Unification and Identity in Civic Culture and Civic Education

Diana Owen

Associate Professor of Political Science
Chair, American Studies
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C

Email: owend@georgetown.edu
Phone: (202) 687-7194

Unification and Identity in Civic Culture and Civic Education

Political culture is "a set of beliefs and assumptions developed by a given group in its efforts to cope with the problems of external adaptation and internal integration" (Barnes 1986). It encompasses "attitudes toward the political system and its various parts, and attitudes toward the self in the system" (Almond and Verba 1963: 13). A nation's political culture is the particular distribution patterns of orientation toward political objects among the members of the nation. More colloquially, political culture can be viewed as a nation's political personality. Established practices considered to have worked well enough to be valid are passed on largely through the process of political socialization. Members of a society develop standard notions about the way the world works. Political culture helps to build community and facilitate communication as people share an understanding of how and why political events and actions take place, and how issues are raised and evaluated. In addition, political culture sets the standards for what is acceptable political behavior.

According to Almond and Verba, a civic culture that is conducive to democratic stability is a "balanced political culture in which political activity, involvement, and rationality exist, but are balanced by passivity, traditionality, and commitment to parochial values" (Almond and Verba 1963: 32). In essence, some individuals are informed and active in politics, others generally obey the rules of the game but participate little, and others have no interest in politics whatsoever. While the civic culture in the United States has remained relatively stable over time, shifts have occurred as a result of transformative experiences, such as war, economic crises, and other societal upheavals, that have reshaped attitudes and beliefs (Inglehart 1990).

Key events, such as the Civil War, World War I, World War II, the Great Depression, the War in Vietnam and the civil rights movement, and the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, have influenced the political worldviews of American citizens, especially young people whose political values and attitudes are less established (Delli Carpini 1986).

While the definition of political culture emphasizes unifying, collective understandings, in reality cultures are multidimensional. The United States can be described as having multiple political personalities largely as a result of the country's federal system of government and immigrant settlement history. While there is a sense of national identity based around the notion of "being an American," citizens have strong regional, state, and community attachments that can uniquely shape their political and civic orientations. American subcultures frequently experience major events in different ways and interpret them through diverse lenses. The southern experience with civil rights was far different than in other parts of the country due to the section's slave history. The effects of the September 11 attacks have been far greater on New Yorkers than citizens in other parts of the country because they experienced the traumatic events first-hand and live directly with the aftermath.

Political subcultures are central to the dynamics of government relations, political deliberation, and policy prescriptions. American political culture frequently is characterized in terms of divisiveness and conflict. When subcultural groups compete for societal resources, such as access to government funding for programs that will benefit them, cultural cleavages and clashes can result. Conflict between competing subcultures is an ever-present fact of American life. In earlier times cultural conflict was manifested in economic rifts between agrarian and industrial interests (Fiorina 2005). Since the 1990s, the notion that the United States is being torn apart by "culture wars" based on moral and religious conflicts has been promoted by

scholars, commentators, and journalists (see Hunter 1991). The extent to which these cultural divisions are present and are damaging to the nation is a matter of debate (Fiorina 2005, White 2003).

The influence of subcultures on the political and civic life of Americans often is not considered sufficiently within the context of civic education. There is tendency to focus on national government and politics to the exclusion of state, local, and regional entities perhaps due to the complexity of the situation. Thus, this paper raises the following question for discussion: What are the implications of American political subcultures for civic education? I begin by examining American federalism and its relationship to the development and maintenance of political subcultures. I then take a stab at addressing the very complicated question: What are the characteristics of American political subcultures? This question has sparked the development of numerous typologies and volumes of scholarly literature. Political subcultures can be based on a variety of factors, including race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and social class. While the implications of these subcultures for American political life are compelling, I will focus here on political subcultures that are rooted in geography. People are physically and legally tied to geographically-based subcultures that can strongly influence citizens' relationship to the polity. Further, to quote former House of Representatives Speaker Thomas P."Tip" O'Neill, "All politics is local." Elazar's classic theory of regional subcultures will provide an illustration of how fundamental differences in political practices and beliefs have been conceptualized. I also will examine the more recent practice of categorizing state subcultures based on their voting preferences in presidential campaigns as red, blue, and purple states. The paper concludes by offering some thoughts about why and how civic education might more effectively take political subcultures into account.

