



5-1998

Elazar's Political Culture: Is It Applicable Today?

Mark M. Springer

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Springer, Mark M., "Elazar's Political Culture: Is It Applicable Today?" (1998). *Theses and Dissertations*. 792.
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/792>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact zeinebyousif@library.und.edu.

ELAZAR'S POLITICAL CULTURE: IS IT APPLICABLE TODAY?

By

Mark M. Springer
Bachelor of Arts, University of North Dakota, 1996

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

Grand Forks, North Dakota

May

1998

1998
Sp 83

This thesis, submitted by Mark M. Springer in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts from the University of North Dakota, has been read by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done and is hereby approved.

Robert W. Kweit
(Chairperson)

May Ann Kweit

J. J. Vinton

This thesis meets the standards for appearance, conforms to the style and format requirements of the Graduate School of the University of North Dakota, and is hereby approved.

Harvey Knell
Dean of the Graduate School

4-24-98

Date

PERMISSION

Title Elazar's Political Culture: Is it Applicable Today?
Department Political Science
Degree Master of Arts

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my thesis work or, in the professor's absence, by the chairperson of the department or the dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this thesis or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.


Signature 
Date 4-23-98

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vii
ABSTRACT.....	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
DEFINING POLITICAL CULTURE.....	3
UTILITY OF POLITICAL CULTURE.....	9
CHANGES IN TRADITIONALISTIC CULTURE.....	11
OTHER STUDIES.....	13
II. METHOD.....	16
DESCRIPTION OF VARIABLES.....	16
THE PROBLEM PRESENTED.....	30
III. RESULTS.....	32
RESEARCH PRESENTED.....	32
IV. CONCLUSIONS.....	39
RESEARCH PROBLEMS EXPLAINED.....	39
HYPOTHESIS EXAMINED.....	41
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	44

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Dependent Variables Used in Testing the Scale of Political Culture (Sharkansky's).....	18
2. Dependent Variables Used in Testing the Scale of Political Culture (Springer 1998).....	20
3. Sharkansky's Political Culture Scale (with Elazar's continuum).....	23
4. Coefficients of Simple Correlation Between the Scale of Political Culture and Dependent Variables (Sharkansky's).....	25
5. Coefficients of Partial Correlation Between the Scale of Political Culture and Selected Dependent, While Controlling for Personal Income and Urbanism.....	27
6. The Member States of Region Used in Testing the Scale of Political Culture.....	28
7. Analysis of Covariance: Intraclass Correlations Between the Scale of Political Culture and Selected Dependent Variables While Controlling for Region.....	30
8. Coefficients of Simple Correlation Between the Scale of Political Culture and Dependent Variables for 1996, 1997 and Sharkansky's Study.....	33
9. Coefficients of Partial Correlation Between the Scale of Political Culture and Selected Dependent, While Controlling for Personal Income and Urbanism for 1996, 1997 and Sharkansky's Study.....	36

List of Tables - continued

10.	Analysis of Covariance: Intraclass Correlations Between the Scale of Political Culture and Selected Dependent Variables While Controlling for Region for 1996, 1997 and Sharkansky's Study.....	37
-----	---	----

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to express his appreciation to his Graduate Committee, Dr. Robert Kweit for taking on the role of advisor and encouraging this study; Dr. Mary Grisez Kweit for providing research material and advisement; and Dr. James F. Vivian for agreeing to help with this project. Each member's patience has allowed me to finish this with confidence. Thank you.

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the utility of Daniel J. Elazar's political culture, developed in 1966. Dr. Ira Sharkansky conceptualized Elazar's political culture in 1969 by applying measures pertaining to participation; size and perquisites of bureaucracy; and scope, magnitude, costs, and innovative character of government programs. He used simple correlation, Pearson's r , to determine whether political culture had any influence on the 23 dependent variables that he arranged under the three different measures. Then, he tested for partial correlation, using per capita personal income and the percentage of the population living in areas considered "urban" as controlling variables. Finally, he tested the variables which were found significant at the .05 level, along with his scale of political culture, to see if the scale persists across regional demarcations using analysis of covariance.

This paper replicated these measures for two years, 1996 and 1997, using data from the *Statistical Abstract*, and compared it to Sharkansky's study. The hypothesis was that the Traditionalistic culture Sharkansky was studying had changed over time due to changes in southern political culture as a result of increased urbanism and migration from the North. However, this study proves that certain measures still show negative correlations that are consistent with Sharkansky's study. Future research should take into consideration a closer examination of the variables used in this study.

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Background

Daniel Elazar proposed a new method for looking at the states in 1966 with his concept of political culture, combining personal observation and historical measures to create a definition that allows one to understand why those in government act they way they do, and what influences their decision-making abilities, along with a better understanding of citizen interaction with state governments.¹ Elazar found that political culture is an unconscious reaction to factors around policymakers and residents that permeated their actions and was derived from their shared cultural experience and location.

Although Elazar's concept had appeal, it lacked statistical measures to prove its existence and its longevity. Fortunately, others in the field of political science took it upon themselves to make Elazar's idea of political culture useful for future research. Ira Sharkansky, then a professor at the University of Wisconsin, first announced his study of Elazar's political culture in the publication *Polity* in 1969.² Sharkansky, realizing that

¹Daniel J. Elazar, *American Federalism: A View From the States* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1966), 84-85.

²Ira Sharkansky, "The Utility of Elazar's Political Culture" in *Polity* Vol. 2, No. 1 (Fall 1969): 66-83.

essential parts of Elazar's culture could not be easily measured, created standards that allowed him to evaluate the utility of Elazar's political culture. Sharkansky created three hypotheses implicit within the framework of Elazar's political culture.

The first hypothesis stated that "the closer a state's culture is to Traditionalism, the *lower* it will be on the measures pertaining to *political participation*" (emphasis added by Sharkansky). The second hypothesis was "the closer a state's culture is to Traditionalism, the *lower* is will score on measures pertaining to the *size and perquisites of the government bureaucracy*." Finally, the third hypothesis held that "the closer a state's culture is to Traditionalism, the *lower* it will score on measures pertaining to the *scope, magnitude or costs of government programs*."³

Traditionalistic culture is generally associated with the Upper and Lower southern states and follows the idea that participation is reserved for those with an elite status, an opposition by the citizens to government growth, and an opposition to government intervention. Sharkansky discovered that his first hypothesis, pertaining to measures of political participation, was more strongly supported through three levels of analysis than his other two hypotheses. This led him to believe that Elazar's scale of political culture was viable under certain conditions. However, he noticed the need to further examine the extent to which political culture enhances our knowledge of participation, public financing, and public services in state governments. It is this observation that prompted this research.

The goal of this thesis is to replicate Sharkansky's study under the guidelines that

³Ibid, 70.

he proposed in the Fall 1969 issue of *Polity*. These measures are replicated twice, using data from the *Statistical Abstract of the United States* for the years 1996 and 1997. This not only allows one to see the differences in Sharkansky's study over time but also assumes that there is a continued degree of change within the last few years. This will test the hypothesis that Sharkansky's conclusions are no longer valid, changed by the increased urbanism and migration within the Traditionalistic states.

