



THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES

Volume 25, Issue 2 (2018), Winter 2018, Pages 1-89

Director-in-Charge: **Seyed Mehdi Mousavi**, Associate Professor of Archaeology

Editor-in-Chief: **Masoud Ghaffari**, Associate Professor of Political Science

Managing Editors: **Shahin Aryamanesh**, PhD Candidate of Archaeology

English Edit by: **Ahmad Shakil**, PhD.

Published by **Tarbiat Modares University**

Editorial board:

A'vani, Gholamreza; Professor of philosophy, Tarbiat Modares University

Bozorg-e-bigdeli, Saeed; Associate Professor of Persian Language and Literature, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Dabir moghaddam, Mohammad; Professor of Linguistics, Allame Tabatabaei University, Tehran, Iran

Ehsani, Mohammad; Professor of Sport Management, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Etemadi, Hossein; Associate Professor of Accounting jobs, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Ghaffari, Masoud; Associate Professor of Political Science, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Hafezniya, Mohammadreza; Professor in Political Geography and Geopolitics, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Hojjati, Seyed Mohammad bagher; Professor, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Hossini, Ali Akbar, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Khodadad Hosseini, Seyed Hamid; Professor in Business, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Kiyani, Gholamreza; Associate Professor of Language & Linguistics, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Kord Zafaranlu, Aliyeh; Associate Professor of General Linguistics-Phonology, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Manouchehri, Abbas; Professor of Political science, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Mehr Mohammadi, Mahmoud; Professor of Curriculum, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Mohaghegh Damad, Seyed Mostafa; Professor of law, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran

Mohseni, Manouchehr; Professor of Sociology, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Najjarzadeh, Reza; Associate Professor of Economics, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Nasseri Taheri, Abdollah; Professor of History, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Parvini, Khalil; Professor of Arabic literature, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Sadr, Seyed Kazem; Professor of Management, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Taslimi, Mohammad Saeed; Professor of Management, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran

Valavi, Ali Mohammad; Professor of History, Al Zahra University, Tehran, Iran

Zanjanizadeh, Homa; Associate Professor of Sociology, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Akbarian, Reza; Professor of Philosophy, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

The International Journal of Humanities is one of the TMU Press journals that is published by the responsibility of its Editor-in-Chief and Editorial Board in the determined scopes.

The International Journal of Humanities is mainly devoted to the publication of original research, which brings fresh light to bear on the concepts, processes, and consequences of humanities in general. It is multi-disciplinary in the sense that it encourages contributions from all relevant fields and specialized branches of the humanities.

The journal seeks to achieve the following objectives:

- To promote inter-disciplinary research in all areas of the humanities.
- To provide a forum for genuine and constructive dialogues between scholars in different fields of the humanities.
- To assist researchers at the pre-and post-doctorate levels, with a wealth of new and original material.
- To make ideas, topics, and processes in the humanities intelligible and accessible to both the interested public and scholars whose expertise might lie outside that subject matter.

Address: **Humanities faculty, Tarbiat Modares University, Nasr, Jalal AleAhmad, Tehran, Iran. P.O.Box: 14115-139**

Web Address for manuscriptsubmission: <http://eijh.modares.ac.ir/>

Email: eijh@modares.ac.ir

Contents

How did Kartir become Kartir?

Sorour Khorashadi, Seyed Mehdi Mousavi..... 1

Historical Criticism and Review of Persian Language and Literature in Pakistan with Emphasis on its Effects on Iranian Studies

Mohammad Mahdi Tavassoli, Karim Najafi Barzgar, Behrouz Geravand..... 21

Addressing Mental Health Issues of International Students at University Sains Malaysia: An Inquiry for Social Work Policy and Practice

Roghayeh Khosravi, Azlinda Azman, Sahar Khosravi, Nima Khosravi..... 31

Pleasurable Experience in Old Collectivist and New Individualist Generations in Iran: Reviving "Safa" as Culture-oriented Pleasure to Decrease Generation Gap


Raika Khorshidian, Hassan Sadeghi Naeini, Asghar Fahimifar..... 44

Political Culture: A Survey in the City of Tehran

Amir Maleki, Alimohammad Javadi, Mohammad javad Zahedi, Yaughoub Ahmadi..... 61

The Mediating Role of Response to Environment in the Relationship between Organizational Solidarity and External Image

Jafar Torkzadeh, Jafar Jahani, Elham Razi..... 77



Political Culture: A Survey in the City of Tehran

Amir Maleki¹, Alimohammad Javadi², Mohammad javad Zahedi³, Yaughoub Ahmadi⁴

Received: 2018/10/29

Accepted: 2019/3/9

Abstract

This study investigates political culture in the city of Tehran, focusing on three of its domains including typology of political culture, classification and typology of political citizens, as well as examination of some variables affecting political culture in Iran. The applied research method is in the form of a survey and questionnaire-based data. The study sample size includes 612 citizens residing in Tehran in 2018. Findings show that most citizens are tended to a subject-parochial political culture. It is indicated that political variables i.e. the cost of political activity, government officials' responsiveness, and institutional political trust are effective on political culture. Using cluster method, the citizens were divided into four categories: critical, obedient, unmotivated, and disappointed. Political culture factors are categorized in three groups by analyzing exploratory factors. These are: pluralistic, value, and involvement -behavioral. Findings show that, citizens have been grown higher in pluralistic, and with value aspects, but are in a low level with behavioral aspect, and this factor could be effective on political culture's type.