American Federalism

The source of much cultural difference, if not conflict, in the United States can be traced to the federal system of government. In the United States, powers and responsibilities are divided among national, state, county, and local governments. The various levels of government significantly participate in all activities of government. At the same time, each level of government is partially autonomous from the others (Grodzins 1966, Peterson 1995).

American federalism has its basis in the United States Constitution which specifies the distinct powers of the national and state governments. The Constitution vests exclusive power in the national government in the areas of foreign relations, the military, trade across national and state borders, and the monetary system. States are prohibited from making treaties with other countries or other states, issuing money, levying duties on imports or exports, maintaining a standing army, or making war. The Constitution also provides for concurrent powers—authority that is given to the national government but which is not barred from the states. Concurrent powers include regulating elections, taxing and borrowing money, and establishing lower level courts. States have some exclusive Constitutional powers, such as amending the Constitution and deciding how the president and Congress shall be elected. However, because the states existed before the Constitution was ratified, the Founders had little to say about their powers until the Tenth Amendment was added in 1791. They had assumed that the states would be the principal policy makers in the federal system (Katz 1997). The Tenth Amendment states: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Under this provision, states have established rights, such as regulating all commerce that is within their borders and police powers to protect the public's health, safety, order and morals.

Federalism has been a contested arrangement since the passage of the Constitution. The

concept of federalism has come to mean different things in theory and practice over the course of

the nation's history. Early on, the states asserted their authority against the encroachment of the

federal government. The states' rights position essentially held that states were justified in

disobeying actions by the national government when they felt that the federal government was

exceeding its constitutionally-granted powers. This doctrine was largely abandoned after the

Civil War (1861 to 1865), as the national government assumed a stronger role in an effort to

bring the fractured nation together. A system of dual federalism, in which the national and state

governments have clearly defined powers, was implemented. Dual federalism assumed that the

national government would be predominant, but only in areas designated by the Constitution.

States' rights and dual federalism were possible in a period when the size and scope of the

national government was limited and the bulk of citizens' needs were addressed at the local

level. Prior to the 1930s, local government budgets were much larger than those of national and

state governments. During the Great Depression, the size of the national government expanded

radically under the New Deal as bureaucracies were established to handle the myriad new

programs designed to aid the country's recovery. Federal money flowed into state coffers to

fund economic revitalization initiatives. The system of dual federalism gave way to cooperative

federalism, an arrangement where federal, state, and local governments would work together to

solve problems. Until the 1960s, the states typically used federal grants-in-aid to fund programs

that they controlled with little national government oversight. The Great Society programs

initiated in 1963 effectively undercut the cooperative arrangement, as the national government

sought to impose federal programs designed to alleviate poverty and racial injustice upon states

and localities. Competitive federalism, where national, state, and local governments vie for

control over programs and policies, became the norm (Kinkaid 1990, Peterson 1995, Shapiro 1995, Katz 1997, Wallin 1998, McDonald 2000, Derthick 2001).

Today, the various levels of government have overlapping powers and responsibilities which can lead to tension and turf wars. Civil rights and education long have been areas where conflicts rooted in federalism have play out. The 1954 federal Supreme Court case of *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* mandated that states remedy inequality in public education by either desegregating schools or spending money on "unequal" black schools to bring them up to acceptable standards (Devins 2004). Southern states expressed their opposition to desegregation, and resisted complying until faced with the threat of losing federal funding. The city of Little Rock, Arkansas, waited until three years after the *Brown* decision to integrate Central High School with the enrollment of nine black students. Governor Orval Faubus, seeking to gain favor with white voters, opposed the desegregation of Central High, and threatened to use the Arkansas National Guard to stop it from happening. President Dwight Eisenhower federalized the National Guard, and ordered soldiers to protect the students on their first day of class. Faubus retaliated on behalf of the state by shuttering all four Little Rock high schools for the 1958-59 school year. After much wrangling, the schools reopened on an integrated basis in 1959 (Jacoway 2007). The No Child Left Behind Act passed by Congress in 2002 greatly increased the federal government's control over public education by imposing requirements on the states and localities for testing and accountability. While Washington celebrated the bipartisan achievement of these sweeping reforms, state and local governments and teachers' unions were less enamored of the bill's requirements that would fall to them to implement. No Child Left Behind is a conditional grant program where states can receive funding if they install the requisite testing systems and ensure that the standards specified by the law are met. The act was

