

Regionalism and Political Opinion in Arkansas: An
Exploratory Survey

ROBERT L. SAVAGE
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

DIANE D. BLAIR
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

It has become commonplace in contemporary discussions of Arkansas politics to make certain intrastate or regional distinctions. For example, based on the evidence of the last decade's statewide and substate elections, Republican candidates are more likely to find favor in northwest Arkansas than in southeast Arkansas. Drawing on everything from legislative positions on the Equal Rights Amendment and creation science bill to advertisements in the Arkansas Times, it is widely assumed that values and attitudes are more progressive in the densely-populated, more urban and sophisticated central region than in the sparsely-populated, more rural and provincial hills and lowlands. The considerable Black population in eastern and southern Arkansas presumably skews political opinions and judgments in one direction, while the increasing numbers of midwestern migrants into northern and western Arkansas presumably have a distinctive and dissimilar political impact.

Surprisingly, however, very little is actually known about these widely-assumed regional distinctions. Citizen opinions and attitudes can be intuitively extracted from voting behavior in candidate and referendum contests, but the pitfalls in doing so are well known to, and readily admitted by, political scientists. The kinds of reliable opinion data which might illuminate these intuitive judgments are, unfortunately, far too costly for most political scientists to obtain.

Our major purpose here is to present some findings on regional variations in Arkansans' attitudes on some contemporary institutions, interests and policy issues. We will begin by briefly reviewing what has been written to date regarding regional variations in Arkansas politics and then describing our data and methods. After presenting our findings we will discuss some possible meanings therein and suggest some directions for future research.

Earlier Studies of Regionalism in Arkansas Politics

When V.O. Key (1949) produced the first systematic study of Arkansas politics, he found little evidence of internal regional variations. In the early twentieth century days of Jeff Davis, he noted, there had been bitter conflict between the hills and Little Rock against the lowlands; and in the 1944 Senate race between Homer Adkins and J.W. Fulbright, Key saw "a glimmer of the general tendency of the upland people over the south to be more enthusiastic over candidates who can be pictured as progressive" (p. 187n). In general, however, Key concluded that Arkansas politics could not be characterized as having strong regional distinctions but rather was one of "petty argument and personal loyalty" (p. 187) with no consistent regional variations.

Richard Yates (1972: 233) began his essay on Arkansas by noting that "The politics and government of this southern-southwestern state are still influenced by sectional divisions, although not so significantly as in the nineteenth century." According to Yates, an imaginary diagonal line, drawn from the northeastern to the southwestern corner, divides Arkansas into two sections with distinctive geological, demographic, economic, and social characteristics, all still "relevant to any consideration of Arkansas politics," while near the state's center, Little Rock and adjacent areas of Pulaski County possess some of the characteristics of each. However, in the course of this excellent essay, Yates presents evidence of this diagonal distinction only twice: the far greater popularity of Republican presidential candidates in the northwestern hill counties than elsewhere; and the 1954 Cherry-Faubus contest which "represents a discernible division between the conservative east and the more liberal west" (pp. 258-259).

In fact, what Yates suggests elsewhere in his essay is that "there are conflicts of interests between eastern and western sections of the state" (p. 240), an assertion supported with references both to legislative behavior and to the gubernatorial contests of 1962 through 1968.¹ Nowhere in this extensive essay, however, does Yates employ data on opinion variations between geographic regions or places of residence.

Jim Ranchino (1972) published the first (and, to our knowledge, the last) systematic study of political opinions in Arkansas. The only regional analysis included in this study, however, was based on voting returns from 1960-1970, rather than survey data; and there is no suggestion as to whether whether regional variations in opinions per se do or do not exist.

¹This conclusion with regard to legislative behavior is supported by Davis (1976) but somewhat contradicted by O'Connor (1979).

Pierce (1974) repeated, but did not elaborate upon Yates' suggested diagonal division. Virtually the same formula was employed by Bass and DeVries (1976). Their descriptive essay begins with the assertion that, "In Arkansas, the South meets the West, and geography helps shape political developments that flow from a heritage of conflicting values and forces" (p. 87). This thesis is neither developed nor sustained, however, nor is evidence of contemporary regional variations presented.

Thompson's (1976: 9) investigation of the Reconstruction period in Arkansas challenges this simple highland-lowland division, insisting rather that Arkansas developed as three distinct "societies": the Eastern or Delta Lowlands, the Northwest Uplands, and the Southern Lowlands, strongly influenced by the Ouachita River and the attraction to Texas. Because of its geographical isolation deriving from its river system, this southwestern section was sympathetic with the Northwest Uplands on such economic measures as railroad promotion. However, a closer social affinity with the Delta Lowlands made the two areas agree on maintaining customary race relations. The thesis is an interesting and provocative one, but Thompson's historical study does not attempt to apply this typology to contemporary politics.

Finally, the most thorough attempt to examine Arkansas' intra-state distinctions is the Savage and Gallagher (1977) study of regionalism in Arkansas politics. Using 71 social, economic, and political aggregate attributes (such as median age and family income, corporate ownership of farms, voting returns, public expenditures, etc.) and applying Q-factor analysis, Savage and Gallagher concluded that while Arkansas counties are generally more alike than they are different, there are in fact three distinguishable county "types": Ozark, Delta, and Urban. These three types roughly correspond to Elazar's Moralistic, Traditionalistic, and Individualistic types of political culture.

A number of distinctions with obvious political significance emerge from this study. The Ozark type, for example, is most distinctive for its high voter turnout and stronger support of Republican candidacies; the Delta type for its lower levels of political participation and strong commitment to Democrats; the Urban type for its strong support of constitutional reform and its higher levels of educational attainment and occupational status. As with the other studies cited, however, there is no reliance upon or presentation of opinion data per se.

The Data and Their Analysis

In April, 1982, the Arkansas Household Research Panel (AHRP) of the University of Arkansas included in their quarterly survey of a continuing panel of Arkansas households a module developed by the present authors. The panel is a randomly-selected sample of households across the state which have agreed to respond to at least

four omnibus mail surveys per year. The response rate for the April, 1982, survey was about 67%, providing 523 usable sets of responses to the portion dealing with political matters.

While this large sample provides a representative sample of the panel, a strong bias results from obtaining initial agreement from households to be included in the panel. Not surprisingly, then, for a mail survey, the panel respondents tend to be white, somewhat older, wealthier, and better-educated than Arkansans generally. The difference is especially notable with regard to education and race. Still, the data are worthwhile if understood as a sample of responses from articulates in Arkansas society. In other words, from a political standpoint, our sample represents that segment in the Arkansas population that has traditionally been most likely to be attentive to and broadly involved in community affairs.

Among the demographic variables provided by the AHRP to its survey clients is the geographic location of respondents in terms of the state's eight Economic Development Districts established by Act 118 of the Arkansas Legislature in 1969 (see Figure 1). As these districts were established partly to accord with national criteria in order to qualify for federal funds, there is no inherent distinctiveness claimed for the regions that flows from traditional cultural patterns. Yet, each of the eight regions is reasonably homogeneous in terms of its geographic, social, and economic attributes (except for the urban-rural dichotomy). We recognize that our small regional subsamples, from the standpoint of sampling theory, offer much less reliability than is desirable. In the end, necessarily, we assert our findings only as a tentative first step at sketching the attitudinal geography of Arkansas politics.