Keywords: Political Culture; Participant Political Culture; Subject Political Culture; Parochial Political Culture; Political Citizens.

¹. Associate Professor, Department of Social Science, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran., a_maleki@pnu.ac.ir (Corresponding Author).

². Faculty Members, Department of Social Science, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran. javadi.alimohammad@pnu.ac.ir

³. Associate Professor, Department of Social Science, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran. m_zahedi@pnu.ac.ir.

⁴. Assistant Professor, Department of Social Science, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran. yahmady@pnu.ac.ir.

Introduction

This study dealt with political culture and it was also meant to discuss typology of political culture as well as dimensions and types of citizenship within the framework of political culture in the Iranian capital city of Tehran. Moreover, the impact of some variables affecting political culture was illustrated in order to explain the concepts and framework of political culture.

Almond and Verba's (1963) classic theory of Civic Culture triggered the systematic efforts to identify citizens' beliefs underlying viable and flourishing democratic institutions. Pye and Verba's (1965) Political Culture and Political Development also put this theory in an even broader cross-national perspective, conceptualizing the role of citizens' beliefs in the processes of nation-building and democratization (Dalton & Welzel, 2014). Almond and Verba's work, i.e. theory of Civic Culture was the first major attempt to understand relationships between citizens' orientations and democracy (Ibid, 2014). They also presented a clear and consistent definition of political culture of a nation: "the particular distribution of patterns of orientations towards political objects among members of a nation" (Almond & Verba, 1963: 13). In other words, they connected the political culture to cognitions, feelings, and evaluation of its population. Besides, they (1963:15–17) characterized a nation's political culture in terms of two dimensions; first, they distinguished between different types of attitudes: (1) cognitive orientations

involving knowledge and beliefs about politics; (2) affective orientations as positive or negative feelings towards political objects; and (3) evaluative orientations containing judgments about political options and processes. Second, they identified four different categories of political objects towards which citizens' attitudes could be directed: (1) political system in general; (2) input objects, such as political parties, interest groups, or political actors engaged in conveying demands from citizenry to institutions; (3) output objects, such as government bureaucracies or agents of state authority implementing public policies; and (4) orientations towards self and others in terms of role models of what an ideal citizen should do (Dalton & Welzel, 2014).

Types of political culture cited by Almond and Verba (1989) were shown in Table 1. According to this Table, parochial culture could occur when "frequency of orientations towards specialized political objects of the four types specified to be zero". In the subject of political culture, there was a "high frequency of orientations toward a differentiated political system, and specifically input objects and self as an active participation approach of zero. The participant political culture "was one in which, members of a society tended to be explicitly oriented to the system as a whole and to both political and administrative structures and processes; in other words, to both input and output aspects of political system" (Almond & Verba, 1989:18).

Table 1. Types of Political Culture (Source: Almond & Verba, 1989: 16)

	System as General Object	Input Objects	Output Objects	Self as Active Participants
Parochial	0	0	0	0
Subject	1	0	1	0
Participant	1	1	1	1

According to dimensions of the aforementioned political culture, Almond and Verba presented three types for citizens; in the first category, individuals could have positive orientations toward a political system and play active roles within it. These individuals represent the participant culture. The second category included individuals who had positive orientations toward a political system, but were inclined toward political passivity and known as subject culture. The third category contained individuals who were indifferent toward a political system and tended to be politically passive that included parochial culture. According to Almond and Verba, these subcultures could be blended to create political culture of a society; therefore, the composition of the political culture could become a central question for analyzing political cultures (Denk et al., 2015). They also stressed that parochial, subject, and participant cultures were ideal-typical models, which did not exist in pure forms in any society. But, they maintained that elements of the three models could be significantly in different proportions in the world of their time. They postulated that elements of the parochial culture were most widespread in the developing world; elements of the subject culture could be observed in the communist world; and those of the participant culture were available in the "free world" of the West (Dalton & Welzel, 2014). Verba et al. also underlined a cluster of orientations that could supposedly support a democratic polity: allegiance to the regime, pride in a political system, and the modest levels of political participation. This allegiant model was most apparent in the United States and Britain, the two mature and stable democracies in their study and lacking in other democratizing