considered by many states to be an unfunded mandate imposed by the federal government, as states were told to implement regulations without receiving sufficient funding to do so.

More recently, efforts by the national government to deal with the country's economic downturn also illustrate the tensions inherent in competitive federalism. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 has provided billions of dollars of federal money to states to improve infrastructure, like highways and bridges, and fund safety-net programs, like food stamps and unemployment insurance. While these stimulus funds have helped improve state finances, states have little flexibility about how and where to spend them. Thus, several conservative Republican southern state governors (Mark Sanford of South Carolina, Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, Haley Barbour of Mississippi, and Bob Riley of Alabama) rejected federal stimulus funds for unemployment benefits because they opposed the requirement that states expand coverage to part-time workers who lose their jobs (Kelley and Fritze 2009). State officials also expressed concerns about the potential costs associated with major federal legislative initiatives, such as health care reform, business activity taxes, and federal mandates under REAL ID, which dictates new security measures for driver's licenses that are issued by the states (Scheppach 2009).

Over time, all levels of government have come to play a greater role in the lives of American citizens. States and localities have the ability to establish and organize their governmental units according to their own rules. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, there are over 87,500 distinct governmental units within the fifty states. The desire for and level of government intervention differs based on particular political subcultures. As we can see from the preceding examples of which there are countless more, state and regional values can influence the degree to which the federal relationship will be cooperative or conflictual.

Conceptualizing American Subcultures

Political subcultures are distinct groups associated with particular beliefs, values, and behavior patterns that exist within the overall framework of the larger culture. They can develop around groups with distinct interests, such as those based on age, sex, race, ethnicity, social class, religion, and sexual preference. Political subcultures also can form around social and artistic groups and their associated lifestyles, such as the heavy metal and hip hop music subcultures. In the United States, subcultures are geographically based as a result of the federal structure of government and immigration patterns, and are especially apparent at the regional, state, and local levels (Berman 2003).

Elazar's American Regional Subcultures

In an effort to explain the vast variations in political processes, institutional structures, political behavior, the political rules of the game, and policies enacted by state and local governments, political scientist Daniel Elazar (1966, 1995) devised a theory of American regional subcultures. Elazar identified three major political subcultures that are situated in particular geographical areas of the United States. The three subcultures have their roots in original American migration streams and settlement patterns. Immigrants came to the United States with "distinct ethnoreligious identities, cultural preferences, and ways of life" (Lieske 1993). As these groups settled, they remained largely separate as they expanded into new frontiers. They established political jurisdictions—settlements, towns, cities, townships, and counties—with distinct governmental identities. The people living within these geographic units were identified with particular political values, attitudes, and behaviors which they passed on generationally. Later arrivals had to adapt to the dominant subculture. American federalism,

which until relatively recently favored state and local autonomy, facilitated the persistence of regional subcultures. Thus, while political subcultures may shift over time, they do so slowly.

