elites' efforts in institutional-building in various countries. This is why in the newly independent countries institutionalism acquired some fascination.

Bryce and Lowell, however, emphasised that the existing studies were partial and incomplete. A more comprehensive study of governments should according to them include also the working of the legal-constitutional frameworks of governments. Such a study, they stressed, required not only a study of the theoretical bases or contexts of governments (i.e. the legal-constitutional framework and governmental institutions) but also an equal emphasis on the study of 'practices of government'. To focus just on constitutions, as lawyers do, was insufficient as it would lead to ignoring the problems of their operation and implementation. On the other hand to focus exclusively on practice, without grounding it in its theoretical (constitutional) framework, would again be an incomplete study, as one may lose sight of the contexts within which the problems of implementation emerge. It was thus, primarily with Bryce and Lowell that the content of institutional approach in comparative political analysis came to be defined as a study of the ‘theory and practice of government’.

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

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

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

**Check Your Progress 1**

**Note:**

i) Use the space given below for your answer.

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

1) What do you understand by the institutional approach?

2) What are its various characteristics?

3) Examine the characteristics of the institutional approach at the turn of the nineteenth century.
3.3 INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH: A CRITICAL EVALUATION

It is interesting that criticisms of the institutional approach in comparative political analysis have come in successive waves, in the early part of the twentieth century and then again in the nineteen fifties. There has been after each wave of criticism a resurgence of the approach in a replenished form. Before the study of institutions acquired a comparative character (however limited) at the turn of the century, the approach was criticised, (a) as given to speculation; (b) as largely prescriptive and normative; (c) concerned only with irregularities and regularities without looking for relationships; (d) configurative and non-comparative focusing as it did on individual countries; (e) ethnocentric as it concentrated on western European ‘democracies’; (f) descriptive as it focussed on formal (constitutional and governmental) structure; (g) historical without being analytical; (h) contributors within this framework were so absorbed with the study of institutions that differences in cultural settings and ideological frameworks were completely ignored while comparing, say, the upper chambers of the UK, USA and USSR; (i) methodologically they were accused as being partial/incomplete and theoretically, it was said they missed the substance of political life.

We saw, however, that with Bryce and his contemporaries the nature and content of the institutional approach underwent a significant change, acquiring in a limited way a comparative character, and attempting to combine theoretical contexts with practices of governments. In the nineteen fifties the institutional approach as it developed with Bryce, Lowell and Ostrogorski, came again under increasing criticism by political scientists like David Easton and Roy Macridis. In his work *The Political System* (1953), David Easton made a strong attack against Bryce’s approach calling it ‘mere factualism’. This approach, alleged Easton, had influenced American Political Science, in the direction of what he called ‘hyperfactualism’. While admitting that Bryce did not neglect ‘theories’, the latter’s (Bryce’s) aversion to making explanatory or theoretical models, had led, asserted Easton, to a ‘surfeit of facts’ and consequently to ‘a theoretical malnutrition’. (You will study in another unit about ‘system building’ as the basis of Easton’s ‘systems approach’ to studying political phenomena. It will not, therefore, be difficult to understand why Easton felt that Bryce’s approach had misdirected American Political Science onto a wrong path.) Jean Blondel, however, defends the institutional approach from criticisms like those of Easton, directed towards its so called ‘factualism’. Blondel would argue first that the charge of ‘surfeit of facts’ was misplaced because there were in fact very few facts available to political scientists for a comprehensive political analysis. In reality very little was known about the structures and activities of major institutions of most countries, particularly about the communist countries and countries of the so called Third World. The need for collecting more facts thus could not be neglected. This became all the more important given the fact that more often than not governments tended to hide facts rather than transmit them. Secondly, the devaluation of the utility of facts regarding institutions and legal arrangements, by the supporters of a more global or systemic approach was, to Blondel, entirely misconstrued. Institutions and the legal framework within which they functioned formed a significant part of the entire framework in which a political phenomenon could be studied. Facts about the former thus had to be compared to facts about other aspects of the political life to avoid a partial study. Facts were, in any case needed for any effective analysis. No reasoning could be done without having ‘facts’ or ‘data’. This coupled with the point that facts were difficult to acquire made them integral to the study of political analysis.
In 1955 Roy Macridis pointed out the need for a 'reorientation' in the comparative study of government. He emphasised that in its existing form comparative study has been 'comparative in name only'. Macridis described the orientation of institutional approach as 'non-comparative', 'parochial', 'static' and 'monographic'. A good proportion of work was moreover, he asserted, 'essentially descriptive'. This was because the analysis was historical or legalistic and therefore 'rather narrow'. (See Roy Macridis, The Study of Comparative Government, pp.7-12).