First of all, it is necessary to understand political culture and what it attempts to explain. This will allow one to understand how political culture is used and what applications it has for society. Understanding the problems that researchers have encountered when attempting to grasp a measure of political culture holds true for this study as well and will be explained. Finally, the results of this study will be presented and an interpretation will be given for the data produced, along with future considerations for research and conclusions resulting from this study.

Defining Political Culture

Developing a concept of what political culture is derives from how one approaches the idea of culture itself. Many definitions of culture center around the idea that it serves as a starting point for studying social interaction. This allows a reference point that can show development of base concepts in collaborations between more than one person, and take as a "given" into situations that involve human subjects.⁴ Culture, thus, creates a system that allows for observation of what society is and what

⁴Donald J. Devine, *The Political Culture of the United States: The Influence of Member Values on Regime Maintenance* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1972), 3.

relationships will persist within that society.⁵

Anthropologists believe that in order for a culture to persist, it must maintain support toward “principled beliefs, rule norms, artifacts, and symbols.”⁶ From a political perspective, these beliefs are present in American thought in the concept of democracy, rule norms are constant in an accepted form of government through popular support, artifacts are shared in the United States’ preservation of landmarks, and symbols are present with items, such as the American flag, respected by many. This creates an identity that can be shared by a nation, yet unique to the individual by how widely these views are shared within his/her region.

In order for a concept to be considered a part of the culture, it must show persistence over time. This can happen through different processes. Enculturation involves the use of social roles as a means for passing on ideas and understandings. Institutional responsibilities also hold members to strict observance of practices that are instilled at an early age.⁷ For Americans, this is developed in institutions and societal roles such as public education, community events, and acceptance of ideals within a community.

Political culture, therefore, attempts to explain the “modalities” that endure within

⁵Joel Lieske, “Political Subcultures of the United States: A New Measure for Understanding Social and Political Behavior,” Paper Delivered at the 1991 meeting of the American Political Science Association, 2.

⁶Donald J. Devine, *The Political Culture of the United States*, 5.

⁷David Hackett Fischer, *Albion’s Seed: Four British Folkways In America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 896.

communities and show in the relationships between government and its citizens.⁸ The transfer of values within a political community is often referred to as political socialization. This process comes into jeopardy when there is a departure from the indoctrination of principles that are commonly accepted in society.⁹ However, this is usually difficult to do because political persistence, like cultural continuity, relies on homogeneity between members.¹⁰

Although the definition of culture is important to political culture, values must also be political in nature in order for them to be considered in any examination of government on a cultural scale.¹¹ Many theories on political culture work under the assumption that a master theory is developed through subsets of political behavior that build on each other to create a broader view of society. Each belief fits into a larger concept that embodies a comprehensive idea of political culture along a continuum.¹²

The American states are often used to develop a pattern of one particular unit fitting into a collective identity of the smaller units; one smaller “box” fitting into a larger box. States are unified under common goals and purposes but remain individual in their

⁸Daniel J. Elazar, “Steps in the Study of American Culture” in *Political Culture, Public Policy and the American States*, ed. John Kincaid (Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1982), 228.

⁹Donald J. Devine, *The Political Culture of the United States*, 17.

¹⁰Joshua Parens, “Multiculturalism and the Problem of Particularism” in *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 88, No. 1 (1994): 170.

¹¹Donald J. Devine, *The Political Culture of the United States*, 15.

¹²Lawrence J. R. Herson, *The Politics of Ideas: Political Theory and American Public Policy* (Homewood: The Dorsey Press, 1984), 233.

approaches and values that they place on the structures within their own entity.¹³ This allows them to maintain their own individual or group cultures, depending on the prevalent view that one has toward behavioral interaction between the states. Most often, they are grouped by a common regional boundary that has created a pattern of interaction between those within the group and a popular view toward political norms that are persistent over time.

One of the first investigations into political culture that used regional boundaries was done by Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba. Their “master theory” looked at how civic virtue, especially political attitudes and social attitudes, fostered democracy in five different nations. They found that the United States and Great Britain exhibited strong tendencies, because of their ability to take action, toward democracy and democratic ideals. Italy, Germany, and Mexico, on the other hand, showed either a lack of commitment to the system in place or a lack of pride for the performance of the government.¹⁴

Almond and Verba are recognized not just for their study but the ideas that they presented on political culture that established conditions for future studies on political culture. “Our study stresses orientation to political structure and process, not orientation to the substance of political demands and outputs.” Almond and Verba set up future

¹³Robert L. Savage, “Patterns of Multilinear Evolution in the American States” in *Political Culture, Public Policy and the American States*, ed. John Kincaid, (Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1982), 26.

¹⁴Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba, *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), 489.

studies, such as Elazar's, by stating that "a similar rigorous separation of public policy orientation, general culture orientation, and socialization patterns" would be necessary to examine the demands and outputs of systems.¹⁵

Some, including Elazar, believe that the developments of boundary and how it relates to demands and outputs are the result of early migrations in American history that left a mark on the region and its development of culture thereafter. David Hackett Fischer, in his book *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways In America*, believes that political culture is the result of four mass migrations by Britains into the United States. The first migration was the result of Puritans moving into the upper North colonies. The second is the result of elite Royalists moving from South England into the colony areas of the South. The third migration was the English and Welch into the middle country through the Delaware Valley and the fourth was the northern British into the Appalachian country. His theory drew patterns between the political culture dominant in parts of Great Britain that have been manifested throughout America along a straight migration across from these initial landing points, contending that all of America is the product of Albion (the first recorded name of Britain given by the Greeks).

Another example of political culture that uses regional demarcation is Joel Garreau's *The Nine Nations of North America*. His divisions include 1) New England, which goes north from New Haven along the Appalachian Mountains and includes New Foundland; 2) The Foundry, which covers Green Bay to Indianapolis to Washington, D.C., along the Appalachians and around the Great Lakes; 3) Ecotopia, which is along the

¹⁵Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba, *The Civic Culture*, 29.

west coast from San Francisco up to Alaska; 4) Dixie, which is all of the states of the former Confederacy; 5) The Islands, which includes Miami, FL and the surrounding islands of Cuba; 6) Mexamerica, which includes most of California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas and all of Mexico; 7) the Empty Quarter, which is placed along the Rocky Mountains with Las Vegas and Denver serving as the lower borders, up to the Canadian Shield and parts of Alaska; 8) the Breadbasket, which runs from Austin to Denver and St. Louis, around Lake Superior and up into Canada; and 9) Quebec, which he states has a “unique” culture of its own. Garreau developed his ideas as a reporter, basing his observations of culture and politics on speech and habitual conditions within the regions.

