May 1983

Policy Traditions in American State Politics

Robert L. Savage
University of Arkansas

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw

Part of the American Politics Commons, Public Policy Commons, and the Social Work Commons

POLICY TRADITIONS IN AMERICAN STATE POLITICS*

Robert L. Savage, University of Arkansas
Political Science Department

ABSTRACT

    An examination of the states across a wide range of policy innovations dur-
ing three historical periods reveals policy traditions having distinctive geo-
graphic limits roughly conforming to major regions commonly recognized in Amer-
ican politics. Only two of these traditions, the "Southern Parochial" and the
"Northeastern Bureaucratic," persist across time and even these have been weak-
ened. This provides some evidence that while multilinear evolution along regional
lines will continue to contribute to differences in policy values among the Amer-
ican states in the foreseeable future, sociocultural integration is the stronger
dynamic in American political development, especially since about 1930.

    Social scientists have long recognized the unique research opportunity af-
forded by the American states, constituting as they do, many separate laboratories
for political investigation. As these semi-autonomous political systems seek to
regulate the conflicts arising among citizens within their respective boundaries,
each is confronted by problems of varying degrees of uniqueness and with different
historical records of managing these conflicts. Each American state, then, is
more than simply a location for happenings or a holder of attributes. Each state
is a complex, semi-autonomous system with patterned modes of behavior, structural
regularities in social relationships, and characteristic societal attributes. And
each state, in the process of acquiring its own milieu, has considerable autonomy
to choose among alternative lines of development. The states are in this sense
producers of values as their choices help to shape the culture, social structure,
and population within their respective boundaries. As the states are also polit-
ical systems acting to regulate social conflict, they continually readjust the
bases of conflict in response to both internal and external changes of their
milieu. Choice, then, is a key ingredient in the differences that occur among the
states, and differences in choices among them arise from variations in informa-
tion, values, and actions that are available to decision makers in the several
states.[1]
    Certainly, previous studies of American state political behavior have ad-
dressed the element of choice even if in many cases only to stress its con-
straints. But the focus in most comparative studies has been on information and
action with relative exclusion of value as a consideration. This emphasis flows
rather naturally from subscriptions to the input-output model of systems analy-
sis in which one looks to the conversion of demands and supports (information) to
policy outcomes (actions). This view of the political process tends to ignore the
fact that each step toward a policy is subject to the decisions of many agents,
each deciding in the fact of a multi-valued choice. This view further tends to
disregard the realm of values imposed upon the actors by previous choices not

only at the individual level but at the systemic level as well.

The elements of choice assuredly are not easily untangled in the real world. Information and action are always value-laden, and values must confront the realities of information and action. Still, values provide a continuity, a patterning, that injects a note of stability into the processes of choice. At the same time, values are typically inferred from series of actions. Actions in turn reflect the interplay of configurations of information and values that are themselves interdependent. Given this essential circularity and autocorrelation, then, the "facts" that are the building blocks of empirical research must always be accepted as tentative and multi-faceted.

This emphasis upon choice, as a derivative of the interplay of information values, and actions, clearly suggests a cybernetic conception of the states as political entities (Deutsch, 1966). Cybernetic models focus especially upon goal-seeking activities. In the face of dissatisfaction, behaving entities make choices so as to move closer to a desirable condition. For any complex system, however, many satisfactions and dissatisfactions may exist at any given time. Thus, complex systems are rather continously faced with the multivalued choice, but to the extent that certain desirable conditions are preferred more or less with regard to others, such entities can be viewed as seeking goals in a develop-mental fashion. Development in this sense refers to the successive institutionalizations of such goals or values. For the American states, development is indicated by continuing approximations to values sought through policy choices.

This linking of goal-seeking and development in human behavioral systems implies sociocultural evolution wherein values serve as genetic structures that are transmitted from one point in time to a later point in time (Deutsch, 1966; Thorson, 1970). And like their genetic counterparts in the biological realm, values impel behavior but do not necessarily compel it, i.e., values determine ranges of possibilities for social systems. For example, the American South has developed along lines diverging from other areas of the nation with respect to the bonds of democratic political association. Southern states did not, however, eschew democratic association as the fundamental political bond. Culture, then, understood as a "socio-genetic system of information transmission," suggests constraints and possibilities, not mechanisms and causes (Thorson, 1970: p. 130; cf. also Paige, 1966; Riggs, 1968).

These considerations--the ubiquity of conflict, and thus of choice, in and among behaving systems, a multifaceted rather than a hierarchical image of reality, and a developmental, as opposed to a causal, perspective--propel the realm of values to the forefront in behavioral analysis. What are needed, then, are appropriate data manipulated by a technique that slices through to present the American states in full array as entities confronting challenges and making decisions as to what is, what ought to be, and what can and will be done. Certainly, no research procedures exist that will parsimoniously compare the full ranges of political behavior within and among the states. Still, the study of state politics is enhanced to the extent that certain dominant patterns within particular segments of behavior are found (see, e.g., Luttbeg, 1970; Savage, 1973, 1975; Walker, 1969). The analysis of dominant patterns of policy values should particularly provide an opening wedge into the study of the symbolic realm of political behavior, a research concern that has tended to be lost in the quantitative analysis of state politics.

POLITICAL CULTURE, POLICY TRADITIONS, AND REGIONALISM

Culture has been construed variously but one useful definition argues that it
consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behavior
acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive
achievement of human groups, including their embodiments in arti-
facts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e.
historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their at-
tached values; culture systems may, on the one hand, be considered
as products of action, on the other as conditioning elements of
further actions (Kroeber and Kluckhohn, n.d.: p. 357; see also
Kluckhohn, 1951; Kluckhohn and Kelly, 1945).

This construction of culture focuses upon patterned behavior, symbolic transmis-
sion, group action, traditional ideas, and values. Thus, culture as a word-con-
struct refers first of all to structured regularities in behavior that are embed-
ded in the symbolic interplay within and between generations. Moreover, this sym-
bolic activity embraces with varying degrees of penetration an entire group or
society. As ideas are formulated and validated by symbolic activity valuations
come to be attached to them such that the ideas become embedded deeper and deeper
as traditional axioms of subsequent behavior. In this way values become struc-
tured and represent one mode of human experience, the "oughtness" that pervades
the cultural field.

The prevailing value system emerges over time with many of its components the
by-products of unintended consequences. Yet, much of that value system is con-
sciously produced and often through the actions of government. It is this aspect
of culture that ought to be of most particular interest to students of politics.
Yet, as Karl Deutsch (1969) points out, political science especially has tended
more readily to accept "mechanistic" models of the political process and focused
more and more on the allocative function of public policies to the relative exclu-
sion of their function in producing values.[2] Assuredly, value allocation and
value production are not unrelated. Both are reflected in governmental policies.
Such policies may be, for example, the initiation of new programs, funding of
established programs, or perhaps simply resolutions, symbolic expressions giving
or denying rhetorical support to some goal that may or may not require subsequent
action by government. Every instance of policy making is, thus, an allocative
effort--"who gets what, when, how" in the celebrated Lasswellian formulation. The
production of values appears in the patterning of such allocative efforts over
time. Thus, for example, the commitment in the United States to democracy was
initially both ill-defined and severely restricted. One line of development in
the growth of this value of democratic association has been the gradual widening
of the franchise to include ever larger portions of the population. Allocation
and production, then, are inextricably linked in a cyclical process.

To the extent that a governmental system pursues a more or less coherent set
of policy directions across time, then, we can speak of a policy tradition. This
tradition directs the general production and growth of values within the society
as well as the more specific allocations granted at any given points in time. In
examining the American states there is the two-headed problem of their uniformity
within a national system and their autonomy as components of a federal system.

For comparative analysis, their shared, invariant characteristics must be sorted out and their utterly unique characteristics most often glossed over. In other words, for the sake of utility on the one hand and parsimony on the other, a small number of basic types or traditions is desirable.

