

PROFILE OF WOMEN HOLDING OFFICE

II

by

MARILYN JOHNSON

and

SUSAN CARROLL

with

Kathy Stanwyck and Lynn Korenblit

**Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP)
Eagleton Institute of Politics – Rutgers – The State University**

\$4.00

PROFILE OF WOMEN HOLDING OFFICE
II

by

Marilyn Johnson and Susan Carroll
with Kathy Stanwick and Lynn Korenblit

Reprinted from *WOMEN IN PUBLIC OFFICE:
A BIOGRAPHICAL DIRECTORY AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS, SECOND EDITION*
(Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, 1978).

Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP)
Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers-The State University
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
201/828-2210

Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP)

The Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP) is a unique research, education, and service center working to increase knowledge about women's participation in public life. As part of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University, CAWP programs reflect Eagleton's interest in political institutions, political practitioners, and public policy in the United States.

The Center believes in encouraging the full and effective involvement of women in American public affairs. National in scope, Center programs support the growth and strength of a truly representative government responsive to the needs of all citizens, female and male alike.

CAWP activities include developing educational programs, generating and sponsoring research, convening conferences and symposia, and publishing and disseminating information. By designing and sponsoring a variety of programs, the Center serves a catalytic role in the development of important information about women's participation in government and politics.

Established in 1971 with the aid of a Ford Foundation grant to the Eagleton Institute, the Center for the American Woman and Politics seeks additional funds to support its programs. Neither CAWP nor the Eagleton Institute of Politics is a lobbying organization. All programs undertaken by the Center and the Institute are nonpartisan, and all donations are tax exempt.

Center Staff

Ruth B. Mandel, Director
Marilyn Johnson, Director of Research
Kathy Stanwick, Research and Information Associate
Ruth Ann Burns, Program Associate
Nancy Becker, Program Consultant
Nancy Hamilton, Secretary
Maryjane Davies, Secretary

NOTE TO READERS

"Profile of Women Holding Office II" is reprinted from *WOMEN IN PUBLIC OFFICE: A BIOGRAPHICAL DIRECTORY AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS, SECOND EDITION*. Analyzing data collected in 1977 for CAWP's national information bank on women in public life, the profile describes today's political women holding office at federal, state, county and local levels of government. The first national "Profile of Women Holding Office" was published in 1976 in the first edition of *WOMEN IN PUBLIC OFFICE* (New York: R.R. Bowker Co.). Reprints of the first profile are available for \$3.00 each from: Center for the American Woman and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers-The State University, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901.

STATISTICAL REPORT: PROFILE OF WOMEN HOLDING OFFICE, 1977

by Marilyn Johnson and Susan Carroll

with Kathy Stanwick and Lynn Korenblit

This profile of women serving in public office is issued by the Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP) as part of its continuing commitment to describe and report on the situation of U. S. women in public life. CAWP's first profile of female officeholders (1975) documented the paucity of women at all levels of public decision making throughout the nation.¹ Although limited progress has been made since 1975, women's talents and skills remain seriously underutilized for the development and implementation of public policies. CAWP offers this new report with the conviction that the nature and extent of women's participation in political life and governmental affairs deserve attention of the general public and of the nation's policymakers.

CAWP's 1975 profile of women in public office has found a place in libraries and classrooms, as well as on the reference shelves of journalists, radio and television reporters, corporate managers and public officials. The profile supplied the first nationwide description of the numbers, location, personal characteristics and political backgrounds of women in office at federal, state, county and local levels. As with all first reports, the profile has stimulated as many questions as it answered. Have the numbers of women relative to men in various offices increased over time? How do the backgrounds and officeholding experiences of women compare with those of men? What special difficulties, if any, do women encounter once they have achieved public office? Do women in office, having received appointment from political leaders or approval from voters, perceive themselves as exempt from sex discrimination? Do women perceive their political roles in ways that differ from the role conceptions of men? Are most local officeholders unambitious for political advancement? Why do women leave public office?

Based on a greatly expanded survey, this second national profile of women holding office addresses many of the important questions stimulated by CAWP's earlier research. This survey includes for the first time small samples of federal appointees and members of the judiciary. We also have questioned, in selected states, male officeholders and women who formerly served in office.

Past comparisons of politically active women and men have tended to rely either on very small samples of officeholders in highly restricted locales or on samples of party leaders in which proportionately fewer women than men were public

officeholders.² The survey of a multi-state sample of men represents an unusual opportunity to examine the role of gender in political leadership among women and men holding equivalent offices.

The inclusion in this analysis of women who have left public office is a first attempt, to our knowledge, to study former officeholders of either sex. Information about former officeholders can provide insight into a number of aspects of the political life of women: the nature of turnover among officeholders, circumstances which cause women to leave office, the degree of continuity in political careers and the impact of officeholding on subsequent activities.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

The report presents the analysis of information from several thousand questionnaires completed by women currently holding office across the country, by men in selected states, and by women formerly in office. (The questions asked are appended to the report.) The analysis is divided into seven major parts:

Part I describes the numbers and location of women in office in 1977 and assesses change since 1975. It examines the proportion of officeholders who are women, variations among states and regions, size of population of the districts in which women serve, and proportions of women on governing bodies of varying size.

Part II examines personal characteristics, organizational affiliations and family patterns.

Part III analyzes political experience, officeholding activities, and self-ratings of performance.

Part IV considers self-reports of liberalism or conservatism, orientations to selected political issues, and orientations to issues conventionally defined as "women's" issues.

Part V examines evaluations of the situation of women in politics, including perceptions of sex discrimination, of special qualities and skills possessed by women, and of advantages experienced and difficulties encountered as women.

Part VI is devoted to an analysis of political ambitions and, in addition, to a comparison of the characteristics of women who have left public office with those who have remained.

Part VII, the final section, summarizes briefly the major research findings, discusses possible interpretations and implications, and suggests emergent issues deserving further investigation.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLES

Early in 1977 CAWP collected books, manuals, directories and lists from which we compiled the names of women officials in various governing bodies. Names included women appointed to the federal executive branch and women serving in the U. S. Congress, cabinet-level offices in the state executive, state legislatures, state appellate and trial courts of general jurisdiction, mayoralties and local councils (including cities, towns, townships, villages and boroughs).³

The Main Sample

From May through July 1977 more than 13,000 questionnaires were mailed to all officeholders who could be identified as women serving in the categories of office included in the study. A second questionnaire, followed by a reminder postcard, was sent to those who did not respond to the initial mailing. Resumes were requested from officeholders who did not complete the questionnaire. Table 1 describes the numbers of women currently serving in each office and the percentages for whom statistical information is available.⁴

The Sample of Men

Questionnaires were mailed to a sample of male state legislators and county commissioners in sixteen states and to mayors and local councilmen in eight of the sixteen.⁵ States were selected to represent a diversity of region.⁶ Fifteen percent of those to whom questionnaires were mailed responded, resulting in a sample of 366 male officials.

The subsample of women in office. For purposes of comparison with men, a subsample of women currently in office has been constructed from the main sample. This comparison sample consists of respondents who hold similar offices in the same states from which men were sampled. The proportions of males holding each kind of office are nearly identical to those of females in the comparison sample. Sixteen percent of the men and 15% of the women are state legislators; 14% of the men and 13% of women are county commissioners; 6% of men and 7% of women occupy mayoralties; 64% of the men and 65% of the women are members of local councils.

Former Officeholders

In an effort to identify some of the conditions and contingencies influencing women to remain in office or to leave, we have questioned a group of women who recently held elective office and responded to the 1975 survey but who no longer serve in office. Respondents to the 1975 survey who were sent questionnaires in 1977 include former state legislators in all states and former local councilwomen, mayors and county commissioners in twenty-five states. Twenty-nine percent of those to whom questionnaires were sent completed

and returned them, yielding a sample of 188 women.

The subsample of current officeholders. For purposes of comparison with former officeholders, a subsample of 550 women has been selected from the main sample of current officeholders. The group consists of respondents to both the 1975 and 1977 surveys who are from offices and states in which information on former officeholders was received.⁷ The sample of former officeholders and the comparison sample of current officeholders are similar in the proportions holding each type of office: former officeholders consist of 19% state legislators, 6% county commissioners, 8% mayors and 67% local councilwomen; corresponding percentages for the comparison sample of women currently in office are 18%, 8%, 9% and 65%.

The Potential for Response Bias

The proportions of nonrespondents mean that caution must be exercised in reviewing the research findings. There is always the danger that those who did not receive questionnaires or who failed to respond are very different from those who replied. A distinct possibility exists that a disproportionate number of completed questionnaires were returned by women with a special interest in the subject of women and politics. The response rate of male officials, as the lowest of the samples, opens the widest potential for bias. Given the sponsorship of the survey and its subject matter, a larger proportion of the men who responded than of nonrespondents may be sympathetic to the concerns of women and to the participation of women in politics. If such a bias does exist, then our data may understate the gender differences among officeholders in attitudes toward women in politics and in positions on "women's" issues.

Since we are unable to pinpoint and adjust for any bias that may exist, caution demands that the reported percentages and averages be regarded as good approximations and not as exact figures. In interpreting tables and research findings, more attention should be paid to the size, consistency and patterning of differences among categories than to any single number.

PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

In the report to follow, Part I, on numbers and location of officeholders, relies for the most part on analyses of compiled lists of officeholders rather than on responses to questionnaires. The remainder of the report is based on analyses of questionnaire returns. Although the separate parts deal with widely varying topics, a basic strategy for presentation of the findings has been utilized in each section.

Variations by Office

Presentation of a topic begins with a description, through a table or textual commentary or both, of women in nine major categories of officeholding: appointees to the federal executive, members of the U. S. House of Representatives, members of the state executive, state judges, state senators, state representatives, county commissioners, mayors and heads of township governing bodies, members of

municipal and township councils.

Special Analyses

In reporting the backgrounds, officeholding activities and attitudes of women holding office, we often shall ask how the basic descriptions may be modified by other dimensions, especially the size of population of the district in which office is held, the age of the officeholder, the year of entry into current office and political party affiliation. These additional analyses are not feasible for every category of office, either because they are not meaningful or because the numbers in some offices are too few to permit subgroupings.

District population. The effect of holding office in a relatively small or relatively large district is examined only at county and local levels, among county commissioners, mayors and local councillors. A distinction is made between districts with populations under 10,000 and those with populations of 10,000 or more.

Age of officeholder. The effect of age is examined among state legislators (upper and lower houses combined) and local councillors. Within these offices, the division of incumbents into four age categories (under 35 yrs., 35-44 yrs., 45-54 yrs., 55+ yrs.) results in subgroups sufficiently large for relatively stable observations.

Year of entry into current office. Subgroupings of officeholders according to year of election or appointment to current office have been made for state legislators (upper and lower houses combined), county commissioners, mayors and local councillors. The analysis distinguishes between those entering their current office in 1974 or earlier and those entering in 1975 or later. This division roughly segregates those achieving office before and after CAWP's earlier survey, which questioned women holding office as of July 1975. Most of the more recent entrants are in their first term of office.

Party affiliation. The association of political party affiliation with other characteristics of officeholders or officeholding is examined among state legislators (upper and lower houses combined), county commissioners, mayors and local council members.

Other special analyses. At various points in the report, research questions are addressed by the introduction of other special analyses that divide officeholders into subgroups. Each of these is described when introduced.

Comparisons of Men and Women

A major theme in this report is a comparison of women with men in office, using the special samples already described. Because the distributions by office for men and women are so similar, we combine offices in presenting the research findings. In reporting differences or similarities based on comparison of the totals, we note whenever a particular pattern does not hold true for every office in the sample.

Tabular Presentation

Tables are utilized in the report as a means of presenting detailed information in more compact form than can be accomplished easily through textual description. (Although the text serves as commentary to the tables, it also contains much information not presented in tabular form.) The format for tabular presentation has been made as uniform as possible, and every attempt has been made to construct tables which are understandable to those readers relatively unfamiliar with quantitative reports.⁸ Each table carries a descriptive title that presents a general statement about information contained therein. Numbers reported consist exclusively of percentages, medians (used to indicate average tendencies), and totals. When totals are so small (under 25) that computations have high risk of being unreliable, percentages are omitted and replaced with raw numbers in parentheses, and medians are reported in parentheses. To assist those who may be unfamiliar with tabular presentation, Footnote 8 supplies simple instructions for reading the tables in this report.

While this report describes basic and previously unavailable information about women in office, many important questions remain unanswered, and some of the research findings may be interpreted in varying ways.⁹ (Footnote 9 discusses some problems of interpretation.) Timely reporting of the basic survey results requires postponing some research questions that could be addressed profitably to the data, as well as some of the more complex analyses. Although further analyses of the data constitute an important part of the ongoing research program at CAWP and will appear in future publications, the answers to some questions await the evidence of future research studies. Therefore, CAWP offers this second profile of women in public office as a contribution to the accumulation of research knowledge about political women in the United States.

PART I. NUMBERS AND LOCATIONS OF WOMEN IN OFFICE

In 1976 and 1977 political women were on the move. Although the changes which have taken place since CAWP's 1975 survey of women in office are not revolutionary, they are noteworthy. Since 1975, the numbers of women have increased in every type of office except the U.S. House of Representatives and the federal judiciary. Nationwide, women comprise more than 9% of state legislators, nearly 11% of state cabinet and equivalent state executive officials, and nearly 8% of mayors and members of township and municipal councils. In 1977, women held approximately 6 to 10% of all offices covered in this survey, while in 1975 they held 4 to 7% of these offices.¹⁰ (See the State Summaries on page xvii for more detail. The reader is cautioned that some changes in the numbers of women serving in office result from more thorough coverage in this second edition. For an explanation of where coverage was expanded and more complete data were available, see the Introduction to this book.)

An overview of women in office at state, county and local levels reveals that no one state or region is consistently high in the numbers of women in every type of office. The diversity in the numbers of women officials may occur for many reasons having no connection with the propensity of women to seek office or their ability to be elected. The numbers are clearly affected by variations in the size of governing bodies, in the number of such bodies within each state, and in the presence or absence of particular offices and governmental forms such as counties or townships.

Federal Offices

In the Carter administration, women received 14% of the presidential appointments as of January 1978. Jimmy Carter is the first president in the history of this nation to have two female cabinet members: Juanita Kreps, Secretary of Commerce and Patricia Roberts Harris, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Prior to 1977, only three other women have served in the federal cabinet.

Progress apparent in the federal executive is not paralleled in the judicial branch. No woman has ever served on the Supreme Court. Of 675 U.S. Circuit and District Court Judges, only 5 are women--a decrease of 3 since 1975.

In the 95th Congress 18 women serve in the U.S. House of Representatives. One female U.S. senator, Muriel Humphrey, was appointed to office after the death of her husband, Senator Hubert Humphrey, in early 1978. The numbers of women in Congress are below the previous highs of 19 representatives in the 94th Congress and 2 senators in the 87th Congress. Several factors have contributed to the relatively stable number of women in Congress: it is difficult for women to obtain their party's nomination in districts with open seats; female candidates face male opponents who campaign with the advantage of incumbency; congressional campaigns require large amounts of money. For these and other reasons, a large influx of women into the U.S. Congress is unlikely. Nonetheless, the increase in women's visibility and participation at lower levels of office places them on political paths which could

lead to Congress and other high-level offices.

State Offices

Two women serve as governors of their states: Ella Grasso of Connecticut and Dixie Lee Ray of Washington. Three women are lieutenant governors: Evelyn Gandy of Mississippi, Mary Ann Krupsak of New York and Thelma L. Stovall of Kentucky. In 1975 one governor and one lieutenant governor were women.

The number of women in state cabinet or equivalent positions has also increased. In 1975, 84 women were identified as holding state-wide executive positions of cabinet-level or higher. In 1977, 97 women were serving in these offices, constituting nearly 11% of an estimated 904 positions.

In the state judiciary, 110 women--nearly 2% of the total--serve as judges in appellate courts and trial courts of general jurisdiction. This number represents a modest increase from the 92 women judges in 1975.

State Legislatures

Slightly over 9% of state legislators in early 1978 were women--101 out of 1975 senators, and 601 of 5,583 state representatives. The numbers of women in state legislatures have risen steadily from 305 (or 4%) in 1969, to 610 (8%) in 1975, to the current 702 (9%) in 1978.

The increases in the numbers of women legislators represent relatively small increments in a large number of states rather than dramatic increases in one or two, as can be seen in Table 2. The New England, West North Central and South Atlantic regions most consistently exhibit gains.

Despite the general trend, not all states show increases since 1975. Thirteen states have lower percentages of women among their legislators in 1978 than in 1975: Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Hawaii, Michigan, Mississippi, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Utah and Wyoming. States in the Mountain region consistently show either decreases or no change.

In 1975, 17 legislatures had less than 5% women; in 1978, only 8 have less than 5%: Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York, Pennsylvania and Tennessee. In 1978, as in 1975, we find the southern states and some of the larger, more populous states with the lowest percentages of women in their state legislatures. The highest percentage of women (28%) is found in the New Hampshire legislature, which is also the largest state legislative body in the country. As it did in 1975, New Hampshire accounts for nearly one-fifth of all women serving in the lower houses.

Legislators vs. Other Officeholders

The general political situation of women within a state cannot be ascertained simply from a knowledge of women's participation in one type of office. This point is illustrated by comparing patterns of

Table 1. NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF WOMEN OFFICEHOLDERS INCLUDED IN STATISTICAL REPORT

	Federal ^a	State Judiciary	State Executive	State Senate	State House	County Commission	Mayoralty ^b	Municipal and Township Council
Total women in office	87	110	97	102	594	660	735	9,195
Number analyzed in statistical profile ^c	35	49	54	62	265	288	292	2,204
Number in profile as % of total in office	40% ^d	44%	56%	61%	45%	44%	40% ^e	24% ^e

^aIncludes executive appointments and U.S. House of Representatives as of November 1977. There were no female U.S. Senators at the time of data gathering.

^bIncludes equivalent on council when no mayor exists.

^cIncludes only those from whom questionnaires were received. Totals used for calculation of percentages in subsequent tables may not equal the totals in this table. They will vary with the number of respondents choosing to answer a particular question and with the number of respondents for whom a particular question is applicable. In addition, where information was available from a secondary source, some officeholders who did not return the questionnaire may be included among the total responses.

^dThis figure represents a proportion of the total number of women serving as of 15 November 1977. As a proportion of those who were initially sent questionnaires, the response rate is 54%.

^eA sizeable proportion of women officeholders at the local level did not receive questionnaires because their names were on lists received in late July, after the cutoff date for mailing. The response rate, excluding those not sent questionnaires, is 42% for mayors and 33% for municipal and township council members.

Table 2. THE PROPORTION OF WOMEN LEGISLATORS HAS INCREASED IN THE MAJORITY OF STATES SINCE 1975

	% Women among State Legislators ^a			% Women among State Legislators ^a			% Women among State Legislators ^a	
	1975	1978		1975	1978		1975	1978
NEW ENGLAND			WEST NORTH CENTRAL			WEST SOUTH CENTRAL		
Maine	13	16	Minnesota	4	6	Arkansas	2	2
Vermont	12	14	Iowa	9	10	Oklahoma	4	5
New Hampshire	24	28	Missouri	6	9	Louisiana	1	1
Massachusetts	6	8	North Dakota	10	13	Texas	4	7
Connecticut	14	20	South Dakota	10	10			
Rhode Island	6	8	Nebraska	2	6	MOUNTAIN		
			Kansas	5	7	Montana	9	9
MIDDLE ATLANTIC						Idaho	10	10
New York	4	3	SOUTH ATLANTIC			Wyoming	8	6
New Jersey	8	11	Delaware	16	13	Nevada	12	12
Pennsylvania	4	4	Maryland	10	11	Utah	8	6
			West Virginia	7	9	Colorado	16	15
EAST NORTH CENTRAL			Virginia	4	6	Arizona	20	18
Wisconsin	8	9	North Carolina	9	14	New Mexico	4	4
Illinois	6	9	South Carolina	4	6			
Indiana	6	6	Georgia	4	5	PACIFIC		
Michigan	6	5	Florida	8	11	Washington	12	15
Ohio	7	6				Oregon	12	11
			EAST SOUTH CENTRAL			California	2	5
			Kentucky	4	6			
			Tennessee	4	2	Alaska	15	7
			Alabama	1	2			
			Mississippi	3	1	Hawaii	13	12

Source: Compiled by National Women's Education Fund, Washington, D.C.

^aSee State Summaries, p. xvii, for absolute numbers of women in state houses and senates as of November 1977.

membership in legislatures with patterns of occupancy in state executive and congressional offices. We find that a relatively large number of women in one type of office does not imply a large number in other offices within a given state. States with average or above-average proportions of women among state legislators are no more likely than other states to have an above-average number of state executives. Thirteen of 24 states with an above-average number of women in the legislature and 13 of 26 below-average states have at least two women in state executive positions. The pattern of congressional representation would appear to run counter to the pattern of state legislative office-holding. Among the 14 states represented by women in the U.S. Congress, 10 are states with below-average percentages of women in their state legislatures.

County and Local Offices

The largest increases in women's elective political participation since 1975 have taken place at the local level of officeholding and, to a lesser extent, at the county level. In 1975, 456 women comprised 2% of officials in county governing bodies. In 1977 there were 660 women, 3% of the total. Thirty-five states show increases since 1975 in the numbers of women on county commissions.

The number of women in mayoralties and on municipal and township governing bodies has shown striking increases since CAWP's first survey. In 1975, we identified 5,931 women as holding office at the local level, an estimated 4% of total officials in the offices surveyed. In 1977, women held 9,930 such positions, an estimated 8% of the total. A

Table 3. LARGE INCREASES IN THE NUMBERS OF WOMEN HOLDING LOCAL OFFICE HAVE OCCURRED SINCE 1975

	Mayors		Local Councillors ^a			Mayors		Local Councillors ^a	
	1975	1977	1975	1977		1975	1977	1975	1977
NEW ENGLAND					EAST SOUTH CENTRAL				
Maine	0	19	87	169	Kentucky	8 ^b	14	6 ^b	141
Vermont	0	3	44	61	Tennessee	2	10	48	50
New Hampshire	5	7	34	41	Alabama	7	14	78	174
Massachusetts	3	17	45	133	Mississippi	8	10	74	116
Connecticut	13	18	117	139	WEST SOUTH CENTRAL				
Rhode Island	2	0	19	18	Arkansas	29	23	131	136
MIDDLE ATLANTIC					Oklahoma	17	21	75	148
New York	26 ^b	30 ^c	161 ^b	500 ^c	Louisiana	9	12	56	74
New Jersey	15	19	198	269	Texas	36	29	241	322
Pennsylvania	22	19	206	452	MOUNTAIN				
EAST NORTH CENTRAL					Montana	6	9	51	68
Wisconsin	10 ^b	9	32 ^b	-	Idaho	7	10	38	61
Illinois	19	8 ^b	170	87 ^b	Wyoming	8	4	26	43
Indiana	0	2	132	165	Nevada	0	2	2	7
Michigan	14	23	514	1846 ^c	Utah	3	4	37	50
Ohio	29	28	167	513 ^c	Colorado	10	17	160	206
WEST NORTH CENTRAL					Arizona	6	11	33	37
Minnesota	23	28	204	332 ^c	New Mexico	8	9	25	44
Iowa	29	37	275	412	PACIFIC				
Missouri	28	39	267	303	Washington	4	17	149	186
North Dakota	4	7	65	82	Oregon	10	11	165	189
South Dakota	12	10	38	49	California	32	46	188	230
Nebraska	12	17	71	99	Alaska	2	8	33	105
Kansas	21	23	184	233	Hawaii	0	0	1	3
SOUTH ATLANTIC					Washington, D.C.	0	0	3	4
Delaware	3	5	19	37	Total	566	735	5365	9195
Maryland	5	11	54	81					
West Virginia	15	7	105	115					
Virginia	6	11	111	114					
North Carolina	10	16	131	171					
South Carolina	5	7	67	71					
Georgia	10	15	67	105					
Florida	13	19	161	204					

^aIncludes Township officials

^bIncomplete Information

^cRepresents Expanded Coverage over the First Edition of *WOMEN IN PUBLIC OFFICE*

⁻Information not available

degree of caution should be exercised in noting that the number of women holding local office has nearly doubled since 1975 because in some states an unknown portion of the increase in officeholders reflects the availability of more complete lists for the 1977 survey. Nonetheless, even with adjustments made for changed coverage, the increase in local officeholding appears to be at least 36% above 1975.

Table 3 presents by state and region the numbers of women holding mayoral and local council offices in 1975 and 1977. When examining changes between 1975 and 1977 in the numbers of women holding local office, only limited types of comparisons can be made. The U.S. Census of Governments does not provide a state-by-state description of the number of officeholders within each state. Without such figures, we cannot calculate the number of women as a percentage of the total number of officeholders in each state. In some states, a large increase in absolute numbers may represent relatively slight change when viewed as a change in the percentage of women among total officeholders. Nonetheless, the changes in absolute numbers of women serving at the local level are impressive. If such changes continue with the momentum of the past two years, women will begin to assume a substantial share of the political decision-making in their local communities.

Population of Officeholders' Districts

District population is an important key to understanding the profiles of officials serving in local and county government. As described in other parts of this report, officeholders from smaller districts differ from those in larger districts in background and family characteristics, political experience and activities of office, positions on issues, perceptions of women's role in politics, and ambition for higher office.

In 1975, we found a majority of mayors and local council members serving in districts under 5,000 population. We speculated then that this pattern might be more true of women than of men, as a manifestation of women's low participation in more

Table 4. THE MAJORITY OF LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS SERVE IN DISTRICTS UNDER 5,000

District Population	Women ^a	Men
	Mayors and Councillors %	Mayors and Councillors %
under 1,000	26	25
1,000-4,999	34	37
5,000-9,999	14	11
10,000-24,999	16	20
25,000-49,999	6	4
50,000 +	4	3
Total	(507)	(235)

^aComparison sample constructed from main sample of women

powerful offices. With the inclusion of a sample of men in the 1977 survey, we are able to compare the size of population of the districts in which men and women serve. As Table 4 reveals, women are no more likely than men to be serving in small districts. Approximately equal proportions of male officeholders and of the comparison sample of women serve at each level of district population. Therefore, if women serve in predominantly small districts, they do so because most districts are small and not because they differ from men in the size of the district in which they are able to achieve office.

An overview of the numbers and locations of officeholders provides the framework for describing the political life of women. But it is only the framework. Despite overall changes in representation, women remain a very small proportion of public decision makers. What are their characteristics? What paths to office have they taken, and what are their plans for the future? How do they view their role in politics? How do they compare with men? Are there symptoms of change in the kinds of women who enter office? We address these and other questions in the remainder of this report. We do so with the awareness that their small numbers alone make women in public office a special group of women.

PART II. BACKGROUND AND FAMILY ROLES OF WOMEN IN OFFICE

Citizenship, minimum age and residence are the only legal qualifications for most public offices. Yet in a number of ways characteristics such as ethnicity, age, education, occupation, income, organizational ties and family roles limit and define the kinds of citizens who do in fact constitute the "pool" from which officials are drawn. Some operate as qualifications for office above and beyond legal requirements. Others point to resources of time and money available for investment in political activity. Still others indicate social placement in roles and networks that favor exposure to the political sphere and the subsequent development or maintenance of political ambitions.

The social backgrounds and family roles of women in office are of interest for what we may learn about two processes: recruitment to office and performance in office. If we learn more about the kinds

of women who achieve public office, we may better understand the nature of the pool of potential officeholders, and of the potential for increases or decreases in the size of the pool. In addition, women may bring special attitudes and priorities to office because they exist in special social situations. If we have knowledge of the social situation of women in office, we may better evaluate the extent to which the increasing number of women officeholders is likely to affect the conduct of government.

The first section of Part II describes the backgrounds and family lives of women officeholders and how these vary according to selected other dimensions. The second section compares women with men in office. A concluding section presents a brief summary.

Table 5. OFFICEHOLDERS NUMBER FEW MINORITY MEMBERS AMONG THEM^a

Ethnicity	Judi- ciary	State Exec.	State Senate	State House	County Comsn.	Mayor- alty	Local Council	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Black, Afro-American	6	3	8	3	3	- ^b	2	2
American Indian, Native American	0 ^b	5	0	-	-	-	1	1
Chicano, Mexican American	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
Puerto Rican	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	3	4	1	1	0	-	-
European (identifies 1 or more European countries as heritage)	88	87	80	80	82	89	85	84
'Caucasian', 'white', 'white American'	0	2	4	4	5	4	3	4
'American', 'Yankee', 'Mid-Westerner'	0	0	2	8	5	5	5	5
Other or mixed self-identification	6	0	2	4	4	2	4	4
Total ^c	(34)	(39)	(51)	(221)	(262)	(250)	(1941)	(2813)

^aTabulations at the federal level are omitted because of low numbers responding.

^bIn this and all other Tables, '0' = no cases in category; '-' = cases less than .5% of those responding.

^cIn this and all other Tables, those not answering or responding 'don't know' have been excluded from bases for percentaging.

Table 6. WOMEN IN OFFICE ARE PREDOMINANTLY MIDDLE-AGED

Age	Fed. Exec. ^a	U.S. House ^a	Judi- ciary	State Exec.	State Senate	State House	County Comsn.	Mayor- alty	Local Council
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Under 30	(0)	(0)	0	2	5	4	2	3	3
30-39	(13)	(3)	8	18	25	24	21	12	23
40-49	(5)	(7)	31	37	28	32	33	25	30
50-59	(4)	(3)	41	37	28	29	35	40	28
60+ years	(0)	(3)	20	6	14	11	9	20	16
Total	(22)	(16)	(39)	(51)	(60)	(267)	(274)	(285)	(2,129)
Median Age	(38)	(47)	52	48	48	47	48	52	47
Total	(22)	(16)	(39)	(51)	(60)	(267)	(274)	(285)	(2,129)
Districts under 10,000 pop. ^b							49	53	48
Total							(119)	(199)	(1,482)
Districts 10,000+ pop. ^b							46	47	46
Total							(128)	(68)	(517)

^aIn this and subsequent Tables, bases lower than 25 are signalled by reporting raw numbers in place of percentages and by placing medians in parentheses.

^bIn this and other Tables, district population is analyzed only at county and local levels.

Table 7. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT RISES WITH LEVEL OF OFFICEHOLDING

Education	Fed. Exec.	U.S. House	Judi- ciary	State Exec.	State Senate	State House	County Comsn.	Mayor- alty	Local Council
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%
High school or less	0	(0)	0	2	3	10	25	37	37
Some college	0	(1)	0	16	12	20	27	25	24
College graduate	18	(4)	0	28	33	37	30	21	24
Some graduate work	4	(0)	0	3	14	7	3	5	3
One or more graduate degrees	78	(9)	100	51	38	26	15	12	12
Total	(27)	(14)	(47)	(58)	(64)	(270)	(282)	(284)	(2,177)

CHARACTERISTICS OF WOMEN IN OFFICE

A profile of women in office is necessarily complex, for such women are not a strictly homogeneous population. We have routinely inspected the data for a number of questions about variations: Can one generalize about women holding public office without regard to the type of office held? Do the Democratic and Republican parties attract distinct types of women? Are women in small districts -- where most local officeholders are found -- notably different from women in larger districts? Do younger officeholders or those more recently elected exhibit characteristics that may foretell change in the kinds of women who hold public office? For reasons of space, we report answers to these questions selectively, ordinarily commenting only when the analysis reveals differences among categories of officeholders. In the conclusion to Part II, we consider these questions more fully.