So far, these cultural observations point to an organizational perspective that attempts to take into account time, space and interaction within an area.¹⁶ This is especially true for Elazar’s concept of political culture.¹⁷ He defines U.S. political culture using three subcultures - individualistic, moralistic, and traditionalistic. Since the basic components and region of the traditionalistic culture has already been examined, it is necessary to explain the individualistic and moralistic cultures to understand how they interact and what their key concepts are.

The individualistic culture believes that government involvement should be limited in its functions and conducted along the same basis that a business would conduct itself, namely, providing what people demand and expecting adequate compensation for

¹⁶J. Steven Ott, *The Organizational Culture Perspective* (Chicago: The Dorsey Press, 1989), 54-55.

¹⁷Daniel J. Elazar, *The American Mosaic: The Impact of Space, Time, and Culture on American Politics* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1994), 229-237.

their efforts. Mutual obligation is pervasive in this society and public officials are expected to perform their services as demanded by the public. Bureaucracy is seen almost as a necessary evil. In one sense, people see the merit system as going against the idea of getting something in return for their support. On the other hand, many officials within the bureaucracy are appointed or elected so they are somehow politically influenced through the people. Change in any direction is determined by what people get in return for their support. Individualistic culture is basically prevalent in the Middle states.

In the moralistic political culture, politics is virtuous and the belief is that government is good, committed to the welfare of the citizens and embodying the virtues of the society. Public service and involvement are encouraged and expected by all citizens. Change does not present a problem as long as the ends are moral. The merit system within a moralistic bureaucracy is rigid and the only major concern for those within a moralistic culture toward bureaucracy is that large scale organization includes the federal government, which tends to eliminate part of the role that a community plays in the development of programs. The region mainly associated with moralistic political culture is New England.

For Elazar's purposes, "political culture can best be understood in terms of the framework it sets for individual and group political behavior - in terms of the political thoughts, attitudes, assumptions and values of individuals and groups and in a range of permissible or acceptable action that flows from them."¹⁸ Although other studies

¹⁸Ibid, 3.

incorporate some aspect of these ideas, Elazar has developed a methodology that performs a distinctive analysis of different regions throughout the United States and relates all of the subcultures to strong political components that are the base of political culture. This allows one to examine regions for their similarities and differences.

Utility of Political Culture

By examining different regions, one can see the differences in traits and values of people living in a similar environmental background, both physical and cultural.¹⁹ Some of the differences that persist are so minute in nature that they may go unnoticed except when some abstraction of culture is used to reinforce these dissimilarities. Policy is one area in which many leaders are faced with the same restrictions with regard to money and national assistance. Recognizing the extent to which a political culture exists across state boundaries can allow one to see characteristics that are shared between states.²⁰

The South is a region often picked for studies because its history has produced a culture that not only ties each state together but also unifies them against a predominant national culture. The southern states that banded together to form the Confederacy maintain a high level of states rights while showing a strong resistance to change in the form of civil rights.²¹ Other factors that have contributed to the South's distinctive and observable culture are the forces behind the mechanization of agriculture in the South and

¹⁹Robert J. Savage, "The Distribution and Development of Policy Values" in *The Ecology of American Political Culture: Readings*, ed. Daniel J. Elazar and Joseph Zikmund II (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1975), 274.

²⁰Ibid, 265.

²¹Donald J. Devine, *The Political Culture of the United States*, 266.

the urbanization movement that developed during the twentieth century. Both show a resistance to change while necessitating the acceptance of these measures to facilitate a working economy.²²

Some studies have focused on how political culture can be linked to violence. A strong military tradition in the South, along with how southerners dealt with race issues, shows a predisposition toward violence that has persisted across time. This includes recent reports of southern cities such as New Orleans, Miami, and Atlanta as having the highest murder rates in the country (not to mention Washington, D.C.).²³

Another viewpoint on how political culture can be used is the organizational culture perspective. This allows one to use region as a reference for learning how people react in different situations.²⁴ Knowing how a region works allows one to develop an approach for dealing with different problems that persist and how to solve them within the mind set of that culture.

All of this lends support for Sharkansky's study and how it best utilizes Elazar's political culture by focusing on the Traditionalistic culture. Some researchers maintain that Elazar's subcultures vary too much and are subjective; however, they often contend that a lot of interpretation within the social sciences has some degree of objectivity and when measuring something that is not altogether visible, it is important to recognize that Elazar's measures have remained constant over a long period of time. After 25 plus years

²²Joel Lieske, "Political Subcultures of the United States," 8.

²³David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed*, 892

²⁴J. Steven Ott, *The Organizational Culture Perspective*, 1.

of testing, Elazar's concept of political culture still holds true, unlike other concepts that have failed the test of time.²⁵ Elazar's political culture has been the subject of many research designs, some lending support to his conclusions by showing that it has allowed people to make prejudgments on policy and political decisions based on political culture perspectives.²⁶

Changes in Traditionalistic Culture

Changes within the Traditionalistic political culture are already observable in Southern states. Metropolitan growth has forced many southern politicians to reconsider federal funds in order to provide for a more attractive environment for businesses.²⁷ These national influences can be perceived as threats to the economic and social well-being of a community. Traditionalistic political culture believes in a federalistic structure in which states' rights are protected. However, the intergovernmental relations between state departments and federal departments may create a bureaucracy that will make urban growth more easy, allowing change to progress in the "new" South.²⁸

Although metropolitan growth has created new opportunities for southern businesses, politics still maintains an elitist tradition that does not allow changes to go

²⁵Joel Lieske, "Political Subcultures of the United States," 1.

²⁶Virginia Gray, "The Socioeconomic and Political Context of States" in *Politics in the American States: A Comparative Analysis*, 6th ed., ed. Virginia Gray and Herbert Jacob (Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1996), 27.

²⁷Earl Black and Merle Black, *Politics and Society in the South* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987), 45.

²⁸Robert L. Savage, "Patterns of Multilinear Evolution," 48.

unchallenged.²⁹ Some have pointed out that urban growth within the South is due in large part to annexation of smaller communities, which maintain their community identity without actually becoming a suburb, and this growth is only artificial because the city itself has not moved in to develop the small towns that it has taken over.³⁰ This would support the concept that a traditionalistic culture is still prevalent within the South.

Evidence that would support changes in the traditionalistic culture would include growth of southern cities, which can also be attributed to the technological advances in the communication industry. This has allowed businesses to relocate where the climate will attract perspective employees and operations can stay in contact with each other across the country.³¹ Southern urban growth's influence on politics has changed the values that are associated with being a politician. A person running for office must consider both the "static" demands of citizens and the increasing push for "progress."³² This could explain some of the changes in attitudes towards participation in the traditionalistic culture, especially for the 1996 data in this study not showing a .05 significance level for those voting for governor.

Sharkansky's study has become synonymous with Elazar's works in many circles. Some praise his addition to understanding Elazar's political culture by producing a

²⁹Ibid, 25.

³⁰Joel Garreau, *The Nine Nations of North America* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1981), 141.