nations. However, the modern wave of comparative research in political culture could offer a different answer to the question of what citizen beliefs were congruent with democracy, so stable and effective democratic government could depend on orientations that people had to a political process - upon a political culture (Almond & Verba, 1963: 498). Other studies conducted during this period also reinforced this basic theoretical framework. For example, Pye and Verba (1965) described cultural impediments to democracy in Egypt, Ethiopia, and Turkey that evoked the concepts of parochial and subject cultures and a lack of a participant one. Daniel Lerner's (1958) work entitled "The Passing of Traditional Society" described how the socioeconomic development and cognitive mobilization could change the political culture of a nation, bringing a transition from parochial and subject orientations to more participant ones. Banfield's (1963) research on a rural Italian village similarly highlighted conditions producing parochial and subject orientations. Lipset's (1959, 1994) "social prerequisite" framework also considered less-developed nations lacking social conditions and public sentiments that favored democracy. Accordingly, democracy required socioeconomic modernization to transform a society and its culture in a democracy-compatible fashion; this research posited a strong relationship between socioeconomic development and that of a democratic civic culture (Dalton & Welzel, 2014). Denk et al. (2015) similarly put an emphasis on the composition of political culture by conceptualizing four alternatives as different political subcultures in the civic culture. The citizens were accordingly classified into four groups: civic, stealth, critical, and disenchanting citizens. Civic

citizens referred to those having active orientations toward their own political role with a positive evaluation of a political system. This mix of attitudes corresponded to the subculture proposed by Almond and Verba highlighted as “participant culture”. Critical citizens were those who had active orientations towards their own political role with a negative evaluation of political system. Moreover, stealth citizens were those who had passive orientations towards their own political role with positive evaluation of a political system. Disenchanted citizens were the ones who had passive orientations toward their own political role with negative evaluation of a political system (Denk et al., 2015 :362).

In this study, the typology of political culture in Iran (the city of Tehran) was illustrated; next, the relationship between variables affecting political culture was described; after that, types of citizens based on political culture were identified.

Questions:

- How is the typology of political culture among citizens in the city of Tehran?
- What are the effects of the variables of institutional political trust, political effectiveness, cost of political activity, and government official responsiveness on political culture?

Measurement of Political Culture

To measure political culture, Almond and Verba’s theories and Tessler and Bergh’s research findings were used. Almond and Verba explored obligations to participate, sense of efficacy, and levels of interpersonal trust among particular orientations. Although their study was later criticized for a number of limitations, such as its failure to examine subcultures, it was the first large-

scale comparative survey of its kind and established the importance of studying attitudes, values, and behavior patterns of ordinary men and women. Since that time, especially during the last decade and a half, there have been numerous empirical investigations of citizen orientations and their relationship to democratization (Tessler & Gao, 2009). Almond and Verba also focused on political cognition, feelings toward government and politics, levels of partisanship, sense of civic obligation, and political efficacy. Dimensions of political culture that had received attention in other studies included political interest, political tolerance, valuation of liberty, rights consciousness, support for civil disobedience, support for media independence, and political participation (Booth & Richard 1998; Garcia et al. 2002; Gibson et al. 1992; Inglehart & Welzel, 2003; Nathan & Shi 1993; Rice & Feldman 1997). As noted, different authors had placed emphasis on different attitudes, values, and behavior patterns along with discussing the elements of democratic political culture orientations. The examined variables by Tessler and Gao used for the measurement of political culture included support for gender equality, tolerance, interpersonal trust, civic participation, political interest, and political knowledge. In this regard, Denk et al (2015) employed two dimensions of political culture: orientations toward a political system and orientations toward citizen role within a political system. These also included four sets of questions, including levels of political trust in national parliament, politicians, and political parties. These questions were combined to form an index of political culture, and the second set involved satisfaction with democracy evaluating individual’s orientations toward a

political system. The latter two sets of questions evaluated orientations toward the role of a citizen. The third variable indicated levels of political interest and the fourth set of variables measured index of internal political efficacy that included how respondents could find politics and how easy it was to make up mind about political matters. In this study, theories of Almond and Verba (1963) as well as findings by Tessler and Gao (2009), Denk et al. (2015), and World Value Survey (use of WVS questionnaire for measuring democracy) were used. Finally; using exploratory studies, empirical findings, and theories of thinkers in the field of political culture, to measure political culture, these variables including civic participant, political trust, political interest, political internal efficacy, gender equality, political knowledge, political tolerance, authoritarianism, satisfaction with democracy, and attitudes toward democracy were used.