Indeed, the literature of American state politics richly suggests that a small number of such types is highly probably, given the tendencies toward shared regional configurations of attributes.[3] Regional groupings in patterns of policy responsiveness are likely due to the variant physical geographies across the states combined with the concommitant economies attached to those geographies. These regional regularities are sometimes complimented, and at other times crosscut, by historical settlement patterns as Elazar (1970, 1972) has shown. Thus, two problems emerge in the analysis of policy traditions as an aspect of regional political cultures: the physical contiguity of states adhering to a common tradition and the likelihood of changes over time in socio-economic structure and settlement patterns.

Social scientists, unwittingly or not, usually apply the term "region" in a functional sense that generally requires territorial contiguity.[4] Unfortunately, the requirement is imposed a priori and not empirically. However, in some disciplines a region is defined in a formal sense that requires some specific level of homogeneity in a given set of attributes.[5] Region may be construed in this sense, then, as a set of states which share locally and relativistically distinctive uniformities in cultural content and form--regardless of their geographical locations relative to one another. Thus, Delaware and Vermont may form a more meaningful region for some purposes (or more strongly share a tradition) than Delaware and Maryland or Vermont and New York. Of course, if geographical contiguity is present as well, then regional analysis is enhanced. Still, the formal definition of region with its requirement for prior, rather than post hoc, analysis and its focus upon the dynamics of man-environment relationships is preferable for most examinations of culture.[6]

Linked with this problematic decision is the problem of regional instability over time. Particularly in the modern era, as technology allows greater independence from the physical environment and as settlement patterns move in ways other than the classical spillover into "virgin" lands, human culture witnesses an expansion of available options, including policy choices. To the extent that diffusion processes are involved, technological advances in communication and transportation further enhance the likelihood of breakdown of functional regions, but not necessarily formal ones. And at the same time, formal regions must always be put to the empirical test of essential homogeneity.

Beyond these considerations, a formal definition more clearly pushes toward theoretical questions as to the dynamics of cultural change. Certainly, if policy traditions are the substantive concern, then these dynamics are of central importance. Those dynamics offer two possibilities with regard to regional distribution: multilinear evolution or sociocultural integration. If the states sharing a regional similarity continue to be distinctive in that same fashion from other states over time, then a pattern of multilinear evolution is evident. Students of comparative state policy making more often, however, argue that the states are becoming more and more alike; indeed, these assertions usually suggest that sociocultural integration is moving so as to bring all the other states up to the "stan-

dard" of the states in the industrial Northeast.[7] Such arguments ignore the multi-dimensionality of development, or "modernization."[8] The more thoroughgoing empirical examinations that actually focus on political change in the states are more equivocal, however. Generally, these studies suggest that regionalism may have been more stable in the past with an accelerated movement toward greater sociocultural integration in the twentieth century, especially in the past three or four decades (Sharkansky, 1970; Savage, 1975, 1978). The research reported here focuses upon policy traditions as indicated by proneness to adopt policies reflecting particular values across time and is thus likely to be the strongest test of sociocultural integration.

AN EMPRIRICAL APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF POLICY TRADITIONS

While public expenditure data reflect values in state policy, the various categories into which such data are aggregated are relatively limited. Moreover, these decisions reflect environmental constraints to a greater degree than do the decisions that actually come prior to these appropriations. Thus, a measure of policy authorization is preferable for the analysis of policy traditions. Such a measure is the speed of adoption of a given policy, the length of time in years required by a state to adopt a policy after its first adoption. These lapsed-time scores are computed for each of 207 policies for all 48 contiguous states.[9] The last state to adopt a given policy is assigned a zero for that adoption item. The lapsed-time scores for a given policy are then derived for the first and subsequent units of adoption from the date for the last state to adopt that policy (or 1971 where one or more states had failed to adopt the policy as of that date). Allowance has been made for states that had not achieved territorial status at the time of the first adoption of a policy by adding to their scores the number of years between the initial adoption date and the date of acquisition of territorial status. These adoption scores provide flexible statistics with a common unit of measurement and are susceptible to a variety of statistical treatments.

The adoption measures have been compiled so as to obtain data for the widest possible variety of policies. These measures include the creation of sundry state agencies; the extension of state activity into various areas of public concern such as education, health, housing, and welfare; the expansion of economic development, including the support of transportation facilities and the regulation of business and professions; the regulation of political participation; intergovernmental relations; and taxation.

The 207 measures of adoption speed are segmented into three broad temporal categories that permit developmental analysis. These three periods were selected so as to give roughly equal numbers of measures for each period and, as much as possible, to mark watershed points in the political development of the states, namely the beginning (about 1900) and ending (about 1930) of the Progressivist era. Thus the nineteenth century offers 72 adoption measures, the early twentieth century has 60 measures, and there are 75 measures for the later twentieth century.

As the concern here is with the extent to which states share common patterns of variation across an array of policies, the Q-data slice is appropriate and factor analysis determines these underlying dimensionalities, i.e., the common types of variation.[10] Thus, a policy tradition is operationally defined by a Q-factor

(depicting the degree of similarity among the states) and its typal array of factor scores across the policy adoption items. The typal array promotes analysis of policy values by presenting the modal configuration of policy adoptions for each type of state.

For each time period the data are correlated, factored by principal components, and rotated with a Varimax solution. Originally the number of factors was determined by the eigenvalue-one criterion, but for each of the three time periods, idiosyncratic factors emerged that made comparisions difficult. Examination of the three matrices by the scree method suggested that a four-factor solution for each matrix is appropriate.[11] Accordingly, the analysis here uses the four-factor solutions.

EMERGENT TRADITIONS IN AMERICAN STATE POLICY MAKING

A four-factor solution explains more than sixty percent of the variation in each instance with a low of 62.2% for the early 20th century and a high of 77.1% for the later 20th. Communalities (h^2) for individual states rarely fall below 0.50 (three instances in the 19th century and three in the early 20th). The empirical results, then, support the decision to use four-factor solutions. Still, the substantive utility of the factor results for each period is the ultimate test of the validity of the decision. Accordingly, each of the time periods is examined in depth below.

POLICY TRADITIONS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The factor matrix presented in Table 1 presents four "regions" defined operationally in the formal sense but even a cursory examination suggests that these regions tend strongly to be functional regions as well. Factor I, best represented by the states of Arizona, Montana, Utah, and Washington, groups fifteen contiguous states from west of the Mississippi River along with the more easterly states of Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, and Maine. Assuredly, this points to a "Western" policy tradition in the 19th century. Factor II, best represented by Alabama, Tennessee, and Texas, is hardly a surprise; it is a "Southern" tradition including all the Old Confederate states and the five adjoining states of Missouri, Kentucky, West Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware. Factor III, best represented by Connecticut and New Hampshire, is "New England," excluding Maine. Factor IV, best represented by New Jersey, exhibits the least contiguity, combining three Mid-Atlantic states in the east with four Midwestern states and Wyoming. For reasons that will become more apparent later, this factor can be called "Mid-American."

Note should also be made of significant secondary saturations as well. Thus, several Factor I states of the Great Plains (Montana, South Dakota, Colorado, Nebraska) load on Factor IV, as well as scattered others. This subsidary regional tendency is less apparent with Factor I states having secondary saturations on Factor II, just as Factor II states having secondary saturations on Factor I are not necessarily the more westerly of the Southern states. On the other hand, four of the five more westerly Factor IV states and only one of the more easterly ones have secondary saturations on Factor I.