Elazar's three major designations include the moralistic, individualistic, and traditionalist subcultures. The moralistic subculture is characteristic of states in New England and the upper midwest, and emphasizes an active role for government and high levels of civic participation. For moralists, government service is equated with public service. The community intervention in private affairs is justified if collective goals are served. "Both the general public and the politicians conceive of politics as a public activity centered on some notion of the public good and properly devoted to the advancement of the public interest" (Elazar 1966: 117). The individualistic subculture is prominent in the Middle Atlantic, lower midwestern, and southwestern states. This subculture views government primarily as a business designed to keep the economic marketplace functioning. It emphasizes private concerns and places limits on community intervention. The business of politics is dominated by "firms" represented by political parties and other stakeholders. Personal and professional advancement, rather than public service, is an acceptable motivation for politicians. The system accommodates some level of corruption as a tolerable price for doing business. Finally, the traditionalistic subculture is found primarily in southern states. Government exists to maintain the existing social and economic hierarchy. There is an adversity to change, and general suspicion of new policies that might upset the status quo. Politicians hail from the ranks of the societal elite. There is little pressure on ordinary citizens to participate in politics. Thus, popular participation is far less important than elite engagement. Traditionalists combine hierarchical views of society with ambivalence about the government as marketplace. Political parties and other formal institutions are less central to the governing enterprise as politics is organized around dominant personalities

or families. Elazar notes that there is evidence of different amalgamations of these three

subcultures across states, but that "unique aggregations of cultural patterns are clearly discernible

in every state . . . giving each state its particular character" (1966: 134).

Elazar's own, largely qualitative, work demonstrated that there was very little change in

the geopolitical map of subcultures over time. The static nature of his subcultural

characterizations and the lack of empirical rigor in his analysis have been sources of scholarly

criticism (Schiltz and Rainey 1978, Lieske 1993). However, numerous empirical investigations

have found support for his underlying theoretical assumptions and the presence of subcultures

resembling those he hypothesized (e.g. Sharkansky 1969, Johnson 1976, Wright 1987,

Fitzpatrick and Hero 1988, Joslyn 1980, Lieske 1993, Nardulli 1990).

The primary indicators of political subcultures employed by Elazar are state and county

level measures of the religious affiliation, racial origin, and ethnic background of inhabitants and

the structure of social and political institutions. The religious affiliation, race, and ethnicity

variables are used as tags to monitor the stability and shifts in the geopolitical map. Religious

affiliation is the starting point in the classification scheme for Elazar, although racial and ethnic

background characteristics can confound the religious tags. For example, working class Italian

and Irish Catholics in Boston, a city with a moralistic subculture, affiliate with the Democratic

Party, while Cuban Catholics in Miami, a city with a traditionalist subculture, are more inclined

to be Republican.

Elazar's work has generated a cottage industry of studies that have tested and elaborated

upon his initial formulation. These studies have employed literally hundreds of variables in an

effort to capture various dimensions of the rather slippery concept of political culture. Table 1

provides a list of some of the factors that have been considered in conjunction with Elazar's

theory in an attempt to develop more nuanced accounting of American political subcultures. This list is far from comprehensive, but it provides insights into the complexity of the subculture concept. The demographic profile of a locality, based on factors such as age, education, income, and social class, is useful to consider, as policy decisions are vested in the needs and resources of given communities. In addition, studies have considered a range of contextual factors germane to political subcultures. These include the structure, organization, and size of government and bureaucracy, the level of financial support for government, taxation policies, the number of programs for citizens, including social welfare policies, the extent to which government decision-making is centralized or dispersed, the power relationships between citizens and their government, the degree to which citizen participation in government is encouraged, and the number of elected officials versus appointed officials holding government office. Another set of factors is associated with the structure and function of political parties, including the centrality of parties to the political process and the level of inter and intra party competition in localities. Finally, the shared political values, identifications, and orientations as well as common priorities held by members of a community are an inherent element of the subcultural fabric. These orientations include party identification, political ideology, civic duty, patriotism, political tolerance, political trust, communitarian, populist, and egalitarian values, attitudes toward the role of government, issues and policy positions, political participation, membership in political and civic groups, and voting (Sharkansky 1960, Johnson 1976, Lieske 1993, Miller, et al. 2005).