Ethnicity

The women in this survey are overwhelmingly Caucasians of European background. Respondents were asked to reply to the question: "What is the principal ethnic or racial heritage with which you identify yourself (e.g. Irish; Afro-American or Black; Chicano; German; etc.)?" A sizeable proportion (15%) made no identification. If those responding present reliable indicators of the total situation, then there are few black women and almost none of any other minority status in state and local governing bodies (Table 5).¹² At least 93% report European, white, or what they seem to consider mainstream American origins. The percentages of minority women among those elected or appointed in 1975 or later are no higher than the percentages among women entering office in earlier years.

At federal levels, minority women are a larger proportion of female officials than at state and local levels. For example, four of 18 women in the 95th Congress are black, and at the end of 1977, there were 11 black, two Asian and eight Hispanic women among the 77 women given major appointments by the Carter administration.

Age of Women in Office

Political elites are predominantly middle-aged. The officeholders in our study are no exception to this well-established fact, as Table 6 confirms. As in the 1975 survey, median age varies little from office to office, though judges, not included in the earlier survey, are similar to mayors in being somewhat older. Federal appointees, also not included in 1975, appear to be markedly younger than other officeholders. At county and local levels of office-holding, women from districts of under 10,000 population are slightly older than women from large districts.

Education

Women holding office are well educated relative to the general population.¹³ Most have attended school beyond high school, though only at state and federal levels are the majority college graduates (Table 7). Among state executives, judges and federal officeholders, the majority have one or more graduate degrees.

As is often true of adults in today's society, education is an ongoing process for many officeholders. The percentages who report having taken courses or attended school within the past year range from 15% of state senators to 37% of judges. Seven percent of all officeholders were working toward a degree, though only 3% attended full time.

Education and age. Similar to age patterns in the general population, older officeholders have less education. For example, the percentage of state legislators aged 55 and over who have completed college is 57%, while 89% of legislators under 35 years old have a college degree. Similarly, 32% of local council members aged 55 or more, but 43% of those under age 35, have completed college. The proportions with graduate degrees among state legislators increase from 19% of those 55 and older to 39% among those under 35 years.

Education and district size. In the smaller districts, proportionately fewer women are college graduates, regardless of age. Indeed, the educational level of officeholders may be more strongly related to district size than to age, as suggested by the fact that 52% of women aged 55 or over in large districts have completed college, in contrast to only 38% of those under age 35 years in small districts.

Employment Status and Occupation

Public office is a part-time activity for many state legislators and for most county commissioners, mayors and local councillors. Substantial proportions of women in these offices, from 30% of state representatives to 56% of local councilwomen, have additional employment outside the home (Table 8).

The present or past occupations of women in office reflect both their elite status and their gender (Table 9). Women in office typically have occupations of higher prestige than do members of the general population, and prestige rises with level of office.¹⁴ Most common are professional/technical occupations, followed by clerical/secretarial and managerial/administrative. The sex-linked nature of the occupations of women officeholders is illustrated in Table 9 by the proportions in selected occupational categories. Among state legislative, county and local officeholders, just four types of occupations -- secretarial/clerical, nursing/health technical, social work and elementary/secondary school teaching -- account for between 30% and 40% of those reporting. Only among state executives, members of the state judiciary, and federal officeholders is there a relative absence of concentration in these four occupations traditionally pursued by women.

Stability vs. change in occupational profiles.

Despite the entry of more and younger women into political office in recent years, the occupational profiles of women officeholders show few signs of change. The occupations of local councillors and mayors differ neither by age nor by year of entry into office. Among county commissioners, a larger proportion of recent entrants (22%) than of those entering in 1974 or earlier (12%) are classified as managerial/administrative. This shift is not

Table 8. MANY WOMEN IN OFFICE ARE EMPLOYED IN OTHER OCCUPATIONS^a

Employment Status	Fed. Exec.	Judi- ciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor- alty %	Local Council %
<u>% Employed Outside Office</u>	(0)	3	5	40	30	38	51	56
Full time	(0)	0	0	22	15	22	32	37
Part time	(0)	3	5	18	14	14	18	18
Time not specified	(0)	0	0	0	1	2	1	1
<u>% Not Employed Outside Office</u>	(15)	97	95	60	70	62	49	44
Last employed '76-'77	(8)	8	10	5	11	10	3	4
Last employed '72-'75	(0)	13	26	11	16	14	14	12
No recent employment	(1)	30	18	32	34	27	26	23
Date not specified	(6)	46	41	12	9	11	6	5
Total	(15)	(37)	(39)	(62)	(253)	(279)	(286)	(2,170)

^aTabulations at the U.S. House level are omitted because of low numbers responding.

Table 9. THE OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE OF WOMEN OFFICEHOLDERS LIES IN A RESTRICTED RANGE WITH A HEAVY CONCENTRATION IN TRADITIONALLY FEMALE OCCUPATIONS

Current or Past Occupation	Fed. Exec.	U.S. House	Judi- ciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor- alty %	Local Council %
<u>Census Categories</u>									
Professional, technical	(15)	(9)	100	45	64	48	50	36	37
Managers, administrators	(7)	(0)	0	49	16	23	18	20	18
Sales workers	(0)	(0)	0	0	7	8	6	9	8
Clerical, secretarial	(1)	(0)	0	6	11	17	18	21	26
Crafts	(0)	(1)	0	0	0	0	-	1	1
Operatives	(0)	(0)	0	0	0	1	1	3	3
Laborers	(0)	(0)	0	0	0	0	-	1	-
Farm	(0)	(0)	0	0	2	1	4	2	1
Service	(0)	(0)	0	0	0	2	3	7	6
<u>Selected Occupations</u>									
Health workers	(1)	(0)	0	0	0	3	8	7	5
Social workers	(0)	(1)	0	9	3	4	6	1	1
Elem., secondary teachers	(0)	(1)	4	3	16	13	16	14	17
Physicians, dentists	(0)	(0)	0	3	0	0	-	1	-
College teachers	(3)	(0)	6	0	9	6	3	1	2
Editors, reporters	(0)	(0)	0	0	7	2	2	2	2
Real estate, insurance sales workers	(0)	(0)	0	0	5	5	3	5	4
Public administrators	(2)	(0)	0	6	5	3	2	1	1
Lawyers	(8)	(6)	90	10	11	3	2	2	1
<u>Median Occupational Prestige^a</u>	(72)	(76)	76	56	51	51	50	48	46
Total	(23)	(10)	(32)	(33)	(56)	(240)	(252)	(262)	(2,036)

^aHodge-Siegel-Rossi Scores as adapted to the 1970 U.S. Census Occupational Codes by the National Opinion Research Center.

concentrated among the younger officeholders but is true of all age categories. In the state legislatures, no differences appear between newcomers and those with longer tenure, but there are perceptible differences between younger and older legislators. Forty percent of legislators aged 55 and over, 42% of 45-54 year olds, 33% of 35-44 year olds and only 23% of those less than 35 years of age are in the four traditionally female occupations we have singled out as rough indicators of occupational sex-differentiation. Among those under 35, higher proportions are in law (12% vs. 1%-5% at other ages) and college teaching (14% vs. 3%-9% among other age groups). Women aged 35-44 years also show signs of less traditionalism in occupation. Higher proportions are managerial/administrative (28%) than in other age categories (14%-29%), and they are more likely to be college teachers (9%) than those over age 45 (3%).

Organizational Affiliations

Surveys of the general population consistently have found an association between participation in voluntary organizations and heightened political activity.¹⁵ Even organizations that are manifestly nonpolitical in aims often serve as vehicles for the development of political motivations and the exercise of political activity.¹⁶ Therefore women in office, as politically active individuals, can be expected to have a relatively large number of organizational memberships. Moreover, variations in numbers and types of memberships may supply indirect evidence of differing political involvements among women in office.

Number of memberships. On the average, from three to six current, active memberships are reported by every category of officeholder (Table 10). Judges and state legislators report the highest number of memberships, followed by those in state executive and federal offices. Mayors average the fewest affiliations, with county commissioners and local councilwomen reporting almost as few.

Officeholders in larger districts have substantially more memberships than those in smaller districts (see Table 11). This difference is probably the result of a less elaborate organizational structure in less populous areas. It could also reflect the lower education of officeholders in small districts, for past research has shown level of education to be associated with organizational participation.¹⁷

Except among mayors, women entering their current offices after 1974 belong to fewer organizations (Table 11). Women under age 35 also average fewer memberships, a pattern true of younger women in the general population (Table 11).¹⁸ Do more recent entrants have fewer memberships because they are younger? Or does tenure in public office represent a form of social participation that, regardless of age, stimulates additional organizational involvements? Detailed analysis of local councilwomen by year of entry within separate categories of age reveals that the more recent officeholders average fewer memberships within each age category under 55 years. Among those 55 and older, newcomers have more memberships.¹⁹

Therefore, with the exception of the older office-

TABLE 10. WOMEN IN OFFICE ARE MEMBERS OF A WIDE VARIETY OF ORGANIZATIONS

Member of at Least One Organization in the Category	Fed. Exec.	U.S. House	Judiciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Consn. %	Mayor-alty %	Local Council %
Political (e.g., Democratic or Republican clubs, LWV)	(14)	(11)	46	64	84	86	65	38	43
Professional, business	(14)	(8)	98	68	64	47	37	30	32
Special service (e.g., Red Cross, Sierra Club)	(5)	(6)	40	34	44	39	35	27	29
Cultural ^a	(2)	(5)	26	14	20	34	24	27	29
Youth-school service (e.g., PTA, Girl Scouts)	(3)	(0)	21	16	16	24	25	22	29
Hobby and sports	(3)	(2)	26	24	16	24	22	21	23
General service (e.g., service club auxiliary, Community Chest)	(3)	(1)	33	30	20	27	26	21	19
Church-related	(0)	(0)	5	10	11	18	13	12	16
Alumni and university service (e.g., AAUW)	(7)	(2)	37	24	33	27	13	10	11
Sororal, fraternal auxiliary	(0)	(1)	19	4	5	10	8	13	10
Labor	(0)	(0)	0	8	8	6	3	5	8
Veterans and auxiliary	(0)	(1)	7	2	3	5	7	9	7
Public officials	(3)	(1)	9	14	17	23	12	8	5
Farm	(0)	(1)	0	2	3	3	3	2	2
Ethnic	(0)	(1)	2	6	6	4	2	3	2
Total	(22)	(13)	(43)	(50)	(64)	(263)	(268)	(265)	(1,947)
Median Total Memberships	(4.0)	(4.2)	6.0	4.3	5.5	5.4	3.6	2.6	3.1

^aCategory includes a number of women's groups whose defined purposes appear to be principally cultural-aesthetic.

Table 11. OFFICEHOLDERS' MEMBERSHIPS VARY WITH DISTRICT SIZE, YEAR OF ENTRY AND AGE

Median Number of Memberships:	State Legis.	County Comsn.	Mayor-alty	Local Council
<u>District Population</u>				
under 10,000		2.9 (115)	2.2 (183)	2.7 (1,298)
10,000+		4.8 (125)	4.1 (65)	4.5 (515)
<u>Year of Entry</u>				
1974 or prior	6.0 (189)	4.0 (105)	2.7 (106)	3.4 (766)
1975 or later	5.0 (123)	3.4 (156)	2.6 (153)	2.9 (1,107)
<u>Age</u>				
under 35 years	4.6 (43)	(2.1) (23)	(2.0) (18)	2.4 (240)
35-44 years	5.1 (77)	4.0 (74)	3.1 (56)	3.3 (539)
45-54 years	5.7 (108)	3.7 (98)	3.0 (96)	3.4 (603)
55 and over	6.1 (71)	4.0 (60)	2.3 (92)	3.0 (489)

holders, tenure in office is associated with an increased number of organizational affiliations.²⁰ Participation in organizations is often viewed primarily as an important antecedent of political participation, a way of developing skills and building constituencies. Our analysis suggests that one must also pay attention to organizational affiliation as a consequence of political activity, perhaps as part of a process by which constituencies are widened and the groundwork laid for political mobility, perhaps merely as an aspect of what officeholders feel is expected of them as officials.

Types of memberships. Women holding office join a wide variety of organizations. This variety is seen in Table 10, which presents the percentages in each

office belonging to one or more organizations of a particular type.²¹ In all categories of office, more officeholders belong to political, professional and special service organizations than to any other type of organization. Groups specializing in cultural pursuits, youth or school service organizations, hobby or sports clubs and general service organizations also attract sizeable proportions of officeholders.

The great majority of women officeholders are members of one or more women's organizations, as Table 12 shows. These organizations are classified into five types: feminist social action groups, whose principal aim is to bring about change in the status of women; general service, reform or social action groups, whose aims may include the status of women but are focused primarily on other issues and activities; professional and business organizations; women's partisan political groups; other women's organizations such as sororities, social clubs or women's auxiliaries.

Patterns of membership in feminist organizations are of particular interest because they parallel patterns of orientations to women's issues and women's role in politics, which will be discussed in Parts IV and V. The varying proportions having membership in feminist groups only in part mirror differences in the propensity to join few or many organizations. County and local officeholders, who average fewer memberships in general, are low in the proportions belonging to feminist groups. Yet judges, who have the highest median number of memberships, are also relatively low in feminist affiliations. More than a quarter of other officeholders report membership in one or more feminist groups, with state legislators showing the highest percentages. Membership in feminist organizations is also proportionately more common among women in larger districts, among Democrats and, despite their fewer organizational ties, among women under age 35.

Family Characteristics

The very high levels of social participation of women in public office are apparent from a review of their occupational and organizational involve-

Table 12. ALTHOUGH MOST WOMEN BELONG TO AT LEAST ONE WOMEN'S ORGANIZATION, LOW PROPORTIONS OF OFFICEHOLDERS HOLD MEMBERSHIP IN FEMINIST GROUPS

Membership in at Least One Organization in the Category	Fed. Exec.	U.S. House	Judiciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor-alty %	Local Council %
Women's organizations, any type	(14)	(11)	81	74	92	91	75	68	65
Feminist-social action (e.g., NDW, WEAL, WPC)	(8)	(4)	14	26	31	31	13	4	4
General social service (e.g., LWV, AAUW)	(2)	(6)	44	31	66	50	35	26	23
Professional, business (e.g., BPW, women lawyers)	(4)	(5)	51	34	50	41	19	17	14
Women's political (e.g., women's party clubs)	(5)	(5)	9	28	30	40	30	14	15
Other women's (e.g., women's clubs, sororities, DAR, OES)	(2)	(4)	35	30	33	39	36	44	40
Total	(22)	(14)	(43)	(50)	(64)	(264)	(270)	(266)	(1,963)

Table 13. MOST WOMEN OFFICEHOLDERS ARE MARRIED

Marital Status	Fed. Exec.	U.S. House	Judiciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor-alty %	Local Council %
Married	(19)	(8)	84	68	72	80	81	76	78
Divorced, separated	(1)	(0)	11	11	11	8	5	7	5
Widowed	(1)	(4)	0	10	8	6	10	11	12
Single	(3)	(1)	5	11	9	6	4	6	5
Total	(24)	(13)	(45)	(53)	(64)	(278)	(282)	(290)	(2,173)

ments. This multiplicity of public affiliations typically co-exists with the family roles of wife and mother.

Marital status. The overwhelming majority of women in every type of office are married, as demonstrated in Table 13²². Marital profiles differ little from office to office. State senators and members of the state executive appear to be slightly less likely to be married and more likely to be single or divorced. Yet the percentages for these offices are based on small numbers and one must be cautious about drawing inferences from them.

Children. Just as most women in office are married, most are mothers, although not of young children. Except for county commissioners (who also have somewhat larger families), the majority in every office have no children under 18 years (Table 14).

Family income. Family income indicates both social status and the extent to which there may be material resources that can be applied to the support of political activity. On the whole, the family incomes of women in office are above average, although few could be classified as enjoying very high incomes (Table 15). Family incomes rise with level of officeholding.

Family and Political Life

Potentially, the family is both resource and focus of strain in relation to political activity. On the one hand, family members may contribute material resources, volunteer labor and psychological support to their politically active members. On the other hand, the demands of political life -- whether full-

time career or "spare-time" activity -- may threaten a drain on family resources, a loss of involvement in family life, and a heightening of family tensions. To explore the connection between family life and the political activity of women, we have analyzed responses to two series of questions: about the perceived supportiveness of the husband and about the perceived effects on family life of a high level of political activity.

Husband's degree of supportiveness. Perhaps because of a popular image of politics as the natural domain of men, relatively little attention has been devoted to the support for political activity that women may receive from their families. Yet a supportive family may be even more important for a politically active woman because public roles for women and for men receive differing degrees of social approval. The woman who fails to receive family support faces the double bind of negative sanctions from her family and uncertain public support.

Women in office do report high levels of support from their husbands, as shown by responses to questions about their husbands' interest in politics, approval of their holding office, participation in their political life and assumption of extra household tasks (Table 16).²³ Very large majorities, three-quarters or more in most offices, report that their husbands "approve and actively encourage" their holding office. Few husbands are perceived as even mildly opposed. In addition, most husbands have at least some interest in politics, and from 36% to 74% report their husbands as "very much interested." On the whole, husbands are not as likely to participate in their wives' political lives or to take on extra tasks at home as they are

Table 14. LOW PROPORTIONS OF WOMEN OFFICEHOLDERS HAVE YOUNG CHILDREN

Age of Youngest Child	Fed. Exec.	U.S. House	Judiciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor-alty %	Local Council %
Under 6 years	(3)	(0)	0	4	2	3	6	3	8
6-11 years	(3)	(1)	7	10	10	14	21	13	17
12-17 years	(0)	(1)	28	16	15	21	25	20	22
18+ years	(4)	(1)	42	31	50	47	40	50	41
Age not reported	(0)	(1)	7	11	3	-	1	-	1
No children	(6)	(1)	16	28	20	15	7	14	11
Total	(21)	(5)	(43)	(49)	(59)	(256)	(282)	(288)	(2,163)

Table 15. MOST WOMEN OFFICEHOLDERS REPORT FAMILY INCOMES IN THE MIDDLE RANGE^a

Family Income:	Judi- ciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor- alty %	Local Council %
Married							
Under \$15,000	0	3	8	9	11	25	20
\$15,000-\$29,999	7	3	31	32	42	48	52
\$30,000-\$49,999	21	41	25	37	28	16	19
\$50,000 and over	72	53	36	22	19	11	9
Total	(29)	(29)	(39)	(197)	(207)	(206)	(1,571)
Unmarried							
Under \$15,000	(0)	(1)	(4)	55	61	62	65
\$15,000-\$29,999	(0)	(9)	(9)	28	31	24	26
\$30,000-\$49,999	(6)	(4)	(1)	10	8	5	7
\$50,000 and over	(1)	(0)	(1)	7	0	9	2
Total	(7)	(14)	(15)	(42)	(49)	(65)	(453)

^aTabulations at the federal level are omitted because of low numbers responding.

to express approval and interest. Nevertheless, the great majority of husbands either often or occasionally facilitate their wives' officeholding through their own participation in political or household activity.

If the political activity of married women is conditional upon spousal support, we would expect higher levels of support among husbands of women in offices that potentially pose the greater threat of family disruption -- offices requiring greater amounts of time or travel away from home. With the exception of members of the judiciary and of the state executive, proportions perceiving political interest, approval, public and household assistance

from their husbands all rise with level of office. The upward trend in political interest and assumption of household tasks is interrupted among judges, and the percentages of state executives reporting interest, approval and public participation are also out of line with the trend. Although the nature of these offices may limit opportunities for the husband's public participation, reasons for lower levels of support in the other dimensions are unclear.

The direction of differences in support among husbands from smaller and larger districts suggests that the reasons for lower supportiveness among husbands of judges and state executives are not to

Table 16. PROPORTIONS OF RESPONDENTS REPORTING SUPPORTIVE SPOUSES RISE WITH LEVEL OF OFFICE^a

	Judi- ciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor- alty %	Local Council %
Husband's Interest in Politics							
Strongly interested	58	39	74	61	50	36	39
Somewhat interested	42	54	26	33	41	49	49
Little interest	0	7	0	6	9	15	12
Total	(31)	(28)	(39)	(209)	(222)	(217)	(1,672)
Approval of Wife's Officeholding							
Actively encourages	94	75	77	75	75	62	60
Approves for the most part	6	21	23	23	22	31	33
Mildly to actively opposes	0	4	0	2	3	7	7
Total	(32)	(28)	(39)	(209)	(221)	(215)	(1,669)
Participation in Wife's Political Activity							
Often	62	36	57	43	38	23	24
Occasionally	34	44	33	36	41	40	37
Never	4	20	10	21	21	37	39
Total	(29)	(25)	(39)	(205)	(221)	(214)	(1,655)
Assumption of Extra Household Tasks							
Often	45	79	71	60	43	33	34
Occasionally	29	18	24	27	43	37	38
Never	26	3	5	13	14	30	28
Total	(31)	(28)	(38)	(204)	(221)	(214)	(1,650)

^aTabulations at the Federal level are omitted because of low numbers reporting

Table 17. PERCEPTION OF CONFLICT BETWEEN POLITICS AND FAMILY LIFE RISES WITH LEVEL OF OFFICE^a

Percent agreeing or agreeing strongly	Judiciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor-alty %	Local Council %
Men's political activity harms family life	56	63	59	54	49	51	49
Total	(34)	(38)	(53)	(239)	(255)	(251)	(1,946)
Women's political activity harms family life	60	66	65	54	51	54	50
Total	(34)	(38)	(55)	(239)	(261)	(265)	(1,995)

^aFederal officeholders are omitted because of low numbers reporting.

be found simply in the demanding nature of their wives' offices. Local officeholding in the smaller districts is less demanding and should pose less inconvenience for other family members. Yet consistent with the pattern of higher supportiveness at higher levels of officeholding, husbands of officials in the larger districts are more often perceived as interested, approving, participating and helping. Apparently, the supportiveness of husbands is not so much contingent on minimal inconvenience as it is dependent upon an environment in which husbands develop a nontraditional view of women's roles (or one in which women can select nontraditional husbands).

Perceived effects on family life. Among a series of items dealing with perceptions of women in politics, officeholders were asked to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement with two statements about family life: "Men can't be really active in politics without having their family life suffer." "Women can't be really active in politics without having their family life suffer." Despite the high levels of support that officeholders perceive from their spouses, they divide fairly evenly in their judgment that being "really active" in politics has deleterious consequences for family life (Table 17). Little distinction between women and men is made in this evaluation.

Perceptions of conflict between an active political life and the quality of family life are proportionately more common among women in higher-level offices, even though women in higher offices tend more often to perceive their husbands as supportive. This apparent anomaly is clarified by Table 18, which presents perceptions of local council members and other officeholders within each category of marital and parental status. Those in higher offices are more likely to perceive conflict between politics and family life only if they have children under 18 years old or, if they have no minor children, if they are divorced or single. Comparing only categories of marital status, we find not the married but the divorced, regardless of whether they have minor children and regardless of level of office, are consistently higher in perceptions of political activity as detrimental to family life. Children do not appear to present the problems that one might predict. The presence of minor children interacts with incumbency of a more demanding office to produce only a slight negative effect on perceptions. Two dimensions contribute in various ways to evaluations of

Table 18. DIVORCED WOMEN AND WOMEN IN HIGHER OFFICES ARE MOST NEGATIVE ABOUT EFFECTS OF OFFICEHOLDING ON THE FAMILY

% Agreeing that Women's Political Activity is Detrimental to Family	Local Councils %	Other Offices %
<u>No children under 18</u>		
Married	50	49
Total	(673)	(381)
Divorced	68	78
Total	(50)	(40)
Widowed	55	46
Total	(185)	(54)
Single	40	62
Total	(93)	(48)
<u>Children under 18</u>		
Married	50	56
Total	(878)	(326)
Divorced	59	64
Total	(46)	(28)
Widowed	54	(13)
Total	(35)	(17)
Single	(4)	(0)
Total	(5)	(0)

political activity as interfering with family life: a relatively demanding office, and the absence of a husband who provides support for political activity.

The importance of spousal supportiveness is confirmed by a comparison of married women whose husbands approve of their officeholding with those whose husbands disapprove. Forty-four percent of local councilwomen and 48% of women in other offices with approving husbands perceive politics as adversely affecting family life. Among those with disapproving husbands, by contrast, 62% of local councilwomen and 70% of women in other offices perceive such ill effects. The small minority of women whose husbands do not approve are similar to divorced women in their tendency to see conflict between family and an active political life. Thus the nature of the conjugal relationship or disruption by divorce of the relationship is strongly associated with the way in which women perceive the connection between family and politics.

CHARACTERISTICS OF WOMEN COMPARED WITH MEN

Recruitment to office is not a random process. The women who enter public office are typically set apart from others by characteristics such as ethnicity, age, education, income or organizational affiliations. To this point, however, our review of the personal attributes and family roles of women in office has failed to address an important question: Have we described the result of selection processes peculiar to women, or have we described the outcome of general processes operating in the selection of both men and women? Undoubtedly, there is no simple answer to this question. We can begin to answer it by comparing women in public office with men holding similar offices. We turn now to this task, utilizing for analysis our sample of men and a comparison sample of women holding similar offices in the same states.

Age of Women Compared with Men

Past research has found women in office to be older than male officials.²⁴ The most common interpretation of this difference is that men enter politics at a young age, as an extension of their traditional role as representative of the family to the larger society. Women, by contrast, wait until their children are older to become involved in public activity. A second explanation is that women, less involved in the labor force and lacking the professional credentials that are often used informally to define qualifications for office, require a longer period of apprenticeship through alternative structures of community organizations or political parties. Whatever the causes, the consequences of delayed political activity for women are likely to include lowered ceilings on political careers.

Our data confirm only in part the understanding that women in public office are older than men. As can be seen in Table 19, the median age of women is only marginally higher than that of

Table 19. LARGER PROPORTIONS OF MEN IN OFFICE ARE UNDER FORTY OR OVER SIXTY YEARS OLD

Age	Women %	Men %
Under 30 years	2	6
30-39	23	26
40-49	31	27
50-59	31	23
60 and over	13	18
Total	(708)	(361)
Median Age	48	46

men -- approximately two years. An examination of the percentages of men and women in each age category reveals that women are concentrated in the middle years, while slightly higher proportions of men are under 40 and over 60 years of age. The disproportion of older men in relation to women results from the men's longer tenure of office and not from an older age of entry into office. In

fact, among those now aged 60 or more, a higher percentage of the women (60%) than of the men (52%) were at least sixty years old when elected. Thirty percent of the older men but only 9% of the older women entered their current offices more than ten years prior to the survey.

Age at entry into office. Evidence for a trend among women toward a younger age at entry into office was presented in the report of the 1975 survey.²⁵ If this trend is apparent only for women and not for men, then the age distribution of women in office is converging toward that of men.²⁶ Underlying such a process would be changes in the general status and roles of women in society. If, instead, age at entry is similarly declining for men, differences in the ages of men and women in office are likely to continue. A pattern of declining age at entry for both sexes could result from general changes in the age structure of the society or from general changes in processes of political recruitment.

Analysis of our data suggests an absence of change in age differences between men and women, for age at entry into office has declined among both sexes by roughly the same number of years. Table 20 presents median age at entry into office, for both

Table 20. AGE AT ENTRY INTO OFFICE IS DECLINING FOR BOTH SEXES

Median Age:	Year of Entry to Current Office				
	76-77	74-75	72-73	70-71	68-69
Of women	44 (278)	46 (241)	44 (109)	48 (31)	(49) (10)
Of men	39 (102)	40 (99)	40 (60)	44 (31)	(45) (19)

the sample of men and the comparison sample of women, in each two-year period over the past decade. In each period, the newly-elected group of women averages at least four years older than its male counterpart. If age at entry into office is an indicator of the potential for similarity between the sexes in patterns of political careers, then we find little to signify that women are becoming more like men in the life-cycle phasing of their political activity.

Education

To the extent that formal education either adds skills or operates as symbolic qualification for office, women are disadvantaged relative to men. In our study, approximately equal proportions of men and women have completed college, but the men are far more apt to have a graduate degree or to have done some graduate work. Twenty-six percent of the men have one or more graduate degrees, and an additional 16% have done graduate work, in comparison to 16% women with graduate degrees and 4% with some graduate study. Equal proportions of men and women had attended school or taken courses within the past year.

Employment and Occupation

Paralleling sex differences in the general population, women in office are much less likely than men to have outside employment. In the sample of men, 86% are employed in addition to holding office, 79% full time. By contrast, only 51% of the comparison sample of women are currently employed, 32% full time.

The current or past occupations of women and men differ in familiar ways. As shown in Table 21, nearly half the women (47%) but relatively few men

Table 21. MALE OFFICEHOLDERS REPORT OCCUPATIONS OVER MORE DIVERSE RANGE THAN WOMEN

Current or Past Occupation	Women %	Men %
<u>Census Categories</u>		
Professional, technical	43	33
Managers, administrators	16	30
Sales workers	8	8
Clerical, secretarial	24	2
Crafts	1	10
Operatives	2	3
Laborers	-	1
Farm	1	10
Service	5	3
<u>Selected Occupations</u>		
Health workers	6	1
Social workers	2	-
Elem., secondary teachers	15	5
Physicians, dentists	-	2
College teachers	4	1
Editors, reporters	2	-
Real estate, insurance sales workers	4	6
Public administrators	2	3
Lawyers	2	4
Median Occupational Prestige ^a	48	50
Total	(678)	(354)

^aHodge-Siegel-Rossi Scores as adapted to the 1970 U.S. Census Occupational Codes by the National Opinion Research Center.

(8%) are in four occupations where women traditionally concentrate -- teaching, nursing, social work and secretarial work. Despite the sex concentration of occupations and the somewhat lower educational levels of women, men do not uniformly have the higher status positions. The average occupational prestige of women is approximately equal to that of men in office.²⁷ Larger proportions of women have professional occupations; men are far more prevalent in managerial and administrative positions. Women predominate in secretarial and clerical occupations; more men are craftspeople and farmers.

Implications of sex differences in occupations. The pattern of sex differentiation in occupations of officeholders raises questions about special difficulties women may face in using their occupations as credentials or as avenues to political

positions. High occupational prestige is characteristic of both men and women who achieve public office. Although the women officeholders do contain large proportions with conventionally female occupations, we know of no evidence that the skills learned in such occupations are less relevant to political performance than skills learned in, for example, engineering, retail management, crafts or farming. Yet the occupational skills of women may not be perceived and acknowledged as conferring competence for political office because they involve tasks executed by women and may be either unfamiliar to or automatically devalued by influential males. Moreover, women's occupations may well be characterized by lower probabilities of exposure to politically active individuals and networks. Therefore, there is some reason to suspect that the occupations of women, regardless of their formal prestige or intrinsic skills, are not as likely as those of men to aid recruitment to office and political mobility.

Organizational Affiliations

Analysis of the organizational participation of women and men in office suggests that women may compensate for their relative educational and occupational disadvantages by extensive participation in voluntary associations. Women in office average more memberships than men (Table 22). The median for men is 2.6, while that for women is 3.6. The difference is especially pronounced among state legislators, where women average 6.1 to the men's 3.6 memberships.