Data, Variables, and Methods

A survey technique was used in this study in which the samples included 612 citizens residing in the city of Tehran in 2018. The sample was measured through Cochran formula, where $n = \frac{NZ^2pq}{Nd^2Z^2pq}$, (N) is the measure of sample's society (8737510 persons) [measured in 2015], z is 1.96, and $p=0.5$ (predicted changes of results), and $q = 0.5$, and $d = 0.05$ error, the measure of sample is 385, and we raised it to 612.

The sampling method in this study was of multi-stage cluster type, in which Tehran

was divided into five clusters of North, South, East, West, and Center, and then two districts were randomly selected in each cluster. Inside each district, blocks were randomly selected and researchers went to doorsteps at first, and interviewed people in streets randomly if didn't receive proper response. Appendix 1 highlights districts, and zones that were chosen in sample randomly, and the number of people who answered to surveyors.

In addition to measuring the political culture, variables affecting political culture (independent variables) including political trust, efficacy of election, cost of political activity, and government official responsiveness were considered.

The political culture consisted of 10 components and 44 items including civic participation (4 items), interpersonal political trust (2 items), political interest (2 items), political internal efficacy (2 items) (a 5-point Likert-type scale from very low to very high), gender equality (3 items), political tolerance (4 items), agree with authoritarianism (4 items), accepting democracy (4 items) (5-point Likert-type scale including strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree), attitudes towards democracy (10 items) (a 10-point Likert-type scale), and satisfaction with democracy (2 items) (a 5-point Likert-type scale). Items of variables, with Cronbach's alpha greater than 0.7, were listed in Appendix 1. The results of descriptive analysis were also shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Results of descriptive analysis of political culture

Components of Political Culture	Range	Average
Civic Participation	5-20	8.77
Interpersonal Political Trust	2-10	5.13
Political Interest	2-10	5.43
Political Internal Efficacy	2-10	5.07
gender Equality	3-15	11.24
Political Knowledge	0-9	3
political Tolerance	4-20	13.10
Agree with Authoritarianism	4-20	11.38
Agree with Democracy	4-20	13.31
Attitude to Democracy	10-100	44.53
Satisfaction with Democracy	2-10	2.79

The score of political culture was 141, the range of political culture was between 49 and 245 and its middle range was equal to 147. It was concluded that the respondents' political culture was lower than average. The descriptive results obtained for the components of political culture were as follows. According to Table 2, for the variables of civic participant, interpersonal political trust, political interest, and political internal efficacy; the values were less than average (near to average), and such results were more than average (near to average) for the variables of gender equality, political tolerance, agreement with democracy, attitudes towards democracy, and satisfaction with democracy. It should be noted that such values were reported low for political knowledge.

Typology of Political Culture

As the average of political culture is 141 (141 of 49-245), this amount is tested with assumed number of 147 (average of 49-245) by one-sample T-test, and a significance

result was gotten, that shows the political culture of Tehran's citizens is lesser than the average. It would be said that political culture among citizens of Tehran is generally subject-parochial. The result shows that the relations among citizens are at general level, but those with political system are tended to be political ineffectuality. Also, the relation between people and state is a one-way path.

For more clear explanation of the status of political culture, and circumstances of Tehran citizens, we categorized the political culture's factors by analyzing exploratory ones, and then, a compression resulted in average of each factor with assumed average, that is the half of the sum of the least amount plus to the highest amount) by one-sample T-test.

By analyzing the exploratory factors in manner of principal components (Varimax rotation) the KMO= 0.73, and the Bartlett's Test is meaningful, meaning that political cultures' factors are suitable for the analysis, whose findings are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Factor Analysis (Varimax Rotation)

Factors Order	Index	Factor Loading	Factor
1	Political Tolerance	0.75	Pluralistic Thinking
	Agreement with Democracy	0.76	
	Attitude to Democracy	0.71	
2	Civic Participation	0.64	Behavioral-Involvement
	Political Interest	0.68	
	Interpersonal Political Trust	0.58	
	Political Internal Efficacy	0.55	
	Political Knowledge	0.44	
3	Gender Equality	0.80	Value-Normative
	Agreement with Authoritarianism	0.61	

As per the above table, the political culture is involved in three factors. Democratic state's acceptance, political tolerance, and attitude to democracy are effective on the first factor; political interest, political internal efficacy, interpersonal political trust, civic participation and political knowledge are effective on the second factor, gender equality and authoritarianism are effective on the third factor. The first factor is a pluralistic thought, the second is related to

involvement-behavioral, and the third is of value & normative. These factors, as a whole, clarify 55% of variations. The next step after classification is comprised of clusters' averages or other factors by one-sample T-test. In other words, this test shows that citizens have a high level in pluralism, and value & normative aspects, and low oriented average in behavioral involvement (Table 4).