Table 1

Empirical Referents of American Political Subcultures

Elazar's Indicators
Religious Affiliation
Racial Origin
Ethnic Origin
Demographic Profile of the Locality
Age
Sex
Income
Education
Government Institutional Context
Structure and Organization of Government
Size of Government/Bureaucracy
Elections versus Appointments to Public Office
Financial Support for Government
Power Relationships Between Government and Citizens
Government Intervention in the Community
Government Policy Innovation
Nature of Government Decision Making Processes (centralized or dispersed)
Citizen Input into Government Decision Making
Political Party Institutional Context
Importance of Political Parties
Level of Interparty Conflict
Level of Intraparty Conflict
Social Structures
Local Economy
Urbanization and Industrialization
Agrarian Traditions
Population Mobility
Family Structure
Social Status
Social Inequality
Environmental Factors
Geography
Climate

Red, Blue, Purple State Subcultures

Elazar's elegant theory and incremental refinements have given way to more crass conceptualizations of political subcultures. A recent, popular characterization of political subcultures categorizes American states based on their presidential voting trends. The label 'red state' is applied to states whose voters primarily favor Republican Party presidential candidates and lean conservative ideologically. 'Blue states' are those favoring Democratic Party contenders and which display more liberal predispositions. 'Purple states' represent swing states where both Republican and Democratic candidates receive support, and voter preferences are mixed or volatile.

The red state, blue state terminology came into vogue during the 2000 presidential election, and has its origins in the brightly colored maps predicting the state-by-state outcome of presidential races employed by television news programs. The results of state contests are essential in presidential elections, as the winner of the Electoral College determines the presidential victor, and not the winner of the popular vote. While such maps have been in use in newspapers since 1908 and on television since the 1960s, it was not until 2000 that all major

media outlets uniformly adapted the red/blue color code, and journalists began routinely to apply the terminology.

The red state, blue state characterization has come to mean more than a simple classification of voting patterns. It is used to define and explain significant subcultural divisions in American society. In the wake of the 2000 campaign, commentators widely proclaimed that the United States was a deeply divided nation based on values issues related to religion, morality, and sexuality (White 2003). As Andrew Gelman observes, "On the night of the 2000 presidential election, Americans sat riveted in front of their televisions as polling results divided the nation's map into red and blue states. Since then, the color divide has become a symbol of a culture war that thrives on stereotypes—pick-up driving red-state Republicans who vote based on God, guns, and gays; and elitist, latte-sipping blue-state Democrats who are woefully out of touch with heartland values" (Gelman 2009). The red/blue typology promotes the simplistic view that American politics can be summed up by the conflict between rural, Christian religious conservatives located primarily in the south and socially-tolerant, secular, pro-choice liberals residing in the northeast and Pacific coast.

The primary assumption underpinning the red/blue state designation is that since 2000 the U.S. has been divided almost equally into two large partisan voting blocs, and has become what commentators describe as "the 50:50 nation" or "the 49% nation" (Fiorina 2005). Proponents use presidential voter preference statistics to demonstrate the fact that winning candidates have received around 49% to 50% of the popular vote which they interpret as indicating intense partisan polarization. As Table 2 indicates, the 2000 and 2004 presidential elections were closely contested both in terms of the popular vote and the Electoral College, representing a departure from the 1996 contest. The situation changed with the 2008 campaign, as Obama's margin of

victory in the popular vote was over 7 percentage points and his win in the Electoral College was

overwhelming.

Table 2

Presidential Election Popular Vote and Electoral College Vote, 1996-2008

	% of Popular Vote	**% of Electoral Vote**
1996		
Bill Clinton	49.23%	70.4%
Bob Dole	40.72%	29.6%
2000		
George W. Bush	47.87%	50.4%
Al Gore	48.38%	49.6%
2004		
George W. Bush	50.73%	53.2%
John Kerry	48.27%	46.7%
2008		
Barak Obama	52.87%	67.8%
John McCain	45.60%	32.3%

While these aggregate data indicate that the 2000 and 2004 elections were close, they are

not sufficient for making claims about the behavior and attitudes of American citizens. In

particular, values divide arguments rest on the assumption that most people are highly concerned

about moral issues, hold deeply rooted, polarized positions on them, and cast their ballots

accordingly. There were some indications (based on somewhat shaky exit poll data) that this was

the case in 2000, before the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and the economic crisis of

2008 dislodged these issues from the national agenda. However, in an extensive analysis of the

values and attitudes of red/blue state voters using data from the 2000 American National Election