Table 22. WOMEN IN OFFICE AVERAGE A HIGHER NUMBER OF MEMBERSHIPS THAN MEN

Member of at Least One Organization in Category	Women %	Men %
Political (e.g., party clubs, LWV)	55	34
Professional, business	35	41
Special service (e.g., Red Cross, Sierra)	30	13
Cultural ^a	27	6
Youth-school service (e.g., PTA, Scouts)	26	17
Hobby and sports	28	15
General service (e.g., service clubs, Community Chest)	20	31
Church-related	18	6
Alumni and university service	15	3
Sororal, fraternal	8	14
Labor	9	12
Veteran and auxiliary	6	14
Public officials	7	2
Farm	2	8
Ethnic	3	3
Total	(678)	(346)
Median Number of Memberships	3.6	2.6

^aIncludes groups whose defined purposes appear to be principally cultural-aesthetic.

This finding has significance for understanding sex differences in political recruitment processes. Since surveys of the general population have consistently found women to have fewer organizational ties than men,²⁸ the more extensive organizational involvement of women officeholders cannot be interpreted simply as a reflection of their gender -- of some feminine impulse to sociability. Instead, it would appear that women who are very active in organizations are able to develop constituencies and build reputations for expertise that facilitate entry into office and maintenance of official status. Even those who lack the professional degrees and occupational ties characteristic of politically active men can find avenues to heightened political participation through organizational ties.

Family Characteristics

Age differences between men and women in office imply differences in their family situations as well. Although men and women do differ in their family characteristics, a causal connection between women's traditionally greater family responsibilities and their older age at entry into office has not been established. The possibility exists that the family characteristics of women are the result and not the cause of their being older than men when they enter office.

Marital status. Lower proportions of women than of their male colleagues are married; higher percentages are divorced or widowed (Table 23). However, since men who have experienced loss of a spouse through

Table 23. A HIGHER PROPORTION OF MALE THAN FEMALE OFFICEHOLDERS ARE MARRIED

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Women</u> %	<u>Men</u> %
Married	79	91
Divorced, separated	6	3
Widowed	11	1
Single	4	5
Total	(741)	(360)

widowhood or divorce are much more apt to remarry than women experiencing similar events, differences in the percentages currently widowed or divorced are not reliable indicators of the relative incidence of disruption of marital ties.

Parental status of women vs. men. Female and male officeholders are equally likely to be parents, and they have approximately the same numbers of children. However, a higher percentage of the men are parents of young children, under 12 years of age.²⁹ The differences are not large: in the total sample, 34% of the men and 24% of the women have children under 12 years. Differences widen at the state legislative level, however, where 35% of men but only 16% of women have young children, even though legislators do not differ in marital status.³⁰

Family income. Whether income distributions are to the advantage of male or female officeholders depends

upon their marital status. Among the unmarried, women more often have incomes under \$15,000 (60% vs. 38% of the men). Among the married, 41% of the women but only 30% of the men report incomes over \$30,000. This difference may in part be explained by a slightly higher percentage of currently employed among women officeholders (51%) than among the wives of male officeholders (46%). It could also stem from the fact that a higher proportion of the women are in late middle age, when family income tends to peak. In addition, women in office may have married men of higher status than their male colleagues.

Family and Political Life

The assumption of public, decision-making roles by women has raised many questions among members of the public -- and in the minds of some scholars -- about the stability of the family lives of political women. Apparently, the image of the politically active woman is so at variance with the traditional relegation of women to housework, to child care and to the protective authority of their husbands that many assume the officeholder must pay a high price in domestic harmony for her political ambitions. Yet in our study the men perceive less support from their wives for political activities, and they are more likely to see political activity as having a negative effect on family life.

Support from husbands vs. wives. A comparison of responses of men and women to questions about the political interest, approval, participation and domestic assistance of their spouse is consistent with the hypothesis that the conjugal relationship may be more critical in the political participation of women than of men.³¹ On every item higher proportions of female than of male officeholders report the supportiveness of their spouses (Table 24). The differences in spousal supportiveness exist regardless of the age of officeholders and regardless of whether they have minor children.

Table 24. HUSBANDS ARE PERCEIVED AS MORE SUPPORTIVE THAN WIVES BY OFFICEHOLDERS

<u>Percent of Married Reporting:</u>	<u>Women</u> %	<u>Men</u> %
Spouse very much interested in politics	48	26
Actively encourages officeholding	67	44
Participates in officeholder's political life	30	25
Assumes extra household tasks	42	29
Total	(554)	(322)

Perceptions of effects on family life. Men are also substantially more likely than women to perceive a very active political life as in conflict with the family. Proportionately more men than women perceive a high level of political activity as detrimental to the family life of men as well as of women. Seventy-seven percent of the men, but only 49% of the women, agree with the statement

that women cannot be really active in politics without having their family life suffer. Seventy percent of the men and 48% of the women subscribe to this belief in reference to the political activity of men.

The wide differences between male and female officeholders in their perceptions of the effects of politics on family life occur regardless of marital status, the presence of minor children, or age of the officeholder. The differences also persist unchanged regardless of the level of spousal support, even though a lower level of support is associated with an increased tendency among both men and women to perceive adverse consequences for the family.

The results of this analysis of the relation between political activity and family roles suggests the hypothesis that family approval is a far more important selective criterion for the political participation of women than of men. It is likely that women whose families disapprove of their political activity fail to seek office in the first place, resulting in a high degree of family support among those who enter office. Men, taking for granted positive sanctions for public activity, perhaps viewing such activity as an important adjunct to their occupations or as their primary career commitment, are less likely to seek family approval before entry into politics. As a consequence, the group of men who do enter politics contains a fairly high proportion of nonsupportive families. As will become apparent in Part VI of this report, in which ambitions for further office are analyzed, familial disapproval may play a role in the greater tendency of men to say they plan to withdraw from public officeholding. Women, too, whose spouses disapprove are more likely than those with approving spouses to plan to leave public office, but relatively few of the women in office lack the support of their husbands. If our interpretation of differences in the family situations of men and women is correct, then increases in women's political participation may depend heavily upon changing marital relationships.

CONCLUSION TO PART II

In our examination of the social and family characteristics of women in office, we have considered differences by office, political party, time of entry into office, age of officeholder and size of district population. We have also compared men with women. A brief summary may serve to clarify the manner in which these dimensions, utilized throughout this report, are or are not linked to the social attributes of officeholders.

Variations by Office

Variations by type of office are sufficient to signal caution before assuming that a description of incumbents of a particular office is a description of all public officeholders. In some respects, the higher the level of office, the more elite the characteristics of officeholders. Education, occupational prestige and family income all rise with level of office. Officeholders also differ in age and number of organizational affiliations, though not as a simple function of level of office. Marital status varies little by office. An impli-

cation of such diverse patterning by type of office is that understanding the nature of women's officeholding requires an office by office examination of the background, behavior and orientations of incumbents.

Party Affiliation

Despite the fact that Democratic and Republican women are shown in other parts of this report to differ in political and social attitudes, political party does not differentiate to any notable degree the social characteristics of women in office. Democrats and Republicans in office are, on the average, of the same age, educational level (a slightly higher proportion of graduate degrees among Democrats), employment status, occupational prestige, family income (slightly higher among Republicans at local levels), marital and parental status. Their husbands are equally likely to support their officeholding activities. Among the characteristics we have considered, only ethnicity (that most minority women are Democrats is well known) and types of organizational affiliation differ by political party.

Common knowledge would not predict the lack of association between party affiliation and social characteristics frequently observed to be related to differing ideologies. Since party affiliation is often "inherited" as an aspect of family tradition, perhaps the source of differing social attitudes of Democratic and Republican women in office lies not so much in their social location defined by demographic characteristics as it does in their social location defined by cultural traditions of family and personal networks.

Tenure of Office

Patterns associated with entry into office before or since 1975 have been examined with a view to defining ways in which recent increases in the numbers of women in office may imply the recruitment of different kinds of women. More recent entrants to office are younger, not only because they have less tenure of office but also because the age of entry into office has been declining over time. Despite their younger age, newcomers differ little in social and family characteristics from women who preceded them into office. Perhaps the detection of trends in the kinds of women recruited to office must await a longer period of observation.

Age of Officeholders

Because age is commonly a sensitive indicator of many aspects of an individual's attributes, behavior and attitudes, we give special attention to the age of officeholders and to the association of age with other social characteristics. Younger cohorts of officeholders exhibit patterns typical of their stage of the life cycle, as reflected in their lower family incomes or membership in fewer organizations. They also may exhibit patterns that reflect social change. Like their age mates in the larger society, younger women in office manifest ongoing social trends by being proportionately less often married, less often mothers, more often college graduates. If such attributes are relevant

to political behavior, then the younger women in office presage changes in the nature of office-holding by women. Yet the anticipation of change should not be exaggerated. Except among state legislators, younger women are no more likely than their older colleagues to possess graduate degrees, and they show few signs to date of deviating from their predecessors in the degree to which their occupational backgrounds are restricted to the traditional pursuits of women.

District Size

The sharpest discriminator of the social characteristics of women in office is the size of the population of their districts. Women in the smaller districts (defined for purposes of analysis as 10,000 and under) at county and local levels of officeholding differ from those in larger districts in nearly every dimension examined. They are slightly older, more often widowed. When married, their husbands are less supportive of their political activity. The younger among them are more likely than younger women in large districts to have minor children. They are less educated, more often employed in addition to holding office, have fewer organizational memberships and of different types. Officeholders in the smaller districts hardly conform to popular stereotypes of the political woman; yet, since the great majority of local officeholders are in such districts, they are more nearly typical of women in office.

Women vs. Men

By implication, the subject of women in politics

holds special interest only because it describes a situation that differs from that of men in politics. More than their small numbers distinguish women from their male colleagues. Though the differences are for the most part undramatic, they cumulatively suggest the ways in which the sex differentiation of social life has operated to reduce women's political involvements. Women in office are proportionately more often middle-aged, while men are either younger or older. Women are not as likely to be married and, when married, less likely to have young children. When married, their family incomes are higher than those of their male counterparts. When unmarried, their incomes are lower. The fact that they belong to more organizations than the men may serve as counterpoint to their lower likelihood of having educational and occupational credentials that would facilitate political participation. Finally, and perhaps most critical in understanding the process of political recruitment of women, relatively few married women enter politics without the support and encouragement of their husbands but a relatively large group of men in politics lack the support of their wives.

Part III, which is devoted to an examination of political background and officeholding activities, continues our examination of the role of gender in political recruitment and considers a further question: Having achieved office, are women distinguishable from men in their official activities?

PART III. POLITICAL EXPERIENCE AND NATURE OF OFFICEHOLDING

In Part III, our report turns to political activity -- to the experience that women and men have acquired before entering their current offices, to the nature of the offices they have entered, and to the ways in which they view their official roles. Part III has four sections. In the first two sections, we describe the political experience and officeholding activities of women officials, noting variations among women according to the office they hold and other characteristics. In the third and fourth sections, we examine the ways in which the political backgrounds and officeholding of women are similar to or different from those of men.

POLITICAL BACKGROUNDS OF WOMEN IN OFFICE

Because women have been entering office in increasing numbers, a larger proportion are newcomers than would be true if the number of new entrants were equal to the number of women who leave office. A little more than half to three-quarters or more of the women in every type of office except Congress have entered their current office since 1973 (Table 25). Substantial proportions, from approximately one-quarter of state judges to 41% of county commissioners and nearly all appointees to the federal executive entered office after 1975. County commissioners, who have shown a large relative increase in numbers although they still constitute a tiny minority on county

governing boards, also have the highest proportion of recent entrants.

Number of Terms in Office

The length of a term of office varies by office and locale, from two years in some governing bodies to six or more years in some state judicial posts. Not all officeholders serve fixed terms of office; many members of the executive branches of government serve at the pleasure of the chief executive, and some judges are appointed for life. Despite such variations, a majority of women in most offices are serving in their first term (Table 26). Exceptions are the U.S. Congress, where no change in the participation of women has occurred in recent years, and the state legislatures where the percentage increase between 1975 and 1977 is somewhat lower than that taking place in earlier periods.

Election and Partisanship

Because of the offices surveyed, nearly all the women in our study serve in elective office. Exceptions occur among 9% of judges, 38% of members of the state executive, and all women in the federal executive. Even for elective positions, appointment to vacancies with unexpired terms may occur, and by statute some judicial positions are filled initially by appointment followed by election. Thus approx-

Table 25. MOST WOMEN HAVE SERVED LESS THAN FOUR YEARS IN THEIR CURRENT OFFICE

Year of First Election to Current Office	Fed. Exec.	U.S. House	Judiciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor-alty %	Local Council %
1971 or before	(0)	(2)	27	17	23	17	11	13	11
1972, 1973	(1)	(8)	19	3	18	20	14	13	17
1974, 1975	(0)	(6)	28	49	30	31	34	39	40
1976, 1977	(24)	(2)	26	31	29	32	41	35	32
Total	(25)	(18)	(47)	(59)	(66)	(278)	(281)	(286)	(2,133)

Table 26. MOST WOMEN OFFICEHOLDERS ARE IN THEIR FIRST TERM OF THEIR PRESENT OFFICE

Number of Terms in Office	Fed. Exec.	U.S. House	Judiciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor-alty %	Local Council %
First	(22)	(2)	66	72	45	37	63	52	59
Second	(0)	(7)	23	14	23	30	24	31	28
Third or more	(0)	(9)	11	14	32	33	13	17	13
Total	(22)	(18)	(44)	(46)	(62)	(255)	(284)	(283)	(2,153)

imately one-quarter of judges and state executives, 14% of local councilwomen, 12% of mayors, 7% of county commissioners, 8% of state senators, and 1% of state representatives were first appointed to their current offices.

In some locations, election to office is legally nonpartisan, with no party labels appearing on ballots.³² Seventy percent of local councilwomen, 74% of mayors, 32% of county commissioners and 67% of judges report that election to their office is nonpartisan. Slightly higher proportions of women entering office in 1975 or later have won partisan elections at county and local levels: 71% of county commissioners, 28% of mayors and 31% of local councilwomen in contrast to 64%, 23% and 28% respectively entering these offices before 1975. Although this difference is very small, it suggests the possibility that women are making inroads in

achieving positions that require nomination and endorsement by political parties.

Party Affiliation and Experience

In every office surveyed, the majority of women officeholders are Democrats (Table 27). Approximately one-third of those in the lower houses of state legislatures and in county or local offices are Republican; one-quarter or less are Republican in state senates, the state executive, the judiciary and the U.S. Congress.

Party identity and year of entry into office. In some offices, Republicans constitute a higher percentage of those entering office in 1975 or later than of those entering office before 1975. This is true of state legislators (38% Republicans among recent entrants vs. 33% among earlier), county

Table 27. DEMOCRATS OUTNUMBER REPUBLICANS IN EVERY OFFICE

Party Affiliation	Fed. Exec.	U.S. House	Judiciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor-alty %	Local Council %
Democrat	(20)	(13)	59	73	71	60	59	50	51
Republican	(1)	(5)	24	16	26	36	30	33	33
Independent	(1)	(0)	12	11	3	4	10	17	15
Other	(0)	(0)	5	0	0	0	1	-	1
Total	(22)	(18)	(42)	(56)	(68)	(281)	(281)	(290)	(2,172)

Table 28. ONLY AMONG STATE LEGISLATORS AND COUNTY OFFICEHOLDERS HAVE A MAJORITY HELD PARTY OFFICE

% Who Report Service in at Least 1 Party Position	Fed. Exec. %	U.S. House %	Judi- ciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor- alty %	Local Council %
One or more of any type	(7)	(13)	21	49	70	73	53	28	29
Total	(27)	(17)	(47)	(61)	(67)	(292)	(287)	(291)	(2,211)
Party office									
Local	(2)	(4)	10	13	32	31	17	17	18
County	(1)	(2)	17	17	21	27	29	12	11
State	(1)	(4)	1	17	27	19	8	6	3
National	(3)	(6)	2	7	6	4	1	-	-
Total	(27)	(17)	(47)	(60)	(66)	(292)	(286)	(292)	(2,211)
Convention delegation									
State alternate	(0)	(0)	2	8	8	10	9	3	5
State delegate	(2)	(0)	2	33	53	60	31	11	13
National alternate	(1)	(1)	7	6	5	7	3	3	1
National delegate	(3)	(4)	2	19	32	16	5	1	1
Total	(19)	(7)	(41)	(52)	(60)	(256)	(265)	(262)	(1,961)

commissioners (34% vs. 24%) and mayors (36% vs. 30%). It would appear that Republicans have been recapturing districts lost to them in the early 1970s, although it is also possible that the Republican party has improved its relative position in the recruitment of women candidates.

Party offices. Among women in office, state legislators and congresswomen appear to be most closely tied to political parties. These officeholders are more likely than others to have past experience or current incumbency in party office at local, county, state or national levels (Table 28). The only instances in which other officeholders approach the party experience of state legislators and congresswomen are the proportion of county commissioners with experience of party office at the county level and the proportion of state executives who have been delegates to national conventions.

Other than type of office, few categorical differences distinguish officeholders with and without party experience. Democrats and Republicans are equally likely to have held party posts. Despite recent observations by journalists and political scientists of a decline in the importance of parties

to political affairs, neither younger officeholders nor recent entrants to office have less experience in political parties than do other officeholders. Women in small districts do indicate less involvement with political parties, a pattern that supplies one more instance of the less extensive social participation of women in small districts.

Former Public Offices

The routes to various political offices are not defined by a specific sequence of prior offices. Substantial proportions of officeholders report no past officeholding and, among those with experience, antecedents to current offices are varied. Moreover, elective and appointive offices do not represent clearly differentiated political careers, with officeholders taking either the elective or the appointive path. Instead, appointment and election both are part of the experience of officeholders in every type of office. The lack of strict sequencing of offices is further illustrated by the fact that offices are sometimes held concomitantly. For example, 11% of women currently in office report second offices, principally as members of appointive boards and commissions.

Table 29. FOR MANY WOMEN THEIR CURRENT OFFICE IS THEIR FIRST GOVERNMENTAL POSITION

Former Public Offices	Fed. Exec. %	U.S. House %	Judi- ciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor- alty %	Local Council %
None	23	(9)	33	39	31	59	63	40	71
Elective only	19	(5)	21	14	40	13	8	30	5
At least one elective and one appointive	4	(2)	15	21	20	6	7	13	3
Appointive only	54	(2)	31	26	9	22	22	17	21
Total	(26)	(18)	(48)	(57)	(67)	(287)	(280)	(286)	(2,141)

Table 30. WOMEN WHO REPORT PREVIOUS GOVERNMENT SERVICE NAME A WIDE VARIETY OF POSITIONS

Type of Former Office Named	Fed. Exec. %	U.S. House	Judiciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor- alty %	Local Council %
Federal Executive	68	(2)	10	8	1	4	0	-	1
U.S. House	4	(0)	0	1	0	0	0	0	-
State Executive	2	(2)	2	11	0	0	0	0	-
State Senate	4	(1)	3	2	0	0	0	0	0
State House	2	(3)	2	8	22	1	1	1	1
Other state position	10	(8)	15	35	23	24	12	3	7
County Commission	0	(1)	0	-	5	2	3	1	-
Special District, other county position	0	(0)	5	14	9	19	34	8	13
Mayoralty	0	(0)	0	3	1	1	1	1	1
Local Council	2	(3)	2	3	8	6	9	36	2
Other local position	4	(0)	5	15	31	43	39	49	74
Judiciary	4	(3)	56	0	0	-	1	1	1
Total responses = 100%	(49)	(23)	(59)	(102)	(91)	(220)	(188)	(263)	(952)
Total cases	(26)	(18)	(48)	(57)	(67)	(287)	(280)	(286)	(2,141)

Table 31. REPUBLICANS ARE MORE LIKELY THAN DEMOCRATS TO HAVE HELD PREVIOUS ELECTIVE OFFICE

	State Legislature ^a		County Commission			Mayoralty			Local Council		
	Dem. %	Rep. %	Dem. %	Rep. %	Ind. %	Dem. %	Rep. %	Ind. %	Dem. %	Rep. %	Ind. %
Held any past office	48	46	29	53	45	58	62	60	29	30	28
Held past elective office	25	31	10	27	14	36	51	45	8	8	9
Held past appointive office	32	22	24	41	31	32	27	32	24	26	22
Total	(214)	(118)	(163)	(81)	(29)	(143)	(93)	(47)	(1,064)	(692)	(341)

^aIndependent state legislators have not been included in analysis because of small numbers.

Types of past public office. The extent and nature of past public officeholding varies with the office currently held (Table 29). A majority of local councillors, county commissioners and state representatives held no public offices prior to entering their current offices. Although most officeholders surveyed are now holding elective office, all but congresswomen, state senators and mayors are more likely to have held appointive than elective office in the past.

Table 30 presents a profile of the past offices held by those with officeholding experience. Local boards and commissions constitute a large percentage of past offices held by state legislators, county commissioners and local officeholders. School boards, planning boards, parks and recreation commissions frequently are antecedent to current elective offices. Beyond this tendency to gain experience at the local level, there appears to be some specialization of past experience at the same level of government in which office is currently held: that is, the experience of county commissioners is more likely than that of other officeholders to have been at the county level; past offices of present state officials tend to have been at the state level; federal appointees have more experience at the federal level than at other levels of government.

Variations in past officeholding. Past public officeholding varies with district population, political party, age and year of entry into office. Women in small districts have less experience with either elective or appointive officeholding than women in large districts. Except among local council members, Republican women are more likely to have held former elective office than Democrats or Independents (Table 31). The greater elective experience of Republican women probably reflects the preeminence of Democrats in government. With appointive offices less open to Republicans, those who do aspire to political careers are likely to take the electoral route. Since younger women have lived fewer years in which they could accumulate political experience, their lower levels of former officeholding are only to be expected. Less predictable is that recent entrants to office have more former officeholding experience than earlier entrants (Table 32). Except among local councillors, where no differences by year of entry exist, larger proportions of those entering office in 1975 or later have held elective office and larger proportions have also held appointive office. This greater experience among newcomers occurs in spite of the fact that they have entered office at younger ages.³³

Table 32. RECENT ENTRANTS HAVE MORE EXPERIENCE OF OFFICEHOLDING PRIOR TO CURRENT OFFICE

% Holding Past Public Office	State Legislature		County Commission		Mayoralty		Local Council	
	elected '74 and prior	elected '75 and later	elected '74 and prior	elected '75 and later	elected '74 and prior	elected '75 and later	elected '74 and prior	elected '75 and later
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Held any past office	40	59	29	43	45	71	28	31
Held past elective office	22	35	12	17	26	55	8	8
Held past appointive office	22	38	21	35	26	32	22	26
Total	(204)	(133)	(113)	(161)	(112)	(167)	(868)	(1,192)

Table 33. MOST LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS RECEIVE UNDER \$1,000 OR NO SALARY FROM THEIR OFFICE^a

Salary	Judiciary	State Exec.	State Senate	State House	County Comsn.	Mayor- alty	Local Council
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
None	0	0	2	-	-	21	18
Under \$1,000	0	2	8	18	11	43	49
\$1,000-\$4,999	0	6	22	17	39	30	28
\$5,000-\$9,999	0	2	30	32	25	3	3
\$10,000-\$14,999	0	0	22	20	11	-	1
\$15,000-\$19,999	0	2	8	4	8	1	-
\$20,000-\$24,999	3	13	6	7	3	1	-
\$25,000 and above - per diem, no annual estimate	97	75	0	-	2	1	-
Total	(35)	(48)	(60)	(251)	(274)	(279)	(2,108)

^aFederal officeholders are omitted because of low numbers responding.

NATURE OF WOMEN'S OFFICEHOLDING

This section considers the activities and concerns of women officeholders -- the extent to which their offices are full time or part time, their committee assignments and preferences, the activities to which they give major emphasis, and their self-ratings regarding effectiveness.

Salary of Office

Although a few, highly visible offices offer substantial salaries, the bulk of public positions are either unpaid or offer only minimal compensation. As can be seen in Table 33, which presents the annual salary of office (with per diem payments calculated at an annual rate by respondents), approximately two-thirds of local offices pay either nothing or under \$1,000 per year. Half of county commissioners and about one-third of state legislators in the survey receive less than \$5,000.³⁴ Only among members of the state executive and judiciary and among federal officeholders do most offices offer salaries that imply full-time positions.

Time Devoted to Office

The salaries of officeholders are incomplete indicators of the amount of time that women spend in

official activity, for commitments of time reflect both the nature of offices and the characteristics of officeholders. As Table 34 shows, local and county officeholders spend, on the average, less than full time in their positions. The median number of hours per week spent on official matters by other officeholders ranges from 45 hours among state representatives to more than 60 hours among federal officeholders. (An unknown proportion of state legislators appears to have reported the amount of time spent during legislative sessions rather than a year-round average.)

Table 34. MEDIAN HOURS OF WORK DEVOTED TO OFFICE FALL SHARPLY FROM FEDERAL TO LOCAL LEVEL^a

Office	Median Hours per Week	Total
Fed. Executive	(64)	(13)
Judiciary	50	(37)
State Executive	60	(44)
State Senate	50	(57)
State House	45	(238)
County Commission	25	(269)
Mayoralty	20	(273)
Local Council	10	(2,002)

^aCongress omitted because of low number reporting.

Variations in time devoted to office. District size, age, employment and family status are associated with the amount of time spent in official duties (Tables 35 and 36). As one would predict, women holding office in small districts spend notably less time in activities related to office than women in large districts. Except among state legislators, younger women under age 35 and older women over age 55 spend less time in office. Those with outside employment also give fewer hours per week to office. Unmarried women (who also are more likely to be younger or older) give somewhat fewer hours to office than the married.

Table 35. DISTRICT SIZE, AGE AND OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT AFFECT TIME GIVEN TO OFFICE

Median Hours of Work per Week in Office by:	State Legis.	County Comsn.	Mayor-alty	Local Council
<u>Size of district:</u>				
under 10,000 ^a		20	16	6
Total		(118)	(165)	(1,388)
over 10,000 ^a		40	26	20
Total		(130)	(68)	(523)
<u>Year elected:</u>				
1974 or before	44	25	20	10
Total	(175)	(111)	(110)	(801)
1975 or later	48	25	20	8
Total	(111)	(153)	(157)	(1,146)
<u>Age</u>				
under 35	45	(20)	(15)	7
Total	(45)	(23)	(20)	(255)
35 to 44 years	45	30	20	10
Total	(72)	(72)	(54)	(559)
45 to 54 years	40	30	20	10
Total	(100)	(106)	(94)	(629)
55 years and over	48	20	20	6
Total	(62)	(59)	(99)	(510)
<u>Current other employ.</u>				
other employment	40	20	16	7
Total	(99)	(101)	(136)	(1,126)
no other employ.	48	33	23	10
Total	(192)	(163)	(134)	(855)

^aDistrict population not analyzed for state legislators.

The unmarried, the employed, the older and younger officeholders may give less time to their offices because they are disproportionately found in less demanding offices and not because they make less of a commitment than their colleagues do. However, we have some reason to assume that differences in the amount of time spent in office reflect not only the nature of different offices but also variations in the commitment of individuals.

Self-rating of commitment relative to colleagues. Women officeholders were asked to rate themselves relative to colleagues on "willingness to work hard" and "time spent on official activities." Most women rate themselves above average on these dimensions (as they do on nearly all items asking for self-ratings). Yet categories of officeholders who make relatively lower self-evaluations of their willingness to work hard or of the time they spend in official activity are precisely those categories in which officeholders report fewer hours per week devoted to office.

Official Issues and Projects

Women in office were asked to name "the three issues or projects of most concern to you in your activities as an officeholder." Table 37 presents, for selected offices, responses classified by functional area of specialization. Offices of state legislator, county commissioner and local councillor have been selected for examination because these offices have sufficient numbers to reveal patterns. In addition, a broad enough range of issues is considered by officials in these offices to permit officeholders to vary in defining the issues of highest importance to them.

When viewed in profile, women's concerns are not confined to a few areas but cover the range of governmental activity. To some degree, the salience of issues depends upon the type of office held. Governmental administration, health, education and welfare are the most prominent activities among state legislators. At the county level, these areas plus public utilities, public works and natural resources receive the most attention from office-

Table 36. UNMARRIED WOMEN WORK FEWER HOURS IN OFFICE THAN THEIR MARRIED COUNTERPARTS

Median Hours of Work per Week in Office by:	All Other Offices	Local Council
<u>Family status</u>		
<u>Married</u>		
children under 18	32	10
Total	(337)	(888)
no children under 18	40	10
Total	(384)	(655)
<u>Unmarried</u>		
children under 18	25	10
Total	(44)	(82)
no children under 18	25	6
Total	(153)	(347)

Table 37. ISSUES CONSIDERED PRIMARY BY WOMEN OFFICEHOLDERS COVER FULL RANGE OF GOVERNMENTAL ACTIVITY

Three Most Important Official Issues or Projects:	State	County	Local
	Legis. %	Comsn. %	Council %
Government responsiveness, citizen involvement, casework	4	6	8
Governmental administration and reform	15	15	9
Intergovernmental relations	1	1	1
Finance, taxation	15	16	12
Health and mental health	6	4	1
Education	10	3	1
Welfare, status of special groups (other than women)	10	12	7
Status of women	5	1	-
Commerce, occupational licensing, consumer protection	3	1	1
Labor and employment	3	1	1
Law, law enforcement, civil rights	8	7	5
Public safety	0	2	3
Public utilities, transportation, communications	3	3	7
Public works	1	8	12
Energy, natural resources	4	2	1
Planning and development, housing, urban renewal	5	11	17
Culture, beautification, parks, recreation	-	2	9
Environment	5	3	3
Mixed, other	2	2	2
Total responses = 100%	(790)	(719)	(5,328)
Total respondents	(278)	(256)	(1,928)

holders. At the local level, cultural activities, parks and recreation, public works, utilities and governmental administration take prominence over issues of health, education and welfare which are major concerns of officials in higher levels of office. At all levels of officeholding, issues of finance and taxation receive a relatively high degree of attention. In every type of office, very few women name any aspect of women's status as among the three issues or projects of greatest concern.

The types of issues and projects preoccupying officeholders vary little with other characteristics of women in office. In the state legislatures, Republican women are less concerned than Democratic women with health, education and welfare and give more attention to issues of finance and governmental administration. However, no differences by political party are apparent at county and local levels. Age and tenure of office do not distinguish the issues and projects of most concern to women in office.

Satisfaction with Committee Assignments

In addition to being questioned about the issues and projects of most concern to them as officials, women in office were asked to identify their assignments as committee members or as official liaisons to other public agencies. The resulting profiles of responses are similar to those for official issues and projects, and therefore are not presented here. The degree of satisfaction

with committee assignments varies with the office held. When asked whether there are assignments preferred in addition to or in place of current assignments, 22% of local councilwomen, 35% of county commissioners and 50% of state legislators named one or more assignments that they would prefer.

If women were to receive the assignments they prefer, would they be concentrated in different areas of governmental activity? Some changes would become apparent. There would be less concentration in areas where women traditionally have served and greater concentration in areas traditionally the domain of men.³⁵ In state legislatures and county commissions, proportionately fewer women would be found on health, education and welfare committees, and more would specialize in governmental administration, finance and taxation. On local councils, relatively fewer women would focus on parks, recreation and public works; proportionately more would be active in finance, taxation, law enforcement and planning. Nevertheless, the changes overall would be slight. Although there may be some tendency to assign women to committees on the basis of feminine stereotypes, a majority of officeholders are satisfied with their assignments.

