

Regionalism in Two Southern States: an Exploratory Study of Intrastate Politicocultural Cleavages

Robert L. Savage
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
John P. Price
Association of Arkansas Counties

***Abstract:** Regional patterns of politicocultural variation within Alabama and Arkansas are explored by Q-factoring a wide array of social, economic, and political data at the county level for each state. The results confirm that in each state there are two regions conforming to the proverbial distinction between the mountain South and the plantation South. Moreover, in each state a number of counties have emerged as a distinctly urban type. These three types are compared with the American subcultural patterns described by Elazar. The areas roughly conform to these subcultural patterns. Further, as predicted, the Moralistic orientation is more clearly delineated in an Arkansas region, the "Ozark," while the Traditionalistic and Individualistic patterns are stronger for two of the Alabama area types.*

Although regional variations within the southern states have been widely recognized, those variations have received little systematic attention from political scientists beyond the usual nod to "mountain Republicanism" and, in some cases, the alignment of Democratic party factions along geographical lines.¹ Yet, in his analysis of American federalism from the perspective of the states, Elazar argues that many intrastate political conflicts flow from differing subcultural orientations that are typically associated with contrasting settlement patterns of geographic regions within the states.² Thus, southern states tend to be divided broadly in terms of mountain areas and plantation areas. More recently, major urban areas have emerged with features distinctive from either of these geographically-based regions. At the same time, there is a peculiarly "Southern" culture associated with an elitist politics fostered

traditionally by racist rhetoric directed toward a population mass that is characteristically deprived of the economic wealth enjoyed in most other areas of the nation. The analysis reported here addresses this question of politicocultural variations in the South as exemplified by two states: one from the Deep South, Alabama, and the other on the southern periphery, Arkansas.

Two sets of hypotheses are at issue here. First, very broadly, are there distinctive politicocultural areas within these states which are at the same time common to both states? And, secondly, can differences between two states be predicted on the basis of their differing locations relative to the southern "core"?³ Thus, the following hypotheses and corollaries are proffered:

1. There are three basic types of politicocultural areas in each state. (a) The basic types of politicocultural areas conform to well-recognized regional and/or settlement patterns in the American South, i.e., the plantation South, the mountain South, and the urban South. (b) The basic types of politicocultural areas conform to the three major subcultural orientations described by Elazar, i.e., Traditionalistic, Moralistic, and Individualistic.

2. The distinctiveness of politicocultural areas within a state is related to the geographical location and peculiar historical development of the state. (a) Both the Traditionalistic and the Individualistic subcultures are more clearly delineated in Alabama (due to its location in the Deep South on the one hand and its earlier urbanization on the other.) (b) The Moralistic subculture is more clearly delineated in Arkansas (due to its closer proximity to the Greater West).

Data and Methods

In order to obtain a wide array of data comprehensive both in terms of being descriptive of social, economic and political characteristics of the population and in terms of geographic spread, county-level data were gathered for all counties in both states. Unfortunately, data for some attributes were available for one, but not the other, state. As these uncommon attributes are in some instances important and even unique indicators of political culture variations, however, they were retained for analysis.⁴

The dataset for each state was subjected to Q-factor analysis using the eigenvalue-one criterion to determine the number of

factors to be extracted.⁵ While any criterion for such extraction is arbitrary, the decision to use this widely-recognized statistical test gives greater weight to arguments for the existence of the basic types of variation, particularly if the numbers conform to the predicted values.

Q-factoring of the datasets is mandated as the resultant factors cluster together those counties that have common patterns of variation and thus the Q-factors represent operationally-defined "politicocultural areas" within each state. To the extent that a factor is composed of more or less contiguous counties, that factor constitutes a "region." The factor score matrices present standardized values for each of the attributes across these basic types of politicocultural areas, thus allowing analysis of the distinctive features of each area.

While the larger, unique datasets provide the statistical information for most of the findings reported here, separate Q-factor analyses were also performed for each state using the 61 attributes common to both datasets.⁶ These analyses allow correlation of the typical arrays (factor scores) across types of counties for both states, thus permitting a test of the congruency of politicocultural areas between the states.

Findings

The factor analytic results confirm the existence of three distinct politicocultural areas both in Alabama and Arkansas.⁷ Moreover, for each state, as shown in Tables 1 and 2, two more or less contiguous regions distinguishing the "plantation" area from the "mountain" area emerged, as did a distinctive Urban County type. Thus, for Alabama, Factor I is the Black Belt Region clustering 24 southern counties with its 9 best representatives all from that portion of the state traditionally called "The Black Belt." Factor II is the Urban County with Jefferson County (Birmingham) as a virtually pure representative, and Factor III is the Northern-Wiregrass County with its best representatives all from the more mountainous areas of the North. This third factor groups the "Wiregrass" area, a tier of counties bordering the Florida Panhandle with the northern rather than southern counties.