All in all, similarities in the responsiveness to new policies in the 19th century strongly reflected sectional divisions in the young nation. An examination

Table 1

CONFORMANCE TO POLICY TRADITIONS IN THE
NINETEENTH CENTURY: A Q-FACTOR MATRIX*

State	Factor				h^2
	I	II	III	IV	
Arizona	89	16	14	12	0.86
Washington	83	16	18	17	0.77
Utah	82	10	22	15	0.76
Montana	80	17	12	36	0.81
South Dakota	79	15	-02	37	0.79
Colorado	79	10	16	29	0.75
Nebraska .	76	18	-04	35	0.74
Idaho	74	16	-01	46	0.79
New Mexico	74	33	13	-12	0.69
Kansas	73	24	-12	23	0.65
Nevada	71	33	-06	35	0.74
Oklahoma	70	35	11	22	0.67
Michigan	69	15	01	14	0.52
Maine	67	09	29	04	0.54
California	65	29	-05	38	0.65
Iowa	64	36	-26	16	0.63
Indiana	63	48	-14	06	0.65
Oregon	57	46	-17	27	0.64
Ohio	51	44	-13	37	0.60
Alabama	14	86	12	04	0.77
Tennessee	09	82	09	-05	0.69
Texas	25	82	13	12	0.77
Florida	03	80	27	01	0.72
Virginia	16	79	-03	05	0.66
South Carolina	05	78	20	-01	0.65
Georgia	08	75	10	16	0.60
Kentucky	30	73	09	15	0.66
West Virginia	31	71	18	05	0.64
Louisiana	29	70	-02	26	0.64
Arkansas	30	69	-11	01	0.58
Missouri	25	68	04	24	0.59
North Carolina	22	66	27	06	0.55
Mississippi	33	65	-16	-04	0.56
Maryland	42	60	-08	20	0.58
Delaware	33	41	19	-06	0.32

Connecticut	-07	17	82	23	0.76
New Hampshire	-05	14	82	26	0.76
Vermont	08	06	79	02	0.63
Massachusetts	30	25	76	-26	0.79
Rhode Island	24	14	48	-01	0.30
New Jersey	24	-07	08	73	0.61
Minnesota	42	09	-03	70	0.67
North Dakota	45	06	04	69	0.69
New York	33	-08	21	65	0.58
Pennsylvania	-01	32	10	64	0.52
Illinois	15	27	-21	57	0.46
Wyoming	48	02	16	57	0.58
Wisconsin	46	-09	02	56	0.54

Cumulative percentages
of total variance are:　　25.3　　46.5　　54.1　　64.8

*Decimals are omitted from factor loadings. FL 0.29 are significant
with p 0.01; significant secondary saturations are underlined.

of typal arrays in Table 2 for the four factors fleshes out the bases for these
distinctive policy traditions.

　　Factor I states are distinctive for their quicker response to policies sug-
gestive of what Elazar (1972) calls a Moralistic political subculture. Thus, poli-
cies supportive of popular participation either directly (female suffrage) or in-
directly through expanding educational opportunities (establishment of a state
college) received quicker response from these states. Localism, another aspect of
the Moralistic orientation, is reflected both in the quicker adoption of a consti-
tutional provision for municipal home rule and a greater reluctance to accept Mor-
rill Act provisions or to establish regulatory agencies (Board of Health) at the
state level or to constitutionally limit the powers of municipal governments. On
the other hand, where local efforts seem contraindicated, e.g., state hospital for
the insane, a state-wide governing board for higher education, and efficient judi-
cial administration (code of civil procedure and rule-making power for the supreme
court), this type of state could be more responsive. Curiously, despite the modern
image of the old wild West, these states were also quicker to abolish capital pun-
ishment and, on the surface seemingly just as curious, they were even more quick,
relatively speaking, than Southern states to adopt anti-miscegenation laws. But
the latter instance simply reflects the demographic reality of greater potential
for racial mixture with the larger number of Amerindians and Asian immigrants.
Similarly, in the reverse direction, a state college for Negroes was an unneces-
sary luxury. And their comparative youth and capability for profiting from other
states' experiences meant that a constitutional revision commission was less nec-

essary and the pre-modern income tax was a dead issue before most of these states had even achieved territorial status. In sum, the states of Factor I in the 19th century were laying the foundations for a Western Populist tradition of public policy that largely fits Elazar's Moralistic political subculture in its overall tone.

Factor II, the "Southern" type, not surprisingly, is positively distinctive for innovativeness with regard to race relations. To a lesser degree, such states are notable for their concern with establishing constitutional minimums for the initial organization of counties and some limitations on state indebtedness. More important for an understanding of Southern political values, however, are the many policies for which states of this type lagged behind other American states. Contrary to the Western states, Southern states were slow to respond to measures promoting mass participation and education. They also lagged with regard to early social welfare legislation, bureaucratic development, business regulation, and conservation. To a lesser degree, the Type II state was also slow in regulating the electoral process, a policy area touching directly upon the maintenance of the political elite. Thus, Factor II conforms to Elazar's Traditionalistic political orientation. More than that, the policy array suggests a stagnant political order seeking to avoid trends prevalent elsewhere in the nation and to cope with internal pressures in a repressive fashion. Hence, in the nineteenth century, a Southern Parochial tradition of public policy emerged quite distinctively.

The New England states of Factor III were just as busily racing toward a modern, secularized system of government with the establishment of a wide array of state government agencies for the better regulation of many public purposes, including health, welfare, and highways. Moreover, these states early began to regulate political parties and to establish merit systems for public employment pointing toward a professionalized governmental system. While the New England states were less supportive of direct measures promoting popular participation than the Western states, they were more quick to expand mass education. On the negative side, Type III states were not so likely to adopt constitutional limitations upon the powers of the legislature in fiscal matters. Thus, while public policy in New England reflected the Moralistic orientation described by Elazar, the more evident thrust of that tradition was governmental expansionism, a Northeastern Bureaucratic tradition.

Factor IV in many ways seems to be a residual type rather than a distinctive policy tradition. The type is positively distinctive for its ardor in constitutionally limiting fiscal powers of the legislature and negatively for its rejection of measures directed against Negroes. To a very large extent, on the other hand, these tendencies reflect prevailing conditions in these states in the post-Civil War period, a rising popular concern for the more extreme excesses of the new industrial order and a relatively lily-white population. Tentatively, then, the type may be called the Mid-American Industrial policy tradition.[12]

State policy making in the first century and a quarter of American political experience reflected the sectional patterns of settlement that have become traditional elements in American folklore. Beyond that, these emerging policy traditions are imbued with the basic subcultural variations predicted by Elazar.

Table 2

TYPAL ARRAYS FOR NINETEENTH CENTURY POLICY
TRADITIONS: Q-FACTOR SCORE MATRIX

Policy	Types			
	I	II	III	IV
Acceptance of Hatch Act provisions	-0.1	-1.1	-0.8	-1.3
Game protection law	2.4	2.1	2.3	2.6
State park	-0.2	-0.2	0.5	-0.0
Constitutional Revision Commission	-0.7	-0.7	-0.4	0.1
Abolition of capital punishment	-0.1	-1.2	-0.7	-0.2
State Superintendent of Public Instruction	2.3	1.5	2.5	2.6
Compulsory school attendance	-0.3	-1.0	0.4	-0.3
State College	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.2
State normal school	-0.0	-0.7	0.5	0.1
Acceptance of Morrill Act provisions	-0.5	-0.2	0.3	-0.3
Statewide governing board for higher education	-0.6	-0.9	-0.8	-1.2
Agency for public library extension	-0.3	-0.4	0.5	-0.1
Australian ballot	0.2	-0.0	0.5	0.1
Regulation of party nominations	-0.8	-0.9	-0.6	-0.7
Complete female suffrage	0.2	-0.9	-0.6	-0.9
Female suffrage: school elections	1.2	-0.6	1.4	1.1
Female suffrage: municipal elections	0.4	-0.7	0.0	-0.2
Female suffrage: non-constitutional elections	0.4	-0.5	-0.4	-0.2
White suffrage	-0.2	2.0	-0.5	0.4
Poll tax as suffrage requirement	-1.1	0.2	-0.2	-1.4
Literacy test as suffrage requirement	-0.3	-0.3	0.9	-0.6
State debt limitation	1.4	0.8	-0.7	1.9
Constitutional allowance for casual state deficits	1.1	-0.0	-0.7	1.9
Duration of state loans constitutionally limited	0.6	-0.2	-0.9	0.9
State constitutionally prohibited from assuming local or corporate indebtedness	-0.3	-0.3	-0.7	-0.8
State constitutionally prohibited from lending credit to private corporations	1.1	1.4	-0.7	1.9
State constitutionally prohibited from contracting debts for internal improvements	-0.5	-0.4	-0.9	0.2
State tax to pay loan is constitutionally irrepealable	0.1	-0.9	-0.9	0.8
State constitutionally prohibited from becoming stockholder in private corporations	0.7	1.0	-0.9	0.3
Aggregate state debt constitutionally limited	0.7	-0.5	-0.7	1.7
Internal improvements by state government constitutionally encouraged	-0.1	-0.3	-0.9	-1.1
Legislative post-audit	-0.9	-0.6	-0.2	-0.8