Self-Ratings of Performance

In evaluating their performance in office, women give themselves high marks. Officeholders were asked to rate themselves relative to other public

officeholders with whom they work. On a list of nineteen qualities relevant to official performance, they were asked to decide whether they are considerably above average, slightly above average, about the same as their colleagues, slightly lower than average, or considerably lower than average. On nearly every dimension, the majority describe themselves as above average. Self-ratings of average are uncommon and of below average are rare. Even in qualities about which women exhibit less confidence relative to other qualities, a third or more report themselves superior to their colleagues. Even if such high self-evaluations involve an element of public presentation of self as an aspect of questionnaire response, women in office appear to be highly self-confident.³⁶

Self-ratings of women in office are so high that one must identify areas of potential uncertainty by examining those items on which relatively lower proportions of women rate themselves as superior. Table 38 presents for selected offices -- state legislator, county commissioner and local councillor -- the qualities on which relatively high and relatively low percentages of women rate themselves above average.³⁷ The highest proportions of women consider themselves superior to their colleagues in interest in public service, understanding people's behavior and motivations, interest

Relatively lower proportions of women rate themselves above their colleagues in their political know-how, financial and economic judgment, influence and prestige with colleagues, ability to make important contacts, ability to argue persuasively, and past training and experience. These items refer to technical expertise and political skill, in which women are often assumed to be deficient. Whether women are indeed relatively less adequate in these aspects of officeholding or whether their self-ratings merely reflect adoption of popular stereotypes is an important question but one which cannot be answered with the data available.

Effect of district size. Local councilwomen from large districts are more likely than councillors from small districts to rate their performance above average on every quality. County commissioners from the large districts also have higher proportions rating themselves above average on half the items: understanding people, time devoted to official activity, responsiveness to constituents, financial and economic judgment, value of past training and experience, and political know-how. On the one hand, since women in small districts are consistently found in this report to be disadvantaged in the social and political characteristics associated with political achievement, this pattern is unsurprising. On the other hand, since women were asked to evaluate themselves relative to the officeholders with whom they work, the result is not easily interpreted as a simple reflection of the actual characteristics of women in smaller districts. It is possible that women have evaluated themselves, not relative to their colleagues, but relative to some ideal-typical image of the officeholder. It is also possible that women in smaller districts, where a more conventional sex role ideology is likely to prevail,³⁹ perceive themselves as unequal to their male colleagues proportionately more often than do women in large districts.

Age and self-ratings. In every quality except general knowledge and intelligence, lower proportions of women officeholders under age 35 than of older officeholders rate themselves above average. This pattern exists among both newcomers and those with longer tenure. Why are younger women less confident of performance? One reason may be that younger women in office lack the "seasoning" in their backgrounds that would give them the confidence that their older colleagues display, for younger women are less likely to have held office prior to their current offices and also have lower levels of participation in voluntary organizations. In addition, youth itself may be a threat to self-esteem. Since officeholders are typically middle-aged, young women have the "deviant" status of both youth and feminine gender. Yet an equally plausible explanation is that younger women in office display the lower self-confidence typical of their age, without any special relevance to the fact that they are officeholders. Some research studies of other groups of women have found lower levels of confidence and self-esteem among women under age 35 years than among older women.⁴⁰

Self-ratings and tenure in office. Local councilwomen and state legislators who entered office in 1975 or later are less likely to rate themselves

Table 38. WOMEN RATE THEIR PERFORMANCE IN OFFICE ABOVE THAT OF THEIR COLLEAGUES

Qualities on Which Higher %'s Rate Self Above Average	State Legis. %	County Comsn. %	Local Council %
Interest in public service	83	84	74
Understanding others' acts	79	80	76
Intrst. in social problems	78	79	72
Time on official activities	83	78	64
Gen'l knowledge, intelligence	85	79	61
Responsive to constituents	78	76	65
<u>Qualities on Which Lower %'s Rate Self Above Average</u>			
Past training, experience	67	64	45
Persuasive in argument	56	61	56
Ability to make contacts	47	59	46
Influence, prestige with colleagues	52	52	43
Financial, economic judgment	49	56	43
Political know-how	49	47	32
Overall effectiveness	71	70	60
Approximate total ^a	(295)	(267)	(2,004)

^aSlight variations in the numbers responding to each item have been averaged.

in social problems, time spent on official activities, general knowledge and intelligence, and responsiveness to constituents. The time commitment and the "people-orientation" implied by these items are consistent with traditional views of women's contributions.³⁸

superior to their colleagues in time devoted to office, value of past training and experience, influence and prestige, political astuteness and overall effectiveness. These differences between newcomers and those with longer tenure exist regardless of the age of the officeholder. Yet county commissioners, who have the highest proportion of recent entrants among officeholders, do not differ from their colleagues with longer tenure. The high self-confidence of the newly elected county commissioners is further illustrated by the fact that, whereas county commissioners with longer tenure of office show less confidence on most items than their counterparts in the state legislatures, newcomers among county commissioners show higher levels of confidence than newcomers to the state legislatures. This exceptional pattern is unexplained by our data. Women comprise a smaller percentage of county commissioners than of other types of officeholder. Perhaps it is not unusual for those in the vanguard of change, as are those now entering county governing bodies, to display extraordinary levels of self-confidence.

POLITICAL BACKGROUND OF WOMEN COMPARED WITH MEN

In comparing the social backgrounds of women and men in office, we have noted the educational and occupational disadvantages of women, speculating that the more intensive organizational participation of women may supply a compensatory route to political spheres of activity. Yet if women who achieve public office do take a different path to political participation, they accumulate much the same experience as men once they enter politics. An examination of the political backgrounds of women and men in office suggests that the women differ only in minor ways from their male colleagues.

Number of Terms in Office

A higher proportion of women than of men are in their first term in office: 44% of the men but 59% of the women in the comparison sample. The proportion of officeholders in their first term is a function not only of trends in numbers but also of turnover in office -- of the tendency to remain in office or to be replaced by others. It appears, however, that the proportionate excess of women over men in their first term is principally a reflection of increasing numbers of women occupying public office. The ratio of women in office in 1975 to women in office in 1977 is nearly identical to the ratio of men to women in their first term.⁴¹ If women had higher turnover in office than men, the latter ratio would be lower than the former. The fact that they are approximately equal means that the disproportion of women in their first term of office may be accounted for simply by increases in the numbers of women in office.⁴²

Partisanship of Election

Although the male and female samples of officeholders are from the same states and types of office, a slightly higher proportion of the men serve in partisan elective office. Thirty-six percent of male council members and mayors and 30% of women in local offices report that election to their offices is partisan. (However, there are no differences among county commissioners.) This finding with

respect to local officeholders lends limited support to a complaint heard among political women -- that many party leaders try to keep women out of positions of leadership (see Part V).

Party Affiliation and Experience

The Democratic party traditionally has had more appeal than the Republican party for minorities and those who are not members of established elites. Therefore, some political observers have assumed that women would disproportionately find the Democratic party more attractive and that the party, in turn, would be relatively more open to sponsorship of women's candidacies. There is a higher proportion of Democratic women than of Democratic men in our samples (see Table 39), although the difference occurs only at the local level. Since women at local levels of officeholding also are more likely than men to have achieved office in nonpartisan elections, the sex difference in party preference does not imply necessarily that the Democratic party is a more active sponsor of female candidates.

Table 39. PROPORTIONATELY MORE WOMEN THAN MEN IN LOCAL OFFICES ARE DEMOCRATS

Party	State Legis.		County Comsn.		Local Offices	
	Women %	Men %	Women %	Men %	Women %	Men %
Democrat	71	69	63	60	49	39
Republican	26	26	30	34	37	47
Independent	3	5	6	6	13	14
Other	0	0	1	0	1	-
Total	(111)	(57)	(94)	(52)	(530)	(240)

Despite their slightly greater tendency to hold office in nonpartisan districts, women are a little more likely than men to have held party office. Forty percent of the women and 34% of the men have held some type of party office. This difference is not confined to party participation at the local level, for higher proportions of women than of men have held party offices above the local level, and higher proportions have been delegates to state and national conventions.

Former Public Offices

Approximately equal proportions of women and men have held some past public office (Table 40). Men are more likely to have held elective office (20% men vs. 13% women), while somewhat higher proportions of women have held appointive offices (23% men vs. 30% women). The relatively greater appointive experience of women may derive from their greater involvement in political parties. Among the previous offices held, mayoralties, local council positions and appointments to state boards and commissions are relatively more common in the backgrounds of men. Appointments to local or county boards and commissions are relatively more prominent in the experience of women. The greater elective

Table 40. WOMEN ARE AS LIKELY AS MEN TO HAVE HELD PAST PUBLIC OFFICE

Former Public Offices Held	Women %	Men %
None	61	63
Elective only	9	14
At least one elective and one appointive	4	6
Appointive only	26	17
Total	(709)	(360)

experience of the men is further illustrated by the fact that a higher proportion of men than of women have lost elections: 26% of the men and 19% of the women. This pattern of proportionately more losing candidacies among the men is true of every office.

OFFICEHOLDING ACTIVITIES OF WOMEN AND MEN

Although women and men are essentially similar in the amount of political experience they bring to their current offices, gender appears to influence the conduct of office. Women and men differ notably in the time devoted to officeholding, in the likelihood of chairing committees or obtaining desired committee assignments, in the emphasis placed on relations with constituents, and in the areas of self-confidence in effectiveness as officials.

Time Spent in Official Activity

In every office, women devote more time to their office than men (Table 41). The greater commitment of time by women is accounted for almost entirely by women with no outside employment. Women with outside employment average no more hours per week in official activity than do men. Among the unemployed, however, women give more hours to their offices than either employed or unemployed men.

Table 41. WOMEN GIVE MORE TIME THAN MEN TO OFFICE ONLY IF NOT EMPLOYED IN ADDITION

Median Hours/Week in Official Activity	Women	Men
Total Sample	15 (678)	10 (344)
Employed Outside Office	10 (343)	10 (290)
No Outside Employment	20 (328)	15 (49)

Performance Emphases

Women and men appear to hold somewhat differing conceptions of their official duties. Table 42 presents responses to a series of questions about which responsibilities of office are given major emphasis, and which are given moderate or minor

emphasis. Higher proportions of women than of men give major emphasis to seeking available research and information on pending legislation or issues. Women also are slightly more likely to stress independent decision-making and to emphasize the development of policy and legislation. Yet the major respect in which women's conceptions of their offices differ from those of men is in the importance they place on relations with constituents.

Table 42. HIGHER PROPORTIONS OF WOMEN THAN OF MEN DESCRIBE THEMSELVES AS ORIENTED TOWARD CONSTITUENTS

% Giving Major Emphasis To:	Women %	Men %
<u>Relations with public</u>		
Discovering public's views	63	49
Educating public on issues	73	60
Helping on individual problems	50	41
<u>Internal references</u>		
Representing party program	6	5
Seeking colleagues' views	29	28
Effecting compromises with colleagues	22	21
Making independent decisions	83	76
<u>Functional emphases</u>		
Getting own issues on agenda	23	25
Researching pending issues	56	36
Developing policy	55	46
Sponsoring legislation	34	29
Making government more efficient	71	73
Exercising administrative functions	21	25
Approximate total ^a	(690)	(345)

^aSlight variations in numbers responding have been averaged.

Higher percentages of women report giving major emphasis to discovering the public's views on pending issues, to educating the public about important issues and to helping constituents with their individual problems. This greater emphasis by women on public representation and constituent responsiveness has been suggested in previous research.⁴³ It appears again in Part V of this report, where relations with the public figure prominently in the advantages women perceive for themselves as officeholders.

The sources of this relatively greater attention by women than by men to representation of the public are unknown, although the difference has significance for the issue of electoral accountability among officeholders.⁴⁴ Service to others figures prominently in the socialization of women. However, sex-role socialization does not explain the relatively greater tendency of women officeholders to express a public service orientation. We suggest that the sex difference in officeholders' orientations to the public derives in part from the

greater involvement of political women in community organizations.⁴⁵ Even if organizational participation by women does not lead directly to open endorsement of their candidacies and subsequent attitudes of political obligation among women in office, their participation is likely to sensitize women to the needs of constituents, to supply ready avenues of communication, and to facilitate the development of conceptions of representation.

Official Issues and Projects

Women have been thought to be highly specialized in their governmental activities, concentrated in health, education and welfare, the status of special populations, good government, culture and beautification.⁴⁶ However, our data show that women exhibit much the same spread as men in the focus of their official activities. As illustrated by Table 43, which presents profiles of the issues and projects of most concern to officeholders, there is only a very small tendency for the concerns of women, relative to those of men, to be specialized in areas traditionally the province of women in public life. A slight degree of differentiation between the activities of women and men becomes

Table 43. WOMEN AND MEN OFFICEHOLDERS RATE SIMILAR ISSUES AS MOST IMPORTANT

Three Most Important Issues or Projects:	Women %	Men %
Government responsiveness, citizen involvement, casework	6	5
Government administration, reform	11	13
Intergovernmental relations	2	1
Finance, taxation	13	17
Health, mental health	3	2
Education	3	2
Welfare, status of special groups	7	3
Status of women	1	-
Commerce, occupational licensing, consumer protection	1	1
Labor and employment	1	2
Law, law enforcement, civil rights	6	7
Public safety	2	3
Public utilities, transportation, communications	6	7
Public works	10	12
Energy, natural resources	1	1
Planning and development, housing, urban renewal	15	14
Culture, beautification, parks, recreation	7	4
Environment	3	4
Mixed, other	2	2
Total responses = 100%	(1,780)	(938)
Total respondents	(638)	(335)

apparent only when several functional areas are considered cumulatively. Women do not differ from men in the attention given governmental administration and reform or intergovernmental relations. By only a very slim margin is finance a larger proportion of the activities of men. Less than ten percentage points distinguish the cumulative interest of women and men in environmental protection, parks and recreation, the cultural arts, health, education and welfare. Twenty-four percent of the issues and projects named by women are in these areas; 15% of those named by men are in these same areas. These patterns of little difference in the official activities of women and men exist whether one examines issues and projects of highest concern, committee assignments, or the committee assignment considered most important by the officeholder.

Why do these findings seemingly contradict past evidence and belief? One possibility is that differences in the specializations of women and men depend upon type of office. Our samples of male and female officeholders are heavily weighted with local officials, while past research has focussed principally on state legislators and members of Congress. Another possibility is that, over time, there is a trend toward less differentiation in the governmental concerns of men and women. Finally, we must raise the question of whether the evidence of past research on the governmental activity of women has been misinterpreted, since past studies have often lacked a controlled comparison sample of men or have observed the few women in Congress, where reliable patterns may be difficult to discern. Perhaps women and men are equally concentrated in areas of government thought to be the specialties of women. If so, then the committee memberships of women reflect in large part the nature of governmental committees rather than the disproportionate assignment of women to limited areas of government.

Committee Assignments

Analysis of the relative frequency with which women and men chair committees and of their relative satisfaction with current committee assignments indicates either that women are being discriminated against or that they are not aggressively pursuing their preferences. Women are less likely than men to chair committees. Fifty-eight percent of the male local councillors, county commissioners and state legislators chair one or more committees; 49% of the women in these offices are committee chairpersons. This disparity is not a reflection of the fact that higher percentages of women are in their first term of office. Whether in their first or a higher term of office, women hold proportionately fewer positions as committee chairpersons.

Women exhibit relatively less satisfaction than men with their committee memberships. In profile, the assignments of women differ from those of men only slightly. Yet women are almost twice as likely as men to express a desire for different assignments. Among local councillors, county commissioners and state legislators, 17% of the men but 31% of the women name one or more assignments that they would prefer to have in addition to or in place of current assignments. The relatively greater desire of women for new assign-

ments exists not only among officeholders in their first term of office but also among those in their second term and in their third or higher term. Although the more politically ambitious officeholders are also more likely to prefer different committees, the relative dissatisfaction of women with their committee memberships is not accounted for by women's greater desire to remain in public office (see Part VI). Regardless of plans to remain in public office, women are less satisfied than men with their assignments.

Self-Ratings of Performance

Although women's position with respect to committee assignments indicates that they face some barriers to leadership and performance within the governing bodies in which they serve, women evaluate their overall effectiveness as highly as men rate theirs (Table 44). On most of the nineteen dimensions on which self-ratings were sought, higher proportions of women than of men evaluate themselves above their colleagues. Women are more likely than men to consider themselves above average in interest in public service, understanding people's behavior and motivations, interest in social problems, time spent in official activities, general knowledge and intelligence, and responsiveness to constituents. In addition to these six qualities, shown in Table 44 as those in which women show the highest levels of self-confidence, larger percentages of women than of men consider themselves superior to their colleagues in willingness to work hard, efficiency and organization, getting along with colleagues, imagination, practicality and independence.

Table 44 identifies six areas in which women have exhibited somewhat lower levels of confidence in their performance. The two aspects of performance in which men clearly rate themselves more highly

Table 44. WOMEN ARE LESS CONFIDENT THAN MEN OF FINANCIAL JUDGMENT, TECHNICAL TRAINING

Qualities on Which Higher %'s Rate Self Above Average	Women %	Men %
Interest in public service	79	63
Understanding others' acts	80	62
Interest in social problems	74	54
Time on official activities	71	59
General knowledge, intelligence	68	60
Responsiveness to constituents	69	55
Qualities on Which Lower %'s Rate Self Above Average		
Past training, experience	51	65
Persuasiveness in argument	54	59
Ability to make contacts	50	45
Influence, prestige with colleagues	47	52
Financial, economic judgment	44	54
Political know-how	38	42
Overall effectiveness	62	59
Approximate total ^a	(671)	(339)

^aSlight variations in the numbers responding to each item have been averaged.

than women involve elements of technical expertise: past training and experience, and financial and economic judgment. The remaining four items point to specifically political skills: ability to argue persuasively, ability to make important contacts, influence and prestige with colleagues, and political know-how. Sex differences in these areas are negligible. One is reminded of the fact that although women have educational and occupational disadvantages relative to men, they bring similar amounts of political experience to office. If they are relatively less secure in their political skills than in some other areas of performance, they are no less secure than their male colleagues.

CONCLUSION

Increases in the numbers of women in public office have produced a large proportion of female officeholders in their first term. Yet these newcomers are not neophytes. They have as much experience in political parties and more experience in public offices than the women who preceded them. The political backgrounds and official activities of women in office contradict the lingering stereotype of the well-meaning but ineffectual woman who cannot compete with her better qualified and more politically astute male colleagues (see Part V).

In only a few respects is the political experience of women unequal to that of men, and even in these respects the differences are slight. Women have less elective experience (either of winning or of losing) than men in comparable offices, and they are less likely to have run in partisan elections. Once in office, women are relatively less satisfied with their committee assignments and are slightly less likely to chair committees. They are less confident than men of the quality of their past training or of their financial expertise.

These decrements must be weighed against the aspects of women's experience and activities that are no different from, or even superior to, those of their male colleagues. Women have been more active in their political parties, and they have more experience with appointive office. The issues and projects that concern them as officials are little different from those of the men. They are notably more oriented toward constituents. They are more motivated to avail themselves of research and information about pending issues. Those women who are not employed in addition to holding office give more time to official activities. Finally, women in office are self-confident in their abilities. In most respects, they perceive themselves as outperforming their male colleagues.

The women in public office today are still in the forefront of social change and, because they are, they are an unusual group of officeholders. If they are in fact superior to their male colleagues in some aspects of performance, their superiority derives from the fact that public office is not yet as available to women as it is to men. If they are less adequate than male officeholders in some respects, their inadequacies also reflect inequality of opportunity. In brief, the results of our comparison of the political background and activity of women and men in public office should become obsolete as the numbers of women and of men who are active in public affairs approach equality.

PART IV. ORIENTATIONS TO PUBLIC ISSUES

Is there a woman's point of view in politics? Surveys of mass public opinion abound and some research has been done with political party leaders, but studies which compare the views of women and men in office are rare.

Public opinion surveys over several decades have found either that women are no different from men or are slightly more conservative in their positions on public issues, even issues of women's rights and political participation.⁴⁷ The major exception to this general pattern occurs with respect to issues of force such as military conflict or punishment of criminals.

Among the studies of political party elites, a major investigation of delegates to the 1972 Democratic and Republican national conventions finds women to be more supportive than men of "women's" issues such as day care, abortion on demand or women's rights. On other issues, women are described as more extreme -- as either more liberal or more conservative than the ideological position of the groups with which they are politically identified.⁴⁸ However, another study of delegates to the 1972 Democratic Convention concludes that women are more liberal on virtually every issue examined.⁴⁹

Public opinion surveys and delegate studies supply inadequate bases for evaluating the extent to which the political views of men and women in public office differ. As we have noted repeatedly in this report, women in office are a select group who differ in many ways from women in the general population. Moreover, the results of delegate studies do not invite inferences about women and men in public office because far fewer female than male delegates hold public office.

Comparisons of the policy preferences and behavior of women and men in public office are only beginning to be made. Women in Congress are both more cohesive and more liberal than can be accounted for by party affiliation alone.⁵⁰ Women in the state legislatures have been found more likely than men to vote for the federal ERA, regardless of party affiliation.⁵¹ A recent examination of 50 male-

female pairs from local councils in Connecticut finds men to be slightly more conservative in self-described political philosophy and on some women's issues but at least as supportive as female colleagues of ERA, feminism and the women's movement.⁵²

Much more research and re-analysis of existing data on both political elites and the general citizenry are required to define precisely the conditions under which sex differences in political perspectives occur, the policies on which women and men differ, and the consequences of these differences for the conduct of public affairs. For the present, we report our analysis of officeholders' orientations to public issues as an additional step toward understanding the potential consequences of women's participation in political life. The first section of Part IV describes the views of women officeholders. The second section is devoted to a comparison of women with men.

POLITICAL ATTITUDES OF WOMEN IN OFFICE

The data to be reported consist of responses to questions about general ideological orientations, the roles of government and industry in promoting equal rights for women, positions on four issues selected as issues of special relevance to women, and positions on five issues selected as not manifestly sex-linked in their content. (For the precise wording of questions and response categories, see questions 14f, item 5 of 18, and 19 at the end of this report.) The issues selected for analysis are not intended to supply a complete description of the political views of women. Rather, they supply a basis for examining women's views on issues of manifest relevance to women in comparison with views on other public issues.

Government, Industry and Women's Rights

Women in office were asked to indicate which of four alternatives is closest to their own feeling about the role of federal government, state government, and private industry in "assuring equal rights for women." The alternatives included: "should do more about it than it now does," "is now doing just

Table 45. OFFICEHOLDERS THINK GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE INDUSTRY SHOULD DO MORE TO PROMOTE EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN^a

Agree more should be done to assure women's rights by ^b :	Judi- ciary <small>2</small>	State Exec. <small>5</small>	State Senate <small>8</small>	State House <small>8</small>	County Comsn. <small>8</small>	Mayor- alty <small>8</small>	Local Council <small>8</small>
Federal government Total	77 (26)	84 (31)	87 (47)	72 (208)	62 (228)	60 (215)	61 (1,685)
State governments Total	81 (26)	88 (32)	88 (48)	77 (208)	67 (216)	64 (199)	64 (1,611)
Private industry Total	92 (26)	88 (32)	94 (46)	85 (198)	79 (211)	76 (189)	76 (1,565)

^aFederal respondents have been omitted because of small numbers reporting.

^bFor precise wording of question and response categories, see item 5 of Question 18 at the end of this report.

about enough," "should be less involved than it now is," "should not get involved at all." Women in office strongly endorse a more active stance from both government and industry in promoting women's rights (Table 45). More action from private industry is desired by the overwhelming majority, between 76% and 94% of women in every type of office. At least six in ten of local and county officials, and even higher percentages of other officeholders, favor a more active role on the part of federal and state governments.

Positions on Issues

As shown in Table 46, clear majorities of women in every office endorse ratification of ERA, oppose a

constitutional ban on abortion and favor extension of social security to homemakers. The only women's issue on which opinion is more evenly divided is governmental provision of child care. On other issues, a majority support legislation to ban mandatory retirement because of age and favor returning a larger share of federal revenues to the municipalities. In most offices, a majority deny that busing to achieve racial balance will prove beneficial to the country. Most local officeholders support increasing the severity of criminal penalties as a way of dealing with the crime problem, although women in other offices are more divided on this issue. Officeholders also are divided on whether the defense budget should be reduced.

Table 46. AMONG WOMEN'S ISSUES, MOST WOMEN OFFICEHOLDERS FAVOR RATIFICATION OF ERA AND SOCIAL SECURITY FOR HOMEMAKERS, OPPOSE A CONSTITUTIONAL BAN ON ABORTION^a

Women's Issues ^c :	Judi- ciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor- alty %	Local Council %
Federal ERA should be ratified							
Agree strongly or moderately	77	93	96	82	69	63	62
Neutral	3	2	0	4	16	17	18
Disagree moderately or strongly	20	5	4	14	15	20	20
The Constitution should ban abortion							
Agree strongly or moderately	19	10	8	14	15	19	23
Neutral	7	2	4	6	8	14	10
Disagree moderately or strongly	74	88	88	80	77	67	67
Homemakers should have social security							
Agree strongly or moderately	55	76	76	71	68	65	59
Neutral	3	0	14	9	12	14	14
Disagree moderately or strongly	42	24	10	20	20	21	27
Government should provide child care							
Agree strongly or moderately	48	70	66	52	46	38	39
Neutral	7	8	4	10	8	13	10
Disagree moderately or strongly	45	23	30	38	46	49	51
<u>Other issues^c:</u>							
Busing for racial balance is desirable							
Agree strongly or moderately	26	50	55	41	30	17	17
Neutral	15	15	7	9	8	15	8
Disagree moderately or strongly	59	35	38	50	62	68	75
Severe penalties would help crime problem							
Agree strongly or moderately	47	39	24	37	56	72	73
Neutral	3	14	2	5	4	4	3
Disagree moderately or strongly	50	47	74	58	40	24	24
The defense budget should be reduced							
Agree strongly or moderately	38	68	73	60	54	38	43
Neutral	14	8	10	11	9	11	13
Disagree moderately or strongly	48	24	17	29	37	51	44
Mandatory retirement should be banned							
Agree strongly or moderately	45	71	71	61	65	70	62
Neutral	13	11	8	13	12	7	10
Disagree moderately or strongly	42	18	21	26	23	23	28
More federal revenue should go to cities							
Agree strongly or moderately	65	59	66	66	81	93	88
Neutral	4	18	18	16	8	2	6
Disagree moderately or strongly	31	23	16	18	11	5	6
Approximate totals ^b	(30)	(38)	(50)	(233)	(257)	(262)	(1,965)

^aFederal respondents have been omitted because of small numbers reporting.

^bSlight variations in the numbers responding to each item have been averaged.

^cFor precise wording of questions and response categories, see Question 19 at end of report.

Table 47. JUDGES, COUNTY AND LOCAL OFFICIALS HAVE MORE CONSERVATIVE IDEOLOGIES^a

Self-Described Ideology:	Judi- ciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor- alty %	Local Council %
Very conservative or conservative	32	12	5	17	35	37	38
Middle-of-the-road	35	29	36	38	33	43	35
Liberal or very liberal	33	59	59	45	32	20	27
Total	(34)	(42)	(56)	(240)	(272)	(270)	(2,049)

^aFederal officeholders are omitted because of low numbers reporting.

Table 48. POSITIONS ON WOMEN'S ISSUES ARE STRONGLY RELATED TO GENERAL IDEOLOGICAL ORIENTATIONS

Agree more should be done for women's rights by ^a :	State Legislature			County Commission			Mayoralty			Local Council		
	Cons. %	Mod. %	Lib. %	Cons. %	Mod. %	Lib. %	Cons. %	Mod. %	Lib. %	Cons. %	Mod. %	Lib. %
Federal government	33	73	89	49	52	83	42	61	78	48	62	78
State governments	44	77	91	51	58	90	49	67	79	50	65	80
Private industry	57	82	96	74	68	92	66	77	88	65	78	86
Approximate totals ^b	(31)	(85)	(124)	(73)	(65)	(75)	(64)	(85)	(43)	(573)	(551)	(437)
Women's Issues: ^{a,c}												
Agree ERA should be ratified	41	83	98	38	75	95	45	66	85	47	64	81
Disagree Const. ban on abortion	43	83	92	69	73	89	52	74	84	57	69	78
Agree homemaker social security	40	59	94	54	65	84	56	64	78	49	61	69
Agree government child care	18	43	74	22	45	75	26	38	62	26	37	58
Other Issues: ^{a,c}												
Agree busing desirable	2	32	69	3	27	65	7	16	37	6	17	34
Disagree severe crime penalties	8	52	84	7	42	77	8	21	52	10	23	46
Agree reduce defense budget	8	53	87	24	51	87	32	30	62	30	40	64
Agree ban mandatory retirement	68	56	68	62	68	68	73	67	69	59	61	68
Agree more fed. rev. for cities	59	56	72	80	86	79	93	93	94	89	88	87
Approximate totals ^b	(39)	(100)	(129)	(90)	(79)	(82)	(90)	(108)	(50)	(711)	(661)	(504)

^aFor precise wording of question and response categories, see Questions 18 (item 5) and 19 at report end.

^bSlight variations in the numbers responding to each item have been averaged.

^c% agreeing and % agreeing strongly, % disagreeing and % disagreeing strongly have been combined.

In state offices, the highest percentages positive or negative on an issue are those in favor of ERA and those opposed to a constitutional ban on abortion. Among county commissioners, the issue of federal revenue sharing with municipalities receives the highest percentage of supporters. Among mayors and local councillors, the percentages endorsing ERA or opposing a ban on abortion are exceeded by those supporting federal revenues for the cities, opposing mandatory retirement, and approving more severe punishments of criminals.

Interrelations of women's issues.⁵³ Positions on women's issues are interrelated, although the association between particular pairs of issues varies in magnitude. The strongest direct relationships occur between ERA and each of the other issues. Thus, among the four issues examined, an office-

holder's position on the ERA is the best single predictor of her views on abortion, on social security for homemakers, and on governmental provision of child care.

Ideological Perspective and Positions on Issues

There are variations by type of office held in the proportions of women who describe themselves as liberal, middle-of-the-road, or conservative in their positions on most contemporary issues (Table 47). Relatively higher proportions are liberal and lower proportions are conservative among members of state legislative and executive branches of government. (Federal officials, though reporting in too few numbers for statistical analysis, also tend to be liberal.)

Respondents' self-descriptions as liberal or conservative are strongly related to positions on most of the issues examined (Table 48). Only two issues -- mandatory retirement and municipal sharing of federal revenues -- show little or no relation to ideological divisions. Liberals are more likely than conservatives to support more action from government and industry in assuring women's rights, to favor ratification of ERA, to oppose a constitutional ban on abortion, to agree that social security should be extended to homemakers, to believe that government should provide child care facilities, to support busing to achieve racial balance, to oppose more severe penalties as the best way of dealing with the crime problem, and to agree that the defense budget should be reduced. Among the four women's issues, ERA is most strongly related to ideology.