In Arkansas, Factor I is the Ozark Region clustering counties largely in the northwestern and more mountainous areas of the

state, Factor II is the Delta Region with its best representatives all from the Mississippi Delta area although the type includes most of the southeastern portion of the state, and Factor III is the Urban County. Thus, the basic politicocultural areas within these two southern states do conform to the hypothesized regional and/or settlement patterns that have generally been recognized in the past.

Table 1
ALABAMA POLITICOCULTURAL REGIONS:
Q-FACTOR MATRIX*

County	FACTOR LOADINGS			h ²
	I Black Belt	II Urban	III Northern- Wiregrass	
Greene	90	24	29	0.95
Bullock	87	27	37	0.97
Lowndes	87	20	37	0.94
Sumter	86	26	39	0.96
Wilcox	85	29	34	0.92
Macon	84	30	25	0.87
Perry	82	26	41	0.92
Hale	79	20	43	0.86
Marengo	77	36	48	0.96
Conecuh	75	24	59	0.97
Choctaw	74	23	58	0.94
Monroe	74	27	59	0.97
Barbour	74	34	57	0.98
Pickens	72	28	59	0.94
Butler	71	29	60	0.95
Henry	71	29	60	0.96
Dallas	71	53	43	0.97
Clarke	70	31	62	0.98
Pike	70	36	58	0.96
Coosa	70	20	64	0.94
Crenshaw	69	25	66	0.97
Chambers	65	32	65	0.94
Autauga	64	41	58	0.91
Russell	60	54	47	0.88

County	I Black Belt	II Urban	III Northern- Wiregrass	h ²
Jefferson	13	93	09	0.89
Madison	16	89	33	0.92
Mobile	27	84	35	0.90
Montgomery	46	72	43	0.91
Jackson	35	68	48	0.81
Lee	49	66	51	0.94
Blount	51	31	78	0.96
Cullman	32	46	78	0.91
Marion	50	31	78	0.95
DeKalb	40	35	78	0.89
Baldwin	38	40	77	0.91
Shelby	48	31	77	0.92
Cherokee	49	32	76	0.92
Cleburne	55	25	76	0.94
Walker	50	37	76	0.96
Marshall	43	45	75	0.96
Franklin	40	39	75	0.87
Winston	36	34	74	0.80
St. Clair	56	29	74	0.94
Clay	59	20	74	0.93
Lauderdale	34	53	74	0.93
Chilton	58	29	73	0.96
Lamar	61	21	72	0.93
Covington	54	36	72	0.94
Geneva	58	29	72	0.94
Fayette	61	28	72	0.97
Randolph	61	30	71	0.97
Limestone	53	37	71	0.93
Lawrence	61	24	70	0.93
Coffee	56	37	70	0.94
Houston	48	45	69	0.90
Dale	46	39	68	0.83
Escambia	62	32	68	0.96
Colbert	42	55	68	0.94
Washington	67	22	68	0.96
Tallapoosa	60	38	68	0.97

County	I Black Belt	II Urban	III Northern- Wiregrass	h ²
Etowah	47	51	68	0.93
Calhoun	46	53	68	0.95
Bibb	67	24	68	0.96
Elmore	60	38	66	0.94
Morgan	42	59	66	0.95
Talladega	55	50	65	0.97
Tuscaloosa	39	57	64	0.89
Cumulative percentages of total variance explained:	36.4	53.7	93.1	

*Decimals are omitted from factor loadings. $FL \geq 0.28$ are statistically significant at $P \leq 0.01$.

In order to determine if these intrastate types conform to Elazar's subcultural variants, however, their attribute arrays must be examined. This is to say that the Alabama Black Belt Region and the Arkansas Delta Region, steeped in the traditions of the Old South, should exhibit the characteristics of the Traditionalistic subculture, the Alabama Northern-Wiregrass counties and the Arkansas Ozark Region should conform more strongly to the Moralistic orientation, and the Urban County of both states should reflect the emergence of an increasingly Individualistic pattern. Still, two caveats should be announced here. First, both states are indeed deeply embedded in the larger southern Traditionalistic political culture so that intrastate variations are largely matters of degree and unlikely to be dramatic. The second warning centers upon the usual complaint of behavioral scientists who must resort to using aggregate data: "we just can't find the purest measures of the relevant indicators."

Still, the results exhibited in Tables 3 and 4 tend to support Elazar's contention of basic subcultural variations within the states.⁸ While the more dramatic differences between regions are largely found in distinctive social and economic traits, there are notable differences in their politics that are not necessarily related to socioeconomic variations.