Still, the data have heuristic value for exploring the answer to that heretofore elusive question about Arkansas politics: To what extent are variations in political beliefs among Arkansans a function of regional differences? And if such differences do exist, to what extent do they conform to and reinforce, or deviate from and challenge, the conventional wisdom of Arkansas political folklore?

Before we attempt to offer some answers to these questions, however, some limitations flowing from the questionnaire itself must be acknowledged. Most simply, the determination of regional differences was not the underlying rationale of the survey. We were concerned initially about the degree to which Arkansans' political beliefs are ideologically structured and, secondarily, with their perceptions of the institutional structure of Arkansas politics.²

²For a more detailed analysis of ideological structure among these respondents, see Savage and Blair, 1982c; and on confidence in institutions, see Savage and Blair, 1982b.

Thus, to whatever extent regional differences do emerge, this study represents a relatively strong test (albeit within the limits of sampling error) for we largely did not include items that directly address those political behaviors that conventional wisdom points to as especially important for regional differences. The one exception is that of partisan self-identification. If regional differences had been a primary concern in the design of the questionnaire, certainly we would have included some items regarding political participation and race-related policy issues. Still, our data permit the most thorough analysis of regional differences in the political opinions of Arkansans to date.

A Profile of Political Opinion in Arkansas

As pointed out above, Savage and Gallagher found in their study of Arkansas counties that similarities were more prevalent than differences. As is shown below, regional variations in opinion phenomena in Arkansas are also less notable than the commonalities in opinion across regions. Accordingly, we begin with a profile of Arkansans (that is, of more articulate and mostly white Arkansans) and then go on to note such regional differences as did emerge in the 1982 survey.

Our first set of questions derived from the quadrennial national surveys conducted by the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center. These questions point to six issues of national policy concern, three of them dealing with economic matters, the other three directed toward issues of contemporary social mores. We asked the respondents to address these questions not only in terms of national action but state action as well.³

The responses to these questions statewide point to a strong conservative stand on economic policy--job security, government health insurance, tax rates (see Tables 1-3). These majorities range from about 53% who prefer flatter tax rates to about 60 % opposing government guarantees of job security. Moreover, while individuals may differ on any given issue with regard to national versus state action, in the aggregate, Arkansans do not want different policy stands taken by the two levels of government.

Opinions on the three social issues, legalization of marijuana,

³In order to save space we present only the regional distributions for positions on national action. Tabular presentations of such distributions for positions on state action are available from the authors upon request. Also available from the authors is the original questionnaire although the wording used in the tables presented here is as close to the original as the tabular forms allow.

women's rights, and abortion, showed much greater variations. For example, about two thirds of our respondents lean toward greater penalties for marijuana consumption (see Table 4). On the other hand, more than 50% feel positive and less than 25% negative about gender equality (see Table 5). The only issue about which there is no clear majority is abortion policy, although the largest plurality favors a life/health endangerment exception and otherwise banning abortions (see Table 6). As with the economic issues, individuals vary with the level of government in their stands, but the aggregate positions on the three social issues statewide are not significantly different across the two levels.

We addressed these six issues in order to be able to make some comparisons with national studies. However, we were also interested in the state's own "policy agenda." To that end we included nine questions dealing with issues receiving recent prominent treatment within the state. Four of these are basically economic issues, primarily concerning the future development of the state's economy, four others basically address social issues, and one encompasses both economic and social aspects.

While Arkansans take a conservative stance on governmental intervention in the economy, they nonetheless are anxious for development of the state's economy. In a general question regarding the encouragement of economic growth, 72.9% favored such encouragement to some extent (see Table 7). And with regard to one recent specific issue frequently tied to the growth issue, the constitutional usury limit, a majority (55.6%) favored a change that promoted economic expansion (e.g., the possibility of greater interest rates) either by increasing, indexing, or eliminating the usury limit (see Table 8).⁴ On the other hand, a slight plurality (44.2%) oppose raising truck weight limits, reflecting a concern for protecting the state's highways (see Table 9), while utility corporations have been spectacularly unsuccessful in linking a need for greater profits with such growth as they have frequently argued. More than 70% of our respondents feel that utilities are making excessive profits (see Table 10).

No common theme underlies the four social issues addressed here nor is there a clear structuring evident in the responses. More than 60% favor stricter punishments and longer prison sentences and about the same number of respondents want to stop aliens from immigrating to the United States (see Tables 11-12). With regard to an issue that placed Arkansas directly in the nation's eye, we asked two questions pertinent to the Scientific Creationism law. A strong plurality (47.8%) indicated support for the teaching of scientific creationism in the public schools but only 23.9% indicated any support for legislative tampering with the content of courses in the schools (see Tables 13-14).

⁴More detailed studies of recent opinion in Arkansas on the usury question are Savage and Blair (1982a); and Britton and Savage (1982).

The final issue of the Arkansas policy agenda concerned the quality of public schools in the state. This issue touches upon both economic and social concerns. While we have no evidence either way, note should be taken of the frequent assertions by both political and economic leaders that inferior public education is a significant factor in the state's failure to attract new industry. In any event, 72.1% of our respondents indicated some dissatisfaction with schools in the state and only 16.5% felt that the state's schools are at all satisfactory (see Table 15).

More general (and considerably more circumspect) measures of policy orientation are partisan and ideological self-identification. Our findings provide no surprise here; Arkansans conform to the image most often associated with the American South. As shown in Tables 16-17, they are Democrats (49.9%) but they also tend to see themselves as conservatives (49.5%). At the same time, more than a quarter of these Arkansans identify with the Republican Party. The liberal element is much smaller (17.9%).

While policy orientations provided the major thrust of our survey, we were also concerned about the institutional framework of politics as perceived by Arkansans. One set of such questions asked the respondents to rate the levels of government in the federal system--national, state, and local (see Table 18). For the most part, Arkansans conform to national tendencies. They have most faith in local government and least faith in the national government. Presumably state government is less salient, for it is the level fewest have the most faith in, and also the level fewest have the least faith in. As to the value of the levels of government, more Arkansans feel that they get the most for their money from local government and the least from the national government. A majority position by Arkansans occurs with regard to the levels of the federal system, however, only in the matter of taxation. Clearly, the national income tax is not popular in the state as 68.5% of these Arkansans feel that the worst tax is imposed by the national government; surely, most of those are pointing to the income tax.

We also queried Arkansans as to the confidence they place in a number of public and private institutions. Generally, we conclude from Table 19 that more altruistic, less remote, and more decentralized institutions receive stronger votes of confidence.⁵

Using a slightly modified list of institutions, we also sought to examine the perceptions, actual and ideal, that Arkansans have of the influence of institutions in the state's politics (see Tables 20-21). Generally, economic institutions are seen as actually having more power and more altruistic institutions having less. However, the relative rankings for perceived influence are not just the reverse of the confidence ratings; note, for example, that banks rank third

⁵See Savage and Blair, 1982b; Savage and Britton (1980).

in confidence and second in perceived influence. Nor are perceptions of the desired influence of institutions equivalent to the confidence ratings, although corporate organizations, whether business or organized labor, are generally desired to have less influence.