Restriction upon special and local laws	1.8	1.2	-0.6	2.1
State merit system	-0.8	-1.0	-0.3	-0.6
Court interpreter	0.9	-0.2	-0.2	1.1
Code of civil procedure	2.3	0.2	-0.3	1.6
Rule-making power for State Supreme Court	-0.2	-0.6	-0.8	-0.5
State Board of Health	-0.6	-0.4	0.1	-0.4
State Hospital for the Insane	1.1	0.6	-0.2	0.7
Maximum hours legislation	0.0	-0.4	0.7	0.5
Child Labor Law	-0.4	-0.9	0.5	-0.3
Minicipal home rule (constitutional)	-0.2	-0.8	-0.5	-0.5
Municipal home rule (statutory)	-0.4	-0.3	-0.2	-0.4
Local government aid to private corporations consti- tutionally prohibited	-0.8	-0.1	0.4	0.1
Ratio limit on municipal indebtedness	-1.0	-1.0	-0.4	-0.1
Municipalities may not lend credit	0.2	0.7	0.4	1.1
Municipalities may not become stockholders	0.2	0.7	0.4	1.1
Minimum size for counties	0.3	1.6	-0.9	0.6
Minimum population for counties	-0.6	1.0	-0.9	0.3
Professional licensing: pharmacists	-0.2	-0.4	0.4	0.0
Professional licensing: dentists	-0.2	-0.3	0.2	0.0
Professional licensing: midwives	-0.5	-0.7	-0.4	0.2
Personal liberty law	-0.8	-1.3	1.3	-1.1
Antimiscegenation law	4.5	3.6	0.7	-1.4
Jim Crow law: railways	-1.0	0.6	-0.9	-1.4
Segregated schools	0.2	1.3	-0.4	-0.2
Black Law (fixing status of free Negro)	-0.6	0.7	-0.9	-1.0
Reconstruction of Negro marital relations	-1.1	1.2	-0.9	-1.2
Limitations on Negro witnesses	-0.6	-0.2	-0.9	-1.0
Prohibition of alcoholic beverages	0.7	0.1	2.2	0.8
State Tax Commission	-0.6	-0.9	0.0	-0.9
Bank deposits tax	-0.8	-1.0	0.9	-0.7
Death tax	0.9	0.6	1.2	1.4
Pre-modern income tax	-1.1	3.2	5.1	-1.1
State liquor monopoly	-0.7	-0.9	-0.5	-1.2
State Highway Department	-0.9	-1.1	-0.3	-1.0
State aid for roads and highways	-0.9	-1.1	-0.4	-1.0
State Board of Charities	-0.4	-0.6	0.3	0.1
Blind education	-0.2	-0.4	0.5	0.0
Deaf education	-0.1	-0.3	0.7	0.1

POLICY TRADITIONS IN THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY

In the first three decades of the present century, the most important forces affecting public policy in the American states were the one-two punches of the Populist movement followed by the Progressivists. We continue to see the impact of these colorful movements even today with the "Taxpayer Revolt" on the one hand and

institutional streamlining measures such as the Sunset Law on the other. Still, as Table 3 shows, these movements did not drastically reshape the topography of policy traditions. Factor I is still basically a western aggregation, sixteen contiguous states west of the Mississippi River and four other states in the Northeast. Factor II is just assuredly the South with ten contiguous states of the Old Confederacy and Delaware. Factor III seems to have spread outward but is still essentially northeastern with Indiana the only non-contiguous state. Factor IV consequently becomes a more midwestern aggregation with only New Jersey as a non-contiguous eastern state adhering to the tradition.

Factor I states continue to reflect the concern for mass participation in politics, being most distinctive for the four measures of direct legislation (see Table 4). At the same time, fiscal conservatism is indicated by the slower response to a variety of new taxes, although this may be only the contemporary mode of rejecting government at higher levels in favor of more localized government. The relative reluctance to accept the provisions of the national government's Sheppard-Towner Act supports this interpretation. In any event, the Western Populist tradition is carried on to the 1930's.

Just as clearly, the Southern Parochial tradition continued through this period. Factor II states continue to innovate in the area of repressive measures for fixing the lower status of blacks and to restrict popular participation, wherever possible. A further development of the image of a Southern Parochial tradition includes the anti-corporatism reflected in the quick adoption of the chain-store tax and the lack of enthusiasm for an anti-injunction law to protect the organizational efforts of the labor movement. Less clearly related are the positive responses to a wide array of new taxes and the simultaneously slow move to adopt programs of public welfare.

Factor III seems to emphasize even more strongly the concern of states of this type to build a modern governmental apparatus. Indeed, this emphasis falls in line especially with Progressivist concerns for more efficient governmental operation, hence acceptance of a legislative research agency, a centralized administrative agency, and various court reforms. These states are also continuing to expand public regulation of the economy and society generally. The Type III states seem to be least concerned with the development of local autonomy, or grass-roots politics. In general, then, the Northeastern Bureaucratic tradition remained live and well and even expanded its geographical spread considerably in the early twentieth century.

Factor IV, again, seems almost a residual type even though its territorial basis is more definite. The stress in states of this type is, in opposition to Factor III states, on expanding grass roots control in local communities although perhaps not at the county level and certainly does not include direct legislation at the state level. A Mid-American Industrial policy tradition remains, then, even more problematic in the early decades of this century.

POLICY TRADITIONS IN THE LATER TWENTIETH CENTURY

Geographical contiguity of policy traditions in the period 1930-1970 is less apparent as shown in Table 5. The western states no longer constitute a major bloc but are dispersed across three factors. Still, three factors exhibit contiguity for a majority of the states constituting them. Factor I is a Northeastern aggrega-

Table 3

CONFORMANCE TO POLICY TRADITIONS IN THE
EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY: A Q-FACTOR MATRIX*

State	Factor				h^2
	I	II	III	IV	
Arizona	87	04	08	26	0.83
Colorado	83	05	08	25	0.76
Nevada	82	-05	-06	19	0.71
Nebraska	81	14	20	17	0.75
Oregon	81	-05	02	18	0.69
North Dakota	81	14	15	20	0.74
South Dakota	76	34	02	18	0.73
Washington	75	03	19	34	0.72
California	75	10	12	20	0.63
Missouri	75	30	13	-06	0.67
Idaho	74	24	04	32	0.71
Ohio	74	08	26	05	0.62
Michigan	70	08	07	22	0.56
Arkansas	70	28	07	-05	0.58
Montana	70	20	14	30	0.64
Oklahoma	67	50	-02	-04	0.70
Massachusetts	64	13	39	03	0.58
Utah	60	-01	36	11	0.50
New Mexico	58	34	13	37	0.61
Maine	55	06	31	15	0.42
South Carolina	15	90	-06	12	0.84
Mississippi	24	81	-07	22	0.77
North Carolina	17	80	02	16	0.70
Georgia	-04	77	33	-20	0.75
Alabama	16	73	12	22	0.62
Virginia	-19	70	35	-20	0.69
Tennessee	20	67	44	04	0.68
Florida	-02	64	32	02	0.52
Louisiana	11	63	-06	33	0.52
Texas	39	57	21	32	0.62
Delaware	22	49	34	23	0.46
Rhode Island	07	02	83	06	0.70
Connecticut	14	06	80	13	0.68
Vermont	20	26	79	03	0.73
New York	18	32	72	14	0.68
New Hampshire	25	13	69	19	0.60

Pennsylvania	15	18	59	42	0.58
Indiana	18	15	59	<u>35</u>	0.52
Maryland	31	<u>47</u>	54	-16	0.64
Wyoming	<u>39</u>	03	06	65	0.58
Minnesota	<u>42</u>	31	<u>34</u>	60	0.74
Illinois	<u>36</u>	16	<u>46</u>	58	0.71
Iowa	<u>47</u>	45	<u>22</u>	57	0.80
New Jersey	<u>34</u>	15	<u>53</u>	57	0.74
Kansas	<u>46</u>	24	<u>33</u>	56	0.70
West Virginia	<u>46</u>	<u>42</u>	14	56	0.72
Wisconsin	<u>32</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>42</u>	54	0.62
Kentucky	28	<u>38</u>	20	40	0.42
Cumulative percentages of total variance are:	26.9	42.8	55.9	62.2	

*Decimals are omitted from factor loadings. FL 0.32 are significant with p 0.01; significant secondary saturations are underlined.

tion primarily, including all of the New England and Middle Atlantic states confounded with three smaller blocs of states from the Northwest, Upper Middle West, and Border States. Factor II is once again the Southern type including Oklahoma with all of the Old Confederacy states except Tennessee. Factor IV aggregates a contiguous belt of thirteen Mid-American state from West Virginia to Wyoming with a bloc of four Desert Southwest states. The altogether non-contiguous Factor III nonetheless is constituted of three western states; yet, examination of secondary saturations suggests that the factor is not really "western."

