Southern Political Science Association

Regionalism in American Politics. by Ira Sharkansky

Review by: Clifton McCleskey

The Journal of Politics, Vol. 34, No. 3 (Aug., 1972), pp. 991-992

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#) on behalf of the [Southern Political Science Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2129307>

Accessed: 04/02/2014 13:28

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Cambridge University Press and Southern Political Science Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Politics*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

critique of the formal planning techniques employed by the Massachusetts Department of Public Works in developing their highway plans for the Boston region. For the political scientist, the most useful part of the study is Frank Colcord's comparative analysis of transportation politics in eight major metropolitan areas. Colcord provides a useful framework for understanding the power of the highway agencies, the political weakness of transit, and the factors underlying changing transportation policy and politics in some areas. Unfortunately, neither Lupo's description nor Fowler's criticisms make any use of Colcord's analytical scheme, leaving the reader with something of a "do-it-yourself kit" rather than a finished product. Nonetheless, the study is worth the time of every student of urban politics, largely because Professor Colcord has provided us with an indispensable analysis of urban transportation politics in the early 1970s.

MICHAEL N. DANIELSON, *Princeton University*

Regionalism in American Politics. By IRA SHARKANSKY. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1970. Pp. xiv, 194. \$9.50.)

Books, like babies, sometimes enter the world without having had a full gestation period. The premature nature of this one is indicated by the sketchy treatment of the related scholarly materials, the repetitiveness of some sections, the sparse interpretation of the data, and the lack of any final summation. Even so, there is something of importance here for students of American politics.

The author's objectives are to measure regional variations in state politics and policies, and to ascertain the relative contribution of economic and "non-economic" forces to regionalism. The dependent variables for the "current" (1960-62) portions are 20 measures of state political characteristics (e.g., voter turnout, legislative mal-apportionment) and 41 measures of public policies in each state. Seven of these variables are utilized for a longitudinal analysis cov-

ering various points in time from 1902 to 1962. The independent variables are (1) state economic development as measured by per capita personal income, total personal income, and extent of urbanization; and (2) residual "non-economic" characteristics, none of them quantified.

On the basis of intra- and inter-regional comparisons of the means and the coefficients of variability for each of the 61 dependent variables, utilizing 17 different combinations of states, Sharkansky concludes that there are indeed regional patterns in state politics and policies. However, the patterns thus established are not always consistent with traditional usage—e.g., the South exists statistically as a region, but New England does not. The long-range tendency, it appears, has been toward more similarity of the states within regions and a shrinking difference between regions. In effect, the nationalization of American politics has been accompanied by increased regionalism.

The author then considers the relationship of the three measures of economic development to the 61 dependent variables, using first the technique of simple, partial, and multiple correlations, and then the technique of analysis of covariance, controlling alternately for region and for economic development. The correlations obtained indicate that the three economic factors fail to account for much of the interstate variation in politics and policies, and the analysis of covariance establishes that factors other than the three measures of economic development are significantly correlated with the dependent variables. Strictly speaking, the author does not demonstrate that these other factors are non-economic, but he judges them to be, and struggles manfully in Chapter 6 to identify some of the historical and cultural factors at work.

In re-opening the scholarly discussion of regionalism and in challenging the economic determinism of some analysts of state policies, Sharkansky has performed a most valuable service. Those who disagree with him probably will not be converted, but they will be forced to take his analysis into account. As is inevitable in any work of this sort, there are several big and little things to quibble about. But, despite its not-quite-finished state, this book is a significant achievement.

CLIFTON MCCLESKEY, *University of Texas at Austin*