Profiles of expected variations of the three subcultural types with regard to those traits measured by the available data would be as follows. The Moralistic subculture will stress public education given its emphasis on the citizen's obligation to participate in the political life of the community. This motive should also produce higher rates of participation, particularly in the electoral system. On the other hand, private solutions to social problems are preferred to public ones, thus, for example, public debt will be lower. And if public solutions must be resorted to, then those decisions should remain as close to the people as possible, hence, local revenue sources will be preferred and autonomy of such local government units as school districts will be stronger. The marketplace orientation of the Individualistic subculture will produce a very different profile. With the active demands of many different groups, public expenditures decisions will be more balanced across program areas. There is not likely to be a strong effort to involve citizens in politics, thus relatively low voter registration but high voter turnout among those who do bother to register. And with government perceived as simply an extension of the economic marketplace, it will seek revenues equally well from any source and will not shy from capital investment even if it means public indebtedness. Finally, efficiency and professionalism are more strongly prized, leading to a greater reliance on hierarchy and administrative decision making, hence less autonomy for specialized governments and fewer elected officials. The Traditionalistic subculture generally will fall between the other two on most measures although there should be noticeably less popular participation.

The evidence of conformity to these cultural prototypes by the intrastate politicocultural areas is mixed at best. The Moralistic profile fits the Ozark County rather well. There is very high voter registration and, given its generally older population, relatively strong commitment to public education. Moreover, public debt is very low although this no doubt is also a reflection of the extreme poverty found in such a county. And contrary to the model, the Ozark County is strongly dependent upon intergovernmental revenues, perhaps even more than the lack of economic wealth would suggest. But at the same time there is strong evidence of a desire to keep political power close to the people with the extremely large

number of elected local officials and the stronger likelihood of school district tax autonomy. The Northern-Wiregrass County of Alabama does not conform so well.⁹ Still, there is the apparent tendency to avoid public debt and a strong self-reliance in revenue production. Beyond these traits, in both states these are the areas that reflect the most independence from partisan affiliations in voting. On more idiosyncratic measures note the relative resistance of the Ozark County to adopting federal food programs and the greater participation in litigation on welfare matters and the higher score of the Northern-Wiregrass County on the Index of Union Sentiment.¹⁰

The political attributes of the Urban County of both states tend to be very similar and generally conform to the Individualistic model. Public expenditures do tend to be more balanced across policy areas. Popular participation is low in terms of voter registration but in Arkansas (comparable data for Alabama is unavailable) those who register exhibit a strong likelihood of voting and are more partisan. Public indebtedness is high as predicted. However, the Urban County appears to be more self-reliant in obtaining public revenues but then such a county is much wealthier than other types in either state. And in both states there are relatively fewer elected local officials and public school districts have independent taxing power. Still, this suggests at least a greater reliance on hierarchy in government.

Table 2
ARKANSAS POLITICOCULTURAL REGIONS:
Q-FACTOR MATRIX*

FACTOR LOADINGS

County	I Ozark	II Delta	III Urban	h ²
Perry	91	26	12	0.91
Izard	91	29	14	0.93
Marion	88	27	27	0.92
Montgomery	87	32	31	0.96
Sharp	87	29	19	0.88
Newton	86	39	19	0.92
Van Buren	84	39	32	0.95
Fulton	81	40	36	0.94
Pike	80	44	36	0.95
Yell	78	41	42	0.96
Searcy	78	47	28	0.91
Cleburne	78	45	39	0.96
Franklin	78	44	40	0.96
Cleveland	77	55	20	0.95
Scott	77	39	38	0.89
Stone	77	47	35	0.93
Polk	76	41	47	0.97
Johnson	76	45	43	0.96
Randolph	76	44	40	0.93
Grant	74	48	38	0.93
Madison	73	45	29	0.83
Lawrence	72	53	39	0.95
Calhoun	72	58	22	0.90
Crawford	71	46	47	0.95
Logan	71	46	50	0.95
Baxter	70	34	56	0.92
Sevier	70	50	41	0.91
Clay	70	55	38	0.94
Carroll	69	45	47	0.90
Prairie	68	60	27	0.90
Howard	67	53	46	0.94