In sum, Arkansans tend toward economic boosterism but are cautious with regard to governmental intervention in the economy. On social issues there is somewhat less agreement. If there is governmental intervention, Arkansans would seemingly prefer that it come at the local level, but they seem cautious even here since that preference for the local level is couched in terms of a relatively low level of confidence in institutions generally. Finally, it seems likely that Arkansans are alienated from state government, given the low confidence in the Legislature and the Office of the Governor combined with the disparity in the perceived and desired levels of political influence of institutions.

Regional Variations

Almost every item in the questionnaire elicited some significant variation in one or more of the developmental districts. However, each of the sets of questions above tended to exhibit different patterns of regional response. The greatest degree of variation arises with partisan and ideological affiliation, followed closely by national policy issues and levels of the federal system. The least variation occurs with the measures of institutional confidence and influence. Moreover, some regions are more variant across the board and others less so. Region 3, Eastern Arkansas, exhibits the least difference from state norms with its greatest deviations appearing with the national policy issues and desired influence of institutions. Region 8, Western Arkansas, varies most from state norms with strong degrees of variance in every category. Generally, along with Eastern Arkansas, Regions 1 (Northwest Arkansas), 4 (Southeast Arkansas), and 5 (Central Arkansas) are less deviant. The more deviant regions other than Western Arkansas are Regions 2 (White River area), 6 (West Central Arkansas), and 7 (Southwest Arkansas).

Eastern Arkansans are generally more conservative with regard to national policy issues. On the state policy issues, they are distinctive only for greater support of economic growth coupled (somewhat oddly) with noticeably less enthusiasm for increasing truck weight limits. Eastern Arkansans do have more than their share of self-professed "strong" conservatives. They do not differ significantly from state averages on the items relating to levels of the federal system. With regard to state institutions, the respondents in this region differ most markedly in desiring more influence for several institutions--higher education, local government, churches, medicine, banks--but less for organized labor. In general, then,

in a conservative state, Eastern Arkansans are somewhat more conservative.

Southeast Arkansans differ from the state norm more often but exhibit much less clarity with regard to any patterning in those differences. Indeed, respondents in this region appear more inclined to take a middle or "neutral" position somewhat more often than those in other regions (note, for example, women's rights in Table 5 and the questions pertinent to scientific creationism in Tables 13-14). The Southeasterners have more than their share of "weak" Democrats and less of "weak" Republicans; there are also fewer "strong" conservatives. The strongest difference in the region's responses concerns perceptions of the levels of the federal system compared to the total sample. They tend to have much greater faith in state government and even less faith in the national government. On only four of the 36 measures relating to institutions in the state do they differ noticeably. In sum, the Southeast Arkansans, living in the heart of the Delta region, do not conform to images often attributed to white Southerners (and most of these respondents are white) more than Arkansans generally. However, their responses to the levels of the federal system suggest that Dixie still lives on in their hearts.

Central Arkansas, containing the largest metropolitan area in the state, is the most liberal region on the national policy issues, especially the social issues. This is true whether the policy action is national or state in origin with regard to legalization of marijuana, gender equality, or abortion. With regard to other opinion areas, deviations are scattered and reflect no consistent pattern.

The respondents of Northwest Arkansas are somewhat surprising inasmuch as theirs is one of the four regions deviating less from state norms. Proverbial folk wisdom within the region, reaching almost mythic proportions, stresses the "apartness," physically and socially, of this land in the hills. Still, the differences revealed in our findings exhibit some generally consistent patterns. With regard to social issues in contemporary state policy concerns (but not the three national social issues), Northwest Arkansans deviate generally in a more liberal direction--less for stricter penal policies, while slightly more likely to welcome refugees. Not surprisingly, Northwest Arkansas is one of only two regions which is more than 40% Republican. The most striking difference, however, is the reversal of the pattern found in the Southeast with regard to the federal system. Northwesterners are the only ones who exhibit greater faith in the national government than in local government. This might seem a logical consequence of Republicans having greater confidence in a national government led, at present, by Republicans. However, the fact that the state government also had a Republican leader at the time the survey was taken had no similar "halo" effect: respondents in the region tend to exhibit much less

faith in the state government. Relatively little difference is evident with regard to institutions within the state, however. Thus, isolation from the state is somewhat reflected in the responses of Northwest Arkansans, but it may be the perception of isolation itself that most marks the region as distinctive from the rest of the state.

The four remaining regions exhibit much greater deviation from state norms. These regions tend to be the more rural and less populated areas of the state. Thus, from a statistical point of view, the overall volume of deviation rather definitely suggests that more than statistical artifact is involved here. The real test is the extent to which patterns of interrelated opinion positions tend to emerge. Let's begin with the White River region of north central Arkansas.

The White River respondents are less supportive of liberal positions on several social issues. Relatively fewer of them support a policy of gender equality or abortion on demand. They are more likely to favor stricter punishments and longer sentences and the teaching of scientific creationism in the public schools. Finally, with regard to social issues, they are less inclined to welcome alien refugees. These policy positions suggest if not a traditional sacral position toward social relationships then at least a less secular orientation. The region has a greater share of "strong" Democrats but also of "independent" Republicans as well; not surprisingly then, there are fewer who are altogether independent of partisan leanings. With regard to the federal system, there are notable discontinuities. A greater percentage of White River respondents than of the total sample place the most faith in the state government, but on the other hand, relatively more of them think they get the most for their money from the national government. Ultimately, however, the most striking difference is their lesser inclination to desire institutions to have influence on state government. Across twelve institutions the region's mean weighted score is only 38.0 compared to a state average of 46.9. Indeed, for only two institutions--churches and banks--are the weighted scores not noticeably less than the weighted scores for the state as a whole. Since the White River respondents are not especially distinctive with regard to confidence in institutions, one interpretation may be that individualism of a rugged sort is involved here. Generally, while the region extends beyond the foothills of the Ozarks, the variant opinion patterns here suggest something of the less secular orientation to political action that is characteristic of Southern upland politics.

West Central Arkansans tend slightly toward greater liberalism, most notably with regard to a national health insurance policy. These respondents are also notable for a somewhat paradoxical stance on the issues underlying the scientific creationism controversy--on the one hand they are less strong in their support of its teaching and on the other hand, less opposed to legislative intervention in

the content of courses in the public schools. "Strong" Democrats are more evident in the region and Republicans generally less so. The region is perhaps most striking, however, with regard to feelings toward local government and toward organized labor. In the federal context, they are most prone to indicate least faith in local government and less inclined to select it as the level of government from which they get the most for their money. They are also less inclined to desire that local governments have influence on state government. With regard to organized labor, West Central Arkansans tend to have greater confidence and desire it to have greater influence on state government than is the case in other regions. They also tend to perceive organized labor as actually having less influence than is true in most other regions. The West Central region, then, is somewhat unique, but it defies any thumbnail description.