³¹Robert L. Savage, "Patterns of Multilinear Evolution in the American States," 48.

³²Earl Black and Merle Black, *Politics and Society in the South*, 303.

political culture scale for each state.³³ Others have shown that Sharkansky's cultural index lacks the depth needed when it comes to measures that try to examine intrastate relations.³⁴ Although this would be true if Sharkansky was studying measures within the states themselves, his focus was on regional perspectives.³⁵ It is this focus that makes this study unique because other studies have tended to examine intrastate differences.

Other Studies

As stated before, a focus on the South for studying political culture allows one to see any changes more acutely than would be the case in other environments because of its distinctive characteristics that do not allow for fast change. One person who has used the South as a basis for studying political culture is Robert Savage. In 1975, he examined the development of policy values and found that the South had an innovative approach to fiscal policy but maintained the status quo through a paternal-cadre of association in politics.³⁶

Savage later looked at evolution in the United States, examining them through use of Elazar's political culture and developing a factor scale to allow easier understanding of what level each state exhibits their subcultural designations and which subculture, either moralistic, individualistic, or traditionalistic, is most likely to influence when there are variations along the political culture continuum. He found that lack of education

³³Robert L. Savage, "Patterns of Multilinear Evolution in the American States," 27.

³⁴Joel Lieske, "Political Subcultures of the United States," 12.

³⁵Ira Sharkansky, "The Utility of Elazar's Political Culture," 73.

³⁶Robert L. Savage, "The Distribution and Development of Policy Values," 274.

continues to persist in the South.³⁷ This, in particular, supports the level of significance found for the number of ninth grade students that graduate from high school.

Joel Lieske attempted to develop a better system for measuring subcultures by looking at social structure, racial origin, ethnic ancestry, and religious affiliation as the sources of political culture. Lieske believed that a good measure of political culture would reflect current conditions and be replicable using mathematical and statistical analysis. He examined subcultures on the county level using cluster analysis which allowed for a larger data set and helped distinguish patterns that were grouped.³⁸ His research showed a close relationship to Elazar's findings on a county level and allows one to see that counties are also useful for conceptualizing conflict between subcultures.

³⁷Robert L. Savage, "Patterns of Multilinear Evolution in the American States," 42.

³⁸Joel Lieske, "Political Subcultures of the United States," 2.

CHAPTER II

Method

Description of Variables

In Sharkansky's study, he relies on 23 dependent variables that he describes as "likely correlates of political culture."³⁹ These include measures pertaining to participation, measures pertaining to the size and perquisites of the bureaucracy, and measures pertaining to the scope, magnitude, costs, and innovative character of government programs. These variables are listed in Table 1 with the subheadings that Sharkansky used to divide each section of dependent variables. He used the *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1964* to obtain data from 1960, 1961, and 1963 for his research.

Table 2 lists the dependent variables that were used in this replication. Unfortunately, the *Statistical Abstract* no longer lists the score for each state for Milbrath's index of suffrage regulations, which was also unattainable through other sources. This measure, therefore, was dropped from the study. In addition, the percentage of selective service registrants who pass mental examinations for each state was also not provided. This dependent variable was also dropped. This study was also forced to combine dependent variables six and seven on Sharkansky's scale, pertaining to

³⁹Ira Sharkansky, "The Utility of Elazar's Political Culture," 72.

percentage of state and local employees covered by health and hospital insurance supported in part by the government, and those covered by life insurance in number seven, because both of the *Statistical Abstract's* used in this study did not provide these measures but instead provided an overall percentage for the entire United States. This was broken down by figuring out the total number of government employees in each state that were covered by health, hospital, and life insurance (these were all the same percentage for each state but were computed using percentages for employees per capita given by the *Statistical Abstract*) for full-time equivalent employees so that the differences could be examined this way instead.

Additionally, Sharkansky did not accurately describe his use of data for measures pertaining to dependent variables number one and number two. Since many state governors are elected in different election years, he did not specify how one would handle the disparities in voter population between Governors and U.S. Representatives elected in one year and those elected a few years later. This study filled in missing cases from 1994 with election results from 1992 and 1996 missing cases from 1994. This may not be an accurate measurement due to incongruities in case measurement but the statistical output seems to support the idea that Sharkansky performed similar procedures for both the percent voting for Governor and the percent voting for U.S. Representatives

Table 1: Dependent Variables Used in Testing the Scale of Political Culture
(Sharkansky's)

Measures pertaining to participation:

- 1) percentage of voting age population voting for Governor
- 2) percentage of voting age population voting for U.S. Representative
- 3) the number of "facilitating" scores each state received on Milbrath's index of suffrage regulations

Measures pertaining to the size and perquisites of the bureaucracy:

- 4) number of state and local government employees per 10,000 population
- 5) average salary of state and local government employees
- 6) percentage of state and local government employees covered by health and hospital insurance covered in part by government
- 7) percentage of state and local government employees covered by life insurance supported in part by government

Measures pertaining to the scope, magnitude, costs, and innovative character of government programs:

- 8) the percentage of citizen's personal income that is paid in taxes to state and local governments
- 9) total state and local government expenditures per capita
- 10) percentage of ninth grade students who remain in high school
- 11) percentage of selective service registrants who passed a mental examination
- 12) total road mileage per capita
- 13) total municipal road mileage per capita
- 14) total rural road mileage per rural resident
- 15) percentage of the state's designated Interstate Highway mileage completed by 1962
- 16) average payment to recipients of Aid to Families of Dependent Children
- 17) average payment to recipients of Old Age Assistance
- 18) average payment to recipients of Aid to the Blind
- 19) average payment to recipients of Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled
- 20) number of AFDC recipients among population with incomes of less than \$2000
- 21) number of OAA recipients among population with incomes of less than \$2000

Table 1 - continued

- 22) number of AB recipients among population with incomes less than \$2000 and over 65 years of age
- 22) number of AB recipients among population with incomes of less than \$2000
- 23) number of APTD recipients among population with incomes of less than \$2000

Table 2: Dependent Variables Used in Testing the Scale of Political Culture
(Springer 1998)

Measures pertaining to participation:

- 1) percentage of voting age population voting for Governor
- 2) percentage of voting age population voting for U.S. Representative

Measures pertaining to the size and perquisites of the bureaucracy:

- 3) number of state and local government employees per 10, 000 population
- 4) average salary of state and local government employees
- 5) total number of employees in state and local government covered by health, hospital and life insurance supported in part by government

Measures pertaining to scope, magnitude, costs, and innovative character of government programs:

- 6) the percentage of citizens' personal income that is paid in taxes to state and local governments
- 7) total state and local government expenditures per capita
- 8) percentage of ninth grade students who remain in high school until graduation
- 9) total road mileage per capita
- 10) total municipal road mileage per urban resident
- 11) total rural road mileage per rural resident
- 12) percentage of total road mileage that is Interstate highway mileage
- 13) average payment to recipients of Aid to Families of Dependent Children
- 14) average payment to recipients of Old Age Assistance
- 15) average payment to recipients of Aid to the Blind
- 16) average payment to recipients of Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled
- 17) number of AFDC recipients among population with incomes below poverty line
- 18) number of OAA recipients among population with incomes below poverty line and over 65 years of age
- 19) number of AB recipients among population with incomes below poverty line
- 20) number of APTD recipients among population with incomes below poverty line

when he performed this study using data from the *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1964* because the significance levels are similar.