Among the offices examined in Table 48, the link between ideology and positions on particular issues is strongest among state legislators, next strongest among county commissioners and weakest among local councillors.⁵⁴ Self-description as liberal or conservative is a better predictor among state legislators than among local council members of views on particular issues. Apparently local officeholders, who more often than not achieve office in nonpartisan elections, are less constrained to bring their positions on particular issues into line with their general views of themselves as liberals or conservatives.

Issue Orientations among Recent Entrants to Office

Legislators and county commissioners entering office since 1974 are, as a group, less liberal and more conservative than earlier entrants to office. Among state legislators, 20% of newcomers describe themselves as conservative and 39% as liberal, in contrast to 12% conservative and 52% liberal among earlier entrants. Among county commissioners, 39% of recent entrants are conservative and 30% are liberal, compared with 31% conservative and 34% liberal among those with longer tenure.

There is a corresponding difference in proportions who are liberal or conservative on specific issues. Somewhat lower proportions of recently elected state legislators take liberal stands on every issue on which conservatives and liberals differ. Among county commissioners, the decline in liberalism is confined to three of the four women's issues: extension of social security to homemakers, ERA and child care.

ORIENTATIONS OF WOMEN COMPARED WITH MEN

Comparison of women officeholders with men in equivalent offices indicates that there is, indeed, a woman's point of view in political affairs, one that is most apparent with respect to women's issues but is not confined to such issues.

Ideology

Higher proportions of women than of men profess liberal political philosophies, while higher proportions of men than of women describe themselves as conservative. Among the women, 30% are liberal or very liberal, 36% are middle-of-the-road, and 34%

are conservative or very conservative. Corresponding proportions for the men are 22% liberal or very liberal, 33% middle-of-the-road, and 45% conservative.

Role of Government and Industry

Women are substantially more likely than men to support increased activity on the part of government and industry in behalf of women's rights. Sixty-five percent of women but only 42% of men endorse a more active role for the federal government. Sixty-eight percent of women and 44% of men feel that state governments should do more to assure equal rights. Seventy-eight percent of women as compared with 58% of men would like to see private industry do more.

Issue Orientations of Women and Men

In addition to greater liberalism in these general perspectives, women in office are more liberal than men on all women's issues analyzed (Table 49). Women and men differ also on some other issues in ways suggestive of a more humanistic outlook among women. Higher proportions of women feel that more severe punishment is not the best way to deal with the crime problem, that mandatory retirement because of age should be banned, and that busing to achieve racial balance will prove good for the country. These differences occur within varied subgroupings of officeholders.

Ideology and positions on issues. Sex differences in the issue positions of women and men in office are not accounted for by the larger proportion of liberals among the women. Although ideology is strongly related to positive or negative views on all issues examined except mandatory retirement and aid to the cities, women differ from men within each category of ideology (Table 50). Among those issues related to ideology, conservative women are more

Table 49. WOMEN TEND TO TAKE MORE LIBERAL POSITIONS ON ISSUES THAN MEN

Women's Issues ^a	Women	Men
	%	%
Agree ratify ERA	67	48
Disagree Constitution ban abortion	71	56
Agree homemaker social security	62	44
Agree government child care	39	32
<u>Other Issues^a</u>		
Agree busing desirable	22	12
Disagree severe crime penalties	31	16
Agree reduce defense budget	46	44
Agree ban mandatory retirement	61	50
Agree more fed. revenue for cities	82	78
Approximate totals ^b :	(662)	(341)

^aFor precise wording of questions and response categories, see Questions 18 (item 5) and 19 at the end of this report. Percent agree and agree strongly, % disagree and disagree strongly have been combined.

^bSlight variations in the numbers responding to each item have been averaged.

Table 50. WOMEN ARE MORE LIBERAL THAN MEN ON WOMEN'S ISSUES REGARDLESS OF IDEOLOGY, PARTY AFFILIATION

Agree more should be done for women's rights by ^a :	Ideology						Party Affiliation					
	Cons.		Mid. of Rd.		Lib.		Rep.		Dem.		Ind.	
	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %
Federal government	54	25	59	43	83	70	56	32	74	51	56	39
State governments	52	26	67	42	83	73	57	34	77	54	58	35
Private industry	72	46	77	60	88	76	72	55	84	63	74	46
Approximate totals ^b :	(172)	(124)	(186)	(88)	(170)	(70)	(194)	(123)	(286)	(138)	(65)	(35)
Women's Issues:^{a,c}												
Agree ratify ERA	47	33	68	47	88	71	59	33	76	63	54	34
Disagree Constitution ban abortion	60	49	72	52	84	75	75	55	70	62	66	38
Agree homemaker social security	49	38	61	43	78	58	52	34	69	49	62	59
Agree government child care	22	18	35	38	64	55	24	20	53	43	26	24
Other Issues:^{a,c}												
Agree busing desirable	6	5	20	6	44	39	11	7	32	18	11	6
Disagree severe crime penalties	9	3	26	9	62	49	19	9	42	25	18	6
Agree reduce defense budget	28	34	42	41	75	65	34	33	57	57	35	30
Agree ban mandatory retirement	60	52	61	42	62	52	55	51	65	48	58	51
Agree more fed. revenue for cities	84	75	84	81	78	80	86	76	79	81	90	81
Approximate totals ^b :	(215)	(149)	(255)	(100)	(189)	(73)	(230)	(140)	(345)	(157)	(80)	(36)

^aFor precise wording of questions and response categories, see Question 18, item 5, and Question 19 at the end of this report.

^bSlight variations in the numbers responding to each item have been averaged.

^c% agreeing and % agreeing strongly, % disagreeing and % disagreeing strongly have been combined.

liberal than conservative men on every issue except busing and the defense budget. Women who describe themselves as moderate are more liberal than their male counterparts except regarding social security for homemakers, child care, and the defense budget. Liberal women are more liberal than liberal men on every issue on which conservatives and liberals differ.

Although gender has an independent effect on issue positions, it does not override the influence of liberal/conservative identifications. This can be seen by comparing the percentages for conservative women with those for liberal men in Table 50. On each issue, higher proportions of liberal men than of conservative women take a liberal position.

Party and positions on issues. Unlike ideology, party is a less important predictor than sex of positions on some issues. As can be seen in Table 50, party affiliation is associated with issue positions, with Democrats more liberal on the issues. Despite the fact that higher proportions of women are Democrats, women are more liberal than men on most issues within each category of party affiliation. On action by government and industry to assure equal rights for women, Republican women are more liberal than Democratic men. Higher proportions of Republican women oppose a constitutional ban on abortion, and approximately equal proportions of Republican women and Democratic men support ERA and extension of social security to homemakers. Among women's issues, party affiliation has more influence than gender only with respect to child care. On other issues, party affiliation is more important than sex with respect to crime, the

defense budget and busing; sex is more important than party on issues of mandatory retirement and aid to the cities.

District population and issue positions. Officeholders from small districts are consistently more conservative on issues than those from large districts. Lower proportions of women in small districts than men in large districts describe themselves as liberal. Nonetheless, women from small districts are at least as supportive of women's issues as men from large districts (Table 51). In addition, women from small districts are more likely than men from large districts to oppose mandatory retirement and endorse aid to the cities.

Education and positions on issues. Although education is associated with issue positions among both men and women, women differ from men regardless of their level of education (Table 51). Higher proportions of the most educated men than of the least educated women describe themselves as liberal. Nevertheless, women who are not college graduates are more likely than men with postgraduate degrees to support action from government and industry to promote women's rights. However, on women's issues and other issues, the influence of education tends to outweigh the influence of gender, with the most educated men more liberal than the least educated women.

On women's issues, differences between men and women are wider among the more educated. Except for views on abortion, the relationship between sex and issue position is stronger among those with college educations or graduate degrees than among those who are not college graduates.⁵⁵

Table 51. SEX DIFFERENCES IN POSITIONS ON ISSUES OCCUR WITHIN EACH CATEGORY OF EDUCATION, DISTRICT SIZE

	Education						District Population				
	Not Coll. Graduate		College Graduate		Post-Grad. Degree		-10,000		10,000+		
	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %	
<u>Agree more should be done for women's rights by^a:</u>											
Federal government	61	43	66	34	75	51	61	37	71	50	
State governments	61	43	72	34	80	57	63	36	75	55	
Private industry	73	56	83	55	86	66	74	55	85	63	
Approximate totals ^b :	(280)	(134)	(176)	(87)	(89)	(82)	(308)	(168)	(217)	(124)	
<u>Women's Issues:^{a,c}</u>											
Agree ratify ERA	58	44	77	46	79	58	60	39	78	62	
Disagree Constitution ban abortion	65	45	78	64	80	72	66	54	78	63	
Agree homemaker social security	58	50	66	36	71	42	60	45	64	42	
Agree government child care	32	26	44	29	53	45	31	24	49	44	
<u>Other Issues:^{a,c}</u>											
Agree busing desirable	15	8	25	10	36	26	15	11	32	15	
Disagree severe crime penalties	22	6	36	17	54	33	21	12	47	22	
Agree reduce defense budget	38	41	54	34	60	59	42	38	54	52	
Agree ban mandatory retirement	60	51	62	51	64	48	57	49	66	52	
Agree more fed. revenue for cities	83	84	85	70	75	77	85	78	79	78	
Approximate totals ^b :	(344)	(159)	(204)	(93)	(104)	(89)	(374)	(194)	(251)	(136)	

^aFor precise wording of questions and response categories, see Question 18, item 5, and Question 19 at the end of this report.

^bSlight variations in the numbers responding to each item have been averaged.

^c% agreeing and % agreeing strongly, % disagreeing and % disagreeing strongly have been combined.

Table 52. REGARDLESS OF AGE, WOMEN ARE MORE LIBERAL THAN MEN ON WOMEN'S ISSUES

	Age								
	Under 35		35-44		45-54		55+		
	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %	
<u>Agree more should be done for women's rights by^a:</u>									
Federal government	67	53	67	45	65	37	62	35	
State governments	71	55	72	48	66	39	63	34	
Private industry	80	64	78	57	80	58	75	54	
Approximate totals ^b :	(66)	(60)	(157)	(91)	(195)	(85)	(120)	(70)	
<u>Women's Issues:^{a,c}</u>									
Agree ERA should be ratified	76	60	75	55	65	47	58	34	
Disagree Constitution should ban abortion	75	61	75	61	73	63	63	42	
Agree homemakers should have social security	78	49	63	41	57	40	62	47	
Agree government should provide child care	44	37	41	36	42	31	32	24	
<u>Other Issues:^{a,c}</u>									
Agree busing for racial balance is desirable	27	22	25	15	19	10	20	6	
Disagree severe penalties would help crime problem	43	20	39	21	30	16	21	7	
Agree defense budget should be reduced	48	51	52	39	44	46	44	42	
Agree mandatory retirement should be banned	56	49	61	55	58	42	67	54	
Agree more federal revenue should go to cities	92	81	81	80	81	77	82	78	
Approximate totals ^b :	(70)	(61)	(179)	(97)	(227)	(92)	(163)	(95)	

^aFor precise wording of questions and response categories, see Question 19 at end of report.

^bSlight variations in the numbers responding to each item have been averaged.

^c% agreeing and % agreeing strongly, % disagreeing and % disagreeing strongly have been combined.

Age and positions on issues. Younger officeholders are more liberal on issues than older officeholders. Yet within each category of age, women are more liberal than men on women's issues (Table 52). Indeed, in nearly every instance younger men are less liberal on women's issues than each older age category of women. On other issues, sex is at least as important as age in influencing positive or negative positions.

CONCLUSION TO PART IV

Among officeholders, gender is more than a minor component of political outlook; it is often more important than characteristics ordinarily receiving greater attention from political analysts. As a predictor of positions on some women's issues, it is more important than political party and age. It has equal importance with education and size of district population. Although gender does not override the association between self-described ideology and positions on women's issues, it has an independent predictive effect.

The importance of sex in the analysis of political

orientations is not confined to issues with substance of direct relevance to women. Among issues analyzed, women are more likely than men to oppose tougher penalties against crime, to support busing to achieve racial balance, and to favor legislation to ban mandatory retirement because of age. They differ from men on these issues regardless of their ideology, party affiliation, age, education or the size of their district populations.

These findings are important in evaluating the potential influence of women in government. Women in office may differ from men in office because of divergent socialization processes and gender-linked roles in the larger society. They also may differ because women who achieve public office represent a selection from the general population of women that is dissimilar to the selection of men for office from the general population of men.⁵⁶ If sex differentiation in positions on public issues persists, a continued increase in the numbers of women in public office will mean a growing impact of the special political perspectives of women on legislative and executive decision-making.

PART V. PERCEPTIONS ABOUT WOMEN IN POLITICS

Even in this decade, ambivalence about the role of women in politics has been widespread both among the electorate and among politically elite men. In a nationwide poll in 1972, a majority of respondents felt that women should become more active in politics, but nearly two-thirds of both women and men agreed that most men are better suited emotionally for politics than most women.⁵⁷ In a comparison made between voters in this poll and delegates to the 1972 national conventions, female delegates were found to disagree with stereotypical opinions about women's fitness for politics, while male delegates were reported to have much the same opinions as the electorate.⁵⁸

As more women achieve office, many voters and politically elite men may be rejecting a view of women as less well-suited for public life. To the degree that such an opinion continues to be held, however, the behaviors it implies will limit the political roles of women.

Women cannot achieve public office and perform successfully in office solely through their own motivations and characteristics. Quite apart from their actual abilities, aspirations and attitudes, they are dependent upon approval from electorates, from political party leaders, and from officeholders with the power to select others for appointive offices. Once in office, women face additional barriers if sizeable proportions of constituents and colleagues automatically regard their competence and qualifications as suspect because of their gender. Moreover, a tendency of social life is for individuals to share the perceptions that others have of them. If women, even politically active women, adopt conventional stereotypes about themselves, they may limit their own political goals.

In Part V, we examine four aspects of perceptions among officeholders about women in politics: per-

ceptions of barriers in access to public office and political leadership, perceptions of difficulties in office that women experience as a result of being women, perceptions of advantages that women in office experience, and perceptions of the characteristics of women in office. Our investigation is necessarily limited to analysis of only a few of the many questions that might be asked about these topics. It is intended to suggest the nature of the dilemma faced by political women rather than to describe fully its dimensions. As in previous parts of this report, we consider in the first section the perceptions of women in public office and variations among women. In the second section, we compare the perceptions of women with those of men in office.

WOMEN IN POLITICS AS PERCEIVED BY WOMEN IN OFFICE

Large proportions of women in office perceive women as discriminated against in access to political leadership. In their description of the difficulties they encounter while serving in public office, women most often mention various forms of sex discrimination. However, women in politics also see advantages deriving from their gender. They often attribute these advantages to their visibility as a small minority and to special contributions that women make to the political sphere of activity.

Perceptions of Discrimination⁵⁹

Although large proportions of women in office perceive discrimination against women in politics, they are far more likely to identify male party leaders than voters as a source of discrimination (Table 53).

The higher the level of office occupied by women officials, the more likely are women to perceive unequal opportunity for achieving political leader-

Table 53. WOMEN IN OFFICE ARE MORE LIKELY TO SEE MEN IN PARTY ORGANIZATIONS THAN VOTERS AS DISCRIMINATORY

	Judi- ciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor- alty %	Local Council %
Women have just as much opportunity as men to become political leaders							
Agree strongly	17	15	16	21	28	35	31
Agree	35	29	24	33	31	30	32
Disagree	11	22	20	27	20	23	22
Disagree strongly	37	34	40	19	21	12	15
Total ^a	(35)	(41)	(55)	(247)	(270)	(278)	(2,056)
In general, voters are more reluctant to support women candidates							
Agree strongly	11	10	7	3	9	14	13
Agree	31	50	36	36	43	46	43
Disagree	20	22	37	34	29	21	26
Disagree strongly	38	18	20	27	19	19	18
Total ^a	(35)	(40)	(56)	(244)	(271)	(269)	(2,010)
Many men in party organizations try to keep women out of leadership roles							
Agree strongly	30	24	33	22	30	26	32
Agree	44	50	53	46	41	47	43
Disagree	23	18	9	21	20	19	17
Disagree strongly	3	8	5	10	9	8	8
Total ^a	(30)	(38)	(55)	(239)	(250)	(246)	(1,873)

^a"Undecideds" have been omitted from percentage bases.

ship. A little more than a third of local officeholders but more than two-fifths of county commissioners and state representatives and half or more of state senators, judges and state executives disagree that women have as much opportunity as men to become political leaders.

In contrast to the tendency for higher proportions of women in higher-level offices to perceive unequal political opportunity, local and county officeholders are more likely than women in higher offices (except the state executive) to perceive voter discrimination. Moreover, higher proportions of local and county officeholders perceive voter resistance than perceive unequal opportunity, while higher proportions of state officeholders perceive unequal opportunity than perceive voter resistance.

Thus a proportion of women officials who feel that women have as much opportunity as men to achieve political leadership nonetheless perceive voters as reluctant to support women candidates. Conversely, a proportion of women who define women as having unequal opportunity do not perceive voters as a source of inequality. Apparently, some officeholders think of "political leadership" apart from the electorate, as referring to positions within their governing bodies or within political parties. Perhaps others think of "opportunity" as unequal only if they regard obstacles as insurmountable, since women elected to public office obviously have overcome whatever barriers are imposed by voters.

Far larger proportions of women in every office perceive discrimination from men in political parties than perceive discrimination by voters. Between 68% and 86% agree or agree strongly that

many men in party organizations try to keep women from attaining leadership positions. Again, larger proportions of women perceive party discrimination than perceive unequal opportunity for political leadership.

Difficulties Encountered as Women in Office

By far the most common difficulty mentioned by women in office is discrimination. Respondents were asked to reply to this question: "What special difficulties, if any, have you experienced as a result of being a woman holding public office?" The question was designed to elicit a range of responses that would represent the salient concerns of women holding office. Respondents were free to mention family pressures, difficulties of raising money for campaigns, inadequacies in background and skills, problems of travel away from home, prejudice against women or various other difficulties -- and all of these appear with varying frequency, as shown in Table 54.⁶⁰

While a minority report that they have experienced no special difficulties, proportions ranging between 50% and 78% across various categories of office mention one or more problems. The difficulties encountered overwhelmingly refer to prejudice and discrimination, principally from male colleagues or other political leaders but also from constituents. Women complain that they are not taken seriously, are stereotyped in their characteristics, are regarded as sex objects, are excluded from the "old boys' networks," are not consulted on pending issues, are discriminated against in committee assignments, are asked to do clerical work and domestic chores, are asked to assume an unfair share of the work load, are subjected to opposition to

Table 54. DISCRIMINATION IS THE MAJOR DIFFICULTY EXPERIENCED BY WOMEN IN OFFICE^a

Type of Difficulty Named:	Judi- ciary	State Exec.	State Senate	State House	County Comsn.	Mayor- alty	Local Council
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Chauvinism, stereotyping, not taken seriously	46	42	33	41	44	38	46
Exclusion from male networks	4	10	12	12	10	5	7
Discrimination in assignments	4	2	5	7	4	2	3
Opposition to programs and ideas	4	7	2	1	1	4	3
Having to prove competence	15	2	12	11	12	20	13
Constituent prejudice	15	10	3	8	10	12	9
Discomfort of minority status	0	12	12	5	9	3	6
Financial support	8	5	3	4	1	1	-
Family pressures	0	5	7	4	3	3	3
Personality difficulty	4	0	3	2	2	2	2
Deficiency in qualifications	0	2	0	2	2	4	4
Other	0	3	8	3	2	6	4
Total difficulties named = 100%	(26)	(41)	(60)	(220)	(242)	(218)	(1,639)
Total naming one or more difficulty	(15)	(25)	(39)	(142)	(151)	(155)	(1,079)
Percent naming one or more difficulty	50%	69%	78%	70%	63%	64%	58%

^aFederal respondents have been omitted because of small numbers reporting.

their programs and ideas because a woman has initiated them, are expected to prove their competence while that of men is taken for granted, and are sometimes avoided or ridiculed by male constituents. Many comment simply that they confront the "old story" of male chauvinism. From two-thirds to more than eight in ten of women officeholders' comments refer to such forms of discrimination.

In addition, some comments deal with the discomforts of minority status. Among respondents' difficulties in this category are the manner in which they are addressed (e.g., as councilman, as gentlemen, by first name when colleagues are addressed more formally), problems of travel to conferences as the only woman in a group of men, problems of attending official social events without an escort or of placing one's husband in an awkward position by taking him along.

Comments about conflict between officeholding and some aspect of family life constitute only from 3% to 7% of total responses. Either women who achieve and stay in public office find satisfactory ways of combining officeholding with their family roles, or the family problems they do encounter are less salient than the discrimination they face as officials, or they do not regard tensions between family and political life as a problem special to women who hold office (see Part II).

Similarly small percentages of the difficulties mentioned involve the personalities or qualifications of the women themselves. While some women feel that they have had to learn to be more assertive, more direct in their communication or less emotional, others report having to learn to be more patient and accepting, less aggressive, or more subtle in their communication. A few women report felt inadequacies in background or skills such as lack of formal education, lack of business training or experience, lack of technical expertise in matters involving construction or machinery, or lack of political experience and skills.

The overall tendency to mention some form of discrimination or prejudice as distinguished from other types of difficulties does not vary with the characteristics of officeholders. Proportions of responses mentioning discrimination are strikingly similar among all categories of characteristics examined: type of office, party affiliation, size of district population, tenure in office, number of other women serving on governing body, age, education, marital status, presence of minor children, conservative or liberal ideology, and membership in feminist organizations.

Women do vary in patterned ways in the proportions saying that they have experienced one or more difficulties, in comparison with the proportions saying that they have experienced no difficulties. However, the kinds of women who are more likely to mention difficulties are also the kinds of women who are more likely to mention advantages. Thus both difficulties and advantages are named proportionately more often by women in higher-level offices, women in large districts, women with female colleagues, younger women, liberals, college graduates, and members of feminist organizations. Apparently, awareness both of difficulties and of advantages reflects a more general consciousness of self as distinct from other officeholders because of gender.

Advantages Experienced by Women in Office

Just as the majority of women name one or more difficulties they have encountered as women in office, the majority name one or more advantages (Table 55). Answers are given within a variety of perspectives, and the types of answers range widely.

A substantial proportion of responses concerns some aspect of relations with the public. Many women think of themselves as more approachable, more trusted, more responsive to the needs and problems of constituents and more knowledgeable about such problems. A minority of responses refer

Table 55. SERVICE TO PUBLIC, SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS AND TREATMENT ARE ADVANTAGES CLAIMED BY WOMEN^a

Type of Advantage Named:	Judi- ciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor- alty %	Local Council %
Constituent service, public representation	33	23	27	22	24	25	34
More approachable	0	0	0	4	5	6	8
More responsive, able to identify needs	0	6	3	6	7	8	12
Public trust	11	11	16	6	5	5	3
Women a special constituency	22	6	8	6	7	6	11
Special skills and performance	9	12	16	30	28	25	27
Superior knowledge and performance	3	3	1	6	4	6	4
More outspoken, independent, innovative	0	0	1	2	3	2	2
Superior interpersonal skills	6	6	2	8	7	6	6
More time; not having to earn a living	0	0	10	12	7	9	9
Women's view, special expertise of roles	0	3	2	2	7	2	6
Visibility, novelty, special treatment	54	56	48	41	40	40	28
Higher visibility, better publicity	46	39	33	29	22	16	10
Special respect for women who achieve	6	3	2	5	8	11	8
Special courtesy, male chivalry	2	14	13	7	10	13	10
Personal satisfactions	2	3	3	0	5	5	7
Other	2	6	6	7	3	5	4
Total advantages named = 100%	(36)	(35)	(63)	(255)	(287)	(252)	(1,923)
Total naming one or more	(22)	(22)	(39)	(150)	(164)	(147)	(1,143)
Percent naming one or more	71%	60%	83%	72%	70%	62%	63%

^aFederal respondents have been omitted because of small numbers reporting.

to women as a special constituency, stressing service to women and support by women.

A wide variety of qualities, patterns of performance and special perspectives are named by respondents as aspects of officeholding in which they personally or women generally excel. Comments made with some frequency are that women are more persistent, more committed, more knowledgeable about their communities, more willing to seek information, more practical and more honest. Women also frequently mention giving more time to their offices either because they are more committed or because they have more flexible schedules than men.

In their interpersonal skills, women see themselves as more understanding of others, more patient, more skilled in effecting compromises. Some respondents see women as more outspoken and willing to dissent, more independent in their political judgments, more willing to take a fresh perspective and develop new programs.

The "woman's point of view" as a special contribution of women to politics also receives mention. Some women specify this perspective by commenting that their family experience has sensitized them to the needs of women and children in the community, that women's minority status makes them more sympathetic to the needs of other special groups such as racial minorities or elderly citizens, or that women are a humanizing influence in government.

Although women in office often complain of their "token" or minority status, many women consider

their visibility as a minority of some advantage in the treatment and publicity they receive. Responses mentioning visibility or novelty as an advantage occur more frequently at higher levels of officeholding. Special courtesies received also are often mentioned as advantages although some women qualify their comments by indicating that they consider these advantages pleasant but of minor value.

Perceptions of the Qualities of Women in Politics

The advantages mentioned by women holding office suggest that large proportions of politically active women think that members of their sex make distinctive contributions to politics. Part of the conventional wisdom about women in politics is that women make special contributions but are also politically naive and relatively inferior to men in their experience and qualifications. In an effort to examine the extent to which women holding public office may adopt such a conventional stereotype, if not for themselves, then for political women in general, we asked officeholders to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement with four statements about the characteristics of women in office. Two of these statements assert special contributions of women: commitment of time and expertise in human relations. Two statements describe women in office as inferior to men: in political astuteness and in qualifications and training. Table 56 presents the four statements and the percentages agreeing or disagreeing with each.

Women in office typically agree with statements of

Table 56. WOMEN SEE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF WOMEN IN OFFICE AS EQUAL OR SUPERIOR TO THOSE OF MEN IN OFFICE

	Judi- ciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor- alty %	Local Council %
Women in office generally devote more time to the job than do men							
Agree strongly	35	43	52	50	57	60	46
Agree	38	30	29	34	30	26	33
Disagree	15	18	19	12	10	7	16
Disagree strongly	12	9	0	4	3	7	5
Total ^a	(26)	(33)	(52)	(217)	(247)	(255)	(1,838)
Women in office are better at the "human relations" aspect of the job							
Agree strongly	30	37	34	38	46	55	48
Agree	49	26	36	33	38	30	36
Disagree	18	26	26	26	13	10	13
Disagree strongly	3	11	4	3	3	5	3
Total ^a	(33)	(35)	(50)	(223)	(249)	(260)	(1,903)
In general, women in office are not as politically astute as men							
Agree strongly	0	10	6	6	10	13	8
Agree	32	10	25	19	20	22	26
Disagree	19	21	25	33	22	24	27
Disagree strongly	49	59	44	42	48	41	39
Total ^a	(31)	(38)	(51)	(242)	(260)	(258)	(1,926)
Women officeholders' qualifications and training usually not as good as men's							
Agree strongly	3	0	6	3	6	6	7
Agree	9	15	14	13	10	17	17
Disagree	21	8	10	22	22	25	23
Disagree strongly	67	77	70	62	62	52	53
Total ^a	(33)	(39)	(51)	(240)	(263)	(263)	(1,965)

^a"Undecideds" have been omitted from percentage bases.

women's superior contributions and disagree with statements asserting inadequacies. By overwhelming majorities, women in every type of office agree or agree strongly that women give more time to the job than men and are better at human relations. By similarly overwhelming majorities, women in every type of office disagree or disagree strongly that women are not as politically astute as men or as well qualified.

Higher proportions of county and state than of local officeholders believe that women's qualifications and training are not inferior to those of men. In addition, higher proportions of county and local officeholders than of state officeholders agree that women are better at human relations. These findings suggest that women in higher-level offices may be more resistant to conventional stereotypes about women, regardless of whether these stereotypes affirm superiority or inferiority. Alternatively, the patterns of response may reflect actual differences in the behavior and characteristics of women who achieve offices above the local level.

WOMEN'S VS. MEN'S PERCEPTIONS OF WOMEN IN POLITICS

In a number of ways, the perceptions that women in office have of their difficulties, advantages and characteristics are not shared by men in office. Men in office perceive discrimination against women differently, are less likely to perceive

superior competencies of women officials, and are more likely to perceive deficiencies.

Perceptions of Discrimination in Access to Office

The men responding to our survey do not differ greatly from women officials in their perceptions of women as subject to unequal political opportunity, party discrimination or voter discrimination (Table 57). Thirty-three percent of men and 38% of women disagree that women have equal opportunity; 60% of men and 55% of women agree that voters are more reluctant to support women. Somewhat larger differences appear in perceptions of discrimination by men in party organizations. Seventy-one percent of women but only 58% of men agree that many men in political parties oppose the attainment of leadership by women.

Although approximately similar percentages of women and men perceive women as having unequal political opportunity, men are more likely to identify voters, and women are more likely to see party leaders as sources of inequality. Among those perceiving unequal political opportunity, 63% of women but 79% of men perceive voters as reluctant to support women candidates, in contrast to 84% of women and 71% of men perceiving discrimination by party leaders. Among those who feel that women have equal opportunity with men, 51% of both men and women perceive voter resistance but a larger proportion of women (63%) than of men (50%) view parties as discriminatory.

Table 57. RELATIVELY MORE WOMEN THAN MEN AGREE PARTIES DISCRIMINATE AGAINST WOMEN

	Women %	Men %
Women have as much opportunity as men to become political leaders		
Agree strongly	30	28
Agree	32	39
Disagree	21	23
Disagree strongly	17	10
Total ^a	(695)	(344)
In general, voters are more reluctant to support women candidates		
Agree strongly	12	11
Agree	43	49
Disagree	27	27
Disagree strongly	18	13
Total ^a	(679)	(335)
Many men in party organizations try to keep women out of leadership roles		
Agree strongly	30	20
Agree	41	38
Disagree	20	28
Disagree strongly	9	14
Total ^a	(639)	(328)

^a"Undecideds" omitted from percentage bases.

Men's Perceptions of Difficulties Faced by Women

Men are less likely than women to name sex discrimination as a problem experienced by women serving in office (Table 58). Larger proportions of the difficulties named by men are focused on conflicts between officeholding and the family life of women officeholders or on perceived inadequacies of personality and qualifications among female officials. Forty-five percent of the responses given by men but only 9% of those made by women are in these areas. In addition, nearly twice the proportion of men's responses (17%) as of women's (9%) refer to the prejudices of constituents. Thus, while women officials perceive their difficulties largely in terms of the behavior of their colleagues or of other political men, men in office perceive women's difficulties as located in the personal qualities and characteristics of women officeholders, or in the public's antipathy toward them.