As the major forces shaping the broader contours of public policy in the states during this latter period have tended to obscure traditional sectional differences, the breakdown of geographical contiguity along the lines evident in the earlier periods is not surprising. Those forces include important nationalizing thrusts such as the Great Depression of the 1930's accompanied by the great expansion of national grant-in-aid programs and the parallel enhancement of interstate communications through the creation of many associations of state officials. At the same time, this later period has witnessed the emergence and spread of a metropolitan-technological frontier that deviates from earlier settlement patterns with respect to the maintenance of sectionalism (Elazar, 1972).

What may be really surprising is the degree of geographical contiguity that persists. Still, nationalizing influences have had a major impact. One bit of evidence showing that impact is the dramatic decrease in the number of "pure" states, i.e., states with no secondary saturations. There are 21 "pure" states for each of the earlier periods but only four for the last period, all on Factor I. This nationalization is further indicated in the greatly increased number of "consensus" policies, i.e., items having a difference of less than one standard devia-

Table 4

TYPAL ARRAYS FOR EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY POLICY
TRADITIONS: Q-FACTOR SCORE MATRIX

Policy	Types			
	I	II	III	IV
Blue-sky law	1.2	2.1	2.0	1.7
Air pollution law	-0.9	-0.4	-0.4	-0.4
Gas and oil conservation law	0.3	-0.2	-0.6	0.2
Amendment XVI: Income tax	1.7	1.7	0.1	1.1
Amendment XVII: Direct election of senators	1.5	-0.2	1.5	1.7
Amendment XVIII: Prohibition	1.3	1.8	1.0	0.9
Amendment XIX: Female suffrage	1.3	-0.7	1.8	1.5
Unratified amendment on child labor	0.1	-1.2	-0.6	0.7
Juvenile probation	0.4	0.6	1.2	0.4
Adult probation	0.6	0.1	1.9	0.7
Juvenile court	1.9	2.3	2.9	1.8
Junior college enabling act	0.0	0.3	-0.6	0.3
Coordination commission for higher education	-1.1	-0.8	-0.9	-1.0
Government research bureau at state university	-0.7	-0.0	-0.9	-0.7
Constitutional initiative	0.9	-1.2	-1.2	-1.4
Statutory initiative	1.8	-1.2	-1.2	-1.4
Recall	0.3	-1.0	-1.2	-0.8
Statewide direct primary	0.9	1.3	0.5	1.2
Grandfather clause	-1.5	1.5	-1.2	-1.4
Optional referendum	1.9	-1.2	-1.0	-1.4
Enabling act: local initiative	1.9	1.2	-1.0	2.1
Enabling act: local recall	1.5	1.0	-1.2	1.8
Enabling act: local referendum	1.8	1.5	0.2	2.1
Central administrative agency	-0.8	-0.9	-0.0	-0.3
Female eligibility for jury service	0.4	-0.5	0.8	0.7
Legislative research agency	0.1	0.3	2.2	0.4
Original budgeting law	-1.1	-0.8	-0.8	-0.9
Statute revision agency	-0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2
Retirement system for state employees	-0.7	-0.3	0.3	-0.5
Judicial council	0.1	-0.1	0.7	0.5
First recognition of ABA judicial Canons	-0.6	-0.4	-0.3	-0.3
Minimum wage provision	0.7	-0.9	0.5	0.4
Equal pay for females	-0.8	-1.2	-0.1	-0.6
Anti-injunction law	-0.1	-1.1	0.3	0.5
Criminal syndicalism law	0.7	-1.2	-1.0	0.5
County home rule	-1.0	-1.0	-0.9	-1.3
State municipal league	0.7	0.9	0.0	1.3
Enabling act: municipal zoning	-0.9	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6

Enabling act: rural zoning	-0.5	0.1	1.3	0.0
Optional forms of county government	-1.2	-0.3	-0.9	-1.4
Professional licensing: engineers	-0.6	0.1	-0.4	-0.2
Professional licensing: accountants	0.9	1.2	1.9	1.4
Professional licesning: nurses	-0.5	-0.1	0.3	-0.1
Jim Crow law: streetcars	-1.3	2.3	-1.0	-1.4
Personal income tax	0.2	1.1	-0.3	0.1
Corporate income tax	0.4	1.3	1.0	-0.1
Gasoline tax	-1.2	-0.8	-0.9	-1.2
Motor vehicle tax	-1.0	-0.8	-0.3	-0.8
Chain-store tax	-0.8	1.1	-0.7	-0.4
Cigarette tax	-0.1	0.7	0.6	0.2
Mortgage registry tax: state	-0.6	0.4	-0.3	-0.3
Forest yield tax	-0.9	-0.5	-0.1	-0.9
Forest serverance tax	-1.3	-0.8	-0.9	-1.3
Automobile registration	-1.2	-0.8	-0.5	-1.0
Highway patrol	-1.1	-0.9	-0.1	-0.9
Workmen's compensation	0.2	-0.0	1.0	0.6
Old age pension	-1.1	-1.1	-0.9	-1.0
Mother's aid	-0.3	-0.6	-0.0	-0.1
Blind pension	-0.5	-0.7	-0.2	0.0
Acceptance of Sheppard-Towner Act provisions	-1.2	-0.8	-1.0	-1.2

tion across the factors. Just over 47% of the policies were "consensual" in the nineteenth century, 50% in the early twentieth, and nearly 83% in the later twentieth. Still, distinctive policy traditions remain.

Type I states are most distinctive for their quick ratification of the Twenty-First Amendment, repealing Prohibition, and their rejection of the sales tax, segregated buses, and the Oil and Gas Compact (see Table 6). More generally, these states have been more responsive than others to measures that enhance governmental operations including interstate agreements in the criminal justice field, collective bargaining for public employees, and the establishment of a planning and development agency. Beyond this, these states are leaders in supporting equity of opportunity beyond governmental circles to the private economic sector. In general, then, while new concerns are evident, the Northeastern Bureaucratic policy tradition has continued in to the later twentieth century.

The Southern states are most distinctive for their rapid adoption of Jim Crow laws on buses and, somewhat less so, a right-to-work law. On the negative side these states dragged their feet with regard to the ratification of Repeal, the establishment of a State Human Relations Commission, and outlawing age discrimination in employment. In general, the Southern states remain unsupportive of popular participation, e.g., the lack of response to the 23rd and 24th Amendments; anti-organized labor if not anti-corporate; and relatively unconcerned about modernizing government.