Southwest Arkansans are more conservative on policy issues than any regional group covered to this point. They are even less supportive of government job guarantees and government health insurance than the state norm but their greater conservatism tends to extend to social issues as well, including marijuana laws, abortion policy, and gender equality. This social conservatism is reflected on current state issues as well: tougher penal policy and support for the teaching of scientific creationism. The region has fewer "strong" Democrats and many more "strong" conservatives. Generally the Southwesterners lean more favorably toward local government and away from the national government. With regard to institutions in the state, they are notable for their lesser confidence in the mass media and their inclination to assign more actual influence to television news in particular. Political conservatism clearly characterizes Southwest Arkansas.

Finally we arrive at the most distinctive and, as it happens, the most conservative of the state's regions, Western Arkansas. On all those policy issues on which Southwesterners are more conservative, except gender equality and scientific creationism, the Westerners also incline to be more conservative than the state norm. To these can be added the tax and refugee policies. Western Arkansans also lean more toward economic boosterism, being even more inclined to encourage growth and, (in perhaps the greatest regional deviation on any survey item) to support raising truck weight limits. At the same time, they seem less inclined to feel the need for school improvements. It is the only region in the state, other than Northwest Arkansas, to have more than 40% Republican Party identifiers. There is more aversion to the national government in Western Arkansas than is indicated in the state norm, but that aversion does not reach the levels found in Southeast or Southwest Arkansas. With regard to institutions in the state, Western Arkansans are most notable for their greater inclination to desire influence in state by corporate organizations. This includes not only utilities, oil

companies, and other big business, but organized labor as well. Thus, generally, Western Arkansas is the most distinctive region in opinion distribution in the state. That distinctiveness is built upon the strongest degree of both conservatism and economic boosterism to be found anywhere in the state.

Concluding Remarks

The most basic question which this paper addresses is whether there are in fact regional differences in Arkansans' political attitudes, and clearly our answer to that question must be affirmative. Regional variations in opinions do indeed exist. Our research also suggests, however, that any easy, overly-broad distinctions, such as those sometimes drawn between the "hill" and "swamp" Arkansans, or between the attitudinal worlds of the Ozark and of the Delta, must be regarded with some suspicion.

First, our data and analyses suggest an underlying base of strong commonalities in the contemporary attitudes of Arkansans. While V.O. Key (1949) might have exaggerated in describing Arkansas as a "case of political consensus in exaggerated form" (p. 185), our contemporary opinion data do indeed indicate that Key was accurate in perceiving "Arkansas' active electorate possesses a high degree of homogeneity" (p. 184). As Savage and Gallagher (1977: 97) found in their analysis of Arkansas counties, so we find with respect to Arkansans' attitudes: they are generally more alike than they are different, and "to travel from Benton County in the extreme northwest to Chicot County in the extreme southeast is hardly a trip between two different worlds."

Second, on some contemporary state policy issues, our data indicate that some of the widest ranges of attitudes occur within areas which have heretofore been generalized together geographically. For example, some of the widest variations in the most intense views on the truck weight issue occur within western Arkansas, that is, between Regions 1 and 8 (see Table 9). More than twice as many Region 8 Arkansans as Region 1 Arkansans take the strongest possible position that truck weight limits should be raised, while more than three times as many Region 1 Arkansans as Region 8 Arkansans express the most intense attitude against raising the weight limit. Similarly, the widest range in views on state penal policy emerges between the Region 1 and Region 8 Arkansans, with Region 1 expressing the most lenient views of any group sampled and Region 8 taking the harshest stance. This same wide spread is nearly duplicated on the issues of utility profits and governmental responsibility for job security. With respect to the latter issue, while the two easternmost Arkansas Regions, 3 and 4, display great similarity on most subjects, twice as many Region 3 Arkansans as Region 4 Arkansans take the most intense position that governments should let each person get ahead on his own.

Explanations for these and other issue-specific variations lie beyond the reach of our data and beyond the purpose of this essay. The existence of such anomalies, however, not only suggests caution in the use of the traditional diagonal division of Arkansas as the beginning of political understanding, but also opens a number of interesting avenues for additional research.

Why, for example, do Region 8 Arkansans, who are in some respects the most economically conservative and presumably therefore the most pro-business group surveyed, express such marked hostility to utility profit-making, especially in contrast to their immediate neighbors to the north in Region 1? Is there a simple contemporary context which explains this disparity (perhaps the Region 8 respondents had just received their electric bills, or perhaps they are serviced by different utilities than are Region 1 respondents), or is there an underlying historical-cultural explanation?

Why are those in Region 7, West Central Arkansas, so much less trusting of local governments than are other Arkansans generally? Is this a residual backlash against once powerful and allegedly unethical local political machines in Garland, Perry, Yell, and Conway counties, or is there a more proximate cause? Do contemporary situations or past developments offer some explanations as to why labor unions find more favor in this region than elsewhere?

In summary, our findings seem partially to substantiate and partially to challenge conventional wisdom about regional variations in Arkansas politics. Since prior observations were based on everything from river routes to folklore, and since the "regions" delineated previously were equally varied in their origins, we did not expect any close comparability between our findings and earlier hypotheses. Indeed, our use of opinion data and our employment of economic development districts precludes any such straightforward comparisons.

Nevertheless, in the broad context of Arkansas political studies, we have offered some further confirmation that there are some attitudinal variations from region to region. We also suggest, however, that they tend to be issue-specific, that sometimes the sharpest variations are within geographically-contiguous areas, and that the variations are frequently not easily explicable by conventional wisdom.

Figure 1



<u>STATE PLANNING REGION</u>	<u>1980 ESTIMATED POPULATION</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE REPRESENTATION</u>	<u>SAMPLE REPRESENTATION</u>
1	285,257	12.5%	14.1%
2	188,374	8.3	8.6
3	388,969	17.0	17.0
4	245,026	10.7	10.5
5	498,566	21.8	20.3
6	238,305	10.4	10.5
7	246,602	10.8	9.4
8	193,126	8.5	8.4
STATE TOTAL	<u>2,284,225</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>98.8%</u>

Table 1

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF POSITIONS ON A NATIONAL POLICY ISSUE: JOB SECURITY

Issue Position	Region ^a								Unknown	All	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8			
Government should see to job and good standard of living	1	5.4	2.2	1.1	3.6	3.8	7.3	2.0	4.5	16.7	3.8
	2	2.7	0.0	1.1	3.6	2.8	1.8	2.0	6.8	0.0	2.5
	3	10.8	13.3	3.4	14.5	11.3	5.5	4.1	4.5	0.0	8.4
	4	21.6	20.0	24.7	27.3	24.5	29.1	18.4	13.6	16.7	22.9
Government should let each person get ahead on his own	5	17.6	17.8	22.5	14.5	21.7	14.5	16.3	27.3	16.7	19.3
	6	25.7	17.8	16.9	18.2	15.1	25.5	30.6	11.4	0.0	19.5
	7	16.2	28.9	29.2	16.4	20.8	14.5	24.5	31.8	50.0	22.8
No response		<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1.1</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total**		100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.9	99.9	100.1	100.0
n		74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	6	523