Study, Fiorina finds that differences in issue positions based on state color designations are

negligible, with a only few exceptions. He concludes that the red state, blue state characterization

portrays American politics as far more divisive than reality, as most Americans are not actively

engaged in a values battle (Fiorina 2005). A 2006 study further indicates that only 5% of

Americans, and 10% of Evangelical Christians, stated that moral issues, like abortion and same-sex marriage, were key factors determining their vote. 85% felt that health care and poverty were more significant than "values issues" in their voting decisions (Jones and Cox 2006). During the 2008 presidential election, the economy, health care, the War in Iraq, and education were most frequently identified by voters as the most important issues. According to a survey by the Pew Research Center, abortion and moral values each were listed as the most important issue by only 1% of voters. Less than 1% of voters indicated that same sex marriage was a pivotal issue in their decision-making.

Despite these limitations, some of which are serious, the red state, blue state typology is difficult to dismiss for a number of reasons. First, the simple state-based distinctions hold up for certain characterizations that allow useful generalizations to be made when discussing American political divides. For example, there are some clear and persistent geographical differences in partisan preferences as indicated in Table 1A (Appendix), although the 2008 campaign has resulted in a general shift in favor of the Democratic Party. Religious partisan cleavages, which can be linked to regional distinctions, also are in evidence. (See Table 2A.) In addition, political discussion now is framed by the media, scholars, and citizens in red state, blue state terms (Gelman, et al. 2007). To understand, enter, and potentially change the debate one should be familiar with the parameters of the red/blue/purple framework.

Subcultures and Civic Education

Federalism and regional values strongly influence American civic culture as well as citizen identities and orientations. Americans have a sense of national identity, but at the same time they have deep-seated regional, state, local, and community-based connections. Evidence suggests that regional subcultures are consequential for political behavior, representation,

governance, and policy making. Subcultures define the reality surrounding most citizens' daily experience with politics and government. They also provide a distinct historical context for understanding political and civic life.

Yet, civic education is largely focused on national politics and government. Textbooks are primarily concerned with national institutions, actors, processes, and elections. Some materials include sections devoted to describing federalism, often in an idealized manner, and perhaps a generic chapter on state and local politics, but little more. Realistically, teaching students about the national government is challenging enough without the further complication of addressing the diversity and complexity of American political subcultures. The foregoing discussion of Elazar's theory and the red/blue/purple framework illustrates the difficulty of conceptualizing and accurately describing political subcultures. Still, it is important for students to understand how government works and civic life is manifested within the context of their resident political subculture.

Service learning programs are an attempt to provide students with practical civic experiences. They are most successful in developing civic dispositions when they are run in conjunction with a classroom curriculum that directly links to the real world encounters. More often than not, this does not occur, as the in-class instruction does not take into account the specific exigencies of the local political subculture (Youniss and Yates 1997).

There are a number of challenges faced when taking subcultures into account in the classroom. Historical events and crises have been experienced in vastly different ways across the nation. In some cases, the experience of the particular subculture has been negative or traumatic. The subculture could be at odds with the rest of the nation or embrace values that run counter to those considered acceptable by the dominant culture. The abuse of children in

sweatshops in the northeast, the civil rights movement in the south, and the treatment of Native Americans in the west bring to light these schisms. How should these subcultural distinctions be treated in the classroom?

Practically speaking, how can the notion of political subcultures be successfully integrated into the civic education curriculum?   What should civic educators include in a lesson plan that takes into account political subcultures? How can such material be presented so as to encourage practical engagement in political and civic life by students?   The following are some very rough suggestions for topics that might be incorporated into a lesson plan that I hope will generate some discussion:

The Basics

What are the structure and organization of state and local government institutions in the students' subculture?
What are the structure and organization of electoral institutions, including political parties?
What other kinds of political and civic institutions are present in the subculture, and what is their role?