Men's Perceptions of Women's Advantages

A lower percentage of men (52%) than of women (65%) perceive one or more advantages experienced by women in office (Table 59). These figures are in contrast to men's somewhat greater tendency to perceive difficulties (68% of men vs. 60% of women). The advantages named also differ in nature from those named by women. A higher proportion of the men's responses mention women's ability to attract women's votes and to serve the needs of women, but a lower proportion are concerned with other aspects of constituent service and representation. Higher percentages of the men's responses also name aspects of special skills and performances. These tend to be heavily, though not entirely, directed to traditional virtues thought to be possessed by women:

Table 58. MEN'S PERCEPTIONS DIFFER FROM WOMEN'S REPORTS OF DIFFICULTIES EXPERIENCED

Type of Difficulty Named:	Women %	Men %
Chauvinism, stereotyping	45	26
Exclusion from male networks	7	1
Discrimination in assignments	3	-
Opposition to programs, ideas	3	1
Having to prove competence	14	4
Constituent prejudice	9	17
Discomfort of minority status	6	3
Financial support	1	-
Family pressures	3	11
Personality difficulty	2	17
Deficiency in qualifications	4	17
Other	3	3
Total difficulties named = 100%	(574)	(288)
Total naming one or more	(372)	(215)
Percent naming one or more	60%	68%

Table 59. RELATIVELY FEWER MEN PERCEIVE ADVANTAGES FOR WOMEN OFFICEHOLDERS: SPECIAL CONTRIBUTIONS ARE NAMED

Type of Advantage Named:	Women %	Men %
Constituent service, representation	30	22
More approachable	8	1
More responsive, able to identify needs	9	8
Public trust	5	1
Women a special constituency	8	12
Special skills and performance	27	57
Superior knowledge and performance	4	8
More outspoken, independent, innovative	2	5
Superior interpersonal skills	5	9
More time; not having to earn a living	10	18
Women's view, special expertise of role	6	17
Visibility, novelty, special treatment	33	17
Higher visibility, better publicity	15	12
Special respect for women who achieve	9	-
Special courtesy, male chivalry	9	5
Personal satisfactions	6	3
Other	4	1
Total advantages named = 100%	(653)	(238)
Total naming one or more	(393)	(163)
Percent naming one or more	65%	52%

commitment of time because women do not have to earn a living, the woman's point of view, skill in human relations, independence and lack of ties to special interests, conscientiousness, patience with detail, and knowledgeable ability.

Perceptions of Women's Characteristics

Examination of the four characteristics selected as

Table 60. WOMEN AND MEN DIFFER IN THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF WOMEN IN OFFICE

	Women %	Men %
Women in office generally devote more time to the job than do men		
Agree strongly	49	17
Agree	33	34
Disagree	13	30
Disagree strongly	5	19
Total ^a	(637)	(283)
Women in office are better at "human relations" aspect of job		
Agree strongly	45	13
Agree	38	32
Disagree	14	38
Disagree strongly	3	17
Total ^a	(640)	(307)
In general, women in office are not as politically astute as men		
Agree strongly	9	7
Agree	23	32
Disagree	27	37
Disagree strongly	41	24
Total ^a	(656)	(321)
Women officeholders' qualifications and training usually not as good as men's		
Agree strongly	7	8
Agree	16	24
Disagree	21	38
Disagree strongly	56	30
Total ^a	(673)	(323)

^a"Undecideds" omitted from percentage bases.

Indicators of conventional perceptions of the contributions and deficiencies of women officeholders reveals that men are proportionately less likely than women to perceive virtues and are proportionately more likely to perceive deficiencies (Table 60). Lower proportions of men agree that women devote more time to office (which, in fact, they do if unemployed -- see Part III). Lower proportions of men than women also see women as superior in human relations. In addition, men are more likely than women to agree with statements that women's political skills and qualifications are not as good as those of men.

With few exceptions, these patterns of difference between women and men occur regardless of marital status, age of youngest child, education, district size, tenure in office, party affiliation, ideology and age. There are only two instances in which male and female officeholders share similar perceptions about women in office: no sex differences in perceptions of women's political astuteness exist among those under 35 and among liberals, and no sex

differences exist with regard to perceptions of women's qualifications or training among those under age 35, liberals and moderates. These exceptions reflect the fact that age and ideology are strongly related among men (though only weakly related among women) to agreement or disagreement with the statements that women lack political astuteness and qualifications for office.

A more complete picture of the differing perceptions that women and men have of women in office is obtained when we examine the various ways in which beliefs about the four characteristics of time commitment, skill in human relations, political astuteness, and qualifications are patterned in the responses of individuals. Fifty-two percent of women but only 25% of men both affirm the superiority of women in commitment of time and/or human relations and deny inadequacies in training and political astuteness. An additional 34% of women but only 19% of men perceive a traditional sexual division of competencies, defining women officeholders as superior in time and human relations but as deficient in political skill and/or in qualifications for office.

By contrast, only 7% of women officeholders but 36% of the men combine rejection of one or both statements regarding women's special contributions with agreement that women's political skills and qualifications are inferior. Only 7% of women officeholders but 20% of men in office deny all sex-linked differences in characteristics typical of women in office -- the pattern of response that would prevail if gender were perceived as irrelevant to political behavior.

Thus patterns of responses to the four statements about women in politics illustrate the disparities in perceptions that exist. Women tend to perceive women in office as either superior or as exhibiting a traditional sexual division of competencies. Men tend to perceive women officeholders as displaying a traditional sexual division of competencies, as inadequate relative to men, or as no different from men.

Sex-linked stereotypes may be usually true, usually false, or sometimes true and sometimes false. Our data can neither confirm nor refute the validity of any of these patterns of perception. We suggest, however, that the disparities in perceptions may be indicative of tensions in the relations between men and women who are officially colleagues. As we point out in the introduction to this report, the men responding to our survey may well have more interest in women's political participation than men who did not respond. Should our assumption prove correct, the evaluations of women's political roles made by the female and male officeholders in our survey may differ even more widely between women and men in the total population of officials.

PART VI. POLITICAL PLANS AND PUBLIC OFFICEHOLDING AMBITIONS

Women officeholders view sex discrimination as a widespread problem for politically active women, and we have suggested that such discrimination is one limitation on political achievement. Some

research concludes that an additional restriction on women's political activity is operative: a lack of political ambition.⁶¹ Previous studies which have compared the officeholding ambitions

of male and female political elites have found women to be less ambitious politically than men.⁶² Lower levels of ambition among women in comparison with men generally have been attributed to differences in sex-role socialization.

The issue of the relative importance of limited ambition versus discrimination as explanations for the lack of greater achievement by women in the political sphere is clearly of more than academic significance. Each explanation implies a different approach to removing obstacles to women's political participation. If the paucity of women in positions of political leadership is due primarily to lower ambition stemming from sex-role socialization, then greater participation must await changes in the attitudes and motivations of women themselves. If the lack of political achievement is due instead to sex discrimination, then increased political involvement by women will depend upon changes in the attitudes of party leaders, voters and others who exercise control over the futures of political women.

To assist clarification of the issue of women's ambition, Part VI is devoted to an examination of the public officeholding aspirations of women in office, as they reported these in 1977. The first section of Part VI describes the ambitions of women currently serving in office and reports the distinguishing characteristics of ambitious women. The second section examines the ambitions of women in comparison with those of men, pointing to the need for revision of the assertion that politically active women are less ambitious than their male counterparts. The third section considers a group of women who have left office since 1975. The concluding section of Part VI briefly summarizes the findings and discusses their implications for the participation of women in public office.

AMBITION AND WOMEN OFFICEHOLDERS

Three questions from our survey are central in analyzing officeholding ambitions. First, respondents were asked if they planned to seek an additional term in the office currently held. Second, respondents were asked if there were any other elective or appointive offices they eventually would like to hold, given the necessary political support and the right opportunities. Third, those who answered this question affirmatively were asked to list all offices which might be of interest.

Women officeholders are politically ambitious. Most women in every category of office definitely or probably plan to seek another term in their present office, and approximately half or more eventually would like to hold some other public office (Table 61).

Those in higher levels of office show some tendency to be more ambitious for additional terms or for other offices. State legislators are more ambitious than county commissioners. In turn, county commissioners are more ambitious than officeholders at the local level. Exceptions to the general pattern occur among mayors, who are no more ambitious than local councillors, and among judges and members of the state executive, who appear less ambitious than state legislators. Perhaps the older average age of mayors and judges, the lengthy term of office of many judgeships, and the appointive nature of some judicial and executive offices affect expressed plans and aspirations of women in these offices.

Among women officeholders who desire other offices, ambitions are affected by current officeholding achievement. Officeholders who aspire to other offices have been classified, on the basis of the highest office desired, as having high, moderate or low officeholding ambition. (See footnote to Table 62 for a complete list of offices considered to reflect each level of ambition.) Consistently greater proportions of state legislators than of county or local officials aspire to federal, state cabinet or other high offices (Table 62). Eighty-nine percent of state senators and 64% of state house members ultimately aspire to these high offices, in contrast to 40% of county commissioners, 20% of mayors and 18% of local councillors.

Leavers, Stayers and Changers

To facilitate more detailed analysis of ambition, officeholders have been classified into three categories on the basis of responses to questions about seeking additional terms in office and seeking other public offices. Those who eventually would like to hold one or more other offices are termed "changers." Officeholders who do not express an interest in other public offices are classified as "stayers" if they plan to seek an additional term in their current office, and as "leavers" if they plan to resign from public officeholding at the end of their current term. Throughout this analysis, changers will be considered more politically ambitious than stayers, and stayers will be con-

Table 61. MOST WOMEN WANT ANOTHER TERM IN CURRENT OFFICE AND/OR AT LEAST ONE MORE PUBLIC OFFICE^a

	Judi- ciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor- alty %	Local Council %
Probably, definitely will seek additional term in current office	82	63	84	82	72	54	62
Total	(37)	(43)	(58)	(251)	(281)	(287)	(2,142)
Would like one or more other offices	50	66	82	62	56	48	49
Total	(34)	(38)	(54)	(237)	(269)	(267)	(2,013)

^aFederal offices have been omitted from analysis because of low numbers of responses.

Table 62. LARGER PROPORTIONS IN STATE THAN IN COUNTY OR LOCAL OFFICES HAVE AMBITIONS FOR HIGH OFFICE^a

Officeholding Ambition ^b :	Judi- ciary %	State Exec. %	State Senate %	State House %	County Comsn. %	Mayor- alty %	Local Council %
High	(15)	(16)	89	64	40	20	18
Moderate	(1)	(3)	11	34	50	54	49
Low	(0)	(0)	0	2	10	26	33
Total	(16)	(19)	(38)	(132)	(136)	(112)	(896)

^aFederal offices have been omitted from analysis because of low numbers of responses.

^bOffices following were considered to reflect high, moderate or low ultimate officeholding ambition:

High -- Federal: president, vice-president, supreme court justice, senator or representative, cabinet or subcabinet officer, ambassador, district judge; State: governor, lieutenant governor, supreme court judge, attorney general, treasurer, secretary of state; Local: mayor of city of 1,000,000 or more.

Moderate -- State: senator or representative, trial judge, appellate judge other than of state supreme court, department head not elsewhere listed; Local: mayor of city of less than 1,000,000 but over 100,000.

Low -- County: head or member of county governing body, judge, other county official or board member; Local: mayor or township head of district less than 100,000 population, municipal judge, member of municipal or township council, other municipal or township official.

sidered more ambitious than leavers. Only two categories of officeholders -- state legislators and local councillors -- are examined in our analysis of leavers, stayers, and changers. These represent the most ambitious and the least ambitious of the categories of officeholders included in our survey, and they also have the advantage of numbers sufficiently large to permit detailed analysis.

The fact that women in office are politically ambitious is further illustrated by the fact that 69% of state legislators and 54% of local councillors are changers, while 26% of legislators and 32% of council members are stayers. Leavers constitute only 5% of state legislators and 14% of local councillors.⁶³

Although the majority of legislators and local councillors are changers, changers vary in the level of their officeholding ambition. Among changers at the local level, 18% desire federal, state cabinet or other offices indicating high ambition; 48% aspire to state legislative or other offices reflecting moderate ambition; 34% desire local or county offices indicating relatively low ambition. Among changers in state legislatures, 56% have high officeholding ambition; 42% have moderate ambition; only 2% list an office at the local or county level as the highest office they desire.⁶⁴

Personal Characteristics and Ambition

The personal characteristics of officeholders may represent resources that can be invested in future political activity or obstacles to additional achievement. Among those influencing political ambition, two stand out as of special importance: age and education.⁶⁵

Age and ambition. An individual's sense of what is achievable is likely to become more constrained as

she grows older. While it may seem reasonable for a local councillor of 35 to aspire to Congress, the same aspiration is likely to seem much less reasonable to the councillor of 65. When the proportions of officeholders aspiring to offices other than those now held are examined, the inhibiting effect of age on political ambition is evident (Table 63). Ninety-three percent of state legislators under age 35 are changers, but only 44% of those aged 55 or more desire to seek other offices. Among local councillors, 65% of those under 35 but only 34% of those aged 55 or more are changers. As shown in Table 63, the proportions of both stayers and

Table 63. YOUNGER WOMEN HAVE HIGHER AMBITIONS

Ambition:	Legislator Age ^a				Councillor Age			
	-35 %	35-44 %	45-54 %	55+ %	-35 %	35-44 %	45-54 %	55+ %
Change	93	83	69	49	65	63	56	34
Stay	7	17	31	51	25	28	32	41
Leave					10	9	12	25
Total	(41)	(65)	(91)	(57)	(241)	(523)	(562)	(434)
Changers' Ambition:								
High	82	48	61	42	20	20	17	7
Mod.	18	52	39	58	51	48	48	46
Low					29	32	35	47
Total	(33)	(48)	(54)	(24)	(145)	(309)	(285)	(135)

^aThe 13 legislators classified as leavers and the 3 legislative changers expressing low ambition are omitted from analysis.

leavers among legislators and councillors rise with increasing age.

Among changers, age is strongly related to the level of office ultimately desired. Of the state legislators under age 35 who express a desire to seek other offices, 82% aspire to federal, state cabinet or other comparable offices reflecting high officeholding ambition. The corresponding figure for state legislative changers 55 or older is 42%. While 20% of changers among local council members under age 35 aspire to high office, only 7% of changers 55 and older have high officeholding ambition.

Education. Education may increase an individual's self-esteem and sense of efficacy which, in turn, may lead her to higher aspirations. It also may provide credentials which are perceived both by the individual officeholder and her colleagues as important qualifications for moving on to more powerful or prestigious offices.

Among both legislators and local council members, those with graduate degrees are far more likely to be changers than those who have not completed college, and the better educated among the changers are far more likely to aim for high office than the less educated changers (Table 64).

Table 64. AMBITIOUS OFFICEHOLDERS ARE BETTER EDUCATED THAN LEAVERS, STAYERS

Ambition:	Legislators			Councillors		
	Non-Coll. %	Coll. %	Post-Grad. %	Non-Coll. %	Coll. %	Post-Grad. %
Changers	60	73	87	50	58	68
Stayers	40	27	13	36	27	21
Leavers ^a				14	15	11
Total	(75)	(114)	(71)	(1,067)	(501)	(214)
Changers' Ambition:						
High	37	60	70	12	21	33
Moderate	63	40	30	46	52	50
Low ^b				42	27	17
Total	(41)	(70)	(54)	(481)	(268)	(135)

^aThose classified as leavers among Legislators are not analyzed because of small numbers.

^bAmong Legislator changers, the three expressing low ultimate ambition have not been analyzed.

The effects of education on ambition are similar among younger and older officeholders, with one exception. For local councillors over age 45, education fails to differentiate among leavers, stayers, and changers, although it does influence the level of aspirations among changers. Education may not be as critical a credential for older women at the local level, especially those whose aspirations do not include high office.

Spouse's Supportiveness of Officeholding

We found in Part II of this report that married women officeholders, especially those in higher-level offices, tend to have husbands who actively support their wives' officeholding. Just as a supportive husband is likely to be an important consideration in the decision to enter public office initially, one would predict that the spouse's political interest, approval, participation, and willingness to share household tasks are important aspects of the development and maintenance of women's political ambitions after achieving office.

Our data show ambition to be fairly consistently related to spousal support (Table 65). The supportiveness of husbands along each of the four support dimensions affects whether local councillors and state legislators desire to leave public office, remain in their current offices, or seek other offices. Among legislative changers, the level of officeholding ambition appears unaffected by degree of spousal supportiveness. At the local level, however, larger percentages of changers with supportive husbands have high officeholding ambition.

Political Characteristics and Experience

In addition to personal and family characteristics, several aspects of the political backgrounds of women in office distinguish more ambitious from less ambitious officeholders. These include size of district population, organizational, party and officeholding experience, self-identified ideology, and party affiliation.

District population. Local officeholders from small districts are likely to face disadvantages in seeking higher offices where the size of the constituency is large and the costs and efforts of campaigning are great. An officeholder from a small district, in comparison with one from a large district, has neither as broad an electoral base nor as much access to organizational networks that could provide funds, workers, and other support for political campaigns.

Local councillors from large districts are considerably more likely to be changers (73%) than those from small districts (48%). Small districts contain higher proportions both of leavers and stayers than do large districts. Among changers, 30% from large districts and only 11% from small districts aspire to offices reflecting high ambition. Although officeholders from large districts tend both to be younger and better educated, the strong relationship between district population and ambition exists quite apart from the age or education of officials.

Organizational, party and officeholding experience. Experience in voluntary organizations, party activities, and public office can teach important skills, assist in developing interpersonal networks, enhance an individual's qualifications in the eyes of voters and party leaders, and increase self-confidence. Any or all of these benefits may contribute to the maintenance and enhancement of officeholding ambitions.

Differences in organizational and political experience appear far more important in distinguishing

Table 65. SUPPORTIVENESS OF SPOUSES IS RELATED TO FUTURE OFFICEHOLDING AMBITIONS

	Husband's Political Interest ^a			Approval of Officeholding ^a			Participation in Political Life ^a			Extra Household Tasks ^a		
	High %	Some %	Low %	High %	Mod. %	Opposed %	Often %	Some %	None %	Often %	Some %	None %
Legislators												
Changers	76	72	(3)	74	68	(3)	74	76	60	75	67	(15)
Stayers	24	28	(7)	26	32	(1)	26	24	40	25	33	(8)
Total	(134)	(65)	(10)	(158)	(47)	(4)	(98)	(74)	(35)	(129)	(52)	(23)
Changers' Amb.												
High	57	54	(2)	55	62	(0)	51	60	(11)	60	39	(7)
Moderate	43	46	(1)	45	38	(1)	49	40	(7)	40	61	(6)
Total	(86)	(41)	(3)	(100)	(29)	(1)	(63)	(48)	(18)	(86)	(28)	(13)
Councillors												
Changers	64	52	47	59	52	55	64	58	50	64	56	47
Stayers	25	34	34	31	33	19	26	30	34	27	31	34
Leavers	11	14	19	10	15	26	10	12	16	9	14	19
Total	(565)	(682)	(162)	(849)	(463)	(96)	(348)	(536)	(517)	(498)	(537)	(365)
Changers' Amb.												
High	20	16	9	19	16	10	26	12	16	22	15	11
Moderate	48	49	51	47	51	51	43	52	50	47	47	55
Low	32	35	41	34	33	39	31	36	34	31	38	34
Total	(337)	(327)	(69)	(467)	(216)	(49)	(207)	(293)	(232)	(303)	(272)	(156)

^aFor precise wording of questions and response categories, see Question 20, items 1-o, at end of report.

the more ambitious from the less ambitious among local councillors than among state legislators. Among council members, changers constitute 70% of those with five or more organizational memberships, 51% of those reporting one to four memberships, and 38% of councillors reporting no organizational affiliations. Sixty-three percent of those with past public officeholding experience are changers, in contrast to 50% of those without such experience. Sixty-eight percent of local officeholders who have held party office are changers, but there are only 48% changers among those who have never held a party post.

In contrast to this pattern among local councillors, organizational affiliations and political experience make little difference in the ambitions of state legislators. Those with a large number of memberships are slightly less likely to be changers (69%) than those with few organizational ties (81%). Approximately equal proportions of changers are found among those with past officeholding experience (70%) and those without such experience (73%). Changers are only slightly more numerous among those who have held party office (72%) than among those who have not (64%). Apparently, for those who have achieved an office at the level of state legislator, the nature of past experience has little influence on the desire to go on to other offices.

Self-identified ideology. Liberals include the highest proportions, and conservatives the lowest proportions, of changers (Table 66). Moreover, among changers, liberals are more likely than moderates, and moderates are more likely than conservatives, to have high officeholding ambitions (Table 66).

Table 66. CHANGERS ARE MORE LIKELY TO IDENTIFY THEMSELVES WITH LIBERAL IDEOLOGY

Ambition:	Legislators			Councillors		
	Cons. %	Mod. %	Lib. %	Cons. %	Mod. %	Lib. %
Changers	63	66	79	47	54	63
Stayers	37	34	21	35	33	26
Leavers				18	13	11
Total	(35)	(93)	(124)	(637)	(596)	(489)
Changers' Ambition:						
High	(8)	45	31	15	13	25
Moderate	(11)	55	69	42	52	48
Low				43	35	27
Total	(19)	(49)	(91)	(278)	(294)	(284)

The association between ideology and ambition is not merely a product of the tendency for liberals to be younger, to be better educated, or to reside in large districts. Analysis of our data reveals that ideology is independently related to ambition.⁶⁶ A higher percentage of liberals than of conservatives have ambitions for further office regardless of other characteristics.

It is not clear precisely why liberalism and political ambition should be related. The most obvious explanation for the relationship between

liberalism and greater officeholding ambition among women officeholders would be that liberalism encompasses a less traditional and more flexible conception of the roles which women should play in society. The problem with this explanation is that liberalism is also associated with greater ambition for the sample of men included in this study. Thus, the true explanation for this relationship is not likely to be sex-specific.

Perhaps both political ambition and ideology are related to a more general psychological predisposition which enables an individual to cope with change, and even to desire it -- whether it be change at the societal level, as is the case with liberalism, or change at the personal level, as is the case with officeholding ambitions. This explanation is given some support by the finding that conservative women are nearly as likely as liberal women to desire additional terms in current offices, where no change in responsibilities, colleagues, or location would be necessary.

Party affiliation. Although party affiliation is related to ideological self-identification, it may exert an independent effect on political ambition. Differences in ambitions of Democrats, Republicans and Independents could reflect real differences in the majority-minority standing of the major parties, as well as the limited opportunities available to those outside the major party structures.

In fact, as Table 67 shows, Democrats are slightly more likely to be changers than Republicans and, at the local level, Independents are less ambitious than either. Among changers in state legislatures, Democrats are considerably more likely than Republicans to desire federal, state cabinet and other offices reflecting high ambitions. However, party makes little difference in the level of officeholding ambitions of changers among local councillors.

When self-identified ideology is considered in connection with party identification, we find liberals the most ambitious among Democrats and Independents, but moderates the most ambitious among Republicans. Thus officeholding ambition may

Table 67. DEMOCRATS ARE MORE LIKELY TO DESIRE OTHER AND HIGHER OFFICES

Ambition:	Legislators			Councillors		
	Dem. %	Rep. %	Indep. %	Dem. %	Rep. %	Indep. %
Changers	75	68	(7)	60	51	43
Stayers	25	32	(4)	28	33	41
Leavers				12	16	16
Total	(161)	(92)	(11)	(885)	(607)	(290)
<u>Changers' Ambition</u>						
High	69	39	(1)	20	15	14
Moderate	31	61	(4)	45	52	45
Low				35	33	41
Total	(107)	(54)	(5)	(485)	(287)	(110)

be in part the product of an interaction among the officeholder's personal ideology, the ideological climate of the dominant wing of the officeholder's party, and the structure of opportunity that the party presents for officeholders, especially for women officeholders, to achieve further public offices.

Ambitious Women as Women in Politics

Knowledge of the characteristics associated with political ambition helps us to identify the kinds of women who, if circumstances permit, will continue to serve in public office. Whether because of these characteristics or because of their ambition, we find that ambitious women differ from less ambitious women in their perceptions of the general situation of women in politics, in their evaluations of themselves as officeholders, and in the positions they take on women's issues.

Perceptions of discrimination. Although one might expect perceived limitation in opportunities to hinder the development and maintenance of ambitions, ambitious women are more likely than less ambitious women to perceive obstacles to women's political leadership. Among both local councillors and state legislators, changers -- especially changers with high officeholding ambitions -- are more likely than stayers or leavers to disagree with the statement: "Women have just as much opportunity as men to become political leaders" (Table 68). Similarly, ambitious women are more likely than less ambitious women to agree that "many men in the party organization try to keep women out of leadership roles."

While ambitious women are considerably more likely than less ambitious women to perceive parties as agents of discrimination against women, changers differ little from stayers or leavers in the proportions agreeing that "in general, voters are more reluctant to support women candidates" (Table 68).

Why are ambitious women more likely than less ambitious women to perceive men in the parties as discriminatory, even though they are no more likely to perceive voters as discriminatory? The answer could stem in part from past experience. Changers are more likely than stayers or leavers to have held one or more party positions and, at the local level, to have held one or more elective or appointive offices. As a consequence, if some men in party organizations do try to keep women out of leadership roles, ambitious women probably have had more opportunity than less ambitious women to experience or to observe this discriminatory activity firsthand.

Perceptions of capabilities. We have found ambitious women to be more likely than less ambitious women to perceive leadership opportunities for women as limited and sex discrimination by males in the party as a barrier to women's attainment of leadership roles. Why, then, do ambitious women, who are more likely to perceive obstacles to women's participation, plan to continue on to other offices while those less likely to perceive barriers plan either to stay in the same office or to leave public office completely?

In part, the answer may lie in differences in

Table 68. AMBITIOUS WOMEN ARE MORE LIKELY TO PERCEIVE DISCRIMINATION WITHIN PARTIES

	State Legislators		Local Councillors		
	Stayers %	Changers %	Leavers %	Stayers %	Changers %
Disagree that women have just as much opportunity as men to become political leaders	40	52	31	30	45
Agree that many men in party organizations try to keep women out of leadership roles	62	76	65	72	80
Agree that, in general, voters are more reluctant to support women candidates	37	39	54	53	57
Approximate totals ^a	(72)	(183)	(226)	(527)	(920)
	Legis. Changers' Amb.		Local Changers' Ambition		
	Moderate %	High %	Low %	Moderate %	High %
Disagree that women have just as much opportunity as men to become political leaders	44	63	33	49	56
Agree that many men in party organizations try to keep women out of leadership roles	72	82	80	80	81
Agree that, in general, voters are more reluctant to support women candidates	38	42	58	57	50
Approximate totals ^a	(68)	(91)	(288)	(328)	(149)

^aSlight variations in the numbers responding to each item have been averaged.

perceptions of the general capabilities of women in politics and in officeholders' self-ratings of their own performance in office. Relative to leavers and stayers, changers are more likely to agree that women in office devote more time to the job than do men. Changers also are more likely to consider women to be as politically astute as their male colleagues, and to be as well qualified for office.

For most qualities on which officeholders were asked to rate themselves relative to their colleagues, higher proportions of changers than of stayers or leavers rate themselves above average (Table 69). This pattern is more pronounced among local councillors but exists also among state legislators.

Thus, relative to less ambitious women, ambitious women are more likely to view women officeholders generally as equal to or superior to male officeholders. They also give higher ratings to their personal performance in office. It is perhaps this stronger sense of the capabilities both of women generally and of themselves specifically which helps to explain why ambitious women, in spite of their greater tendency to see opportunities as limited, plan to continue in politics while less ambitious women do not.

Views on women's issues. A question of special interest to many concerned with women in politics is whether women who will be serving in political office in the future are likely to be supportive of feminist positions on women's issues. An incomplete but suggestive answer to this question can be gained by comparing the positions of those who desire further office and those who desire to remain in the same office with those who have no plans to continue serving in public office.

Changers at both the state legislative and local levels are more liberal than either stayers or

Table 69. CHANGERS MAKE HIGHER SELF-RATINGS THAN STAYERS, LEAVERS

Percent Rating Self Above Average ^a :	Legislators		Councillors		
	Stay	Change	Leave	Stay	Change
	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Interpersonal</u>					
Get along w/coll.	69	72	57	64	55
Influence w/coll.	44	56	32	40	48
Argue persuasively	49	61	42	49	66
Make impt. contacts	40	50	34	39	54
Understand others	69	84	68	70	83
Responsive constit.	82	76	56	60	73
Independence	88	94	70	74	87
<u>Commitment</u>					
Interest pub. serv.	81	84	57	69	82
Interest soc. prob.	69	83	59	71	78
Time spent	82	85	49	56	76
Willing work hard	93	95	70	78	89
<u>Knowledge</u>					
General knowledge	69	92	49	51	73
Training and exper.	70	67	39	36	54
Financial judgment	44	56	34	38	49
Political know-how	40	54	16	22	44
<u>Traits</u>					
Organization	63	74	59	63	79
Imagination	61	75	52	62	78
Practicality	65	72	58	61	73
Overall effectiveness	56	77	43	53	72
Approx. totals ^b	(71)	(181)	(232)	(536)	(939)

^aFor precise wording of questions and response categories, see Question 14, item g at end of report.

^bSlight variations in the numbers responding to each item have been averaged.

Table 70. CHANGERS ARE MORE LIBERAL ON WOMEN'S ISSUES THAN EITHER LEAVERS OR STAYERS^a

	State Legislators		Local Councillors		
	Stayers %	Changers %	Leavers %	Stayers %	Changers %
Agree Federal ERA should be ratified	77	88	52	59	70
Disagree Constitution should ban abortion	74	86	61	66	71
Agree homemakers should have social security	65	75	59	55	61
Agree government should provide child care	44	58	31	37	44
Approximate totals ^b	(69)	(180)	(226)	(518)	(922)

	Legis. Changers' Amb.		Local Changers' Ambition		
	Moderate %	High %	Low %	Moderate %	High %
Agree Federal ERA should be ratified	84	95	61	74	83
Disagree Constitution should ban abortion	86	87	66	74	76
Agree homemakers should have social security	70	82	58	62	68
Agree government should provide child care	44	72	38	43	65
Approximate totals ^b	(68)	(92)	(288)	(408)	(151)

^aFor precise wording of questions and response categories, see Question 19 at end of report.

^bSlight variations in the numbers responding to each item have been averaged.

leavers in their views on the four women's issues included in this study (Table 70). Stayers, in turn, are more liberal than leavers on all issues except social security benefits for homemakers. With this one exception, greater percentages of changers and stayers than of leavers support the ERA, oppose a constitutional amendment to prohibit abortion, favor social security coverage for homemakers, and support government provision of child-care services.

The greatest support for feminist positions on these issues at both the state legislative and local levels is found among changers who aspire to high office. Changers at the local level who aspire to no offices beyond the local or county levels differ little from stayers in their views on women's issues.

The relationship between greater ambition and more feminist issue positions is only in part a reflection of the more liberal general ideological orientation of the ambitious. When the views of changers, stayers and leavers on women's issues are compared among conservatives, moderates and liberals separately, differences between the ambitious and the less ambitious are diminished but do not disappear. Thus, a relationship between feminist issue positions and ambition persists apart from general ideology.

AMBITIONS OF WOMEN COMPARED WITH MEN

Our data show that when women and men who occupy equivalent offices are compared, women are at least as ambitious for public officeholding as men. As noted in the introduction to this report, there is a close correspondence between the percentage of male respondents in each category of office and the percentage of females in the comparison sample who

are in each category of office. Thus, the women and men compared in our study are very similar with regard to current officeholding status.

Previous studies of political elites have found men to be considerably more ambitious politically than women, in contrast to our finding.⁶⁷ Research which has explored differences in the ambitions of women and men has for the most part examined delegates to major party conventions. In investigating political ambition, these studies have not compared women and men who are equivalent with respect to current officeholding status. Because male delegates in these studies are much more likely than female delegates to hold public office, it is not surprising that women are found to be less ambitious than men with regard to public officeholding.