^aRegion 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

**Some totals vary from 100.0% due to rounding error.

Table 2

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF POSITIONS ON A NATIONAL POLICY ISSUE: GOVERNMENT HEALTH INSURANCE

Issue Position	Region ^a								Unknown	All	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8			
Government health insurance	1	6.8	2.2	9.0	5.5	11.3	18.2	6.1	6.8	16.7	8.8
	2	5.4	11.1	6.7	7.3	7.5	9.1	0.0	4.5	0.0	6.5
	3	8.1	2.2	7.9	12.7	10.4	9.1	6.1	11.4	0.0	8.6
	4	17.6	22.2	14.6	23.6	17.0	14.5	8.2	13.6	33.3	16.6
Private health insurance	5	10.8	4.4	10.1	16.4	11.3	20.0	22.4	9.1	16.7	12.8
	6	18.9	13.3	12.4	18.2	14.2	9.1	18.4	18.2	0.0	14.9
	7	29.7	37.8	37.1	14.5	27.4	18.2	32.7	36.4	33.3	29.3
No response		<u>2.7</u>	<u>6.7</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>0.9</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>6.1</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2.5</u>
Total		100.0	99.9**	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
n		74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	6	523

^aRegion 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

**Total varies from 100.0% due to rounding error.

Table 3

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF POSITIONS ON A NATIONAL POLICY ISSUE: TAX RATES

Issue Position	Region*								Unknown	All	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8			
Increase the tax rate for high incomes	1	14.9	13.3	12.4	5.5	17.0	12.7	6.1	6.8	16.7	12.0
	2	4.1	6.7	9.0	9.1	7.5	10.9	4.1	4.5	0.0	7.1
	3	13.5	20.0	13.5	18.2	14.2	10.9	14.3	9.1	33.3	14.3
	4	9.5	11.1	7.9	16.4	16.0	12.7	18.4	11.4	0.0	12.6
Have the same tax rate for everyone	5	13.5	11.1	11.2	7.3	5.7	12.7	12.2	9.1	0.0	9.9
	6	12.2	13.3	9.0	7.3	5.7	9.1	10.2	6.8	0.0	8.8
	7	32.4	24.4	37.1	34.5	34.0	27.3	32.7	50.0	50.0	34.2
No response		<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1.0</u>
Total**		100.1	99.9	100.1	100.1	100.1	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9
n		74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	6	523

*Region 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

**Some totals vary from 100.0% due to rounding error.

Table 4

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF POSITIONS ON A NATIONAL POLICY ISSUE: LEGALIZATION OF MARIJUANA

Issue Position	Region*								Unknown	All	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8			
Make marijuana use legal	1	2.7	2.2	5.6	3.6	10.4	7.3	2.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
	2	1.4	4.4	1.1	3.6	4.7	7.3	0.0	2.3	0.0	3.1
	3	9.5	6.7	3.4	3.6	4.7	5.5	6.1	2.3	0.0	5.2
	4	17.6	15.6	10.1	9.1	9.4	9.1	8.2	15.9	0.0	11.5
Make penalties higher	5	9.5	11.1	2.2	7.3	9.4	7.3	10.2	6.8	0.0	7.6
	6	12.2	4.4	11.2	7.3	7.5	7.3	4.1	9.1	0.0	8.2
	7	47.3	55.6	66.3	61.8	52.8	56.4	67.3	63.6	100.0	58.7
No response		<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>0.9</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.8</u>
Total**		100.2	100.0	99.9	99.9	99.8	100.2	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.1
n		74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	6	523

*Region 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

**Some totals vary from 100.0% due to rounding error.

Table 5

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF POSITIONS ON A NATIONAL POLICY ISSUE: GENDER EQUALITY

Issue Position		Region*								Unknown	All
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Women and men should have an equal role	1	32.4	20.0	38.2	34.5	43.4	30.9	38.8	36.4	33.3	35.6
	2	10.8	8.9	3.4	5.5	11.3	14.5	8.2	4.5	0.0	8.4
	3	8.1	11.1	11.2	12.7	10.4	10.9	12.2	6.8	16.7	10.5
	4	24.3	28.9	19.1	25.5	17.9	10.9	10.2	27.3	16.7	20.1
Women's place is in the home	5	13.5	8.9	11.2	9.1	7.5	16.4	10.2	13.6	16.7	11.1
	6	8.1	6.7	5.6	5.5	1.9	3.6	4.1	0.0	16.7	4.6
	7	2.7	15.6	9.0	3.6	7.5	7.3	14.3	9.1	0.0	8.0
No response		0.0	0.0	2.2	3.6	0.0	5.5	2.0	2.3	0.0	1.7
Total**		99.9	100.1	99.9	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0
n		74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	6	523

*Region 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

**Some totals vary from 100.0% due to rounding error.

Table 6

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF POSITIONS ON A POLICY ISSUE: ABORTION (NATIONAL)

Issue Position: National Abortion Policy	Region*								Unknown	All
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Abortion should <u>never</u> be permitted.	12.2	11.1	7.9	3.6	1.9	7.3	2.0	18.2	16.7	7.5
Abortion should be permitted only if the life and health of the woman is in danger.	39.2	42.2	46.1	40.0	34.0	23.6	51.0	36.4	66.7	39.2
Abortion should be permitted if, due to personal reasons, the woman would have difficulty in caring for the child.	10.8	8.9	9.0	18.2	10.4	10.9	8.2	11.4	0.0	10.7
Abortion should <u>never</u> be forbidden, since one should not require a woman to have a child she doesn't want.	25.7	17.8	14.6	18.2	36.8	23.1	20.4	20.5	16.7	23.9
Other	9.5	11.1	12.4	7.3	10.4	3.6	8.2	6.8	0.0	9.0
No response	2.7	8.9	10.1	12.7	6.6	25.5	10.2	6.8	0.0	9.8
Total**	100.1	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.1	100.1
n	74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	6	523

*Region 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

**Some totals vary from 100% due to rounding error.

Table 7
REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF POSITIONS ON A STATE POLICY ISSUE: ECONOMIC GROWTH

Issue Position		Region*								Unknown	All
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Growth should be encouraged	1	25.7	35.6	51.7	43.6	37.7	40.0	46.9	40.9	33.3	40.2
	2	12.2	11.1	18.0	16.4	17.0	14.5	18.4	15.9	0.0	15.5
	3	21.6	20.0	13.5	23.6	17.0	14.5	6.1	22.7	16.7	17.2
	4	17.6	20.0	7.9	10.9	17.9	16.4	20.4	6.8	16.7	14.7
Growth should be discouraged	5	10.8	2.2	4.5	3.6	3.8	9.1	4.1	2.3	0.0	5.2
	6	2.7	2.2	1.1	1.8	0.9	0.0	0.0	6.8	0.0	1.7
	7	9.5	8.9	2.2	0.0	5.7	5.5	4.1	4.5	33.3	5.4
No response		0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Total**		100.1	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.1
n		74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	6	523

*Region 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

**Some totals vary from 100.0% due to rounding error.

Table 8
REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF POSITIONS ON A POLICY ISSUE: USURY REGULATION