Table 4. One Sample T-Test of Political Culture and factors of Political Culture

Factors	Indexes	Average	Average Assumed	t-value	Sig.
	Political Culture	141	147	-8.87	0.001
Pluralistic Thinking	Agreement with Democracy	13.3	12	10.1	0.001
	Political Tolerance	13.1	12	9.4	0.001
	Attitude to Democracy	40.9	39	8.19	0.001
Behavioral-Involvement	Civic Participation	8.7	12	-19.77	0.001
	Interpersonal Political Trust	5.13	9	-68.4	0.001
	Political Interest	8.49	9	-4.9	0.001
	Political Internal Efficacy	5	6	-15.7	0.001
	Political Knowledge	3	4.5	-19.16	0.001
Value-Normative	Gender Equality	11.24	9	22	0.001
	Agreement with Authoritarian	11.5	12	-2.44	0.01

This result is close to Robert Dahl's theory about political participation. He believes that when people are not faced with a considerable difference, they pay to policy less, and their political involvement gets lower, as the cost of political participation gets high. He believes that if a person thinks that his knowledge, and awareness is limited, he avoids from politics because he thinks that he can't understand politics (Dahl, 1364:88) So, in his notion, the loss of political discretion, loss of feeling of efficacy, considering high cost of political participation, are those factors which cause to reduction in political participation, that is effective on political culture, and as said before, the political culture of Tehran's citizens is significantly low on involvement-behavioral aspect, in the other word citizens got low scores in special fields of internal political efficacy, political knowledge, political interest, and political trust that it would be resulted that citizen are oriented to subject-parochial political culture.

Another effective issue on political culture is the cost of political participations (Dahl's theory implies to this matter). Our findings show that political activities of Tehran's citizens would have incurred high costs for them (10.12 among 3-15), that is higher than the average, and it's significance by one-sample T-test ($t= 12.7$, $sig = 0.001$); It means that citizens think if they involve in political activities, they will have some problems in legal framework, employment, and being monitored, by making a relation between political costs, and political culture

by Pearson's test, as it's shown in Table 6, their relation was reverse, and at 0.001, i.e. more feeling by citizens that political participation has high costs for them, lesser participation involvement- behavioral aspect and political culture would be, and they will be oriented to subject-parochial political culture.

Independent Variables

The variables of institutional political trust (8 items) (a 6-point Likert-type scale including not at all, very low, low, somewhat, high, and very high), efficacy of election (4 items) (a 6-point Likert-type scale from not at all to very high), cost of political activity (3 items) (a 5-point Likert-type scale including strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree) and government official responsiveness (4 items) (a 5-point Likert-type scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree) were considered as independent variables and their impact was measured on political culture. Table 6 shows the list of independent variables. According to Table 5, the score of institutional political trust was 25.06, the range of institutional political trust was reported from 8 to 48 and its middle range was equal to 28. It could be observed that institutional political trust was lower than average, efficacy of election was average, cost of political activity was more than average, and government officials responsiveness was at an average level.

Table 5. Independent Variables

Independent Variables	Range	Average
Institutional Political Trust	8-48	25.06
Efficacy of Elections	0-24	12
Cost of Political Activity	3-15	10.12
Government Officials Responsiveness	4-20	12.34

Relationship between Independent Variables and Political Culture

The results of investigation into relationships between independent variables and political culture indicated (Table 6) that all the independent variables were significantly correlated with political culture. There was also a positive relationship between three variables of institutional political trust, political

effectiveness, and government official responsiveness and political culture; in other words, increase in each of these variables could enhance participant political culture and the variable of cost of political activity was negatively correlated with political culture; in other words, increased cost of political activity could decrease participant political culture.

Table 6. Relationship between Political Culture and Independent Variables

Dependent Variable	Independent Variables	Correlation Coefficient	Significance Level
Political Culture	Institutional Political Trust	0.31	0.001
	Political Effectiveness	0.28	0.001
	Cost of Political Activity	-0.35	0.001
	Government Officials Responsiveness	0.28	0.001

Classification of Citizens

In this study, a two-step analysis was used to cluster citizenship situation. As Table 7 suggests, the range of all the four variables is between 1 and 5, so the assumed mean score for each variable is 3, and hence, higher scores are considered as more positive attitudes.