In addition, past studies frequently have argued that differences in the ambition of women and men are to be expected because of differences in sex-role socialization. However, if one considers instead an alternative approach -- an examination of the various characteristics related to political ambition and the manner in which women and men in office differ in these characteristics -- there is little reason to suspect that female and male officeholders would differ widely in officeholding ambition.

We have found that several characteristics are related to political ambition: age, education, spousal support, district population, organizational memberships, party experience, previous officeholding experience, self-identified ideology, and party affiliation. While women and men in office differ with regard to many of these characteristics, the net effect of these differences in contributing to the development of political ambition should favor neither women nor men. Equal

proportions of women and men serve in large districts, and equal proportions have prior experience with public officeholding. One would expect the slightly older age of women in office and their lower education relative to men to result in lower ambition for women. However, higher proportions of women in office have supportive spouses, belong to many organizations, have held party office, are Democrats, and are liberals. One would expect these characteristics to lead to higher ambition for women and thus roughly to cancel the effects of older age and lower education in decreasing women's ambition relative to that of men.

Aspirations for Additional Terms, Other Offices

In the samples of women and men currently serving in public office, we find women to be more likely than men to desire an additional term in current office, to be more likely to desire other public offices in the future, and to be about equally as likely to aspire ultimately to a high-level office. Women are more likely than men to be changers and less likely to be stayers or leavers.

Additional term in office. Women are as ambitious and perhaps more ambitious than men in planning to seek an additional term in current office. As Table 71 shows, there are virtually no differences between women and men in this respect among legislators, county commissioners and mayors. Among local councillors, proportionately more women (62%) than men (48%) desire an additional term. In the two samples as a whole, another term

in current office is planned by 64% of the women and by 55% of the men.

Other public office. Intentions to seek one or more public offices other than the one now held display a pattern similar to plans for an additional term (Table 71). Higher percentages of women than men among local councillors and county commissioners desire other public offices. Approximately equal proportions of women and men in state legislatures and mayoralties would like to hold other offices. In the total male and female samples, 57% of men and 44% of women eventually would like to hold other public offices. Again, women appear no less ambitious than men, and perhaps more ambitious.

Highest office desired. Nearly equal proportions of female and male officeholders are ambitious for high-level offices (Table 72). In the total sample, 16% of the men and 14% of the women aspire to federal, state cabinet or other offices reflecting high ambition.

Changers, stayers, and leavers. Similarity in the proportions of women and men aspiring to high office occurs because of two patterns in the data which tend to offset one another: (1) a higher proportion of women than of men are changers and a lower proportion are leavers (Table 73); (2) among changers, male changers more often aspire to high office than do female changers (Table 73). Thus, only among changers could slightly higher proportions of men be considered more ambitious. In the total samples of male and female officeholders, equal proportions

Table 71. LARGER PROPORTIONS OF WOMEN THAN OF MEN PLAN ADDITIONAL TERMS OR PLAN TO SEEK OTHER OFFICES

	Legislature		County Comsn.		Mayoralty		Local Council		Total	
	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %
Probably, definitely will seek additional term in current office:	85	80	58	59	51	(11)	62	48	64	55
Total	(96)	(57)	(92)	(51)	(55)	(22)	(475)	(224)	(718)	(358)
Would like one or more other offices:	68	66	58	36	55	(11)	55	41	57	44
Total	(91)	(55)	(85)	(52)	(53)	(21)	(451)	(221)	(680)	(353)

Table 72. APPROXIMATELY EQUAL PROPORTIONS OF WOMEN AND MEN ARE AMBITIOUS FOR HIGH OFFICE

Highest Level of Other Public Office Desired:	Legislature		County Comsn.		Mayoralty		Local Council		Total	
	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %	Wmn. %	Men %
High	45	42	21	13	8	(4)	8	9	14	16
Moderate	14	14	26	15	24	(3)	24	16	23	16
Low	1	2	6	2	17	(3)	21	12	16	9
Office not specified	8	7	5	6	6	(1)	3	5	4	5
Desire no other public office	32	34	42	64	45	(10)	45	59	43	55
Total	(91)	(55)	(85)	(52)	(53)	(21)	(451)	(224)	(680)	(353)

Table 73. LARGER PROPORTIONS OF WOMEN THAN MEN WANT OTHER OFFICES

Ambition:	Wmn. %	Men %
Changers	63	49
Stayers	26	29
Leavers	11	22
Total	(619)	(315)
<u>Changers' Ambition:</u>		
High	27	39
Moderate	43	39
Low	30	22
Total	(360)	(141)

of women and men have high officeholding ambitions.

Other Variables and Sex Differences in Ambition

While our data show women to be no less ambitious than men, we should ask as a final question whether differences between female and male officeholders in characteristics related to ambition have obscured an underlying tendency for women to be less ambitious. If women and men in office were equal in age, education, spousal support, organizational involvements, political experience, party affiliation and ideology, then would we find men more ambitious politically than women? Our data do not permit a complete answer to this question.⁶⁸ However, no one of the characteristics associated with ambition accounts for the finding that women are as ambitious as men. When we compare women and men who are in equivalent categories of age, education, spousal supportiveness, size of district, political experience, party affiliation or ideology, we find in each comparison that higher proportions of women than of men are changers, and lower proportions of women than of men are leavers.

Further research on the political ambitions of women relative to men currently serving in comparable positions is needed. Replication of our finding that women are at least as ambitious as men would suggest that the paucity of women serving in offices at the state and federal levels cannot be attributed to lack of political ambition as readily as it has been in the past. Rather, confirmation of our research findings would call attention to the need for closer examination of the way in which structures of political opportunity restrict the achievement of ambitious women.

WOMEN NO LONGER IN OFFICE

The ambitions of officeholders refer to some unknown combination of plans, aspirations and fantasy. Clearly, a number of contingencies intervene in producing various career outcomes, and these contingencies are located in the personal lives and characteristics of officeholders as well as in the structure of opportunities confronting them.

Which officeholders actually leave public office and which remain is a question that has not been addressed directly by researchers. In an effort to

identify some of the circumstances associated with remaining in office or leaving, we have questioned a group of officeholders who responded to the 1975 survey but who are no longer in office. These former officeholders are compared with a group of current officeholders who held similar offices in 1975. (For a description of the samples, see the introduction to this report.)

Leaving Office

Most of the 188 former officeholders in our sample left office voluntarily: 17% resigned before their term of office expired; 47% completed their term of office but decided not to run for re-election; only a little more than a third (36%) were defeated in a bid for re-election. Among those who did not run for re-election, 12% ran for higher office.

Voluntary leavetaking. Reasons for early resignation or failure to run for re-election vary widely, ranging from those bearing on the office itself to occupational demands or preferences, to relocation of the family or other family concerns. Reasons mentioned by more than 5% of voluntary leavers are listed in Table 74. Very few of the former officeholders indicate that they left out of some sense of not performing well. Only 2% feel that they lacked the technical expertise for doing a really effective job, and only 2% report that they felt they could not win re-election. Advanced age is mentioned by only 1%. It appears that women voluntarily leave office largely in

Table 74. WOMEN LEAVE OFFICE VOLUNTARILY FOR A WIDE VARIETY OF REASONS

Reasons for Leaving Office ^a :	Voluntary Leavers %
Wanted to run for higher office	12
Felt I had accomplished what I had set out to do	18
Felt I had done my share and it was someone else's turn	25
Disillusionment with what the office could accomplish	21
Disillusionment with my colleagues in office	14
Demands of a separate occupation	21
Wanted to take a job I felt would be more rewarding	13
Wanted to go back to school	8
Financial pressures	7
Children needed more of my time	16
Husband needed more of my time	13
Husband was actively opposed to my holding office	8
Other family members needed more of my time	7
Family moved to a new area	13
Total ^b	(119)

^aReasons given by less than 5% of respondents are omitted from table.

^bTotal percentages do not add to 100 because each respondent could give more than one reason.

response to other opportunities, other role demands with higher priority, or loss of interest in the activities of office.

Election defeat. Among the 80 women defeated for re-election, only 19% lost primary campaigns. Forty-six percent were defeated in partisan general elections, and the remaining 35% lost nonpartisan elections. Defeats took place in multi-member districts nearly as often (46%) as in single-member districts (54%).⁶⁹ In neither type of district was there more than a small percentage of instances in which other women emerged as winners, although replacement by a woman appears to be less likely in the single-member district, where only one winner was a woman in 36 races for which information was reported. In multi-member districts, where a total of 108 seats were at stake, women took only eight.

Women who lost elections were asked to comment on any aspect of the election of special significance to them. All of the resulting comments express perceived reasons for losing. As is the case with expressed reasons for leaving office voluntarily, perceived causes for electoral defeat vary widely. Table 75 lists reasons given by more than 5% of election losers. Most prominent among their perceptions -- of interest because these women had already been elected at least once before suffering defeat -- is that opposition to women in politics contributed to their loss. Apart from discrimination against women, the characteristics of the district, the nature of the opposition and the political behavior of the candidate herself are almost equally likely to be mentioned as causes of election defeat.

Table 75. OPPOSITION TO WOMEN IN OFFICE IS ONE OF MANY PERCEIVED CAUSES OF ELECTION LOSS

Reasons for Defeat ^a :	Election Losers %
Opposition to women in office	20
Did not campaign actively	13
Inadequate financial support	12
Lack of party support	12
Smear campaign tactics	12
Loss of constituent support through stands on controversial issues	10
Office especially targeted by opposition	8
Poor media coverage	8
Poor campaign techniques	7
Total ^b	(61)

^aReasons given by less than 5% of respondents are omitted from table.

^bTotal percentages do not add to 100 because each respondent could give more than one reason.

Comparison of Former with Current Officeholders

In an effort to learn more about the circumstances of leaving office than might be apparent in the

reasons reported by officeholders, we have compared systematically voluntary leavetakers and defeated officeholders with women who continue to serve in public office. Our comparison has included all the major variables examined in this report and, although some noteworthy differences have emerged, our general conclusion is that former officeholders do not differ widely from women currently serving in public office. We shall return to this point after a brief description of those characteristics that do seem to distinguish former from current officeholders.

Voluntary leavers. In comparison with current officeholders, voluntary leavers have less education and political experience, somewhat less self-confidence about their personal performance as officials, more of a sense of conflict between family and political life, and greater conservatism with regard to women's roles. In some ways, voluntary leavers resemble current officeholders who plan to resign at the end of their current term of office.

Voluntary leavers have less formal education (42% college graduates) than those who remain in office (53% college graduates). Higher proportions of voluntary leavers (75%) than of current officeholders (52%) serve in districts with under 10,000 population. Only 26% of voluntary leavers had held public office prior to their most recent office, in comparison with 40% of current officeholders. Thirty-four percent of voluntary leavers but 40% of current officeholders have held party office. In evaluating their performance as officials, voluntary leavers are less likely than current officeholders to rate themselves highly on general knowledge and intelligence, past training and experience, financial judgment, time devoted to office, and practicality.

Our data offer some evidence that voluntary leavers have relatively more traditional conceptions of women's roles. Although they are similar to current officeholders in perceptions of spousal support, 73% perceive a high level of political activity on the part of women as detrimental to family life, in comparison with 51% of current officeholders. Only 58% of voluntary leavers favor ratification of the ERA, in contrast to 71% of women currently in office. Only 35% support governmental provision of child care, in contrast to 45% of current officeholders.

Defeated officeholders. The dimensions that distinguish officeholders defeated in elections from current officeholders differ somewhat from those that distinguish voluntary leavers. Defeated officeholders differ from current officeholders in age and education, spousal support and perceptions of conflict between family and politics, party involvements, and perceptions of discrimination against women.

Officeholders defeated in elections are slightly older than current officeholders. While there are no differences in the proportions under 40 or over 60, we find 40% of the defeated and 32% of current officeholders in the 50-59 year age category. Conversely, 22% of the defeated but 31% of the current officeholders are between 40 and 49 years of age. Defeated officeholders also have slightly less education as a group, with 47% college graduates in contrast to 53% college graduates among current officeholders. This pattern of differences suggests

the possibility that some portion of defeated officeholders may have found their age and education to be disadvantages in their attempts to remain in office.

Defeated officeholders perceive higher levels of spousal support than current officeholders. For example, 65% of the defeated report that their husbands approved and encouraged their officeholding, in comparison with 51% of current officeholders who report high approval from spouses. However, defeated officeholders, like voluntary leavers, are more likely to perceive conflict between women's political activity and family life. Sixty-three percent of the defeated in comparison to 51% of current officeholders see an active political life as damaging to family life. It is possible that defeated officeholders experienced relatively more tension between family and politics as officeholders. It is also possible that the experience of election defeat has contributed to their perception of conflict.

Defeated officeholders are no more liberal in their positions on women's issues than current officeholders. Yet, as already described, defeated officeholders attribute their election loss to opposition to women in politics more often than to any other single cause. In addition, higher proportions of the defeated than of current officeholders perceive unequal political opportunity for women generally (59% defeated vs. 43% current), discrimination by party leaders (84% defeated vs. 71% current), and discrimination from voters (66% defeated vs. 50% current). They also are more likely to mention one or more difficulties encountered as a result of being a woman in office (77% defeated vs. 63% current) and, at the same time, they are less likely to name any advantage to being a woman in office (45% defeated vs. 63% current). Perhaps women defeated in elections have served in districts presenting more than ordinary resistance to women in politics. It is also possible, however, that perceptions of discrimination tend to be heightened by the experience of losing an election.⁷⁰

Those defeated in elections show markedly stronger involvements with political parties than do current officeholders. Sixty-nine percent of the defeated but only 40% of current officeholders have held party office. In addition, more than twice the proportion of defeated (13%) as of current officeholders (6%) report giving major emphasis to representing the programs of their party in their official activities.

Did a strong party involvement play a part in the defeat of officeholders in our sample? Approximately one-third of defeated officeholders lost nonpartisan elections. Perhaps a strong party involvement is a disadvantage in such elections. In addition, we note that defeated officeholders are slightly more likely to be Democrats (62%) than are current officeholders (53%). Since we found in Part III of this report that recent entrants to office are slightly more likely to be Republican than those with longer tenure of office, the defeated officeholders may reflect recent gains by Republicans. Perhaps those with strong party involvements are more likely than others to lose their bids for re-election when electorates shift

their preferences from one party to the other or when they return to usual patterns of voting after a brief period of crossover.

Political Ambitions of Former Officeholders

For large proportions of former officeholders, leaving public office has neither signaled nor precipitated a loss of interest in serving in public office. In their high ambitions for future public office, those defeated in elections resemble the changers among current officeholders. Seventy-four percent of the defeated desire other public offices, in comparison with 59% of current officeholders. Even among voluntary leavetakers, 41% would like to hold public office in the future, suggesting that a number of "voluntary" leavers are in fact "reluctant" leavers. Among officeholders who desire other offices, the defeated (36%) are as likely as current officeholders (32%) to have high officeholding ambitions, although only 17% of voluntary leavers have ambitions for high office.

In our comparison of former with current officeholders, we have noted the differences observed. We also have commented that these differences are few relative to the large number of variables examined. The absence of consistent and strong differences between current and former officeholders, in combination with the finding that large proportions of former officeholders remain ambitious for future office, suggests that external circumstances may be at least as important as characteristics of officeholders in determining which officeholders leave and which remain.

The political ambitions of officeholders represent only one indication of the likelihood of continuing in office. For a clearer understanding of the phenomenon of leavetaking, we must examine also the characteristics of the districts in which officeholders serve. In addition, we must separate from voluntary leavers the "reluctant leavers," who resign from public office because their families move or because of competing demands from family and/or occupation. Finally, in order to evaluate the extent to which gender affects the likelihood of leaving public office and the circumstances of leaving, we require research that includes the study of men who remain and men who leave public office.

CONCLUSION TO PART VI

Politically ambitious women are different from the less ambitious. They are the younger, the better educated, the more experienced organizationally and politically. They serve in the larger districts. They are more likely than other officeholders to rate their own performance in office highly. The married among them are more likely to have the support and encouragement of their spouses. They are more liberal in their ideological orientation, are more liberal in their positions on women's issues, and are more likely to perceive women's capabilities as equal or superior to those of men. These characteristics suggest a nontraditional conception of the role of women and often a desire to change the status of women in society. If politically ambitious women realize their ambitions, then higher-level offices may be filled increasingly by women interested in altering the societal position of women.

The majority of women in office are committed to public officeholding and ambitious for advancement. The typical female officeholder is as ambitious as her male counterpart. Even women no longer in public office display considerable interest in public officeholding, for large proportions would like to hold office in the future.

On the one hand, we find large proportions of women in office to be ambitious. On the other hand, we find large proportions of women in office perceiving discrimination against women, especially from male party leaders and from colleagues. And the more ambitious a woman is, the more likely is she to perceive discrimination. The juxtaposition of ambition and perception of discrimination suggests that one cannot accept without question the validity of assertions that women are not nominated as party candidates or appointed to higher-level positions

in larger numbers because of difficulties in finding qualified women who will accept such positions. True, there are women who lack commitment to public officeholding and who would prefer to leave office. There are others who would prefer to remain in their present positions. But such women are proportionately no more numerous than men, perhaps less numerous.

If there ever was a reality to the assumption of low ambition among women, that reality appears to have become a myth. Yet, the persistence of myth also molds reality. The idea of low political ambition among women itself may serve as an obstacle to women's political achievement. If future research supports our finding that politically active women are as ambitious as similarly situated men, then the myth of women's low ambition should be discarded.

PART VII. CONCLUSION TO PROFILE, 1977

Our purpose in this profile of women in public office has been to present a wide variety of research findings, keeping commentary to a minimum and allowing the reader to select aspects of our description to use for particular purposes. Nonetheless, a number of broader points emerge from this variety, connecting discreet research findings and also raising questions for future research. In this concluding section, we shall comment briefly on a few of these points.

Avenues of Political Recruitment of Women vs. Men

Although the proportions of elective offices filled by women are increasing, women remain a small minority of officeholders. A number of research findings indicate that women who do achieve public office follow routes into office that differ from those typical for men. These differing paths of recruitment may reflect special difficulties experienced by women who wish to enter political office, difficulties stemming in part from the gender-linked roles of women in the society at large, in part from discrimination against women by political leaders.

Political activity has not been as socially legitimate for women as for men. Perhaps as a consequence, family support appears to be a basic condition for officeholding by women. Few married women in office lack the support and encouragement of their husbands. Not only are men in office less likely to perceive their spouses as supportive but also men are more likely to perceive conflict between politics and family life for politically active women and men alike.

Women have less formal education than men in office, and their occupations are heavily concentrated in areas such as teaching and secretarial work that may not receive ready acceptance as qualifications for public officeholding. However, women may compensate for their lack of credentials in these areas through a more intensive apprenticeship in voluntary organizations and political party

activities. Women belong to more organizations than do men, and they are more likely to have held offices in their political parties.

Although women have had relatively extensive party experience, most women in public office feel that many men in party organizations try to exclude women from leadership roles. The fact that women's past public officeholding is more likely to have been appointive, while that of men is more likely to have been elective, may be an indirect indicator of a tendency for party organizations to reward party service by women with minor appointive offices in place of nominations for elective office.

The result of lesser educational and occupational credentials, greater organizational and party involvements, and perceptions that party leaders discriminate may be a period of political apprenticeship prior to holding elective office that is longer for women than for men. If so, a longer apprenticeship may help to explain women's relatively older age at entry into office.

Barriers to Mobility

Once in office, women are at least as committed to public officeholding and as ambitious for other public offices as their male colleagues. Yet, women may be encountering gender-based obstacles to political mobility. Women officeholders are less likely than men with similar tenure in office to hold leadership positions within their governing bodies. They are less likely to chair committees, and they are less likely to be satisfied with their committee assignments. Although men in office perceive women's difficulties as related to family pressures, inadequacies of background, personality faults or constituents' prejudices against women, women officeholders perceive their major difficulties to stem from prejudice and discrimination on the part of their colleagues and of male political leaders. The more politically ambitious an officeholder, the more likely she is to perceive discrimination from these sources.

Political Perspective of Women in Office

Gender is a component of political outlook and performance as well as of political recruitment and mobility. Women in office are ideologically more liberal than men, and they take more feminist positions on women's issues such as ERA, abortion, social security for homemakers, child care, and the role of government and industry in assuring equal rights for women. In addition to differing from men in issue positions, women report different emphases in the performance of their official duties. They are more concerned with constituent relations, with policy development and with being well-informed on pending issues.

If these subjective perspectives are being translated into political actions, then the participation of women in public affairs is changing both the style and content of governmental decision-making. The distinctive impact of women is likely to grow as more women achieve public office and will continue as long as women and men continue to have differing roles in the society.

Variations Among Women in Office

To be precise, one should speak not of a profile of women in office but of many profiles. The patterned variations among officeholders are so numerous that one must question the descriptive adequacy of attempts to portray "political woman" as a single type.

Women officeholders vary by type of office held in most characteristics examined: in ethnic or racial identification, in education, occupation, numbers and types of organizational affiliations, family income, spousal support of officeholding, perceptions of conflict between family and political life, self-rating of official performance, ideology, feminist orientation, perceptions of women's situation in politics, and political ambition. Some of these variations form consistent trends, with the proportions possessing a particular characteristic rising or falling regularly from one level of officeholding to the next. But others show less regular patterning, emphasizing the point that caution must be exercised in efforts to generalize to all women in office from studies of women in a particular type of office.

In addition to type of office held, a number of other characteristics divide women officeholders into fairly distinct groups. Among the more important of these are the size of district population, age, and political ambition.

Since both the characteristics of the population and the nature of political offices differ in small and large districts, district population sharply separates the characteristics, orientations and activities of officeholders. Most notably, women holding office in small districts are less educated, are less involved in organizations, are less politically experienced, devote less time to officeholding, are less ambitious politically, and are more conservative ideologically.

The age of officeholders is also important in delineating their political status and behavior.

Younger officeholders often differ from older officeholders in ways characteristic of women in the general population who are at their stage of the life-cycle. For example, younger officeholders are members of fewer organizations than older officeholders, have less political experience, are more likely to describe themselves as liberal, are more ambitious but have somewhat lower levels of confidence. Younger officeholders also manifest ongoing trends in the larger society, for they are less likely to be married or to be mothers, are better educated, and in some offices are less likely to have traditionally female occupations.

Finally, politically ambitious women differ from less ambitious officeholders in a wide variety of characteristics, reflecting both causes and consequences of ambition. Most prominently, ambitious women are younger, are better educated, receive more encouragement from their husbands, serve in larger districts, are more self-confident of their performance as officials, are more liberal, more feminist, and more conscious of sex discrimination.

Women Who Leave Office

The large differences resulting from a comparison between ambitious and unambitious women are not replicated in the comparison of former with current officeholders. Our initial exploration of the circumstances of leaving public officeholding suggests that women who become former officeholders are not dramatically different in their backgrounds, officeholding activities and political orientations from women who continue to serve. Election defeat may be more a function of district characteristics and events than of individual qualities and motivations. Moreover, substantial proportions of voluntary leavetakers relinquish their offices because of external circumstances such as illness or relocation of the family.

An implication of these findings about former officeholders is that political ambition is likely to be a very inexact predictor of future officeholding. Many women who leave office are politically ambitious (and it is likely that many who remain are relatively unambitious). Women who are defeated in elections remain highly ambitious, despite their election loss. A portion of the women who leave office voluntarily are not interested in politics or the activities of office and lack confidence in their own capabilities or qualifications. Even among voluntary leavetakers, however, at least two in five would like to return to public office.

Needed Research

Our report has consisted principally of a description of women in public office. However, description is not explanation, and questions can be appended to most of the findings presented: "Why?" "How?" "With what consequences?" Much additional research and analysis are required, to eliminate competing explanations and thus to provide appropriate interpretations.

Many important questions cannot be answered through ordinary survey research. For example, there is a need for longitudinal studies that will clarify the

extent to which women officeholders possess particular characteristics and attitudes before entering office versus the extent to which these change as a consequence of officeholding. There is also a need for studies in which groups, structural patterns or policies -- rather than individuals -- are the focus of analysis, to clarify the manner in which the characteristics and attitudes of women as individuals become reflected in the functioning of governing bodies.

Below are listed a number of questions for additional research that have arisen from our study. Although the list is long, it contains only a sampling of the many research questions stimulated by the findings of our survey.

Variations among officeholders. What explains the differing characteristics and orientations of women in different kinds of political offices? Do women enter different offices from candidate pools that are identifiably distinct though overlapping? Or do women change in patterned ways as a result of holding different types of offices?

Officeholding and the family. What constitutes family support for the political activity of women? How is this support developed and maintained? What are the consequences of lack of support? In what ways do women's definitions of their maternal and spousal responsibilities affect their career patterns?

Age of officeholders. Why are women older than men when they enter office? What are the implications for subsequent career patterns of differing ages of entry into political office?

Appointive vs. elective office. Why are women more likely than men to have served in appointive office? What are the consequences for political careers of differing sequences of elective and appointive offices?

Party experience. Why, since larger proportions of women than men have held party offices, do such large proportions of women perceive discrimination from men in political parties? Are women permitted to hold party office and minor appointive offices while being overlooked as candidates for elective office?

Political ambition. What explains the finding that women are as politically ambitious or more ambitious than men? Are the women recruited to public officeholding such a select group that their political ambition is predictable? Or has a rough equality of ambition between other groups of women and men gone largely unrecognized, obscured by inadequate research analyses? How are the political ambitions of women affected by various experiences of officeholding? By what processes is ambition expanded, decreased, or maintained unchanged?

Officeholding and constituent relations. Why are women officeholders more oriented to constituent relations than men holding office? Does the pattern result from general sex-role orientations that lead women to be more humanistic in outlook and more concerned with service to others? Does it result from more extensive organizational involvement of women prior to and after entry into public office?

What are the consequences of a greater orientation to the public for other aspects of official performances?

Beliefs about women in politics. What explains the differing perceptions of women and men regarding the nature of women's qualifications for office and the extent and sources of sex discrimination? Are women's qualifications being perceived by men through the filter of ill-considered stereotypes? Are women overestimating their qualifications in relation to the demands of their offices? Do women who are excluded from the informal socialization and sponsorship occurring in male networks tend to misunderstand the informal demands and qualifications of officeholding? What are the consequences of sex differences in evaluations of women as officeholders for the effective functioning of governing bodies in which women and men serve as colleagues?

Ideology. To what extent are the greater liberalism and more feminist orientations of women in public office reflections of the kinds of women who seek public office, and to what extent are they the result of experiences in office? In what ways are the more feminist positions of women officeholders apparent in their activities as officials? Do such attitudes affect, for example, voting patterns, attempts to influence political agendas, the kinds of legislation introduced, administrative policy decisions, hiring and personnel practices, political appointments?

The fact that most research findings in this report raise further research questions reflects, in part, limitations on the analysis that could be accommodated within these pages. However, it also attests to the recency of research interest in politically active women,¹ and to the need for accumulation of studies that give serious attention to describing and explaining the role of gender in politics. A note of finality in ending this report would be inappropriate. Instead, our final statement must be: to be continued.

NOTES

¹"Profile of Women Holding Office," by Marilyn Johnson and Kathy Stanwick, is the 37-page statistical essay in Center for the American Woman and Politics, *Women in Public Office: A Biographical Directory and Statistical Analysis* (1976). Reprints of the essay are available for \$3.00 from the Center for the American Woman and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J. 08901.

²Partial exceptions are Diamond (1977), who examines legislators in four New England states, and Leader (1977), who analyzes the ERA vote among state legislators. Among studies with small and restricted samples are: Gehlen's (1977a, 1977b, 1969) studies of Congresswomen; Merritt's (1977) investigation of municipal council members in Cook County, Illinois; Mezey's (1977) analysis of

local council members in Connecticut; Bers' (1976) analysis of school board members in Cook County, Illinois; King and McAuliffe's (1976) comparison of male and female county supervisors in Pennsylvania; Kirkpatrick's (1974) study of state legislators. Studies of party elites include: Soule and McGrath (1977), Kirkpatrick (1976), Costantini and Craik (1972), Jennings and Thomas (1968).

³Although extensive efforts were made to collect complete and accurate information, some gaps remain. A complete, current list of officials at one or more governmental levels was unavailable for the states following: Illinois (mayors and local councillors), Missouri (township officials) Nebraska (township officials), New York (township officials, mayors and local councillors), Wisconsin (local councillors). In a few states, lists arrived too late for questionnaire mailings: Arizona (mayors and local councillors), Illinois (township officials), Michigan (township officials), Mississippi (mayors and local councillors). In some states, local elections were held while the data-gathering process was underway. Questionnaires could not be sent to newly-elected local officials in Colorado, Connecticut, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri and Oklahoma. However, the total numbers in the state summaries on p. xvii reflect current lists where available, even though questionnaires were not mailed to officeholders in the instances cited above.

⁴Perhaps as a result of a lengthy questionnaire and the time of mailing, the response rate is not as high as it was in the 1975 study. The questionnaire is nearly twice as long as that used in 1975, which may have increased nonresponse. Because we mailed in late spring and early summer, in contrast to the March through May mailing in 1975, a number of officeholders were on vacation and did not receive their questionnaire in time for inclusion in the survey; others, for whom only office addresses were available, did not receive the questionnaire in time because their governing bodies were not in session.

⁵We utilized systematic sampling procedures, selecting every Nth name after a random start on a list of names for a particular office and state. The sampling interval was varied for each office and state to yield a sample for mailing that would roughly equal the number of female officeholders in each category.

⁶State legislators, county commissioners, mayors and local councilmen were sampled in Georgia, Kansas, Minnesota, New Jersey, Oregon, Texas, Vermont and Wyoming. Legislators and county commissioners alone were surveyed in Arizona, Indiana, Maryland, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee and Washington.

⁷This procedure has resulted in samples of current and former officeholders from states and categories as follows: state legislators only -- Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, West Virginia; county commissioners, mayors and local council members only -- California, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, Washington; all four offices --

Arizona, Indiana, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Wyoming.

⁸Only a few types of tables will be encountered in this report. A common type utilizes percentages that add to 100% down each column of the table, as in Table 4. At the bottom of each column is given in parentheses the number of officeholders constituting the base for calculation of the percentages. Officeholders not answering the question on which the tabulation is based, or to whom the question does not apply, are not included in the percentage base. Whenever the total numbers are too small to justify percentages (less than 25 in this report), this fact is signaled by the practice of presenting absolute numbers in parentheses in place of percentages, as illustrated by federal officeholders in Table 6.

At the top of each column is listed the office or category of officeholders for which the tabulation has been made. Down the left-hand side of the table are the characteristics of officeholders (e.g., ethnic identify, age, education) that are being tabulated. Thus each row of a table represents the percentages of officeholders in each category who display a particular characteristic or attitude. Comparisons among officeholders can be made by reading the percentages in each row across. In Table 5, for example, 6% of female respondents serving in the state judiciary identify themselves as black, as compared with 3% in the state executive, 8% in state senates, etc.

In a few tables, percentages for subcategories may be given in addition to major divisions. In Table 8, for example, the major division employed vs. not currently employed are subdivided by whether current employment is full or part time, and by when those not currently employed were last employed. In Table 9, the percentages in selected occupations are given in addition to the percentages in each of the major occupational categories of the U. S. Census.