County	I Ozark	II Delta	III Urban	h ²
White	67	50	51	0.96
Boone	66	43	54	0.91
Independence	65	54	43	0.91
Little Rock	63	53	41	0.84
Pope	62	49	58	0.96
Lee	41	86	17	0.93
Phillips	25	85	36	0.92
Crittenden	31	83	37	0.92
St. Francis	43	83	28	0.95
Chicot	40	82	35	0.96
Monroe	48	81	26	0.96
Desha	47	80	33	0.97
Jefferson	32	78	50	0.97
Mississippi	32	77	46	0.90
Woodruff	56	75	26	0.95
Cross	49	75	37	0.95
Lincoln	60	75	19	0.96
Arkansas	45	71	48	0.93
Jackson	52	69	42	0.93
Poinsett	54	69	40	0.93
Drew	56	69	39	0.94
Lonoke	58	68	36	0.93
Lafayette	65	67	23	0.93
Miller	41	67	57	0.94
Ouachita	48	66	47	0.89
Columbia	53	66	46	0.93
Dallas	58	66	33	0.87
Hempstead	60	65	39	0.94
Bradley	56	65	38	0.89
Ashley	40	65	49	0.83
Nevada	62	64	37	0.94
Union	45	63	56	0.91
Craighead	46	63	57	0.92
Clark	51	62	52	0.92
Conway	60	60	40	0.88
Greene	58	59	50	0.93
Hot Spring	55	56	53	0.91

County	I Ozark	II Delta	III Urban	h ²
Washington	43	46	74	0.95
Sebastian	37	52	72	0.94
Garland	41	48	71	0.91
Pulaski	07	55	66	0.75
Benton	60	42	63	0.94
Saline	54	52	58	0.90
Faulkner	55	56	56	0.93
Cumulative percentages of total variance explained	40.2	73.9	92.3	

*Decimals are omitted from factor loadings. $FL \geq 0.26$ are statistically significant at $p \leq 0.01$.

The Black Belt and Delta types do not appear to be so congruent in their political attributes as the Urban types but more so than is the case for Northern-Wiregrass and Ozark types. Educational expenditures take a high proportion of the total outlay in both the Black Belt County and the Delta County, a result that is not surprising with their youthful populations. On other matters of public finance mixed results occur. The Delta County is less dependent on intergovernmental revenues than expected while the Black Belt County exhibits more autonomy in school district taxation than predicted. And with regard to political partisanship Delta County voters seem less committed to the Democratic Party than those in the Black Belt counties.

In general, then, the congruence of the attributes of the empirically-determined politicocultural areas with Elazar's subcultural orientations is uneven. Still, these surface comparisons do provide some support for the second hypothesis and its corollaries. The Arkansas Ozark County does fit the Moralistic type much more strongly than its Alabama counterpart. To a lesser extent, as predicted, the Alabama Black Belt County is more congruent with the Traditionalistic subculture than the comparable Arkansas type.

Table 3
TYPAL ARRAYS FOR ALABAMA
POLITICOCULTURAL REGIONS:
FACTOR SCORE MATRIX

Attribute	TYPAL ARRAYS		
	I Black Belt	II Urban	III Northern- Wiregrass
% urban, 1970	-0.6	2.6	-0.9
% of popn. under 5 yrs. of age, 1970	-0.4	-0.7	-0.5
% of popn. 18 yrs. and older, 1970	0.3	0.6	0.9
% of popn. 65 yrs. and older, 1970	-0.3	-0.8	-0.4
Birth rate per 1000 popn., 1970	-0.2	-.04	-0.4
Death rate per 1000 popn., 1970	-0.3	-0.8	-0.4
Death rate (under 1 yr.) per 1000 births, 1970	0.5	-0.7	-.04
Death rate (under 28 days) per 1000 births, 1970	-0.1	-0.7	-0.3
Population density, 1970	-0.6	0.3	-0.9
% non-white popn., 1970	2.5	-0.1	-2.6
% change in net migration, 1960-1970	-1.8	-0.8	-0.0
% change in Negro net migration, 1960-1970	-1.6	-0.6	-0.4
% foreign stock, 1970	-0.6	-0.8	-0.6
% veteran status, 1970	-0.5	0.3	-0.2
% born in different state, 1970	-0.8	-0.0	-0.5
Median school yrs. completed, 1970	-0.5	-0.6	-0.4
% of students in private elementary and secondary schools, 1970	-0.5	-0.8	-0.8
% of females who are high school graduates 1970	-0.2	0.7	-0.2
% of males who are high school graduates, 1970	-0.3	0.8	-0.1
% of persons 25 yrs. and older with 5 yrs. of school or less, 1970	0.2	-0.8	-0.8
% of persons 25 yrs. and older with 4 yrs. of high school or more, 1970	-0.2	0.7	-0.1
% of persons 25 yrs. and older with 4 yrs. of college or more, 1970	-0.5	-0.4	-0.8