Formal Laws and Rules Governing Political Participation

How do citizens effectively participate in government and politics in the subculture? (For example, through contacting local officials, attending meetings, petitioning)
What are the laws governing citizen participation? (For example, laws governing voter registration, running for office, electioneering)

Subcultural Norms and Informal Practices

What are the dominant political and civic norms of the subculture? How does politics and government *really* work in the subculture? (Compared to textbook and idealized accounts)
What are the informal norms and practices that characterize government and politics in the subculture?
What are the most effective methods for participating in civic and political life given the nature of the subculture? (For example, is working through political parties effective, or are political personalities more important?)

Topics for Discussion

What does federalism mean in practice in the subculture? (Does the subculture have a more cooperative or competitive relationship to the national and state governments? What does this mean in terms of policies and resources at the state and local level?

How do the political and civic attitudes, norms, and values of the subculture reflect those embraced by the nation as a whole? In what ways might they have differed from values in other parts of the nation in the past and present, especially in relation to particular societal events?

How might citizens deal with government officials that are not responsive to their inputs and that fail to enact innovative policies within the context of the subculture?

In a country as diverse and complex as the United States, it may not be adequate to provide civic training for students using a one-size-fits-all model that is oriented toward national government and politics. Perhaps customizing the curriculum to present specific material on local political subcultures might instill greater civic understand and competences in young people.

Table 1A
Party Identification by Region, 1972-2008

			1972	1976	1980	1984	1988	1992	1996	2000	2004	2008
1% of the electorate	Northeast	Democrat	39	51	42	47	49	47	55	56	55	59
		Republican	59	47	47	53	50	35	34	39	43	40
		Independent	-	-	9	-	-	18	9	3	-	-
24%	Midwest	Democrat	39	48	41	41	47	42	48	48	48	54
		Republican	59	50	51	58	52	37	41	49	51	44
		Independent	-	-	7	-	-	21	10	2	-	-
32%	South	Democrat	29	54	44	36	41	41	46	43	42	45
		Republican	70	45	52	64	58	43	46	55	58	54
		Independent	-	-	3	-	-	16	7	1	-	-
23%	West	Democrat	40	46	34	38	46	43	48	48	50	57
		Republican	57	51	53	61	52	34	40	46	49	40
		Independent	-	-	10	-	-	23	8	4	-	-

Source: The New York Times, National Exit Polls Table, Geography
(http://elections.nytimes.com/2008/results/president/national-exit-polls.htm)

Table 2A
Party Identification by Religion

			1972	1976	1980	1984	1988	1992	1996	2000	2004	2008
42% of the electorate	White Protestants	Democrat	22	41	31	27	33	33	36	34	32	34
		Republican	76	58	63	72	66	47	53	63	67	65
		Independent	-	-	6	-	-	21	10	2	-	-
19%	White Catholics	Democrat	42	52	40	42	43	42	48	45	43	47
		Republican	57	46	51	57	56	37	41	52	56	52
		Independent	-	-	7	-	-	22	10	2	-	-
2%	Jewish	Democrat	64	64	45	67	64	80	78	79	74	78
		Republican	34	34	39	31	35	11	16	19	25	21
		Independent	-	-	15	-	-	9	3	1	-	-
38%	Born-again or evangelical Christians	Democrat	-	-	40	30	24	31	-	-	34	41
		Republican	-	-	56	69	74	56	-	-	65	57
		Independent	-	-	3	-	-	14	-	-	-	-

			1972	1976	1980	1984	1988	1992	1996	2000	2004	2008
40%	Attend religious services at least once a week	Democrat	-	-	-	-	-	36	-	39	38	43
		Republican	-	-	-	-	-	48	-	59	60	55
		Independent	-	-	-	-	-	15	-	2	-	-

Source: The New York Times, National Exit Polls Table, Geography
(http://elections.nytimes.com/2008/results/president/national-exit-polls.htm

References

Almond, Gabriel, and Sidney Verba. *The Civic Culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Barnes, Samuel H. *Political Culture.* Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, 1986.

Berman, David R. *Local Government and the States.* Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2003.

Delli Carpini, Michael X. *Stability and Change in American Politics*. New York: New York University Press, 1986.

Derthick, Martha. *Keeping the Compound Republic.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 2001.