It was necessary to make another change involving variables that Sharkansky used and those used in this study. Sharkansky used the percent of the state's designated Interstate Highway mileage completed by 1962. The Interstate Highway program is now complete, making this outdated. This study used the percentage of total road mileage that is Interstate Highway mileage to see which states were granted more road mileage, establishing how much federal funds were granted to a state and the influence of federal funds on state roads.

As seen in Table 2, there was another modification made necessary by the listings used in the *Statistical Abstract*. No indication was given for recipients of AFDC, OAA, AB, or APTD with incomes of less than \$2000 in the *Statistical Abstract*. This is a criticism of Sharkansky's study that has been raised before by research using the same methodology as Sharkansky.⁴⁰ Following the other researcher's example, this study used the total number of recipients and used population statistics to derive the percent living below the poverty line instead of Sharkansky's indication of those living below the \$2000 mark.

It must also be noted that Sharkansky used only the 48 mainland states. This concept has been repeated in the current research. The reasons for this, as explained by Elazar, are because the development of migration patterns and shared values that were

⁴⁰Edward J. Clynch, "A Critique of Ira Sharkansky's 'Utility of Elazar's Political Culture'," *Polity*, Vol. 5 (Fall 1972): 141.

established due to proximity make them more susceptible to study, whereas Hawaii and Alaska derive their own American political culture from distinctive participation in events that took place in the twentieth century. Sharkansky developed a scale of political culture from Elazar's notes that was used to test for simple correlation between each dependent variable and whether it maintained some relationship with culture. Table 3 shows each state's score on the political culture scale and includes the scale that Elazar uses to show a progression of cultural pervasion that is present throughout the different states. Elazar's scale will allow one to better interpret the results of Sharkansky's Political Culture Scale on Table 3.

Table 3: Sharkansky's Political Culture Scale (with Elazar's continuum)

Alabama	8.57	Nebraska	3.66
Arizona	5.66	Nevada	5.00
Arkansas	9.00	New Hampshire	2.33
California	3.55	New Jersey	4.00
Colorado	1.80	New Mexico	7.00
Connecticut	3.00	New York	3.62
Delaware	7.00	North Carolina	8.50
Florida	7.80	North Dakota	2.00
Georgia	8.80	Ohio	5.16
Idaho	2.50	Oklahoma	8.25
Illinois	4.72	Oregon	2.00
Indiana	6.33	Pennsylvania	4.28
Iowa	2.00	Rhode Island	3.00
Kansas	3.66	South Carolina	8.75
Kentucky	7.40	South Dakota	3.00
Louisiana	8.00	Tennessee	8.50
Maine	2.33	Texas	7.11
Maryland	7.00	Utah	2.00
Massachusetts	3.66	Vermont	2.33
Michigan	2.00	Virginia	7.86
Minnesota	1.00	Washington	1.66
Mississippi	9.00	West Virginia	7.33
Missouri	7.66	Wisconsin	2.00
Montana	3.00	Wyoming	4.00

M	MT	MI	IM	I	IT	TI	TM	T
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

$$C = \frac{\text{sum } c}{n}$$

C stands for the average numerical value assigned to a state's culture; c equals the value Elazar assigns subareas within a state; n equals the number of such designations within a state.

It is also important to make note that Elazar's definition of political culture allows flexibility to adapt for changes in political culture. He designed the progression scale to lend easier understanding of cultural persistence but this makes it difficult to fully develop a pure reading of political culture within the states because of the circular continuum created. This study, like Sharkansky's, straightens the continuum out in order to test for culture within a moment of time. Hopefully, use of this study with Sharkansky's will provide results that will enable one to see a change in culture over the course of time.

In the first analysis, Sharkansky took the dependent variables, along with the political culture scale, and found significant relationships (.05 level) for simple correlation, using Pearson's r . Then, he applied partial correlation to see whether the relationship between political culture and the dependent variables persisted when compared to environmental conditions that are often used in comparative studies. The two variables used for partial correlation were "per capita personal income and the percentage of the population living in areas considered 'urban' by the U.S. Bureau of the Census."⁴¹

The results of simple correlation showed significance for 15 of the 23 dependent variables at the .05 level. The results of Sharkansky's coefficients of simple correlation are shown in Table 4. The test for partial correlation showed significance in all but one of these 15 dependent variables. Sharkansky notes that the partial correlation was lower than the simple correlation, indicating that personal income and urbanism have an impact

⁴¹Ira Sharkansky, "The Utility of Elazar's Political Culture," 75.

Table 4: Coefficients of Simple Correlation Between the Scale of Political Culture and Dependent Variables

(Sharkansky's)

Measures pertaining to participation:

1) percent voting for Governor	-.59*
2) percent voting for U.S. Representative	-.79*
3) liberality of suffrage regulations	-.54*

Measures pertaining to bureaucracy:

4) number of government employees	-.44*
5) salary of government employees	-.57*
6) employees covered by health insurance	-.31*
7) employees covered by life insurance	-.11

Measures pertaining to government programs:

8) tax effort	-.43*
9) total expenditures/capita	-.62*
10) high school graduations	-.74*
11) exam successes	-.82*
12) total road mileage	.17
13) municipal road mileage	-.01
14) rural road mileage	-.24
15) completed I-system	-.30*
16) AFDC payment	-.75*
17) OAA payment	-.67*
18) AB payment	-.56*
19) APTD payment	-.42*
20) AFDC recipients	-.25
21) OAA recipients	-.11
22) AB recipients	.14
23) APTD recipients	-.21

* significant at the .05 level.

For complete definition of variables, see Table 1.

on politics and culture within the United States. However, this impact was not significant enough to displace the influence political culture has on the dependent variables. The results of Sharkansky's coefficients of partial correlation are shown in Table 5.

Next, Sharkansky used analysis of covariance to determine whether region had any affect on political culture and the level of significance that he found in the 15 dependent variables. He used two demarcations to control for region, believing his study would prove that traits persisted independent of time and location. These demarcations are used in this study and are shown on Table 6. Sharkansky's results indicate levels of significance at the .05 level for 6 of the 15 variables. From these results, one can see that measurements pertaining to participation and to government programs appear to prove that political culture crosses regional boundaries and is persistent over time. The results from Sharkansky's analysis of covariance are displayed in Table 7.