It was however, realised in the 1950s, and continued to be the concern, that there remained actually a paucity of fact from which valid generalisations could be made. There was thus, asserts Blondel, a 'surfeit of models' rather than a 'surfeit of facts'. Blondel emphasised that building models without grounding them in facts would result in misinformations. This misinformation, given that facts about some countries were harder to come by, was likely to affect and at times reinforce preconceptions about these countries. Thus while writing about Latin American Legislatures in 1971, W. H. Agor remarked that there was a tendency to assert that legislatures in that part of the world were very weak. Statements such as these, he said, were based on 'extremely impressionistic evidence' that is, in the absence of 'facts' consciously collected for the purposes of the study. Thus the need for collecting and devising ways of collecting facts was stressed emphatically by followers of the institutional approach. The criticisms were, however, followed by works which had a more comparative focus and included non-western countries. Further, there was also an attempt to undertake studies comparing structures not determined by legal-constitutional frameworks e.g. G.Sartori’s work on Parties and Party Systems (1976) which included in its scope in a limited way Communist countries and those of the Third World, and F.Castles’ study of Pressure Groups and Political Culture (1967).

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.
   ii) Check your answer with the answer given at the end of the unit.

1) What are the limitations of the institutional approach as pointed out by Easton and Macridis?

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

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

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

3.4 THE INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH IN CONTEMPORARY COMPARATIVE STUDY

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

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

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

An underlying assumption of the approach was a belief in the uniquely western character of democracy. This meant, as stated in the Introduction (section 3.1), that democracy was seen as not only western in its origins but its application elsewhere was imagined and prescribed only in that form. This led, as mentioned earlier, to a largely westcentric study i.e. a concentration on countries of western Europe and North America. Blondel feels that the decline in the influence of the approach in the 1950s was in part due to its inability to accommodate in its scope of inquiry ‘non western (liberal) governments’ particularly the predominantly Communist countries of Eastern Europe and the newly independent countries of Asia and Latin America. Thus an approach which prided itself on associating theory with practice found itself unable to modify its framework of inquiry to study facts which did not conform to liberal constitutional democracies. The decline of the institutional approach in the 1950s was due in part also, as seen earlier, to the concerns by system theorists to building theories based on inductive generalisations, rather than conclusions derived from facts.

Since the late nineteen sixties and seventies, however, the institutional approach resurfaced in a form which is called ‘new institutionalism’ and can be seen as having these characteristics: (a) As the term suggests, new institutionalism, retained its focus on the study of theory and practice of institutions. The approach stressed the importance of state and its institutional structures. (P. Evans, D.Rueschemeyer and T.Skocpol eds., Bringing the State Back In, 1985), Without providing an overarching framework within which the institutions may be said to function (as in structural-functional approach). It focussed instead on the manner in which the institutions interrelate. (b) While refraining from making overarching frameworks, the approach did not, however, avoid making generalised conclusions. The preoccupation with the collection of facts, also did not diminish. In striving for this combination, i.e., an adherence to fact based study aimed towards making generalised conclusions, however, the institutional approach, was careful (i) to ‘draw conclusions only after careful fact-finding efforts have taken place’ and, (ii) to make a prudent use of induction so that one ‘kept close to these facts even when generalising’ (see Jean Blondel, ‘Then and Now: Comparative Politics’, p.160); (iii) the thrust of the approach, has by and large been on what is called ‘middle-range analysis’ where facts about specific institutions are collected to cover a broader area offering greater scope for comparison. These facts are, however, analysed without offering inductive models. Thus, comparative works on the political parties (e.g. G.Sartori’s Parties and Party Systems, 1976; Budge and H.Keman. Parties and Democracy, 1990), pressure groups (F.Castles’
Institutional Approach