Attribute	I Black Belt	II Urban	III Northern- Wiregrass
% of students in elementary and secondary schools who are Negro, 1970	3.0	0.1	-2.8
% of owner-occupied housing units, 1970	0.1	0.3	1.4
% of occupied housing units with all plumbing facilities, 1970	-1.7	1.6	1.3
% of occupied housing units with home freezers, 1970	0.1	-0.6	0.9
% of change in farm popn., 1960-1970	-2.5	-2.1	-1.4
Mean value of farm land per acre, 1969	-0.7	0.2	-0.1
Harvested crop land as a percentage of total land area, 1969	0.6	0.5	-0.4
% of farms with sales of \$40,000 and over, 1969	-0.6	-0.8	-0.4
% of farms owned by corporations, 1969	-0.6	-0.9	-0.7
% of mfg. establishments with 20-99 employees, 1967	-0.7	-0.1	-0.3
% of labor force employed in government, 1970	-0.2	-0.2	-0.6
% of labor force employed in mfg., 1970	-0.3	-0.8	0.8
% of labor force employed in wholesale and retail trade, 1970	-0.4	-0.3	-0.3
% of labor force employed in prof. and managerial positions, 1970	-0.3	-0.1	-0.6
% of females who are in labor force, 1970	0.0	0.1	0.1
% of labor force working outside county of residence, 1970	-0.3	-1.3	0.5
% of families with income less than \$3000, 1970	0.6	-0.8	-0.6
% of families with income of \$10,000-\$14,999, 1970	-0.6	-0.2	-0.2

Attribute	I Black Belt	II Urban	III Northern- Wiregrass
% of families with income of \$15,000-\$24,999, 1970	-0.6	-0.4	-0.7
% of families with income of \$25,000 and over, 1970	-0.6	-0.8	.06
% of direct general expenditures spent for education, 1967	0.5	-0.0	0.6
% of direct general expenditures spent for highways, 1967	0.3	-1.2	-0.5
% of direct general expenditures spent for health & hospitals, 1967	-0.6	-0.9	-0.1
General debt outstanding, 1967	-0.7	2.7	-2.0
Property tax payments per capita, 1967	-0.6	0.2	-0.3
% of general revenue from inter-governmental revenue, 1967	2.9	-1.5	-0.7
% of general revenue from tax revenue, 1967	-1.8	1.5	0.8
Number of elected local officials per 10,000 popn., 1967	0.1	-1.5	0.0
Number of public school systems, 1967	-0.6	-0.9	-0.6
% of public school systems with property-taxing power, 1967	0.8	1.0	0.5
% of direct general expenditures spent for education, 1972	0.8	-0.4	0.5
% of direct general expenditures spent for highways, 1972	-0.0	-1.0	-0.5
% of direct general expenditures spent for health & hospitals, 1972	-0.7	-0.5	-0.1
General debt outstanding, 1972	-1.3	5.1	-2.7
Property tax payments per capita, 1972	-0.5	0.6	-0.1
% of general revenue from inter-governmental revenue, 1972	1.4	-0.6	0.1
% of general revenue from tax revenue, 1972	-0.6	0.1	-0.2
Index of Union Sentiment	-0.7	-0.9	-0.5

Attribute	I Black Belt	II Urban	III Northern- Wiregrass
% of eligible white voters registered, 1968	2.1	0.0	1.0
% of eligible black voters registered, 1968	1.5	0.4	-0.4
% of vote for Nixon, Presidential Election 1968	-1.1	-0.4	-0.0
% of vote for Wallace, Presidential Election, 1968	-0.1	0.0	2.0
% of vote for Nixon, Presidential Election, 1972	-0.5	0.4	2.2
% of vote for Sparkman, Senatorial Election, 1966	1.0	0.6	0.3
% of vote for L. Wallace, Gubernatorial Election, 1966	0.9	0.1	1.0
% of vote for Allen, Senatorial Election, 1968	-0.1	0.1	2.2
% of vote for G. Wallace, Gubernatorial Election, 1970	-0.6	0.2	2.8
% of vote for Sparkman, Senatorial Election, 1972	0.2	0.5	1.0
% of vote for G. Wallace, Gubernatorial Election, 1974	1.5	0.8	1.0
% of vote for Gallion, General Election, 1966	1.5	0.7	0.6
% of vote for M. T. Allen, General Election, 1966	1.5	0.9	0.4
% of vote for Baggett, General Election, 1966	1.8	0.7	0.2
% of vote for Beard, General Election, 1966	1.0	0.4	0.7
% of vote for L. Wallace, Dem Run-off, 1966	-0.0	-0.3	1.5
% of vote for M. T. Allen, Dem. Run-off, 1966	0.6	0.5	0.4
% of vote for Baggett, Dem. Run-off, 1966	1.0	0.5	-0.2

Attribute	I Black Belt	II Urban	III Northern- Wiregrass
% of vote for Beard, Dem. Run-off, 1966	0.9	0.4	0.3
% of vote for Gallion, Dem. Primary, 1966	0.7	0.4	1.0
% of vote for G. Wallace, Dem. Run-off, 1970	-0.3	-0.2	1.4
% of vote for CA on literacy test, 1965	0.2	0.9	1.4