Issue Position: Usury Regulation	Region*								Unknown	All
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Revise to less than 10%	5.4	8.9	7.9	18.2	9.4	9.1	10.2	6.8	0.0	9.2
Keep at 10%	29.7	37.8	32.6	32.7	34.0	36.4	36.7	38.6	16.7	34.0
Over 10% to 15%	29.7	26.7	23.6	25.5	19.8	36.4	28.6	18.2	66.7	26.0
Over 15%	4.1	0.0	4.5	7.3	5.7	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	3.4
Tied to an index	21.6	17.8	19.1	5.5	21.7	7.3	12.2	20.5	16.7	16.6
Eliminate usury limit	9.5	6.7	11.2	10.9	7.5	9.1	10.2	13.6	0.0	9.6
No response	0.0	2.2	1.1	0.0	1.9	1.8	0.0	2.3	0.0	1.1
Total**	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.1	99.9	100.0	100.1	99.9
n	74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	6	523

*Region 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

**Some totals vary from 100.0% due to rounding error.

Table 9

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF POSITIONS ON A STATE POLICY ISSUE: TRUCK WEIGHT LIMITS

Issue Position		Region*								Unknown	All
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Raise the weight limit to promote economic growth	1	16.2	22.2	13.5	14.5	19.8	18.2	24.5	34.1	33.3	19.5
	2	14.9	2.2	4.5	20.0	12.3	1.8	10.2	18.2	0.0	10.3
	3	8.1	17.8	10.1	10.9	11.3	10.9	6.1	13.6	33.3	11.1
	4	5.4	17.8	16.9	9.1	12.3	12.7	18.4	11.4	0.0	12.6
Keep the weight limit to protect the roads	5	10.8	11.1	10.1	7.3	12.3	7.3	4.1	4.5	16.7	9.2
	6	13.5	6.7	6.7	16.4	3.8	16.4	6.1	4.5	0.0	8.8
	7	29.7	22.2	36.0	20.0	27.4	27.3	26.5	9.1	16.7	26.2
No response		1.4	0.0	2.2	1.8	0.9	5.5	4.1	4.5	0.0	2.3
Total**		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.1	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0
n		74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	6	523

*Region 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

**Some totals vary from 100.0% due to rounding error.

Table 10

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF POSITIONS ON A STATE POLICY ISSUE: UTILITY PROFITS

Issue Position		Region*								Unknown	All
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Utilities are making excessive profits	1	27.0	40.0	39.3	40.0	46.2	41.8	44.9	43.2	50.0	40.3
	2	24.3	11.1	18.0	14.5	17.0	23.6	16.3	29.5	0.0	18.9
	3	23.0	17.8	14.6	16.4	16.0	12.7	12.2	4.5	33.3	15.5
	4	9.5	13.3	7.9	10.9	8.5	5.5	8.2	4.5	0.0	8.4
Utilities are simply trying to stay in business	5	6.8	4.4	11.2	10.9	4.7	0.0	10.2	9.1	0.0	7.1
	6	4.1	6.7	4.5	3.6	2.8	3.6	2.0	0.0	0.0	3.4
	7	5.4	4.4	4.5	3.6	3.8	12.7	6.1	9.1	16.7	5.9
No response		0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Total**		100.1	99.9	100.0	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	100.0	99.9
n		74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	6	523

*Region 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

**Some totals vary from 100.0% due to rounding error.

Table 11

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF POSITIONS ON A STATE POLICY ISSUE: PENAL POLICY

Issue Position		Region*								Unknown	All
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Stricter punishments and longer sentences	1	25.7	42.2	46.1	45.5	49.1	41.8	49.0	59.1	50.0	44.4
	2	14.9	22.2	9.0	14.5	14.2	21.8	16.3	15.9	0.0	15.1
	3	12.2	11.1	16.9	3.6	3.8	5.5	12.2	6.8	16.7	9.2
	4	12.2	8.9	9.0	10.9	9.4	9.1	4.1	11.4	0.0	9.4
More emphasis on rehabilitation	5	16.2	11.1	3.4	5.5	1.9	7.3	0.0	2.3	16.7	5.9
	6	2.7	0.2	5.6	5.5	7.5	3.6	6.1	0.0	0.0	4.4
	7	14.9	2.2	6.7	10.9	14.2	9.1	8.2	0.0	16.7	9.4
No response		1.4	2.2	3.4	3.6	0.0	1.8	4.1	4.5	0.0	2.3
Total**		100.2	100.1	100.2	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.1
n		74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	6	523

*Region 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

** Some totals vary from 100.0% due to rounding error.

Table 12

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF POSITIONS ON A STATE POLICY ISSUE: REFUGEES

Issue Position		Region*								Unknown	All
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
America must welcome and assist the world's refugees	1	2.7	2.2	5.6	3.6	6.6	1.8	2.0	0.0	0.0	3.6
	2	4.1	2.2	2.2	5.5	4.7	5.5	4.1	0.0	0.0	3.6
	3	14.9	4.4	6.7	10.9	8.5	9.1	12.2	6.8	16.7	9.4
	4	9.5	15.6	13.5	16.4	12.3	12.7	10.2	18.2	0.0	13.0
America cannot afford to accept additional refugees	5	17.6	20.0	15.7	5.5	9.4	14.5	14.3	15.9	0.0	13.6
	6	20.3	20.0	19.1	25.5	20.8	16.4	18.4	25.0	0.0	20.3
	7	29.7	35.6	36.0	30.9	36.8	34.5	36.7	34.1	83.3	35.0
No response		1.4	0.0	1.1	1.8	0.9	5.5	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
Total**		100.2	100.0	99.9	100.1	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0
n		74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	6	523

*Region 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

**Some totals vary from 100.0% due to rounding error.

Table 13

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF POSITIONS ON A STATE POLICY ISSUE: SCIENTIFIC CREATIONISM

Issue Position	Region*								Unknown	All	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8			
Scientific creationism should be taught equally with evolution	1	39.2	44.4	38.2	30.9	34.9	25.5	46.9	29.5	33.3	36.1
	2	8.1	6.7	3.4	1.8	2.8	10.9	2.0	4.5	0.0	4.8
	3	2.7	6.7	6.7	7.3	7.5	10.9	4.1	6.8	33.3	6.9
	4	13.5	6.7	9.0	18.2	16.0	9.1	14.3	18.2	16.7	13.2
Scientific creationism should not be taught in public schools	5	2.7	0.0	5.6	5.5	4.7	3.6	4.1	2.3	0.0	3.8
	6	6.8	4.4	5.6	7.3	3.8	1.8	2.0	6.8	0.0	4.8
	7	25.7	31.1	27.0	23.6	29.2	34.5	22.4	29.5	16.7	27.7
No response		1.4	0.0	4.5	5.5	0.9	3.6	4.1	2.3	0.0	2.7
Total**		100.1	100.0	100.0	100.1	99.8	99.9	99.9	99.9	100.0	100.0
n		74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	6	523

*Region 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

**Some totals vary from 100.0% due to rounding error.

Table 14

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF POSITIONS ON A STATE POLICY ISSUE: LEGISLATIVE INTERVENTION IN SCHOOL CURRICULA