Table 5: Coefficients of Partial Correlation Between the Scale of Political Culture and Selected Dependent Variables, † While Controlling for Personal Income and Urbanism

Measures pertaining to participation:

1) percent voting for Governor	-.45*
2) percent voting for U.S. Representative	-.71*
3) liberality of suffrage regulations	-.46*

Measures pertaining to bureaucracy:

4) number of government employees	-.31*
5) salary of government employees	-.36*
6) employees covered by health insurance	-.31*

Measures pertaining to government programs:

8) tax effort	-.64*
9) total expenditures/capita	-.47*
10) high school graduations	-.66*
11) exam successes	-.76*
15) completed I-system	-.20
16) AFDC payment	-.68*
17) OAA payment	-.58*
18) AB payment	-.42*
19) APTD payment	-.37*

† Selected on the basis of significant coefficients of simple correlation with the scale of political culture.

* significant at the .05 level

For a complete definition of each variable, see Table 1.

Table 6: The Member States of Region Used in Testing the Scale of Political Culture

Demarcation #1	Demarcation #2
Northeast:	New England:
Maine	Maine
New Hampshire	New Hampshire
Vermont	Vermont
Massachusetts	Massachusetts
Rhode Island	Rhode Island
Connecticut	Connecticut
New York	
New Jersey	Middle Atlantic:
Pennsylvania	New York
	New Jersey
North Central:	Pennsylvania
Ohio	Maryland
Indiana	Delaware
Michigan	
Illinois	Upper South:
Wisconsin	Virginia
Minnesota	West Virginia
Iowa	North Carolina
Missouri	Kentucky
North Dakota	Tennessee
South Dakota	
Nebraska	Lower South:
Kansas	South Carolina
	Georgia
South:	Florida
Maryland	Alabama
Delaware	Mississippi
Virginia	
West Virginia	Near West:
North Carolina	Ohio
South Carolina	Michigan
Georgia	Indiana
Florida	Wisconsin

Table 6 - continued

Demarcation #1	Demarcation #2
Kentucky	Illinois
Tennessee	
Alabama	North West:
Mississippi	Minnesota
Arkansas	Iowa
Louisiana	North Dakota
Oklahoma	South Dakota
Texas	Nebraska
	Kansas
West:	Montana
Montana	Wyoming
Wyoming	Colorado
Colorado	
New Mexico	South West:
Arizona	Missouri
Idaho	Arkansas
Utah	Louisiana
Washington	Oklahoma
Oregon	Texas
Nevada	New Mexico
California	
	Far West:
	Idaho
	Washington
	Oregon
	Nevada
	Utah
	Arizona
	California

Table 7: Analysis of Covariance: Intraclass Correlations Between the Scale of Political Culture and Selected Dependent Variables While Controlling for Region†

	Demarcation #1	Demarcation #2
Measures pertaining to participation:		
1) percent voting for Governor	.028	.122*
2) percent voting for U.S. Representative	.129*	.225*
3) liberality of suffrage regulations	.217*	.091
Measures pertaining to bureaucracy:		
4) number of government employees	.059	.009
5) salary of government employees	.025	.053
6) employees covered by health insurance	.010	.101*
Measures pertaining to government program:		
8) tax effort	.118*	.248*
9) total expenditures/capita	.088*	.042
10) high school graduations	.157*	.349*
11) exam successes	.220*	.282*
15) completed I-system	.001	.038
16) AFDC payment	.142*	.207*
17) OAA payment	.106*	.204*
18) AB payment	.026	.036
19) APTD payment	.014	.064

† Selected on the basis of significant coefficients of simple correlation with the scale of political culture. The analysis of covariance is performed twice: once with each demarcation of the states.

* significant at the .05 level.

For the complete definition of each variable, see Table 1.

The Problem Presented

In Edward J. Clynch's critique of Sharkansky's study, he found that some measures were able to maintain a significant level within regional sets when using personal income and urbanism while controlling for region.⁴² This study was established to evaluate whether the Elazar's political culture withstood time and regional limitations. Clynch's critique allows one to see that Sharkansky's study tests true for intra regional factors associated with the Traditionalistic political culture. This study, therefore is more of a hybrid of Sharkansky and Clynch. The theory is the Traditionalistic culture has changed if significance levels differ between Sharkansky's results and current findings. The change found will prove that the Traditionalistic culture is no longer evident within the United States.

First of all, this research must attempt to disprove Sharkansky's findings for his three hypotheses at the simple correlation. Second, it must show that measures of partial correlation, using urbanism and per capita incomes, show no significance or a decrease in the significance that Sharkansky's study showed. Finally, persistence across demarcations should show a separation from traditions over time. Statistical measures will be performed using the same methods that Sharkansky performed, although there will be three less dependent variables due to unavailable statistics as noted above.

⁴²Edward J. Clynch, "A Critique of Ira Sharkansky," 141.

CHAPTER III

Results

Research presented

The first step taken was data entry from the *Statistical Abstracts* from 1996 and 1997. Many of the measures that Sharkansky presented are not in easily definable form in the *Statistical Abstract* and had to be computed by hand. This not only caused a time problem but required multiple pages of data to perform output for one dependent variable. The first run of this study using Sharkansky's model was done using the 1996 data and the second run using the 1997 data. These are presented together here to allow one to see the differences between these years. This study will also include Sharkansky's results on the same table so that it will be easier to see whether Sharkansky's methods have persisted over time.

First of all, simple correlation was performed using Pearson's r . The dependent variables were tested to see how well they associate with Sharkansky's Political Culture Scale. The results for 1996, 1997 and Sharkansky's simple correlation results are presented in Table 8 based on Table 2, a listing of the dependent variables used in this study.

Table 8: Coefficients of Simple Correlation Between the Scale of Political Culture and Dependent Variables for 1996, 1997 and Sharkansky's Study

	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>Sharkansky's</u>
Measures pertaining to participation:			
1) percent voting for Governor	-.433*	-.554*	-.59*
2) percent voting for U.S. Representative	-.644*	-.630*	-.79*
Measures pertaining to the size and perquisites of the bureaucracy:			
3) number of government employees	.105	.090	-.44*
4) salary of government employees	-.549*	-.539*	-.57*
5) number of employees covered by insurance	.159	.163	NA
Measures pertaining to scope, magnitude, costs, and innovative character of government programs:			
6) Tax effort	-.144	-.188	-.43*
7) total expenditures/capita	-.384*	-.385*	-.62*
8) high school graduations	-.640*	-.640*	-.74*
9) total road mileage per capita	-.262*	-.254*	.17
10) municipal road mileage	.284*	.236	-.01
11) rural road mileage	-.279*	-.267*	-.24
12) I-highway mileage	-.051	-.172	NA
13) AFDC payment	-.118	-.118	-.75*
14) OAA payment	.037	.037	-.67*
15) AB payment	.079	.069	-.56*
16) APTD payment	.039	.039	-.42*
17) AFDC recipients	.501*	.498*	-.25
18) OAA recipients	.501*	.501*	-.11
19) AB recipients	.503*	.461*	.14
20) APTD recipients	.498*	.497*	-.21

* significant at the .05 level.