In the first cluster; there are respondents whose political trust is lower than average, but their political interest values are above the average suggesting that this group of

people is interested in political discussions although not very trusted. Also, in this group, individuals could feel the effectiveness of participation in elections in their social life and also their satisfaction with the performance of democracy is high, so they could be assumed as critics and even called critical citizens (Table 8). Thus, 27.6% of these respondents are considered to be critical citizens. The classification of citizens in terms of political culture is shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Cluster Analysis of Citizens of Political Culture

Clusters	Interpersonal Trust		Political Interest		Efficacy of Elections		Satisfaction of Democracy		Relative Distribution	
	Means	Std. Deviation	means	Std. Deviation	means	Std. Deviation	means	Std. Deviation	Frequency	Percent
1	2.85	0.41	3.41	0.62	4.53	0/47	4/12	0/51	169	27/6
2	2.77	0.41	2.68	0.73	4.18	0/62	2/88	0/57	231	37/7
3	1.44	0.38	2.33	0.83	2.73	1/34	2/38	0/65	104	17
4	2.75	0.71	2.70	0.90	1.74	0/76	2/16	0/54	108	17/6
Combined	2.56	0.69	2.83	0.84	3.60	1/31	3/01	0/93	612	100

Table 8. Types of Citizens

Dimensions of Orientation toward Political Role	Degree of Orientation toward Political Role			
political interest Efficacy of Elections	High High	Low High	Lowest Low	Low Lowest
Type of citizen	Critical	Obedient	Unmotivated	Disappointed
All of the Orientations Toward Political System Have Negative Evaluation both of the Political Trust and Satisfaction with Democracy.				

In the second cluster, there are respondents who are not much interested in discussing political issues and even not happy with the performance of democracy despite their lack of trust in a political system. They also had a sense of effectiveness in political processes and could take part in elections. Moreover, they believe that elections could influence their social life. These people are termed as obedient citizens, including 37% of those who had low political trust and satisfaction with democracy as well as low political interest and high political effectiveness (political role) (Tables 7 & 8).

The respondents in the third cluster are included individuals whose level of political trust and political interest is lower than that in all other groups. They also have lower political feelings and satisfaction with performance of democracy than those of the two previous clusters. Therefore, in this

cluster, the researchers faced with unmotivated citizens who constitute 17% of the respondents (Tables 7 & 8).

In the fourth and the final cluster, there are people with political trust and political interest lower than the average whose political effectiveness and satisfaction with democracy is lower than those in all other groups. These respondents are termed disappointed citizens whose political trust is lower than average. Their satisfaction with performance of democracy is also at the lowest level among the four groups of citizens and their political interest is less than average with the least amount of political effectiveness. As well, 17.6% of the respondents are considered to be disappointed citizens (Tables 7 & 8).

Conclusion

In this study, a typology of political culture inspired by Almond and Verba's classification was divided into three categories: participant, subject, parochial. The findings were reduced to three categories of typology of political culture in Tehran, kinds of citizens by political culture, and some variables affecting political culture.

In total, these results were obtained from three types of political cultures: the most of political culture among Tehran's citizens are subject-parochial. In this study, political culture's factors are classified into three groups: pluralistic, value, and involvement-behavioral. Findings show that citizens' score in pluralistic and value aspects are significantly more than the average, and is significantly lesser than the average in involvement-behavioral aspect; in other words, citizens have grown, more than the average, in pluralistic, and values aspects, and have grown lesser than the average, in involvement-behavioral aspect. As these aspects of involvement and participation of citizens is based on costs, and rewards. They think that their political activities would have high costs, and practically they involve themselves in political matters less, and it finally gives them a passive political role; and causes that they would have a negative, or neutral position against political system, and effects on civic citizens.

According to the cluster analysis, citizens were divided into four categories; critical, obedient, unmotivated, and disappointed citizens. None of them had a positive evaluation toward the political system. The critical citizens had negative attitudes toward the political system, but in both dimensions of politics (political interest and political effectiveness); they could also play active roles. These individuals included

27.7% of the citizens. These people also had high political effectiveness and political interest (active in political role), and their political trust and satisfaction with their democracy was low (passive in orientations towards the political system). Obedient citizens included those who had a negative evaluation of the political system, but in the dimension of political interest, they could play a passive role and even an active role in political effectiveness. This group included 37.6% of these citizens, although these people had a negative tendency toward the political system and they were inactive in the dimension of political interest (one dimension of the political role). They were also active in terms of political effectiveness (the other political role). The unmotivated citizens were those who had a negative evaluation on the political system (the lowest level of political trust among the four types of citizens), and they also had a passive role in political interest and political effectiveness. This passivity was lower than that of critical and obedient citizens and included 17% of these respondents. These citizens had the lowest level of political trust and their level of satisfaction with democracy was lower than other (critical and obedient) citizens. The political interest of all these citizens and political effectiveness of critical and obedient citizens was also reported to be at lower levels.

Disappointed citizens were those who had a negative evaluation toward the political system (low satisfaction with democracy) and also inactive in political interest with the lowest passive role in political effectiveness. This group included 17.6% of citizens. According to the categorization provided by the types of citizens, none had positive orientations toward the political system; in total, 72.4% of citizens were obedient, unmotivated, and disappointed

individuals and this matter could prevent political development. Moreover, critical citizens made up of 27.7% of these individuals and were not a high percentage in terms of political development. With regard to types of citizens and lack of participant citizens as well as low percentage of critical citizens (four types of citizens mentioned), the development of political culture was predicted to be slow.