Issue Position	Region*								Unknown	All	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8			
State legislation limited to school curriculum only	1	31.1	33.3	28.1	20.0	41.5	32.7	36.7	38.6	0.0	32.7
	2	12.2	13.3	9.0	27.3	8.5	10.9	8.2	6.8	0.0	11.5
	3	12.2	8.9	24.7	5.5	9.4	3.6	10.2	13.6	16.7	11.9
	4	18.9	15.6	12.4	25.5	17.0	16.4	14.3	15.9	50.0	17.2
State laws defining content of courses permissible	5	9.5	15.6	5.6	12.7	1.9	10.9	10.2	11.4	0.0	8.4
	6	6.8	4.4	5.6	1.8	3.8	9.1	2.0	2.3	0.0	4.6
	7	8.1	8.9	7.9	7.3	15.1	12.7	14.3	11.4	16.7	10.9
No response		1.4	0.0	6.7	0.0	2.8	3.6	4.1	0.0	16.7	2.9
Total**		100.2	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.1
n		74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	6	523

*Region 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

**Some totals vary from 100.0% due to rounding error.

Table 15-

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF POSITIONS ON A STATE POLICY ISSUE: SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

Issue Position		Region*								Unknown	All
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Arkansas public schools need major improvements	1	33.8	26.7	42.7	49.1	56.6	43.6	42.9	43.2	33.3	43.6
	2	16.2	15.6	11.2	12.7	12.3	10.9	18.4	6.8	0.0	12.8
	3	25.7	17.8	15.7	12.7	10.4	16.4	8.2	15.9	50.0	15.7
	4	6.8	20.0	12.4	12.7	7.5	7.3	14.3	6.8	0.0	10.3
Arkansas public schools are satisfactory at present	5	9.5	11.1	5.6	7.3	0.9	7.3	2.0	13.6	16.7	6.5
	6	2.7	6.7	3.4	3.6	6.6	5.5	2.0	4.5	0.0	4.4
	7	4.1	2.2	6.7	1.8	3.8	9.1	12.2	6.8	0.0	5.5
No response		<u>1.4</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1.1</u>
Total**		100.2	100.1	99.9	99.9	100.0	100.1	100.0	99.9	100.0	99.9
n		74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	6	523

*Region 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

**Some totals vary from 100.0% due to rounding error.

Table 16

PARTISAN SELF-IDENTIFICATION WITHIN ARKANSAS REGIONS

Partisan Self-Identification	Arkansas Regions*								Unknown	All
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Strong Democrat	8.1	20.0	13.5	14.5	11.3	20.0	4.1	4.5	16.7	12.0
Weak Democrat	14.9	17.8	18.0	34.5	25.5	27.3	26.5	18.2	16.7	22.6
Independent Democrat	12.2	11.1	18.0	14.5	20.8	10.9	14.3	11.4	33.3	15.3
Independent	20.3	6.7	10.1	10.9	18.9	18.2	12.2	11.4	16.7	14.3
Independent Republican	17.6	22.2	20.2	14.5	11.3	7.3	18.4	25.0	0.0	16.3
Weak Republican	21.6	8.9	5.6	3.6	7.5	1.8	6.1	13.6	0.0	8.6
Strong Republican	2.7	4.4	4.5	0.0	0.9	5.5	6.1	6.8	0.0	3.4
Don't know/other/no response	<u>2.7</u>	<u>8.9</u>	<u>10.1</u>	<u>7.3</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>12.2</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>16.7</u>	<u>7.5</u>
Total**	100.1	100.0	100.0	99.8	100.0	100.1	99.9	100.0	100.1	100.0
n	74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	6	523

*Region 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

***Some totals vary from 100.0% due to rounding error.

Table 17

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF IDEOLOGICAL SELF-IDENTIFICATION

Ideological Self-Identification	Region* (Z's)								All**
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Strong liberal	1.4	8.9	1.1	3.6	5.7	1.8	0.0	4.5	3.3
Weak liberal	5.4	0.0	3.4	5.5	3.8	3.6	2.0	0.0	3.3
Leaning liberal	16.2	8.9	10.1	5.5	14.2	16.4	4.1	11.4	11.3
Middle-of-the-road	16.2	15.6	14.6	14.5	16.0	18.2	12.2	13.6	15.1
Leaning conservative	29.7	22.2	24.7	25.5	23.6	16.4	22.4	34.1	25.4
Weak conservative	12.2	15.6	11.2	21.8	7.5	3.6	14.3	13.6	11.7
Strong conservative	9.5	13.3	20.2	3.6	10.4	10.9	24.5	6.8	12.4
Don't know/rejects terms/no response	<u>9.5</u>	<u>15.6</u>	<u>14.6</u>	<u>20.0</u>	<u>18.9</u>	<u>29.1</u>	<u>20.4</u>	<u>15.9</u>	<u>17.6</u>
Total***	100.1	100.1	99.9	100.0	100.1	100.0	99.9	99.9	100.1
n	74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	523

*Region 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

**Includes six respondents whose regional location is unknown.

***Some totals vary from 100.0% due to rounding error.

Table 18

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTIONS OF RESPONSES TO THE
LEVELS OF THE FEDERAL SYSTEM

Response and Region*	Level of Government (%'s)			No response	Total**	n
	National	State	Local			
A. MOST FAITH IN:						
1	44.6	17.6	32.4	5.4	100.0	74
2	28.9	28.9	35.6	6.7	100.1	45
3	31.5	22.5	37.1	9.0	100.1	89
4	21.8	32.7	38.2	7.3	100.0	55
5	30.2	19.8	38.7	11.3	100.0	106
6	34.5	21.8	34.5	9.1	99.9	55
7	22.5	18.4	46.9	12.2	100.0	49
8	27.3	20.5	36.4	15.9	100.1	44
All***	31.0	22.0	37.7	9.4	100.1	523
B. LEAST FAITH IN:						
1	36.5	25.7	33.8	4.1	100.1	74
2	51.1	15.6	28.9	4.4	100.0	45
3	47.2	15.7	25.8	11.2	99.9	89
4	61.8	9.1	25.5	3.6	100.0	55
5	51.9	17.9	20.8	9.4	100.0	106
6	40.0	16.4	32.7	10.9	100.0	55
7	55.1	18.4	16.3	10.2	100.0	49
8	56.8	11.4	22.7	9.1	100.0	44
All***	49.5	16.6	25.8	8.0	99.9	523
C. MOST FOR THE MONEY FROM:						
1	29.7	17.6	48.6	4.1	100.0	74
2	28.9	28.9	31.1	11.1	100.0	45
3	24.7	28.1	42.7	4.5	100.0	89
4	23.6	38.2	34.5	3.6	99.9	55
5	15.1	32.1	46.2	6.6	100.0	106
6	27.3	29.1	34.5	9.1	100.0	55
7	22.4	28.6	32.7	16.3	100.0	49
8	13.6	31.8	43.2	11.4	100.0	44
All***	22.8	29.3	40.5	7.5	100.0	523
D. WORST TAX IMPOSED BY:						
1	66.2	17.6	12.2	4.1	100.1	74
2	62.2	20.0	11.1	6.7	100.0	45
3	69.7	13.5	11.2	5.6	100.0	89
4	76.4	10.9	7.3	5.5	100.1	55
5	67.0	15.1	12.3	5.7	100.1	106
6	61.8	12.7	10.9	14.5	99.9	55
7	73.5	10.2	4.1	12.2	100.0	49
8	72.7	9.1	2.3	15.9	100.0	44
All***	68.5	14.0	9.8	7.8	100.1	523