Type III states are different not only in their geographical dispersion but in the peculiar array of preferences indicated by policy adoption scores. There is some evidence to suggest support for the redistribution of wealth, most notably the

Table 5

CONFORMANCE TO POLICY TRADITIONS IN THE
LATER TWENTIETH CENTURY: A Q-FACTOR MATRIX*

State	Factor				h^2
	I	II	III	IV	
Vermont	83	23	01	24	0.80
Delaware	81	24	05	17	0.75
New Hampshire	80	20	04	34	0.80
Minnesota	75	24	45	17	0.85
Massachusetts	74	-01	26	22	0.66
Idaho	74	25	14	47	0.86
New Jersey	72	06	11	01	0.54
New York	71	12	04	33	0.62
.Oregon	70	20	45	15	0.76
Montana	69	26	04	50	0.80
Maine	68	22	16	51	0.79
Connecticut	66	11	37	42	0.76
Wisconsin	65	16	56	15	0.78
Kentucky	60	25	17	51	0.72
Pennsylvania	60	18	08	49	0.64
Maryland	60	26	14	33	0.56
Rhode Island	58	13	58	25	0.76
Tennessee	48	45	36	44	0.77
Georgia	06	88	01	38	0.88
South Carolina	19	80	16	28	0.78
Mississippi	01	79	13	46	0.84
North Carolina	05	74	43	05	0.73
Florida	36	73	00	42	0.83
Arkansas	37	71	02	45	0.84
Oklahoma	04	70	43	34	0.79
Alabama	30	68	-06	44	0.74
Texas	31	67	-22	34	0.71
Virginia	45	64	28	-08	0.70
Louisiana	08	61	53	25	0.72
Washington	47	19	58	39	0.75
California	51	22	57	43	0.82
Colorado	42	19	52	40	0.63
Kansas	13	38	23	79	0.84
North Dakota	01	43	23	76	0.83

-219-

Illinois	45	28	20	75	0.89
New Mexico	46	26	20	73	0.89
South Dakota	11	44	27	71	0.78
Indiana	51	34	18	69	0.89
Michigan	50	25	27	69	0.86
Ohio	55	29	28	67	0.92
Wyoming	49	33	18	66	0.82
Utah	52	40	18	65	0.89
Arizona	42	34	20	64	0.75
Nevada	49	24	07	64	0.71
Iowa	50	30	25	61	0.76
Missouri	58	25	29	58	0.84
Nebraska	28	39	11	58	0.58
West Virginia	48	30	20	56	0.67
Cumulative percentages of total variance are:	27.2	45.0	53.7	77.1	

*Decimals are omitted from factor loadings. FL 0.28 are significant with p 0.01; significant secondary saturations are underlined.

early adoption of the gift tax but these same states tended to be slow in accepting the various welfare programs funded by federal grants. These states also exhibit a strong interest in reforming the judiciary.

Type IV, combining both Mid-American and Western states, is even less clear as a tradition of public policy. The type positively emphasizes the adoption of a sales tax, the establishment of a Legislative Council, and membership in the Oil and Gas Compact. There are no policies that states of this type have clearly resisted.

The analysis of typal arrays further supports the contention of a breakdown in longstanding traditions of policy preferences among the American states. It remains to show in a straightforward fashion the extent to which policy traditions have persisted or merged over time.

EVOLUTIONARY PATTERNS IN POLICY TRADITIONS

Where a given policy tradition for an earlier temporal period is correlated positively with policy traditions of later periods, it seems reasonable to assert that the tradition is a persistent one in American state policy making. On the other hand, since the content of policy arrays changes necessarily, this assertion means simply that some states continue to share a similar pattern of adoption proneness over time. Such persistence can be determined by correlating the loadings of the states for a given factor against those for every other factor. Table 7 presents these correlations.[13] Clearly, the Southern Parochial tradition is persistent in this regard with the weakest correlation at 0.68 for the nineteenth and later twentieth centuries. Likewise, the Northeastern states, with New England

-220-

Table 6

TYPAL ARRAYS FOR LATER TWENTIETH CENTURY POLICY
TRADITIONS: Q-FACTOR SCORE MATRIX

Policy	Types			
	I	II	III	IV
Soil conservation districts	-0.2	0.3	-0.1	0.1
Fair trade law	3.8	3.0	3.0	3.6
Cooling off for door-to door sales	-0.7	-0.6	-0.7	-0.6
Oil and gas compact	0.2	1.9	0.8	2.1
Pest control compact	-0.7	-0.7	-0.5	-0.6
State grant for municipal waste treatment facilities	0.1	-0.4	-0.4	-0.5
Radiation control act	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2
Amendment XXI: Repeal of Prohibition	4.5	1.1	3.2	2.6
Amendment XXII: Two-term limit for President	1.9	1.7	0.8	1.8
Amendment XXIII: Electoral vote for D.C.	0.5	-0.4	0.2	0.5
Amendment XXIV: Elimination of poll tax	0.2	-0.6	0.0	0.2
Amendment XXV: Presidential succession	-0.2	-0.3	-0.3	-0.2
Victim compensation	-0.8	-0.7	-0.7	-0.7
Interstate parolee compact	1.0	0.0	0.6	0.7
Interstate juveniles compact	0.7	0.2	0.8	0.4
Agreement on detainers	-0.1	-0.5	-0.3	-0.5
Police standards law	-0.3	-0.5	-0.2	-0.4
State medical examiner	-0.1	-0.2	-0.8	-0.5
State commission of post-mortem examiners	-0.5	-0.0	-0.8	-0.6
State planning board	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2
Planning and development agency	0.8	0.7	0.3	0.7
Science and technology advisory council	-0.6	-0.3	-0.8	-0.6
Compact for education	-0.4	-0.3	-0.4	-0.4
Personnel qualification agreement for education	-0.6	-0.6	-0.7	-0.7
State board for junior colleges	-0.4	-0.6	-0.5	-0.4
Interstate library compact	-0.3	-0.5	-0.5	-0.6
Court administrator	0.4	-0.1	0.7	0.1
Judicial code of ethics	0.5	0.5	1.3	0.5
Judicial qualifications commission	-0.8	-0.6	-0.3	-0.6
Legislative Council	1.8	1.6	1.8	2.6
Collective bargaining: state employees	-0.6	-0.7	-0.7	-0.7
Collective bargaining: municipal employees	-0.5	-0.7	-0.6	-0.6
Collective bargaining: policemen	-0.6	-0.7	-0.6	-0.6
Collective bargaining: firemen	-0.5	-0.7	-0.7	-0.6
Collective bargaining: teachers	-0.5	-0.7	-0.4	-0.6
Interstate compact on mental health	0.7	-0.0	-0.4	0.1
Mentally disordered offender compact	-0.8	-0.7	-0.8	-0.6

Abortion law liberalized	-0.8	-0.5	-0.5	-0.7
Screening for PKU in infants required	-0.2	-0.2	-0.3	-0.3
Uniform Anatomical Gift Act	-0.7	-0.5	-0.6	-0.5
State Housing Finance Authority	-0.6	-0.7	-0.8	-0.6
Anti-age discrimination in employment	0.3	-0.4	2.0	-0.4
Right-to-work law	-0.8	1.8	-0.8	0.8
Department of Community Affairs	-0.2	-0.1	-0.0	-0.6
State commission on local government	-0.9	-0.6	-0.8	-0.5
Civil defense compact	1.9	1.7	1.4	1.8
Military aid compact	-0.2	-0.5	-0.8	-0.7
National Guard compact	-0.9	-0.7	-0.8	-0.7
Human Relations Commission	1.2	-0.6	1.1	0.5
Fair housing law: private housing	-0.0	-0.7	-0.1	-0.5
Jim Crow law: motor carriers	-0.9	4.2	-0.8	-0.7
Liquor tax	-0.4	-0.3	-0.4	-0.4
Multistate tax compact	-0.8	-0.6	-0.7	-0.5
Sales tax	0.2	2.7	3.1	3.6
Mortgage registry: local	-0.5	-0.3	0.7	-0.7
State lottery	-0.7	-0.7	-0.8	-0.7
Gift tax	0.2	0.5	2.5	-0.7
State income tax withholding	0.7	0.4	-0.3	-0.1
State Department of Transportation	-0.7	-0.7	-0.5	-0.7
Vehicle registration agreement	-0.5	-0.7	0.9	0.3
Bus taxation proration	-0.4	-0.7	-0.8	-0.7
Taxation of motor fuels compact	-0.6	-0.7	-0.8	-0.7
Equipment safety compact	0.1	-0.1	0.0	0.2
Driver license compact	-0.5	-0.4	-0.0	-0.2
Medical advisory board for driver licensing	-0.9	-0.7	-0.8	-0.7
Passenger restraint device required in automobiles	-0.2	-0.2	-0.2	-0.2
Old age assistance	-0.6	-0.5	-0.6	-0.5
Aid to dependent children	1.7	1.5	1.2	1.4
Aid to the blind	1.2	1.3	1.0	1.1
APTD	1.8	1.8	1.1	1.5
AABD	-0.5	-0.3	-0.8	-0.3
Unemployment insurance	-0.7	-0.6	-0.7	-0.7
Child placement compact	-0.5	-0.7	-0.8	-0.6
Extension of unemployment payments to 39 weeks	-0.9	-0.7	-0.8	-0.7
Highway relocation assistance	-0.8	-0.6	-0.8	-0.7

constituting the core area, show this persistence, albeit much weaker. The weakest correlation (r=0.35) is again between the nineteenth and later twentieth. The Western Populist tradition is clearly sustained in the early twentieth century but appears to move toward a more midwestern locus in the later twentieth. The Mid-American policy tradition weakens in the early twentieth century and then seems to disappear altogether in the last period. Unfortunately, the correlation matrix gives no further information.