For a complete definition of each variable, see Table 2.

These results show some considerable differences in parts when compared to Sharkansky's results. Only five of the twenty variables examined are found to support Sharkansky's research. Two of the five are measures pertaining to participation, not varying by a wide margin from the data that Sharkansky produced. Only one measure of size and prerequisites of the bureaucracy, average salary of state and local government employees, showed a connection to Sharkansky. A large change in the size of bureaucracy has been federal transfers to states that has caused them to establish their own bureaucratic infrastructure, forcing state governments to hire more employees. This would account for the differences between this study and Sharkansky's. Measures pertaining to scope, magnitude, costs, and innovative character of government programs also showed some wide variations. The only measure that was close to any in this category that Sharkansky observed was percentage of ninth grader students who remain in high school until graduation.

The most noticeable differences are in last half of the study involving Aid to Families of Dependent Children (AFDC), Old Age Assistance (OAA), Aid to the Blind (AB), and Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled (APTD). Sharkansky's study shows a higher negative correlation between payment to these groups and political culture while my study shows a greater association toward the numbers of these groups amongst the population. Some of this can be explained by recent devolution of funding to the states, making the ability of governments to pay difficult and exacerbating the number of those below the poverty line.

Partial correlation was performed on those measures that recorded a significance

at the .05 level. All of these will be listed along with the five variables that matched Sharkansky's results to see if there is still any correlation after personal income and urbanism are taken into account. The results of this procedure are displayed in Table 9.

While controlling for urbanism and personal income, the same dependent variables show close relationships to the data that Sharkansky studied. In addition, only one of the variables from this study did not pass the significance level but 11 of the 12 did. This follows closely to how Sharkansky's variables performed on the partial correlation test with 14 of the 15 still showing significance.

The final statistical measure to be performed is analysis of covariance. The two demarcations presented in Table 6 allow one to test these variables independent of regional factors. Like Sharkansky, this study performed the statistical procedure including all twelve of the variables that showed significance at the .05 level from the test of simple correlation with political culture. Table 10 shows the comparisons among the 1996, 1997 and Sharkansky's data. Once again, Table 2 will be used to facilitate the examination of this study's results while examining the significance regarding the five variables that showed the same significance as Sharkansky's variables did.

Table 9: Coefficients of Partial Correlation Between the Scale of Political Culture and Selected Dependent Variables,† While Controlling for Personal Income and Urbanism for 1996, 1997 and Sharkansky's Study

	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>Sharkansky's</u>
Measures pertaining to participation:			
1) percent voting for Governor	-.504*	-.622*	-.45*
2) percent voting for U.S. Representative	-.671*	-.669*	-.71*
Measures pertaining to size and perquisites of the bureaucracy:			
4) salary of government employees	-.471*	-.511*	-.36*
Measures pertaining to government programs:			
7) total expenditures/capita	-.279*	-.302*	-.47*
8) high school graduations	-.664*	-.679*	-.66*
9) total road mileage	-.453*	-.459*	NA
10) municipal road mileage	.109	.089	NA
11) rural road mileage	-.460*	-.464*	NA
17) AFDC recipients	.425*	.453*	NA
18) OAA recipients	.426*	.458*	NA
19) AB recipients	.426*	.424*	NA
20) APTD recipients	.422*	.425*	NA

† Selected on the basis of significant coefficients of simple correlation with the scale of political culture .

* significant at the .05 level.

NA = not applicable

For the complete definition of each variable, see Table 2.

Table 10: Analysis of Covariance: Intraclass Correlations Between the Scale of Political Culture and Selected Dependent Variables While Controlling for Region† for 1996, 1997 and Sharkansky's Study

	<i>Demarcation #1</i>			<i>Demarcation #2</i>		
	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>Sharkansky</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>Sharkansky</u>
Measures pertaining to participation:						
1) percent voting for Governor	.185	.019*	.028	.117	.021*	.122*
2) percent voting for U.S. Rep.	.005*	.003*	.129*	.002*	.004*	.225*
Measures pertaining to bureaucracy						
4) salary of gov. employees	.006*	.008*	.025	.001*	.001*	.053
Measures pertaining to government programs:						
7) total expenditures/capita	.229	.258	.088*	.060	.072	.042
8) high school graduations	.001*	.001*	.157*	.001*	.001*	.349*
9) total road mileage	.440	.328	NA	.002*	.003*	NA
10) municipal road mileage	.101	.086	NA	.072	.075	NA
11) rural road mileage	.416	.002	NA	.002*	.305	NA
17) AFDC recipients	.080	.081	NA	.073	.075	NA
18) OAA recipients	.078	.078	NA	.071	.071	NA
19) AB recipients	.068	.113	NA	.063	.109	NA
20) APTD recipients	.086	.088	NA	.079	.082	NA

† Selected on the basis of significant coefficients of simple correlation with the scale of political culture. The analysis of covariance is performed twice: once with each demarcation of the states.

NA=Not Applicable.

* significant at the .05 level.

For the complete definition of each variable, see Table 2.

Note: Sharkansky's study gave the data and indicated significance while this study was only able to show the significance level due to ANOVA results.

The results for analysis for covariance show that many variables have shown significance for political culture and independent from regionalism. Two dependent variables show .05 levels of significance across both demarcations and throughout all of the studies done. The percentage of voting age population voting for U.S. Representative and percentage of ninth grade students who remain in high school until graduation both demonstrate significance, although it may be possible to explain their significance by examining other social factors.

Traditionally, voter turnout is lower for midterm elections and decline in voter turnout has been persistent through the latter half of the twentieth century. The percentage of ninth grade students who remain in high school until graduation supports Sharkansky's findings. The statistics for 1996 and 1997 varied only slightly on many of these measures, making the results appear close or the same when comparing 1996 to 1997. A longer period of time between the two years that this study compared to Sharkansky's may have given a clearer indication of when changes occurred. However, the hypothesis for this study can be rejected on the basis that the data, compared to Sharkansky's, produced the same results, indicating little or no change.

CHAPTER IV

Conclusions

Problems Examined

One problem with studying political culture is that unforeseen forces can go unaccounted for but need further explanation. For example, the correlation found between percentage of voting age population voting for U.S. Representatives and Sharkansky's political culture scale could be spurious but without further examining different factors involved with voter turnout and political participation, it is easy to assume that there is a strong relationship present. The control variable used for partial correlation, urbanism and per capita personal income may be influenced by many other factors themselves such as a depressed or inflated economy which affects the different market systems within cities, either driving residents away or providing better services than other cities with desirable qualities.

At the base of understanding political culture is the problem of understanding human behavior. "Different people do the same things for different reasons." By accepting results from prior research, future research is possibly endangered by a weak correlation that may exist. It may also be possible that ideas that may be the actual driving force behind the association between two variables are not presented and an

important link is missing between the variables, causing a spurious relationship.⁴³ The problems with looking at political culture are not just confined to this study alone. However, clarification is needed in future research to allow replication that produces meaningful results.