Table 4
TYPAL ARRAYS FOR ARKANSAS
POLITICOCULTURAL REGIONS:
FACTOR SCORE MATRIX

Attribute	TYPAL ARRAYS		
	I Ozark	II Delta	III Urban
% urban, 1970	-2.3	0.9	2.7
% of popn. under 5 yrs. of age, 1970	-0.4	-0.4	-0.7
% of popn. 18 yrs. and older, 1970	1.0	0.5	1.2
% of popn. 65 yrs. and older, 1970	0.0	-0.6	-0.5
Median age, 1972	0.5	-0.4	0.0
Birth rate per 1000 popn., 1970	-0.4	0.0	-0.5
Death rate per 1000 popn., 1970	-0.1	-0.5	-0.6
Death rate (under 1 yr.) per 1000 births, 1972	-0.2	0.2	-0.7
Death rate (under 28 days) per 1000 births, 1972	-0.2	-0.2	-0.6
Population density, 1970	-0.8	-0.7	-0.2
% nonwhite popn., 1972	-1.4	2.4	-2.3
% change in net migration, 1960-1970	0.2	-3.3	1.3
% change in Negro net migration, 1960-1970	-0.4	-2.0	0.3
% foreign stock, 1970	-0.5	-0.8	-0.6
% veteran status, 1970	0.1	-0.3	0.8
% born in different state, 1970	-0.2	-0.9	0.7
Median school years completed, 1970	-0.3	-0.4	-0.1
% of students in private elementary and secondary schools, 1970	-0.5	-0.7	-0.5
% of females who are high school graduates 1970	-0.2	-0.3	1.3
% of males who are high school graduates, 1970	-0.3	-0.3	1.3
% of persons 25 yrs. and older with 5 yrs. of school or less, 1970	-0.4	0.4	-1.3

Attribute	I Ozark	II Delta	III Urban
% of persons 25 yrs. and older with 4 yrs. of high school or more, 1970	-0.3	-0.4	1.3
% of persons 25 yrs. and older with 4 yrs. of college or more, 1970	-0.5	-0.7	-0.4
% of students in elementary and secondary schools who are Negro, 1970	-1.6	3.0	-2.5
% owner-occupied housing units, 1970	1.6	0.0	1.2
% of occupied housing units with all plumbing facilities, 1970	0.3	-0.7	3.3
% of occupied housing units with home freezer, 1970	0.8	0.6	-0.7
Medical doctors per 1000 popn., 1972	-0.6	-0.8	-0.1
Dentists per 1000 popn., 1972	-0.5	-0.7	-0.6
General hospital beds per 1000 popn., 1972	-0.5	-0.7	-0.5
% change in farm popm., 1960-1970	-0.3	-3.8	-0.9
Mean value of farm land per acre, 1969	-0.7	0.6	-0.2
Harvested cropland as a percentage of total land area, 1969	-0.6	2.2	-0.4
% of farms with sales of \$40,000 and over, 1969	-0.5	0.3	-0.7
% of farms owned by corporations, 1969	-0.6	-0.6	-0.8
% of mfg. establishments with 20-99 employees, 1967	-0.6	-0.1	0.0
% of labor force employed in government, 1970	-0.2	-0.4	-0.5
% of labor force employed in mfg., 1970	0.3	-0.1	-0.2
% of labor force employed in wholesale and retail trade, 1970	-0.3	-0.3	-0.1

Attribute	I Ozark	II Delta	III Urban
% of labor force employed in professional and managerial positions	-0.3	-0.4	-0.1
% of females who are in labor force, 1970	-0.2	-0.2	0.5
% of labor force working outside county of residence, 1970	-0.5	-0.7	-0.8
% of workers using public transportation 1970	0.4	-0.3	-1.2
% of families with income less than \$3000, 1970	0.4	0.3	-1.4
% of families with income of \$10,000-14,000, 1970	-0.6	-0.4	-0.0
% of families with income of \$15,000-24,999, 1970	-0.6	-0.6	-0.5
% of families with income of \$25,000 and over, 1970	-0.5	-0.7	-0.7
Number of radio stations per 10,000 popn., 1972	-0.5	-0.6	-0.5
Television coverage from out-of-state, 1972	-0.5	-0.7	-0.8
% of direct general expenditures spent for education, 1967	0.8	1.1	-0.1
% of direct general expenditures spent for highways, 1967	-0.1	-0.6	-0.7
% of direct general expenditures spent for health & hospitals, 1967	-0.4	-0.8	-0.3
General debt outstanding, 1967	-1.1	-0.5	0.2
Property tax payments per capita, 1967	-0.3	0.6	1.1
% of general revenue from inter-governmental revenue, 1967	1.3	0.4	-0.7
% of general revenue from tax revenue, 1967	-0.3	0.2	0.4
Number of elected local officials per 10.000 popn., 1967	6.0	-1.4	-2.8
Number of public school systems, 1967	-0.5	-0.7	-0.7