An alternative approach to analysis of the data is available that provides fur-

Table 7

CORRELATION OF POLICY TRADITIONS

	Nineteenth Century				Early Twentieth Century				Later Twentieth Century			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Nineteenth Century												
I	1.00	-0.43	-0.41	0.11	0.76	-0.47	-0.45	0.21	-0.07	-0.22	0.25	0.45
II		1.00	-0.22	-0.54	-0.39	0.74	-0.30	-0.36	-0.40	0.68	-0.22	-0.15
III			1.00	-0.29	-0.25	-0.12	0.50	-0.24	0.35	-0.25	-0.07	-0.28
IV				1.00	0.20	-0.37	0.08	0.44	0.11	-0.32	0.10	0.08
Early Twentieth Century												
I					1.00	-0.60	-0.49	0.11	0.02	-0.32	0.18	0.44
II						1.00	-0.22	-0.25	-0.50	0.77	-0.23	-0.34
III							1.00	-0.08	0.54	-0.45	-0.10	-0.20
IV								1.00	0.13	-0.34	0.09	0.26
Later Twentieth Century												
I									1.00	-0.78	-0.05	-0.24
II										1.00	-0.24	-0.04
III											1.00	-0.19
IV												1.00

ther insights: higher-order Q-factor analysis. Just as with the factor analyses of the raw data matrices, the states are clustered in terms of their similarity in loadings across the twelve policy traditions. Table 8 presents that matrix, showing that the geographical basis of the policy traditions found originally in the nineteenth century generally persists across the entire time frame.[14] The "Mid-American" tradition very definitely weakens, however, as only Illinois and Pennsylvania have statistically significant saturations on Factor IV. The typal arrays of the twelve policy traditions across the "higher" policy traditions, presented in Table 9, more clearly and graphically show what is evident in the three period factor analyses and the correlations of the factor loadings. The Southern Parochial tradition declines over time but remains strong. The Northeastern tradition persists and grows geographically by expanding into the Mid-American and Western   .
states. The Western Populist tradition splits asunder in the later twentieth century with some of these states moving toward the Northeastern tradition and others toward a new Mid-Western tradition that also encompasses some of the older Mid-American tradition. The original Mid-American Industrial tradition had already split in the early twentieth century with a number of its former adherents beginning to model themselves after the Northeastern states. The fourth type emerging in the later twentieth century seems, then, to be something altogether new.

POLICY TRADITIONS AND THE FUTURE

The adoption of new policies in the American states has largely reflected a pattern of multilinear evolution revolving about well-recognized geographical sections, then, rather than a pattern of sociocultural integration.[15] The American South has been especially persistent in this regard but New England, as a core area of the greater Northeast, has also been very persistent. Still, the analysis of the larger values indicated by specific policies raises considerable doubt about the continued viability of this multilinear tendency.

These doubts are amplified by Deutsch's concerns regarding value production and value growth. Value production and the resulting allocations of those values have tended along very narrow lines where regional distinctions are notable. For varying reasons many of these regional value patterns have reached very nearly their ultimate and do not point, in themselves, to new values. Thus, it seems that the states are ripe for a stronger thrust of sociocultural integration than ever before.

This "erosion" of the multilinear dynamic comes at a time when the mechanisms of diffusion and population settlement patterns are also more conducive to integration than ever before. The diffusion mechanisms in American state policy making are primarily national starting with the mass media generally and organizational channels such as the various associations of state officials and related agencies. And, of course, the influence of the national government is highly pervasive. Population settlement patterns have changed to reflect Elazar's "metropolitan-technological frontier" which, while not necessarily counterproductive of a multilinear dynamic, is very amenable to increased sociocultural integration.

Moreover, policy responses of the states in the 1970's suggest that an integrative trend is very much dominant at the present time. While it is still too early for any rigorous analysis, the tendency toward universal adoption of such policies

Table 8

CONFORMANCE TO POLICY TRADITIONS ACROSS THE THREE PERIODS:
A HIGHER-ORDER Q-FACTOR MATRIX*

State	Factor				h^2
	I	II	III	IV	
Michigan	95	-03	-21	23	1.00
Utah	94	-17	18	03	0.95
Montana	91	-12	03	30	0.93
Nebraska	90	-09	-26	09	0.89
Nevada	90	02	-19	22	0.89
California	87	-14	-16	-07	0.81
Arizona	85	-11	-10	-02	0.75
Colorado	85	-36	-14	-01	0.87
Ohio	85	20	-03	23	0.82
South Dakota	83	-03	-56	-02	1.00
Idaho	81	-11	-03	31	0.77
Washington	81	-38	-05	-03	0.80
Maine	79	-02	49	12	0.88
Oregon	78	01	01	11	0.62
New Mexico	77	23	-11	12	0.67
Alabama	-05	91	-10	-12	0.86
Florida	-29	88	07	-05	0.87
Tennessee	-04	87	12	-11	0.79
Mississippi	06	81	-46	-09	0.88
Georgia	-31	80	-16	-10	0.77
Arkansas	55	77	-16	-16	0.95
South Carolina	-21	76	-30	-17	0.74
Kentucky	26	73	05	32	0.71
Texas	11	73	-20	-08	0.59
Connecticut	-27	-23	82	-04	0.80
Vermont	-15	-01	82	02	0.70
New Hampshire	-21	-16	77	04	0.66
Massachusetts	33	-03	74	-30	0.75
Rhode Island	-18	-12	72	02	0.57
Illinois	14	04	-23	78	0.68
Pennsylvania	-16	02	32	75	0.69
Missouri	61	46	11	-09	0.60
Iowa	57	31	-34	46	0.75

North Dakota	54	-24	-50	11	0.61
Oklahoma	54	27	-53	37	0.78
Virginia	-25	69	04	-14	0.52
Maryland	29	65	37	07	0.65
West Virginia	36	65	-07	20	0.60
North Carolina	-31	62	-34	-38	0.74
Delaware	17	59	51	17	0.66
Wisconsin	14	-53	08	48	0.54
Kansas	49	08	-56	45	0.76
Louisiana	-17	55	-63	-11	0.74
Minnesota	17	-37	-02	66	0.60
New York	04	-29	53	56	0.68
New Jersey	00	-48	31	55	0.63
Indiana	43	47	03	54	0.70
Wyoming	42	-41	-30	51	0.71

- -

Cumulative percentages of total
   variance are: 29.8   52.1   66.1   75.7

---

*Decimals are omitted from factor loadings; FL 0.71 are significant with
p 0.01.

Table 9

TYPAL ARRAY OF POLICY TRADITIONS

	Type			
Policy Tradition	I	II	III	IV
Nineteenth Century				
I. Western Populist	1.7	-0.5	-0.9	-0.3
II. Southern Parochial	-0.6	1.9	-0.6	-0.9
III. Northeastern Bureaucratic	-1.3	-0.9	1.8	-1.9
IV. Mid-American Industrial	-0.4	-1.1	-0.9	1.4
Early Twentieth Century				
I. Western Populist	1.7	-0.5	-0.2	-0.2
II. Southern Parochial	-1.0	1.5	-0.7	-0.8
III. Northeastern Bureaucratic	-0.9	-0.4	1.6	0.8
IV. Mid-American	-0.6	-0.8	-0.8	0.9
Later Twentieth Century				
I. Northeastern	0.7	0.1	1.7	1.5
II. Southern Parochial	-0.2	1.4	-0.6	-0.6
III. Western (truncated)	-0.4	-0.8	-0.3	-0.7
IV. Mid-Western	1.1	0.3	-0.0	0.7

as sunset laws, energy agencies, generic drug substitution laws, and the legalization of laetrile suggest integrative tendencies. Sectional deviations still exist, for example, in such matters as equal rights for women and collective bargaining for employees, but these are continuing issues from an earlier time. Thus, sectionalism will likely continue to color patterns of state policy making for the remainder of this century. For better or worse, then, a more universal pattern seems to be more likely in the foreseeable future barring any significant changes in present American socioeconomic trends.