In addition to investigating the typology of political culture and the types of citizens in political culture in this study, the impact

of some independent variables on political culture were also examined. The variables of institutional political trust, political effectiveness, and government official responsiveness were found to have positive impacts on the development of political culture and the variable of cost of political activity had a negative effect on such development. These factors could also be considered important for the growth and development of a political culture.

References

- [1] Almond, G.; Verba, S., (1989). *The Civic Culture Revisited*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Co.
- [2] Almond, G., Verba, S., (1963). *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Co.
- [3] Banfield, E., (1963). *Moral Basis of a Backward Society*, New York: Free Press.
- [4] Booth, J. A., and Richard, P. B., (1998). "Civil society, political capital, and democratization in Central America". *The Journal of Politics*, 60 (3), 780–800.
- [5] Dahl, Robert A., (1986). *Modern Political Analysis*, Translate from English to Persian by Mozaffariyan Hossein, Tehran: Emam Sadegh University.
- [6] Dalton, R.J. and Welzel, C., (2014). *The Civic Culture Transformed From Allegiant to Assertive*, Cambridge University Press.
- [7] Denk, T. and Christensen, S. H., and Bergh, D., (2015). "The Composition of Political Culture—A Study of 25 European Democracies". *Springer Science Business Media New York* 2015 St Comp Intl. Dev (2015) 50:358–377
- [8] Garcia, C., Kotze, H., and Dutoit, P., (2002). "Political culture and democracy: the South African case". *Politikon*, 29 (2), 163–181.
- [9] Gibson, J. L., and Duch, R. M. AND Tedin, K. L., (1992). "Democratic values and the transformation of the Soviet Union". *The Journal of Politics*, 54 (2), 329–371.
- [10] Inglehart, R. and Welzel, C., (2003). "Political culture and democracy: analyzing cross-level linkages". *Journal of Comparative Politics*. 36(1), 61–79.
- [11] Lipset, S. M., (1959). "Some social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy". *American Political Science Review*.
- [12] Lipset, S. M., (1994). "The Social Requisites of Democracy Revisited". *American Sociological Review* 59: 1–22.
- [13] Nathan, A. and Shi, T., (1993). "Cultural requisites for democracy in China: findings from a survey". *Daedalus*, 122 (2), 95–123.
- [14] Pye, L., and Verba S., (1965). *Political Culture and Political Development*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- [15] Rice, T. and Feldman, J. L., (1997). "Civic culture and democracy from Europe to America". *Journal of Politics*, 39 (4), 1143–1172.
- [16] Tessler, M., GAO, E., (2009). *Democracy and the Political Culture Orientations of Ordinary Citizens: a Typology for the Arab world and beyond. ISSJ 92rUNESCO2009, Published by Blackwell Publishing Ltd.*

Appendix 1. Zone, districts and numbers of selected areas

Count	Region	Districts of Selected	Zone
30	Niyavaran	D-1	North
30	Tajrish		
31	Golhak	D-3	
30	Seyedkhandan		
30	Khaniabad	D-19	South
30	Shahrak-e Shariati		
30	Khazane	D-16	
29	Naziabad		
30	Ahang	D-14 and 16	East
30	Tehranpars		
30	Neirohavaee	D-13	
30	Emamat		
30	Kashani	D-5	West
30	Pounak		
30	Shahrak-e Gharb	D-2	
30	Gisha		
12	Chitgar	D-22	
30	Yousofabad	D-6	
30	Vliasar		
30	Jomhori	D-11	
30	Moniriyeh		

Appendix 2. Items used to measure political culture	
Civic Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation in religious institutes - Activity in political groups and parties - Participation in solving youth cultural and social problems - Involvement in political newspapers and press
Interpersonal Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How much are people reliable in general discussions and speeches? -How much do you agree with this sentence nowadays do not trust on anybody?
Political Interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How much is politic important in your life? - How much do you speak about political subjects when you are with friends?
Political Internal Efficacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How much do you agree with this statement: Politics is a complex matter? -How much are political subjects and matters understandable for you?
Gender Equality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Men make better political leaders than women - University education is more important for a boy than a girl - A woman may work outside home if she wishes
Political Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Name of minister of Foreign Affairs - Name of minister of Economy - Name of the Government's spokesman - Name of the Parliament's chairman - Vice President - Head of the Participation Party - Head of the Islamic Motalefeh Party - Secretary of the Guardian Council - Name of the Parliament's spokesman
Political Tolerance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - religious minorities can be used as political officials - It is better to preventing meetings, gatherings and conferences of opposed political parties - In my opinion, it is better to boycott newspapers that are politically opposed to the government - I am not discomfort of political activity of parties that are opposed to mys ideas and opinions
Agreement or Disagreement with Authoritarianism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suppression of parties and groups that disrupt public order - There is a need for leaders whose status is beyond law in every country -Most of the times, leaders should be obeyed without questions. - In face of inequality and social and economic problems, I am not willing to disrupt the order of society by protests
Agreement or Disagreement with Democracy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Having a strong leader who does not need to be involved in a parliament or an election - Having a council of experts that make decisions according to their own interests (without the need to the government and president) -Having a democratic government -Having a military government