Attribute	I Ozark	II Delta	III Urban
% of public school systems with property-taxing power, 1967	1.7	0.1	1.4
% of direct general expenditures spent for education, 1972	1.0	1.1	1.2
% of direct general expenditures spent for highways, 1972	-0.1	-0.6	-0.7
% of direct general expenditures spent for health and hospitals, 1972	-0.4	-0.8	-0.3
General debt outstanding, 1972	-1.7	-0.1	0.9
Property tax payments per capita, 1972	-0.4	2.0	1.4
% of general revenue from intergovernmental revenue, 1972	1.1	0.6	-0.8
% of general revenue from tax revenue, 1972	-0.2	0.1	0.1
Average millage, 1971	0.7	0.8	1.2
Incidence of AFDC recipients, 1972	-1.0	0.8	-0.4
Incidence of OAA recipients, 1972	1.5	0.1	0.6
Incidence of fair hearing by State Dept. of Public Welfare, 1968-1969	-0.2	-0.7	-0.7
Speed of adoption of federal food distribution programs	-0.9	1.2	-0.8
% of voter turnout, General Election, 1972	0.7	0.7	1.1
% of eligible voters registered, 1970	1.7	1.2	0.3
% of eligible voters registered, 1972	2.0	1.0	0.4
% of vote for Nixon, Presidential Election, 1968	0.5	-1.3	1.1
% of vote for Wallace, Presidential Election 1968	0.1	1.2	-0.7
% of vote for Nixon, Presidential Election, 1972	0.8	0.9	1.2
% of vote for Bumpers, Gubernatorial Election 1970	1.2	0.2	1.0
% of vote for Fulbright, Dem. Primary, 1968	0.2	0.7	0.6

Attribute	I Ozark	II Delta	III Urban
% of vote for Faubus, Dem. Primary, 1970	0.5	0.9	1.1
% of vote for Riley, Dem. Primary, 1970	-0.5	0.5	0.1
% of vote for Bumpers, Dem. Primary, 1972	0.5	0.6	1.4
% of vote for Pryor, Dem. Primary, 1972	0.1	0.3	0.4
% of vote for Bumpers, Dem. Primary, 1974	1.0	0.3	1.3
% of vote for Pryor, Dem. Primary, 1974	0.2	0.7	0.5
% of vote for Faubus, Dem. Primary, 1974	0.6	0.2	-0.6
% of vote for Purcell, Dem. Primary, 1974	0.6	1.7	-0.3
% of vote for Brandon, Dem. Primary, 1974	0.1	-0.6	0.8
% of vote for proposed Constitution, 1970	-0.4	0.3	1.1
% of vote for CA to permit private contracting for state printing, 1974	-0.1	0.7	1.1
% of vote for CA to increase salaries of state officials, 1974	-0.4	0.9	0.6
% of vote for CA to increase salary limits for county officials, 1974	-0.1	0.9	0.7
% of vote for CA to allow the legislature to set maximum interest rates, 1974	-0.5	-0.2	-0.4

These assertions are given further support by the stronger, purer factor loadings of the better representatives of the Arkansas Ozark and Alabama Black Belt Counties. And while the Urban County as a type in both states fits the Individualistic model, the factor loadings of the better Alabama representatives are much stronger than those in Arkansas.

These comparisons are not, of course, too very rigorous. To provide a more rigorous comparison, correlations were computed

Table 5

**INTERTYPAL CORRELATIONS FROM FACTOR SCORE MATRICES
OF 61 MATCHED ATTRIBUTES
FOR ALABAMA AND ARKANSAS COUNTIES***

		ALABAMA			ARKANSAS		
		Black Belt	Urban	Northern- Wiregrass	Delta	Ozark	Urban
ALABAMA	Black Belt	1.00	0.16	0.18	0.69	0.37	-0.16
	Urban		1.00	0.10	0.31	-0.19	0.59
	Northern-Wiregrass			1.00	0.19	0.45	0.49
ARKANSAS	Delta				1.00	0.07	-0.02
	Ozark					1.00	0.34
	Urban						1.00

*The measure of correlation is the Pearsonian r .

for the factor score arrays for three-factor solutions of reduced data matrices of 61 common attributes for each state. Table 5, somewhat contrary to the visual comparison largely of political attributes, shows that the Black Belt and Delta Counties are more similar than the two Urban Counties. However, many of the attributes lost from analysis due to the reduced data bases are political attributes. It comes as no real surprise that these types of counties retain much of the socioeconomic structure that comprises the contemporary (and past) popular image of the Old South.