ENDNOTES

*This essay is a revised version of a paper originally presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Political Science Association, Fort Worth, Texas, March, 1979.

[1]Cf. Vickers (1967). The more general view of politics leading to this emphasis on choice as a key element in the understanding of political behavior flows especially from Deutsch (1966) and Nimmo and Ungs (1967); and more generally from the works of Friedrich Nietzsche and Albert Camus.

[2]Cf. also the Preface to Deutsch (1966: pp.vii-viii).

[3]Notable works on regionalism in American politics include Elazar (1970, 1972); Elazar and Zikmund (1975); Jensen (1951); Luttbeg (1970); Patterson (1968); Savage (1973, 1975); Sharkansky (1970).

[4]V.O. Key and his students in their various works on specific American regions follow this mode, as does Sharkansky (1970).

[5]Cf. the usage of the eminent anthropologist, Julian Steward (1955). Luttbeg (1970) and Savage (1973, 1975) follow his construction.

[6]For a succinct examination of the alternative modes of regional analysis, see the introduction to Berry and Hankins (1963).

[7]Cf., e.g., Hofferbert (1966). However, he seems to retreat from this position later (1968).

[8]Unfortunately, the heuristic essay by Crittenden (1967) is generally overlooked.

[9]Alaska and Hawaii are dropped from consideration as the requisite information is not available for most of the policies.

[10]The analyses reported here are not simply expansions of the Q-factor derived structures of regional policy diffusion reported in Walker's (1969) seminal study of innovation diffusion among the American states. His method of computing the adoption scores has the effect of producing a doubly-standardized matrix for factoring. This reduces the variance primarily to within-state variance, and the resulting factors more closely correspond to what I have labeled as "policy profiles" elsewhere (1971). The factors reported here retain the full temporal variation and are rightly called "policy traditions."

[11]The eigenvalue-one criterion produced 8-factor solutions for both of the two earlier periods and a 10-factor solution for the last period. The eigenvalues for the 19th century are 20.2, 5.6, 3.7, 2.0, 1.6, 1.3, 1.2, and 1.2 respectively. For the early twentieth century they are 19.1, 6.0, 3.4, 2.5, 1.9, 1.6, 1.4, and 1.1. In the last period, the ten eigenvalues are 5.5, 3.5, 2.6, 2.5, 2.3, 2.0, 1.9, 1.9, 1.7, and 1.6. Strictly interpreted, the scree test strongly points to a three-fac-

-227-

tor solution as more correct statistically but for comparative and substantive pur-
poses I have used a four-factor solution. Rummel (1970) is a readable source for
reviewing this and other technical aspects of factor analysis for the reader un-
familiar with these decision criteria.
    [12]This appellation seems further supported as the concern for limiting what
appeared to many as the unfair access of corporations to government conforms to the
marketplace conception of government as Elazar (1972) posits for the Individuali-
stic political subculture. And it is especially in the more easterly states of
Factor IV that he locates the origins of this subculture.
    [13]The measure of correlation is the Pearsonian r.
    [14]Initially, an eigenvalue-one criterion was used to determine the number of
factors, resulting in a six-factor solution. However, only the first four factors
had states with significant saturations. A five-factor solution had the same re-
sult; thus, the four-factor solution is presented here. The four factors very
acceptably explain almost 75% of the variance, and only four states have communali-
ties (h^2) under 0.60.
    [15]See Steward (1955) for a comprehensive analysis of these alternative cultural
dynamics. Also, see Savage (1973) for their application in a broader socioeconomic
and political context to the American states than that presented here.

REFERENCES

Berry, Brian J.L., and Thomas D. Hankins
  1963 A Bibliographic Guide to the Economic Regions of the United States. Chicago:
        Department of Geography Research Paper No. 87, University of Chicago.
Crittenden, John
  1967 "Dimensions of modernization in the American states." American Political
        Science Review 61:989-1001.
Deutsch, Karl W.
  1966 The Nerves of Government: Models of Political Communication and Control.
        New York: Free Press.
  1969 "Some quantitative constraints on value allocation in society and politics."
        Pp. 347-65 in Arnold A. Rogow (ed.), Politics, Personality and Social Sci-
        ence in the Twentieth Century: Essays in Honor of Harold D. Lasswell. Chi-
        cago: University of Chicago Press.
Elazar, Daniel J.
  1970 Cities of the Prairie. New York: Basic Books.
  1972 American Federalism: A View from the States, Second Edition. New York:
        Thomas Y. Crowell.
Elazar, Daniel J., and Joseph Zikmund II (eds.)
  1975 The Ecology of American Political Culture: Readings. New York: Thomas Y.
        Crowell.
Hofferbert, Richard I.
  1966 "Ecological development and policy change in the American states." Midwest
        Journal of Political Science 10:464-83.
  1968 "Socioeconomic dimensions of the American states." Midwest Journal of Polit-
        ical Science 12:401-18.
Jensen, Merrill (ed.)

  1951 Regionalism in America. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
Kluckhohn, Clyde
  1951 "The study of culture." Pp. 86-101 in Daniel Lerner and Harold D. Lasswell
       (eds.), The Policy Sciences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Kluckhohn, Clyde, and William H. Kelly
  1945 "The concept of culture." Pp. 78-106 in Ralph Linton (ed.), The Science of
       Man in the World Crisis. New York: Columbia University Press.
Kroeber, A.L., and Clyde Kluckhohn
  n.d. Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions. New York: Vintage
       Books.
Luttbeg, Norman R.
  1971 "Classifying the American states: an empirical attempt to identify internal
       variations." Midwest Journal of Political Science 15:703-21.
Nimmo, Dan, and Thomas D. Ungs
  1967 American Political Patterns: Conflict and Consensus. Boston: Little, Brown.
Paige, Glenn D.
  1966 "The rediscovery of politics." Pp. 49-58 in John D. Montgomery and William
       J. Siffin (eds.), Approaches to Development: Politics, Administration and
       Change. New York: McGraw-Hill.
Patterson, Samuel G.
  1968 "The political cultures of the American states." Journal of Politcs 30:198-
       209.
Riggs, Fred W.
  1968 "Political aspects of developmental change." Pp. 130-71 in Art Gallaher,
       Jr. (ed.), Perspectives in Developmental Change. Lexington: University of
       Kentucky Press.
Rummel, R.J.
  1970 Applied Factor Analysis. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
Savage, Robert L.
  1971 "Sociocultural Change and Policy Values in the American States." Unpublished
       Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia.
  1973 "Patterns of multilinear evolution in the American states." Publius 3:75-
       108.
  1975 "The distribution and development of policy values in the American states."
       Pp. 263-83 in Daniel J. Elazar and Joseph Zikmund (eds.), The Ecology of
       American Political Culture: Readings. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.
  1978 "Policy innovativeness as a trait of American states." Journal of Politics
       40:212-224.
Sharkansky, Ira
  1970 Regionalism in American Politics. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
Steward, Julian H.
  1955 Theory of Culture Change: The Methodology of Multilinear Evolution. Urbana:
       University of Illinois Press.
Thorson, Thomas Landon
  1970 Biopolitics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
Vickers, Geoffrey
  1967 "The multivalued choice." Pp. 259-78 in Lee Thayer (ed.), Communication:
       Concepts and Perspectives. Washington, DC: Spartan Books.

Walker, Jack L.
  1969 "The diffusion of innovations among the American states." American Politi-
       cal Science Review. 63:880-99.