Attitude to Democracy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Government taxes the rich and subsidizes the poor - Religious authorities interpret laws - People choose their leaders through free elections - People receive governmental aids for unemployment - The army takes over when the government is incompetent - Civil rights protect people from oppression imposed by the government - Women have the same rights as men - The political leader is in power for only a few years - People should be free to discharge their leaders - The government makes people's incomes equal
Satisfaction with Democracy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How much do you agree with this idea; democracy may have problems, but it is better than any other government - How much are you satisfied with performance of democracy in country

Appendix 3. Items used to measure independent variables

Institutional Trust	Political	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trust in the Parliament - Trust in Ministers - Trust in President - Trust in Judiciary System - Trust in Guardian Council - Trust in Broadcasting Organization - Trust in Osolgerayan (Fundamentalists) Party (one of the political parties in Iran) - Trust in Eslahtalaban (Reformists) Party (one of the political parties in Iran)
Efficacy of Elections		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parliamentary elections - Presidential elections - Assembly of Experts for Constitution (people who make decisions for designating or dismissing the Supreme Lear of Iran) elections - City and Village Islamic Councils of Iran
Cost of Political Activity		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Political activities in a legal framework do not result in any problems. - The government makes problems regarding the recruitment of political opposition - The person who is practicing political activities is always under surveillance
Government Official Responsiveness		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If government officials act illegally, they will be prosecuted for their crimes and then punished - If people file complaints against government officials, they will be dealt with at their requests - If government officials make mistakes, they will apologize and be responsive

فرهنگ سیاسی: بررسی در شهر تهران

امیر ملکی^۱، علی محمد جوادی^۲ محمد جواد زاهدی^۳، یعقوب احمدی^۴

تاریخ پذیرش: ۱۳۹۷/۱۲/۱۸

تاریخ دریافت: ۱۳۹۷/۸/۶

چکیده

نوشته حاضر به مطالعه فرهنگی سیاسی در شهر تهران در سه محور تیپولوژی فرهنگ سیاسی، طبقه‌بندی شهروندان سیاسی و بعضی از متغیرهایی که بر فرهنگ سیاسی تأثیر دارند می‌پردازد. روش تحقیق پیمایشی و با ابزار پرسش‌نامه صورت گرفته است، حجم نمونه ۶۱۲ نفر از شهروندان تهرانی است و در سال ۱۳۹۷ انجام شده است. نتایج نشان می‌دهد که بیشتر شهروندان تهرانی به سمت فرهنگ سیاسی محدود-تبعی جهت‌گیری شده‌اند، متغیرهای اثربخشی سیاسی، هزینه فعالیت‌های سیاسی، پاسخگویی مسئولان و اعتماد سیاسی نهادی بر فرهنگ سیاسی مؤثر است. در تحلیل خوشه‌ای شهروندان به چهار دسته تقسیم شدند: انتقادی، مطیع، بی‌انگیزه و ناامید. به‌وسیله تحلیل عاملی اکتشافی شاخص‌های فرهنگ سیاسی در سه بعد دسته‌بندی شد: پلورالیستی، ارزشی و درگیری-رفتاری. نتایج نشان می‌دهد که شهروندان در بعد پلورالیستی و ارزشی رشد داشته‌اند ولی در بعد درگیری-رفتاری از سطح پایینی برخوردارند و این عامل می‌تواند بر نوع فرهنگ سیاسی مؤثر باشد.

واژه‌های کلیدی: فرهنگ سیاسی، فرهنگ سیاسی مشارکتی، فرهنگ سیاسی تبعی، فرهنگ سیاسی محدود، انواع شهروندان سیاسی.

پژوهشگاه علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرهنگی
پرتال جامع علوم انسانی

۱. دانشیار علوم اجتماعی، دانشگاه پیام نور، تهران، ایران. a_maleki@pnu.ac.ir (نویسنده مسئول).

۲. استادیار علوم اجتماعی، دانشگاه پیام نور، تهران، ایران javadi.alimohammad@pnu.ac.ir

۳. دانشیار علوم اجتماعی، دانشگاه پیام نور، تهران، ایران m_zahedi@pnu.ac.ir

۴. استادیار علوم اجتماعی، دانشگاه پیام نور، تهران، ایران yahmady@pnu.ac.ir