*Region 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

**Some totals vary from 100.0% due to rounding error.

***Includes six respondents for whom their regional location is unknown.

Table 19

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF CONFIDENCE IN INSTITUTIONS (weighted scores)

Institution	Region*								All
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Churches	74.3	81.1	84.3	84.5	80.7	77.3	87.8	75.0	80.8
Medicine	74.0	68.9	71.2	68.4	73.1	76.4	76.6	75.0	72.6
Banks	73.0	70.0	71.3	70.9	68.9	70.0	76.5	65.9	70.8
Higher Education	75.7	66.7	71.4	68.2	66.0	63.6	66.3	72.7	69.0
Television News	52.0	51.1	47.8	50.9	53.3	57.3	45.9	45.5	50.9
Newspapers	49.3	52.2	43.3	48.2	49.5	50.9	42.9	52.3	49.1
Local Government	48.6	44.5	50.6	41.8	42.9	49.1	52.0	43.2	46.6
State Legislature	40.6	43.3	43.8	40.1	37.3	41.9	37.8	35.2	40.1
Office of the Governor	36.5	44.4	42.7	37.3	33.0	37.3	42.9	45.5	38.9
Utilities	36.5	27.8	27.0	32.7	25.5	33.6	30.6	30.7	29.8
Organized Labor	28.4	20.0	24.2	30.9	28.3	37.3	21.4	31.8	28.2
Oil Companies	25.0	21.1	20.2	20.9	19.3	27.3	26.5	34.1	23.1
Mean Score	51.2	48.4	49.8	49.6	48.2	51.8	50.6	50.6	50.0
n	74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	523

*Region 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

**Includes six respondents whose regional location is unknown.

Tabla 20

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF PERCEIVED INFLUENCE OF INSTITUTIONS (weighted scores)

Institution	Region*								All
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Utilities	76.4	75.6	83.7	80.0	79.3	74.6	78.6	85.2	79.4
Banks	70.9	80.0	78.6	78.2	77.4	72.7	70.9	83.0	76.6
Other Big Business	75.0	71.1	74.7	71.8	80.2	79.1	77.6	80.7	76.6
Oil Companies	72.3	67.8	75.8	70.9	73.6	69.1	74.5	75.0	73.0
Legal Profession	71.6	72.2	72.5	75.5	75.9	65.5	74.5	75.0	72.8
Television News	66.9	64.4	70.2	64.5	70.3	70.5	74.5	73.9	69.4
Newspapers	62.8	60.0	58.4	54.5	65.1	60.0	66.3	68.2	62.0
Organized Labor	52.7	51.1	64.0	64.5	59.9	50.9	59.2	61.4	58.0
Higher Education	60.1	56.7	58.9	60.0	50.9	53.6	56.2	56.8	56.4
Medicine	46.6	52.2	51.7	50.0	56.1	53.6	49.0	58.0	52.2
Local Government	46.0	52.2	51.1	54.1	56.6	47.3	54.1	55.7	51.7
Churches	46.0	50.0	43.8	46.4	45.8	50.9	52.0	56.8	47.9
Mean Score	62.3	62.8	65.3	64.2	62.1	58.1	61.3	64.4	64.7
n	74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	523

*Region 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

**Includes six respondents whose regional location is unknown.

Table 21

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF DESIRED INFLUENCE OF INSTITUTIONS (weighted scores)

Institution	Region*								All
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Higher Education	76.4	58.9	80.3	70.0	69.3	69.1	69.4	73.9	72.0
Local Governments	70.9	60.0	74.7	61.8	66.5	62.7	68.4	72.7	67.9
Churches	58.1	60.0	68.0	64.5	51.9	50.9	59.2	62.5	59.4
Medicine	50.7	37.8	59.0	53.6	47.6	50.9	54.1	56.8	52.0
Banks	47.3	46.7	55.6	52.7	41.5	47.3	51.5	53.4	49.3
Legal Profession	45.9	38.9	46.6	48.2	42.0	38.2	49.0	47.7	44.6
Television News	43.2	34.4	42.1	49.1	45.6	45.5	45.9	43.2	42.9
Newspapers	45.9	36.7	41.6	38.2	42.9	43.6	43.9	48.9	42.6
Other Big Business	38.5	31.1	38.6	40.0	28.3	37.3	42.9	50.0	37.1
Organized Labor	33.1	26.7	26.4	31.8	31.1	42.7	35.7	39.8	33.0
Utilities	29.7	24.5	33.7	30.9	30.2	32.7	34.7	44.3	32.4
Oil Companies	27.0	22.2	29.2	30.0	25.5	31.8	33.7	39.8	29.3
Mean Score	45.0	38.0	47.2	42.5	41.4	43.4	46.2	49.4	46.9
n	74	45	89	55	106	55	49	44	523

*Region 1: Northwest Arkansas EDD; 2: White River PDD; 3: East Arkansas PDD; 4: Southeast Arkansas EDD; 5: Central Arkansas PDD; 6: West Central Arkansas PDD; 7: Southwest Arkansas PDD; 8: Western Arkansas PDD.

**Includes six respondents whose regional location is unknown.

References

- Bass, J., and DeVries, W. (1976). *The Transformation of Southern Politics: Social Change and Political Consequence Since 1945*. New York: Basic Books.
- Britton, C.R., and Savage, R.L. (1982). "Popular Perceptions of Financial Institutions and the Usury Question in Arkansas," *Arkansas Business and Economic Review* 15, 2: 8-14.
- Davis, N. (1976). "A Factor Analysis of Voting Blocs in the Arkansas House of Representatives." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Arkansas Political Science Association, Hot Springs.
- Key, V.O., Jr. (1949). *Southern Politics in State and Nation*. New York: Knopf.
- O'Connor, P.F. (1979). "The Fluidity of One-party Legislative Voting: Some Deviant Findings," *GPSA Journal* 7, 2: 149-174.
- Pierce, N.R. (1974). *The Deep South States of America*. New York: Norton.
- Ranchino, J. (1972). *Faubus to Bumpers: Arkansas Votes, 1960-1970*. Arkadelphia, Arkansas: Action Research.
- Savage, R.L., and Blair, D. (1982a). "Arkansans and the Usury Law in 1982," *Arkansas Business and Economic Review* 15, 2: 27-28.
- _____. (1982b). "Arkansans and Their Institutions: The Question of Public Confidence Again," *Arkansas Business and Economic Review* 15, 3: 10-14.
- _____. (1982c). "Ideological Orientations and State Issue Responses: Are They Related?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Savage, R.L., and Britton, C.R. (1980). "The Question of Public Confidence: Arkansas and the Nation," *Arkansas Business and Economic Review* 13, 4: 20-23.
- Savage, R.L., and Gallagher, R.J. (1977). "Politiocultural Regions in a Southern State: An Empirical Typology of Arkansas Counties," *Publius* 7, 1: 91-105.
- Thompson, G.H. (1976). *Arkansas and Reconstruction: The Influence of Geography, Economics, and Personality*. Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press.
- Yates, R. (1972). "Arkansas: Independent and Unpredictable," in *The Changing Politics of the South*, W.C. Harvard, ed. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: LSU Press.