Although Sharkansky states that many of his variables are derived from the *Statistical Abstract of 1964*, other researchers attempting to replicate Sharkansky have grappled with how he extracted variables from the Statistical Abstract that are not labeled the way he has labeled them, especially for the number of recipients for AFDC, OAA, AB, and APTD as well as how he dealt with the inconsistencies of voting for U.S. Representatives within a single year of examination. He has also been criticized for not clarifying his conclusions.⁴⁴

Measuring political culture is still a problem that persists within the field of Political Science. Sharkansky's political culture scale has gained widespread acceptance but it follows the ideas put forth by Elazar in 1966. "Political culture is not a static concept."⁴⁵ This thesis attempted to show that the Traditionalistic political culture has not remained static over time. However, there are outside influences that may have accounted for the similarities. Measures pertaining to participation may be affected by cynicism, which has developed a strong attachment to social, political, religious, and

⁴³Daniel J. Elazar, "Steps in the Study of American Political Culture," 229.

⁴⁴Edward J. Clynnch, "A Critique of Ira Sharkansky," 139.

⁴⁵David E. Procter, *Enacting Political Culture: Rhetorical Transformations of Liberty Weekend 1986* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1991), 19.

scientific ideas. The growth of cynicism has led some to believe that it is generally an unrecognized form of culture.⁴⁶

Hypothesis Examined

This study set out to show that the measures that Sharkansky proved in 1969 were no longer prevalent due to a change in the Traditionalistic political culture. This does not appear to be the case as the research indicates. The analysis of covariance showed significance for at least one variable within each different subset of measures. Only three of these variables were compatible with Sharkansky's study and only two were consistent with three studies examined.

In the area of political participation, both variables used in this study showed strong negative support, indicating that there is still a traditionalistic, noninvolvement view when it comes to voting. As mentioned before, a cynical culture may be the reason but it is also possible that cynicism is a stronger part of the traditionalistic subculture. Future research may pursue this by exploring the different levels of participation involved within the states and attempting to understand how or if culture is the influencing factor.

Measures relating to the bureaucracy showed little association, except for the average salary of state and local government employees. It is difficult to explain how this strong negative relationship would persist without taking into account political culture perspectives. Sharkansky's results for analysis of covariance did not prove this variable to be statistically significant. This study, however, showed a strong negative association

⁴⁶Jeffrey C. Goldfarb, *The Cynical Society: The Culture of Politics and the Politics of Culture in American Life* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), 138.

towards the salary of state and local government employees, strongly supported in the analysis of covariance, which would support the concept of a traditionalistic culture prevailing in the South.

A negative relationship toward finishing high school may be why other factors relating to government programs, such as the number of AFDC, OAA, AB, and APTD recipients below the poverty line is so high. This marks a change in Sharkansky's research because his partial correlation showed a significant negative relationship toward average payments given to these groups. It would be interesting for further research to examine how this change occurred and when it may have happened. His analysis of covariance showed a significant relationship across both demarcations for payments to AFDC and OAA recipients. This research indicated a strong positive relationship for the number below the poverty line when no such distinction existed when Sharkansky tested for it, although the analysis of covariance does not support it across the two demarcations.

Although this research did not disprove Sharkansky's study, it is useful in developing the concept of culture over time. In conclusion, it provides one with measures that have persisted over time. These measures may be questionable in some respects but still produce the results that Sharkansky believed they would. Hopefully, future research can come up with better measures that can be compared to Sharkansky's to see if there is something within the measures themselves that predispose them to traditionalistic culture over time.

Future research considerations in the subfield of political culture should examine the federal structure. Lieske's approach, looking at the county level, was interesting but it

only allows one to examine a single state. Interactions between border cities of different states provide an interesting microcosm of subculture and allow for better examination of policy perspectives. It may also be useful to examine the process by which cities like this attract business. Is it an intense rivalry for commerce or are there unwritten rules that are developed from a cultural understanding developed over time?

Some future considerations should also consider other measures, such as participation in local groups, that will help better define what Sharkansky examined. Differences in allocations to the states may help understand the government programs that are instituted within states. It would also help to develop measures that would examine the infrastructure that has developed for bureaucracies within the states in order to understand the cultural perspective and its affects on policy. This study shows that there is still a need to explain why Elazar's political culture is persistent over time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Almond, Gabriel A. and Sidney Verba. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1963.
- Black, Earl and Merle Black. *Politics and Society in the South*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1987.
- Clynch, Edward J. "A Critique of Ira Sharkansky's 'Utility of Political Culture.'" *Polity* Vol. V, Fall 1972: 139-141. 1972.
- Devine, Donald J. *The Political Culture of the United States: The Influence of Member Values on Regime Maintenance*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. 1972.
- Elazar, Daniel J. *American Federalism: A View From the States*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell. 1966.
- _____. "Steps in the Study of American Political Culture." In *Political Culture, Public Policy and the American States*, ed. John Kincaid, 223-235. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues. 1982.
- _____. *The American Mosaic: The Impact of Space, Time, and Culture on American Politics*. Boulder: Westview Press. 1994.
- Fischer, David Hackett. *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways In America*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1989.
- Garreau, Joel. *The Nine Nations of North America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1981.
- Goldfarb, Jeffrey C. *The Cynical Society: The Culture of Politics and the Politics of Culture in American Life*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1991.

Bibliography - continued

- Gray, Virginia. "The Socioeconomic and Political Context of States." In *Politics in the American States: A Comparative Analysis*, Sixth Edition, ed. Virginia Gray and Herbert Jacob, 1-34. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press. 1996.
- Herson, Lawrence J.R. *The Politics of Ideas: Political Theory and American Public Policy*. Homewood: The Dorsey Press. 1984.
- Lieske, Joel. "Political Subcultures of the United States: A New Measure for Understanding Social and Political Behavior." Paper delivered at the 1991 Meeting of the *American Political Science Association*. 1991.
- Ott, J. Steven. *The Organizational Culture Perspective*. Chicago: The Dorsey Press. 1989.
- Parens, Joshua. "Multiculturalism and the Problem of Particularism." *American Political Science Review* 88: 169-180. 1994.
- Procter, David E. *Enacting Political Culture: Rhetorical Transformations of Liberty Weekend 1986*. New York: Praeger Publishers. 1991.
- Savage, Robert L. "The Distribution And Development of Policy Values." In *The Ecology of American Political Culture: Readings*, ed. Daniel J. Elazar and Joseph Zikmund II, 263-283. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. 1975.
- _____. "Patterns of Multilinear Evolution in the American States." In *Political Culture, Public Policy and the American States*, ed. John Kincaid, 25-58. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues. 1982.
- Sharkansky, Ira. "The Utility of Elazar's Political Culture." *Polity* Vol. II, Fall 1969: 66-83. 1969.
- Statistical Abstract of the United States*. 117th Edition. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1997.
- Statistical Abstract of the United States*. 116th Edition. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1996.