Check Your Progress 3

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

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

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

3.5 LET US SUM UP

The institutional approach in its various forms has been an important constituent of comparative political analysis. The study of institutions of governance was at the core of political analysis be it the explorations of the ideal state of Plato's Republic or the typology of States proposed by Aristotle in his Politics. In its classical and early modern forms the approach was more philosophical and speculative, concerned with ideal typical states and prescribing the norms of ideal governance. With Montesquieu and his successors the preoccupation of the approach with legal-constitutional frameworks or structures of democracies became entrenched. The belief in institutions of liberal constitutional democracies, however, did not translate into a study of the manner in which the structures of governance functioned. More often than not, at least till the end of the nineteenth century, the intricacies of the legal-constitutional structures or the theoretical framework of governance, continued to seize the attention of political scientists and legal experts. So far, thus the approach could be said to have been characterised by a preoccupation with constitutions and legal-formal institutions of government and normative values of liberal democracy. This approach was propagated also by colonial regimes to popularise European liberal values in the colonies. The works of the institutionalists were also extremely relevant to the elite's efforts in institution building in various countries. This is why in the newly independent countries institutionalism acquired some fascination.

It was, however, only by the late nineteenth and early twentieth century that scholars like Bryce, Lowell and Ostrogorski, broke new grounds in the study of institutions (a) by combining the study of theoretical-legal-constitutional framework with facts about their functioning and, (b) giving the study a comparative flavour by including into their works the study of institutions in other countries. Thus, the approach, by the first quarter of the twentieth century, could be said to have acquired a limited comparative character and rigour by combining in its analysis theory and practice of institutions. In the nineteen fifties, however, the approach came under attack from 'system builders' like Easton and Macridis. The latter criticised the approach (a) for overemphasising facts (b) for lacking theoretical formulations which could be applied generally to institutions in other countries and (c) for lacking a comparative character. These theorists preferred on their own part to build 'holistic' or 'global' 'models' or 'systems' which could explain the functioning of institutions in countries all over the world. An important criticism
leveled against the practitioners of the institutional approach was their westcentric approach i.e. their failure to take up for study institutions in the countries of the Third World, and communist countries of Eastern Europe. The failure to study these countries emanated in effect from the normative framework of this approach which could accommodate only the theoretical paradigms of western liberal-constitutional democracies. The lack of tools to understand the institutions in other countries of the developing and the communist worlds resulted in a temporary waning of the influence of this approach. It resurfaced, however, in the late sixties and early seventies, in a form which while retaining its emphasis on facts, did not shy away from making generalised theoretical statements, without, however, attempting to build inclusive models.

Check Your Progress 4

Note: i) Space given below is provided for your answer.
   ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of the unit.

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

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

3.6 KEY WORDS

Configurative description: Study of political institutions oriented towards a detailed description of some countries without the use of any explicit conceptual framework.

Empiricism: A strand in philosophy that attempts to tie knowledge to experience. Pure empiricists would argue that the basis of true knowledge are facts which are derived through sense perceptions.

Ethnocentrism: The application of values and theories drawn from one's own culture to other groups and people's ethnocentrism implies bias or distortion.

Fact: A fact is what is said to be the case and it is associated with observation and experiment.

Formal-legalism: the constitutional orientation comprising detailed descriptions of the rules, supposedly governing the operations of cabinets, legislators, courts and bureaucracies.

Liberal democracy: a form of democratic rule that balances the principle of limited government against the ideal of popular consent. Its 'liberal' features are
reflected in a network of internal and external checks on government that are designed to guarantee liberty and afford citizens protection against the state. Its 'democratic' character is based on a system of regular and competitive elections, conducted on the basis of universal suffrage and political equality.

**Model:** A theoretical representation of empirical data that aims to advance understanding by highlighting significant relationships and interaction.

**Non-comparison:** Most of the texts in the field of comparative government either studied one single country or engaged in parallel descriptions of a few countries.

**Normative:** The prescription of values and standards of conduct; what 'should be' rather than what 'is'.

**Parochialism:** Restricted or confined within narrow limits e.g., in comparative politics there was a typical bias in the selection of relevant countries to be studied - the United Kingdom, France, Germany and the United States of America - and in the relevant variables to be employed for description.

**Perspective:** The term widely used in social sciences to talk about different ways of seeing, interpreting and experiencing social reality.

**Value:** Values are statements which are supposed to be much more tied up with judgement and subjectivity. Values are suppositions, they are not objective and they do not apply to all people.

### 3.7 SOME USEFUL BOOKS


Blondel, Jean, *The Discipline of Politics*, Buttermorths, London, 1981. (Chapter 7: Middle Level Comparisons)


### 3.8 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

**Check Your Progress 1**

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

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

3) See Sub-section 3.2.2
Check Your Progress 2

1) See section 3.3

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

Check Your Progress 3

1) See section 3.4

Check Your Progress 4

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

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