Conclusion

The hypotheses that provoked this line of inquiry all received at least modest support. The results do suggest basic lines of similar politicocultural cleavages at work in two separated southern states. Still, one might ask, do these cleavages contribute to an understanding of contemporary political conflicts? For the most part the data used here do not speak to that point. To be sure, the differences among the areas in Presidential contests as shown in Tables 3 and 4 is clearly evident but those differences may simply reflect in many cases the "friends and neighbors" syndrome so familiar to students of Southern electoral politics.

The answer is that the cleavages uncovered here merely provide a base for further explorations. Two such areas of research would be the impact of these politicocultural areas upon electoral results, as mentioned above, and upon legislative behavior. If commonalities and differences among voters, legislators, or any other state political actors are to be examined along regional or politicocultural lines, then those analyses should be in terms of **regions** or **political cultures** and not arbitrary cartographical distinctions as has so often been done in the past.

But while this type of analysis may help to unravel some old mysteries, it may also reveal new mysteries. An example of this is the electoral support given to George Wallace in presidential and/or gubernatorial campaigns in these areas. Not surprising to most would be the lower levels of voting support that he received in the Urban County of either state and in the Ozark County, nor the strong support he garnered in 1968 in Arkansas' Delta region. But

in Alabama his strongest support has been from the Northern-Wiregrass area and he has fared least well in the Black Belt region. One explanation well may be that in his home state of Alabama, his populist appeals have touched a responsive chord in more Moralistic areas, while his early disregard of racist appeals did not endear him to Black Belt voters. Then, as he turned to such appeals, voters in the Black Belt were increasingly black. The opposite results obtained in Arkansas politicocultural areas, at least in part, because citizens there were much less aware of the evolution of Wallace's policy stand. Of course, data of a very different sort would be required to validate this explanation.

In any event, this study is an exploratory one. Similar research in the future should expand in two directions. The first of these is spatial. Other states must be examined in the same way as Alabama and Arkansas, which may not be sufficiently indicative of the South, let alone the nation.

The second direction is temporal. If cultural differences are involved, then these regional developments are rooted in history. Moreover, the Urban County as a distinct political subculture in the American South is a relatively recent development. Quantitative historical analysis of regionalism in the American states might well offer new insights into the movement and evolution of political culture and perhaps even open our eyes to the future.

Notes

Acknowledgments: This is a revised version of a paper originally presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Political Science Association, Dallas, Texas, April 1977. The authors wish to thank Kenneth D. Bailey, University of Arkansas, and Raymond B. Wells, Auburn University at Montgomery, for granting access to their unpublished data files. Also, much thanks to Lewis Leslie and Connie Holt for their assistance beyond the proverbial call in data preparation.

1. See, e.g., V. O. Key, Jr., **Southern Politics in State and Nation** (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949).
2. Daniel J. Elazar, **American Federalism: A View From the States**, Second Edition (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1972).
3. On core areas within geographical regions, see generally David E. Sopher, "Place and Location: Notes on the Spatial Patterning of Culture," **Social Science Quarterly**, 53 (September 1972), 331-332; and as applied specifically to the American states, Robert L. Savage, "Patterns of Multilinear Evolution in the American States," **Publius**, 3 (Spring, 1973), 94-97.
4. Tables 3 and 4 provide, respectively, listings of the 94 attributes used for Arkansas counties and the 82 attributes for Alabama counties.
5. Varimax rotations were used for all factor analyses; for further information on factor analytic options see R. J. Rummel, **Applied Factor Analysis** (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1970).
6. The factor analytic results for these two smaller data matrices are not reported here but may be obtained from the authors upon request.
7. Using the eigenvalue-one criterion actually resulted in a four-factor solution for Arkansas. However, as no county had its highest loading on the fourth factor, the decision to generate a three-factor solution seems fully warranted.
8. No attempt is made here to present a systematic analysis of the complete typal profiles. However, for such an analysis for one of these states, Arkansas, see Robert L. Savage and Richard J. Gallagher, "Politicocultural Regions in a Southern State: An Empirical Typology of Arkansas Counties," **Publius**, 7 (Winter, 1977), 91-105.
9. The voter registration data is no test here as most Alabama counties in 1968 had 100% or more white voter registration. Perhaps these data only show that more accurate (honest?) rolls were kept in the Urban County.
10. The Index of Union Sentiment was derived by the senior author from data provided by Donald B. Dodd of Auburn University at Montgomery. The index reflects support given to the Union cause during the Civil War.