Devins, Neal. "What Brown Teaches Us about the Rehnquist Court's Federalism Revival." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 37, no. 2 (2004): 211-214.

Elazar, Daniel. *American Federalism: A View From the South.* New York: Crowell, 1966.

Elazar, Daniel J. *The American Mosaic.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994.

Fiorina, Morris P. *Culture War? The Myth of a Polarized America.* New York : Pearson Longman, 2005.

Fitzpatrick, Jody I., and Rodney E. Hero. "Political Culture and Political Characteristics of the American States: A Consideration of Some Old and New Questions." *Western Political Quarterly* 41 (1988): 145-53.

Gelman, Andrew. *Red State, Blue State, Rich State, Poor State.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Gelman, Andrew, Boris Shor, Joseph Bafumi, and David Park. "Rich State, Poor State, Red State, Blue State: What's the Matter with Connecticut?" *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 2007: 345-367.

Grodzins, Morton. *The American System: A New View of Government in the United States.* New York: Random House McMillan, 1996.

Hunter, James Davison. *Culture Wars.* New York: Basic Books, 1991.

Inglehart, Ronald. *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Jacoway, Elizabeth. *Turn Away Thy Sun.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 2007.

Johnson, Charles A. "Political Culture in American States: Elazar's Formulation Examined." *American Journal of Political Science* 20, no. 3 (1976): 491-510.

Jones, Robert P, and Dan Cox. "American Values Survey: Initial Report." *media.pfaw.org.* October 25, 2006. http://media.pfaw.org/pdf/cav/AVSReport.pdf (accessed September 10, 2009).

Joslyn, Richard. "Manifestations of Elazar's Political Subcultures: State Public Opinion and the Content of Political Advertising." *Publius* 10 (1980): 37-58.

Katz, Ellis. *American Federalism, Past, Present and Future.* April 1997. http://www.doge.us/govecon/AmericanFederalismPast.pdf (accessed September 10, 2009). Kelley, Matt, and John Fritze. "Governors Reject Stimulus Money for Unemployment." *usatoday.com.* March 15, 2009. http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2009-03-15-unemployment_N.htm (accessed 2009 10, September).

Kinkaid, John. "From Cooperative to Coercive Federalism." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 509 (1990): 139-52.

Lieske, Joel. "Regional Subcultures of the United States." *Journal of Politics* 55, no. 4 (November 1993): 888-913.

McDonald, Forrest. *States' Rights and the Union.* Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2000.

Miller, David Y., David C. Barker, and Christopher J. Carman. "Research Note: Mapping the Genome of American Political Subcultures: A Proposed Methodology and Pilot Study." *The Journal of Federalism* 36, no. 2 (2005): 303-315.

Nardulli, Peter. "Political Subcultures in the American States: An Empirical Examination of Elazar's Formulation." *American Politics Quarterly* 18, no. 3 (1990): 288-297.

Peterson, Paul E. *The Price of Federalism.* Washington, D.C. : Brookings, 1995.

Scheppach, Raymond C. "Federal Stimulus Dollars, State Deficits--and Federalism." *stateline.org.* June 12, 2009. http://www.stateline.org/live/details/story?contentId=406430 (accessed September 10, 2009).

Schlitz, Timothy D., and R. Lee Rainey. "The Geographical Distribution of Elazar's Political Subcultures Among the Mass Population: A Research Note." *Western Political Quarterly* 31, no. 3 (1978): 410-415.

Shapiro, David L. *Federalism: A Dialogue.* Northwestern University Press, 1997.

Sharkansky, Ira. "The Utility of Elazar's Political Culture." *Polity* 2 (1969): 66-83.

Wallin, Bruce. *From Revenue Sharing to Deficit Sharing.* Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1998.

White, John Kenneth. *The Values Divide.* New York: Chatham House, 2003.

Wright, Jr., Gerald C. "State Political Culture and Public Opinion." *American Political Science Review* 81, no. 3 (1987): 797-813.

Youniss, James, and Miranda Yates. *Community Service and Social Responsibility in Youth.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.