In some tables, percentages in each column do not add to 100% because each officeholder may fit into more than one of the categories being tabulated. For example, Table 10 reports the percentages holding membership in various types of organizations.

Occasionally, the percentages in a table refer to items mentioned rather than total number of officeholders. For example, Table 37 shows the percentages of total issues and projects of particular kinds reported by officeholders as of importance to them.

Medians are utilized in some tables. The median is the middle number in a series of numbers; 50% of cases are at or above the median value and 50% are at or below the same value. Thus if the numbers 25, 32, 42, 54 and 67 represent years of age of five officeholders, the median is 42 years. An example of reporting of medians is in Table 6, which shows median ages of officeholders in each category of office and, for county and local officeholders, for those in large and small districts. The number of officeholders included in the calculation of the median is found in parentheses below the median. Whenever the base for calculation is small (less than 25), this fact is signaled by the practice of placing the median in parentheses. For example, the median age of federal appointees is 38 years. The number of officeholders on which the median is calculated is 22. Since this number is less than 25, the median age of federal appointees is shown in parentheses.

⁹Among the many issues of interpretation of research conducted at a single time period, two arise repeatedly in this analysis.

Problems of interpreting the causal direction of events. Statements of relationship between two or more phenomena will appear throughout this report. For example, we note that employed women devote fewer hours to their offices, on the average, than unemployed women. This simple research finding does not lead directly to an understanding of the process at work. It may be that employed women reduce the strain associated with multiple roles by giving fewer hours to their offices. Or it may be that after entering office, some women find that the office requires little of their time and enables them to seek outside employment. It is also possible that employment and hours devoted to office are not directly related in any causal chain. Some additional situation, such as relatively low socio-economic status of the family, may lead some women both into the labor force and into less important and less demanding public offices, with no direct connection between the two events found to occur together.

Problems of interpreting variations by age or by tenure of office. Because of considerable interest in the question of whether women currently entering public office differ significantly from their predecessors, this report comments on differences in our data between younger and older women, and between those in their first term and more experienced officeholders. These differences can be interpreted in several ways. (The more technically minded reader will find a thorough explanation of problems of interpreting age data in Matilda White Riley, Marilyn Johnson and Ann Foner, Ageing and Society, Vol. III: A Sociology of Age Stratification. New York: Russell Sage, 1972, Chapter 2.) For example, if women who have held office for more than one term are different from newcomers, this could occur: (a) because newly elected women today differ from newly elected women in past elections; (b) because women entering office are similar no matter when they are elected but change with experience in office; (c) because women are similar when they are elected, but only certain kinds of women go on to serve a second term; (d) some combination of the above. Only successive repetitions of the research over a period of time can help to eliminate all but one of these competing explanations.

¹⁰Since the actual number of women officeholders continually varies, and since there is no precise and up-to-date count of the total number of officeholders at the local level, we have supplied ranges representing our best estimates.

¹¹This figure was calculated by excluding mayors in Kentucky, New York and Wisconsin and local council members in Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin.

¹²The National Roster of Black Elected Officials, published annually by the Joint Center for Political Studies, Washington, D.C., supplies a source of detailed information about black women officials. See also Fitch (1977), Prestage (1977), Conyers and Wallace (1976).

¹³See Table 10, page xxvii in Johnson and Stanwick (1976).

¹⁴We have used the Hodge-Siegel-Rossi scale of occupational prestige as adapted to the 1970 U. S. Census Occupational Codes by the National Opinion Research Center. The scores are constructed from the results of national surveys that ask respondents to estimate the social standing of occupations. When applied to U. S. Census occupational classifications, scores range from 9 (bootblack) to 82 (physician). (For details of the scoring system see National Data Program for the Social Sciences, Codebook for the Spring 1977 General Social Survey, Appendix G. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, July 1977.) In the 1977 General Social Survey conducted by NORC, the median score of occupational prestige for a sample of women and men in the general population was 36 (calculated by the author from distributions supplied in the codebook). In contrast, the median score of women in office is 48. Those who have achieved higher-level offices average more prestigious occupational backgrounds, as shown in Table 9.

¹⁵For example, see Olsen (1974), Verba and Nie (1972), and Erbe (1964).

¹⁶Verba and Nie (1972).

¹⁷See, for example, Olsen (1974), Verba and Nie (1972), Hodge and Treiman (1968), Hausknecht (1962).

¹⁸Cutler (1976), Johnson (1975).

¹⁹This exception to the general pattern may occur because a disproportionate number of the very old -- those over age 70 -- are found among those entering office before 1975. The reduction of organizational involvements among those of advanced old age is a common phenomenon.

²⁰Just as age does not explain differences by tenure of office in the level of organizational affiliation, tenure of offices does not explain age patterns of membership. Among both newcomers and those with longer tenure, officeholders under age 35 average fewer memberships.

²¹The specific organizations named by respondents have been re-classified into fifteen categories. These categories are adaptations of those used in several studies of the population conducted by the National Opinion Research Center (see, for example, Verba and Nie, 1972). Organizations are classified on the basis of type of membership restriction (e.g., ethnic, occupational, religious) and, where such restrictions are not specified, in terms of the manifest primary purpose of the organization. In making classifications, extensive use was made of organizational descriptions in the Encyclopedia of Associations, 8th edition, vol. 1 edited by Margaret Fisk. Detroit: Gale Research Co., 1973.

²²Our report of women in public office in 1975 showed the marital status of women in public office to be similar to that of women in the general population (Johnson and Stanwick, 1976, Table 14, page xxx).

²³See Question 20, parts l, m, n, o at the end of this report.

- ²⁴For example, see Stoper (1977, p. 323), Bers (1976), Conyers and Wallace (1976, pp. 83-84), Dubeck (1976), Kirkpatrick (1974, p. 38), and Jennings and Thomas (1968, p. 476). But see also Diamond (1977, p. 38), who notes that proportionately more men are either under 40 years or over 65 years of age; King and McAuliffe (1976, p. 4), who found women younger than men among county supervisors; Costantini and Craik (1972, p. 222), who found no consistent age differences by sex among party leaders.
- ²⁵Johnson and Stanwick (1976, Table 9, page xxvii).
- ²⁶A prediction of ultimate convergence assumes no counter tendency for women to remain in office longer than men.
- ²⁷See Footnote 14 for a description of the Hodge-Siegel-Rossi score of occupational prestige.
- ²⁸See, for example, Johnson (1975), Olsen (1974), Verba and Nie (1972), Hodge and Treiman (1968), Almond and Verba (1963), Hausknecht (1962).
- ²⁹A similar finding is reported by Diamond (1977), Lee (1977), and Stoper (1977).
- ³⁰Whether there are proportionately fewer mothers of young children than fathers of young children among officeholders because women are reluctant to enter politics while their children are still young is an issue for further research.
- ³¹Evidence for this hypothesis is examined among state legislators by Stoper (1977). In a survey of school board members conducted by the National School Boards Association (1974), the encouragement of family members was more likely to be mentioned by women than by men as influential in the decision to run for election. Lex (1977) also finds that spousal support is important in the reasons given by female state legislators for their decision to run for election or re-election.
- ³²Hawley (1973, pp. 16-18) reports that elections of mayors and council members are nonpartisan in 64% of communities with over 5,000 population.
- ³³Recent entrants have more past officeholding experience than earlier entrants, even with age controlled.
- ³⁴The low salaries of state legislators reflect in part the large number of women legislators from New Hampshire.
- ³⁵For descriptions of the governmental activities in which women officeholders are concentrated, see Diamond (1977), Gehlen (1977a, 1977b, 1969), Johnson and Stanwick (1976), Kirkpatrick (1974).
- ³⁶Kirkpatrick (1976, 1974) reports similar findings, among state legislators and among national convention delegates.
- ³⁷For a complete list of items, see Question 14g at the end of this report.
- ³⁸See also Diamond (1977, ch. 4), Bers (1976), National School Boards Association (1974).
- ³⁹Note the lower levels of husband's supportiveness reported by women in small districts, described in Part II of this report.
- ⁴⁰See, for example, Riley and Foner (1968, pp. 240-302).
- ⁴¹We have calculated, for the comparison sample of women, the total numbers in the relevant offices in 1975 (1,345 women) and 1977 (1,688 women), omitting local councilwomen for Minnesota because of changes in coverage. The resulting ratio is .80, compared with a ratio of .78 of men to women in their first term of office.
- ⁴²The evidence on this point remains tentative because we have compared total numbers of officeholders with survey respondents. It is possible that nonrespondents differ in the proportions serving in their first term of office.
- ⁴³Diamond (1977, ch. 4), Bers (1976).
- ⁴⁴See Prewitt (1970).
- ⁴⁵A noticeable minority of women in office -- approximately one-fifth of local officeholders and more than two-fifths of state legislators -- have held membership in the League of Women Voters, an organization that explicitly stresses the position of officials as representatives of the public.
- ⁴⁶Diamond (1977), Gehlen (1977a, 1977b), Bers (1976), Kirkpatrick (1974), Werner (1968).
- ⁴⁷For example, see Nunn et al. (1978, ch. 7), Pomper (1975, ch. 4), Louis Harris (1972), Erskine (1971), Gruberg (1968), Campbell et al. (1964), Duverger (1955), Stouffer (1955, ch. 6), Lazarsfeld et al. (1948).
- ⁴⁸Kirkpatrick (1976, pp. 447-455). Since Kirkpatrick finds sex differences on women's issues but no sex differences on other issues, her finding of high correlations among social, political, and sexual ideologies is worth further analysis.
- ⁴⁹Soule and McGrath (1977). Differences from the Kirkpatrick findings may reflect sampling differences. Soule and McGrath drew quota samples for each state delegation based on sex, race and age. Kirkpatrick does not appear to have controlled for race or age in her analysis. Both studies control for candidate preference. See also Sullivan et al. (1974, pp. 33-34) for still another view of women and men at the 1972 Democratic Convention.
- ⁵⁰Frankovic (1977), Leader (1977).
- ⁵¹Leader (1977). Diamond (1977, pp. 49-51) finds women slightly more liberal than men on all policy issues examined in her study of New England state legislators.
- ⁵²Mezey (1976). Mezey's finding that men are as supportive of the ERA, feminism and the women's movement is counter to our finding of greater liberalism among women on women's issues. The difference may be due in part to differences in sampling procedures. Mezey paired men with women on the same councils, while we randomly sampled

men from municipalities in selected states, whether or not they were serving on the same councils as female respondents. Perhaps men with female colleagues are more likely to take a feminist position on issues than men with no female colleagues.

⁵³The findings described in this paragraph result from an analysis in which responses to issues are dichotomized, and the association between each pair of issues is examined with the others controlled. Yule's Q is employed as a measure of the strength of a relationship.

⁵⁴Findings are based on an analysis of the relative sizes of Yule's Q as measures of the association between liberalism/conservatism and agreement/disagreement on an issue.

⁵⁵For example, women and men who are not college graduates are separated by 8 percentage points in their views on social security for homemakers and by 14 percentage points in their views on the ERA. In contrast, women and men with post-graduate degrees are separated by 29 percentage points on social security and by 21 percentage points on the ERA.

⁵⁶For example, women achieve office at older ages and have unusually supportive spouses.

⁵⁷Louis Harris (1972, pp. 15-16).

⁵⁸Kirkpatrick (1976, pp. 462-470).

⁵⁹The questions analyzed in this section are adaptations of those asked of delegates to the 1972 national Democratic and Republican conventions by Jeané Kirkpatrick and associates. Kirkpatrick, (1976, pp. 458-462, 567.) Although Kirkpatrick combines the items into a single index of perceived discrimination, we find that the items relate in differing ways to a number of other variables and, therefore, we examine them separately.

⁶⁰A maximum of three difficulties named by a respondent have been included in classifications and tabulations. If more than three were named, the first three mentioned were included.

⁶¹For example, see Kirkpatrick (1976, 1974).

⁶²Diamond (1977), Farah (1976), Kirkpatrick (1976), Fiedler (1975), Costantini and Craik (1972), Jennings and Thomas (1968). One exception to the general pattern of findings in previous research is

in Merritt (1977), where women are found to be no less ambitious for higher office than men.

⁶³Because the 13 state legislators who are leavers do not provide enough cases for additional analysis, they are excluded from further description.

⁶⁴The 3 legislators expressing low officeholding ambition are omitted from further analysis. Categories of offices classified as indicating moderate and high levels of officeholding ambition are different for state legislators and for local councilors because of the greater tendency for state legislators to aspire to federal offices. The following offices are considered to represent moderate ambition for state legislative changers but high ambition for changers among local councilors: federal subcabinet position, federal department head below the cabinet level, federal district judge, lieutenant governor, state supreme court judge, state attorney general, state treasurer, secretary of state. All other offices remain classified as set forth in the footnote to Table 62.

⁶⁵Some characteristics also related to political ambition -- such as marital status, age of youngest child or residential stability -- are so heavily age-related that their separate effects cannot be disentangled in the type of analysis utilized in this report.

⁶⁶Age, education, and district size also are independently related to ambition.

⁶⁷See studies listed in Footnote 62.

⁶⁸Unfortunately, sample size does not permit simultaneous controls for all variables showing independent relationships with ambition.

⁶⁹Since the two-thirds of local districts that are nonpartisan also tend to be multi-member districts, the percentages of defeated officials from nonpartisan and multi-member districts may be low in relation to the percentages of these types of districts among total election districts.

⁷⁰See Kingdon (1967) for a discussion of effects of winning and losing on candidates' perceptions.

⁷¹The Center for the American Woman and Politics has issued a bibliography of work published or in progress between 1950 and 1976 on the political participation of women in the U. S. See Stanwick and Li (1977).

REFERENCES

- Almond, Gabriel A., and Verba, Sidney. The Civic Culture. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- Bennett, Stephen E., and Klecka, William R. "Social Status and Political Participation: A Multivariate Analysis of Predictive Power." Midwest Journal of Political Science 14 (August 1970): 355-382.
- Bers, Trudy Haffron. "Local Political Elites: Men and Women on Boards of Education." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, 1976.
- Campbell, Angus, et al. The American Voter. New York: John Wiley, 1960.
- Center for the American Woman and Politics. Women in Public Office: A Biographical Directory and Statistical Analysis. New York: R.R. Bowker, 1976.
- Conyers, James E., and Wallace, Walter L. Black Elected Officials. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976.
- Costantini, Edmond, and Craik, Kenneth. "Women as Politicians: The Social Background, Personality, and Political Careers of Female Party Leaders." Journal of Social Issues 28 (1972): 217-236.
- Curtis, James. "Voluntary Association Joining: A Cross-National Comparative Note." American Sociological Review 36 (October 1971): 872-880.
- Cutler, Stephen J. "Age Differences in Voluntary Association Memberships." Social Forces 55 (1976): 43-58.
- Diamond, Irene. Sex Roles in the State House. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1977.
- Dubeck, Paula J. "Women and Access to Political Office: A Comparison of Female and Male State Legislators." Sociological Quarterly 17 (winter 1976): 42-52.
- Duverger, Maurice. The Political Role of Women. Paris: UNESCO, 1955.
- Erbe, William. "Social Involvement and Political Activity: A Replication and Elaboration." American Sociological Review 29 (April 1964): 198-215.
- Erskine, Hazel. "The Polls: Women's Role." Public Opinion Quarterly 35 (summer 1971): 275-290.
- Farah, Barbara G. "Climbing the Political Ladder: The Aspirations and Expectations of Partisan Elites." In New Research on Women and Sex Roles at the University of Michigan, edited by Dorothy G. McGuigan. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Center for the Continuing Education of Women, 1976.
- Fiedler, Maureen, R.S.M. "The Participation of Women in American Politics." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, 1975.
- Fitch, Nancy E. Black Women in Politics. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, Government Division, 1977.
- Frankovic, Kathleen A. "Sex and Voting in the U.S. House of Representatives: 1961-1975." American Politics Quarterly 5 (July 1977): 315-330.
- Gehlen, Frieda L. "Legislative Role Performance of Female Legislators." Sex Roles 3 (1977a): 1-18.
- _____. "Women Members of Congress: A Distinctive Role." In A Portrait of Marginality, edited by Marianne Githens and Jewel L. Prestage. New York: David McKay, 1977b.
- _____. "Women in Congress: Their Power and Influence in a Man's World." Transaction 6 (October 1969): 36-40.
- Gruberg, Martin. Women in American Politics: An Assessment and Sourcebook. Oshkosh, Wis.: Academia Press, 1968.
- Hausknecht, Murray. The Joiners: A Sociological Description of Voluntary Association Membership in the United States. Totowa, N.J.: Bedminster Press, 1962.
- Hawley, Willis D. Non-Partisan Elections and the Case for Party Politics. New York: John Wiley, 1973.
- Hodge, R.W., and Treiman, D.J. "Social Participation and Social Status." American Sociological Review 33 (October 1968): 722-740.
- Jennings, M. Kent, and Thomas, Norman. "Men and Women in Party Elites: Social Roles and Political Resources." Midwest Journal of Political Science 7 (November 1968): 469-492.
- Johnson, Marilyn. "Changing Patterns of Voluntary Affiliation in the Later Years." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, 1975.
- _____, and Stanwick, Kathy. Profile of Women Holding Office. Reprinted from Women in Public Office: A Biographical Directory and Statistical Analysis, compiled by Center for the American Woman and Politics. New York: R.R. Bowker, 1976.
- Joint Center for Political Studies. National Roster of Black Elected Officials. Washington, D.C.: Joint Center for Political Studies, published annually.
- Karnig, Albert K., and Oliver, Walter B. "Election of Women to City Councils." Social Science Quarterly 56 (March 1976): 605-614.
- King, Elizabeth G., and McAuliffe, Joan. "Women County Supervisors: Are They Different?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, 1976.
- Kingdon, John W. "Politicians' Beliefs about Voters." American Political Science Review 61 (March 1967): 137-145.

Kirkpatrick, Jeane J. The New Presidential Elite. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976.

_____. Political Woman. New York: Basic Books, 1974.

Lazarfeld, Paul F., et al. The People's Choice. New York: Columbia University Press, 2nd edition, 1948.

Leader, Shelah Gilbert. "The Policy Impact of Elected Women Officials." In The Impact of the Electoral Process, edited by Louis Maisel and Joseph Cooper. Sage Electoral Studies Yearbook, Volume III. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1977.

Lee, Marcia M. "Why Few Women Hold Public Office: Democracy and Sexual Roles." In A Portrait of Marginality, edited by Marianne Githens and Jewel L. Prestage. New York: David McKay, 1977.

Lex, Louise. "A Summary of the 1976 Survey of Women State Legislators." Summary of research findings from "The Feminist Movement: Its Impact on Women in the State Legislatures." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1977.

Louis Harris and Associates, Inc. The 1972 Virginia Slims American Women's Opinion Poll. New York: Louis Harris and Associates, Inc., 1972.

Merritt, Sharyne. "Women in Municipal Government: The Case of Cook County." Report to the Center for the American Woman and Politics, 1977.

Mezey, Susan Gluck. "Local Representatives in Connecticut: Sex Differences in Attitudes Toward Women's Rights Policy." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, 1977.

National School Boards Association. Women on School Boards. Evanston, Ill.: National School Boards Association, 1974.

Nunn, Clyde Z., Crockett, Harry J., and Williams, J. Allen, Jr. Tolerance for Nonconformity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Olsen, Marvin E. "Interest Association Participation and Political Activity in the U.S. and Sweden." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, 1974.

Pomper, Gerald. Voters' Choice: Varieties of American Electoral Behavior. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1975.

Prestage, Jewel L. "Black Women State Legislators: A Profile." In A Portrait of Marginality, edited by Marianne Githens and Jewel L. Prestage. New York: David McKay, 1977.

Prewitt, Kenneth. "Political Ambitions, Volunteerism, and Electoral Accountability." American Political Science Review 64 (March 1970): 5-17.

Riley, Matilda White and Foner, Anne. Aging and Society, Vol. 1: An Inventory of Research Findings. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1968.

_____, Johnson, Marilyn, and Foner, Anne. Aging and Society, Vol. III: A Sociology of Age Stratification. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1972.

Soule, John W. and McGrath, Wilma E. "A Comparative Study of Male-Female Political Attitudes at Citizen and Elite Levels." In A Portrait of Marginality, edited by Marianne Githens and Jewel L. Prestage. New York: David McKay, 1977.

Stanwick, Kathy and Johnson, Marilyn. "Women Appointed to State Boards and Commissions." Report to the Women and Power Committee of the National Commission for the Observance of International Women's Year. U.S. Department of State, 1976.

_____, and Li, Christine. The Political Participation of Women in the United States: A Selected Bibliography, 1950-1976. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1977.

Stoper, Emily. "Wife and Politician: Role Strain among Women in Public Office." In A Portrait of Marginality, edited by Marianne Githens and Jewel L. Prestage. New York: David McKay, 1977.

Stouffer, Samuel A. Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1955.

Sullivan, Denis G., et al. The Politics of Representation: The Democratic Convention 1972. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1974.

Van Hightower, Nikki R. "The Recruitment of Women for Public Office." American Politics Quarterly 5 (July 1977): 301-314.

Verba, Sidney and Nie, Norman. Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Werner, Emmy E. "Women in State Legislatures." Western Political Quarterly 21 (1968): 40-50.

QUESTIONNAIRE

The following are questions asked of women currently in office. The same questions were asked of men, although in different order. The questionnaire sent to former women officeholders omitted questions 10, 15 and 18 and added the questions designated for former officeholders at the end of this section.

* * *

PART I - FOR YOUR DIRECTORY LISTING (Please print or type)

1. Your name 2. Governmental office address: office telephone: 3. Home address: 4. Date of birth: _____
5. What is your party affiliation? Democrat _____
Republican _____ Independent _____ Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____
6. CURRENT GOVERNMENTAL OFFICE (Do not include political party positions in this section. If you currently hold more than one office, indicate that below, but please answer all questions only with reference to the highest level position you now hold)
 - a. Name and location of your office or position (e.g., St. Rep., 6th Dist.; Mayor, Dallas)
 - (1) Highest level position currently held: _____
 - (2) Other governmental office(s) now held: _____
 - b. Level of government to which your position applies (e.g., federal, state, county, local)
 - c. Is your office normally _____ Elective _____ Appointive? If elective, were you first appointed to fill an unexpired term? Yes _____ No _____
 - d. What was the year of your first election or appointment to this office? 19 _____
 - e. Is this your _____ 1st, _____ 2nd, _____ 3rd, _____ 4th, or _____ th term of office?
 - f. If you hold membership on (or act as official liaison to) any committees, boards, or commissions as an assignment of your office, please list below and indicate whether you are the Chair:
7. FORMER PUBLIC OFFICES Please indicate all former governmental offices (including board and commission memberships) you have held, level of government, dates of service, and whether the office was elective (E) or appointive (A). (Do not include political party positions in this section.) Position _____ Level (local, county, state, national) _____ Years of service _____ Elective or appointive _____
8. PARTY POSITIONS
 - a. Were you ever a delegate or an alternate to a state and/or national political convention? In what year(s)? _____
 - b. Please list any other positions within your party, elective or appointive, that you currently hold or have held in the past (e.g., precinct leader, county committeewoman). (Do not include political clubs in this section.) Position _____ Level (local, county, state, national) _____ Years of Service _____ Elective or Appointive _____
9. EMPLOYMENT AND OCCUPATION In addition to holding

- office, are you now employed? Yes _____ No _____
 - a. If yes: Are you employed _____ full time or _____ part time? What is your occupation? _____
 - b. If no: In what year were you last employed? 19 _____ What was your occupation in the year you were last employed? _____
 10. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND List schools you attended, dates of attendance, major field of study (if any), and degrees or certificates received (if any).
 11. CURRENT EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITY During 1977, have you taken courses or been enrolled in school or received formal training of any kind? Yes _____ No _____
Yes. If yes, please describe:
 - a. the nature of the courses or program _____
 - b. the dates of attendance _____
 - c. the kind of degree or certificate, if any, that you are (or were) seeking _____
 - d. whether attendance is (or was) _____ full time or _____ part time
 12. ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIPS Please list (1) organizations in which you currently hold active membership and (2) organizations in which you are not currently active but in which you have held active membership within the past ten years. Please give the complete name of the organization (not just the initials) and the year in which you first joined.
 - CURRENT MEMBERSHIPS
 - a. Professional, occupational, or labor union
 - b. Civic, social welfare, or reform groups
 - c. Political clubs
 - d. School-related and youth groups
 - e. Social or recreational groups
 - f. Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____
 - WITHIN PAST TEN YEARS
 - a. Professional, occupational, or labor union
 - b. Civic, social welfare, or reform groups
 - c. Political clubs
 - d. School-related and youth groups
 - e. Social or recreational groups
 - f. Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____
- PART II - FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES ONLY**
- Answers to all questions in PART II will NOT BE INCLUDED UNDER YOUR NAME in the directory. They will be used only for statistical charts and analysis, with no names or other identifying materials attached.
13. CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUR OFFICE
 - a. What is the annual salary, if any, of your office? \$ _____ (If payment is in the form of an amount per session or per meeting, please indicate how much would be earned per year for full attendance.)
 - b. How many women and how many men currently hold office in your governing body? (Please include yourself): _____ women and _____ men, out of _____ total members
 - c. What is the size of population under the jurisdiction of your governing body or office? _____

d. If your office is elective, what is the population of the district from which you were elected?

e. If your office is elective, are elections to your office: Partisan (Party label appears on the ballot with the candidate's name) Nonpartisan (no party labels appear on the ballot)

14. ACTIVITIES OF OFFICE

a. Please estimate the number of hours per week that you spend on matters related to your office: hours/week

b. If you hold membership on more than one committee, board, or commission as an assignment of your office, please name the one you consider: most important ; most time-consuming .

c. Are there committee, board, or commission assignments you would like in place of or in addition to your current assignments? No Yes If yes, please list in order of preference:

d. What are the three issues or projects of most concern to you in your activities as an officeholder?

e. Considering all the responsibilities of your office, how much emphasis do you place on each of the following? Please indicate the degree of emphasis by placing a number from 1 to 4 in the blank beside each item 1=Major emphasis 2=Moderate emphasis 3=Minor emphasis 4=Not a responsibility of my office

- Educating the public about important issues
- Making government more efficient
- Developing policy
- Helping constituents with their individual problems
- Seeking the opinions of my colleagues on pending issues
- Initiating and sponsoring legislation or ordinances
- Smoothing conflicts and effecting compromises with colleagues
- Getting my own priority issues on the agenda
- Exercising administrative and oversight functions
- Discovering the public's view on pending issues
- Representing the program of my political party
- Seeking available research and information on pending legislation or issues
- Making independent decisions on the merits of each issue

f. On most contemporary issues, do you generally think of yourself as: Very conservative

 Conservative Middle-of-the-road Liberal

 Very liberal Other (PLEASE SPECIFY).

g. Relative to the other public officeholders you work with, please rate yourself on each of the following qualities as: 1=Considerably higher than average 2=Slightly higher than average 3=About the same as my colleagues 4=Slightly lower than average 5=Considerably lower than average 6=Can't evaluate

- General knowledge and intelligence
- Valuable past training and experience
- Financial and economic judgment
- Getting along with colleagues
- Willingness to work hard
- Efficiency and organization
- Influence and prestige with colleagues
- Imagination
- Understanding people's behavior and motivations
- Interest in public service
- Time spent on official activities
- Political know-how
- Ability to make important contacts
- Responsiveness to constituents

- Practicality
- Independence
- Ability to argue persuasively
- Interest in social problems
- Overall effectiveness

15. PAST CANDIDACIES Have you ever in the past been a candidate for elective office in which you lost the election? No Yes If yes: For which office(s)? In which year(s)? Was the election a primary?

16. POLITICAL PLANS AND GOALS

a. Do you plan to seek an additional term in the office you now hold (or, if you hold appointive office, would you accept a reappointment)?

 Definitely Probably Probably not Definitely not Don't know

b. If you had the necessary political support and the right opportunities, are there other elective or appointive political offices at the local, county, state, or national levels that you would eventually hold? No. Would prefer to remain in my current office or would prefer not to hold any public office after leaving the one I now hold. (If no, skip to Question 17.) Yes. Please list all offices that might be of interest to you.

c. If you answered yes to b, all things considered, which one office would you like to hold next in the future?

d. If the future office you are interested in is an elective office, how much money would you guess would be needed to finance you campaign adequately? \$. interested in appointive office next

e. Please indicate how important each of the following considerations is likely to be in your decision whether to seek the office you would like to hold next. Beside each item, place the number that comes closest to your own feeling about the matter. 1=So important that I would not seek office without it 2=Important but not critical 3=Somewhat important 4=Of minor or no importance 5=Does not apply to my situation or the office I seek

- Having sufficient numbers of volunteer campaign workers
- Being assured of sufficient campaign funds
- Getting favorable treatment from the media
- Having the support and endorsement of party leaders
- Having the support or endorsement of key organizations
- Being able to run unopposed in the primary election
- Not having to challenge an incumbent in the primary election
- Not having to run against an incumbent in the general election
- Feeling that I can do a better job in office than other potential candidates
- Having financial independence or security
- Not having children still in school
- Having support and encouragement from my husband
- Having an experienced campaign manager
- Being able to hire professional campaign services for literature, polling, targeting the district, etc.
- Being approached for the office rather than having to initiate a candidacy
- Not having to move or travel away from home

17. COMPARISON OF WOMEN AND MEN IN POLITICS

a. What are the special advantages, if any, which you have experienced as a result of being a woman

in public office? _____

b. What special difficulties, if any, have you experienced as a result of being a woman holding public office? _____

c. Beside each statement, please indicate the number that comes closest to your own opinion. 1=Strongly agree 2=Moderately agree 3=Moderately disagree 4=Strongly disagree 5=Unable to decide

- _____ Women have just as much opportunity as men to become political leaders.
- _____ Many men in the party organizations try to keep women out of leadership roles.
- _____ In general, voters are more reluctant to support women candidates.
- _____ Men can't be really active in politics without having their family life suffer.
- _____ Women can't be really active in politics without having their family life suffer.
- _____ Women in office generally devote more time to the job than do men in office.
- _____ Women in office usually are better at the "human relations" aspects of the job.
- _____ In general, women in office are not as politically astute as men.
- _____ The qualifications and training of women in public office are usually not as good as those of men in office.

18. ROLES OF GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY Below is a list of some common social or individual problems and needs. For each problem or need, decide which number comes closest to your own feeling about whether (a) federal government (b) state government, (c) private industry 1=Should do more about it than it now does 2=Is now doing just about enough 3=Should be less involved than it now is 4=Should not get involved at all

- Preventing inflation
- Accumulating funds for retirement security
- Assuring full employment
- Providing mass transportation systems
- Assuring equal rights for women
- Controlling air and water pollution
- Improving the availability and quality of medical care
- Abolishing poverty
- Providing financial aid to students
- Assuring equal rights for minorities
- Improving the quality of neighborhoods
- Protecting the consumer against poor services or products and unreasonable prices
- Ending discrimination against older workers
- Encouraging industrial and commercial development
- Supporting the cultural arts
- Regulating the supply and distribution of energy
- Encouraging technological innovation
- Encouraging research on social problems

19. POSITIONS ON CURRENT ISSUES Please indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements by placing a number from 1 to 6 in the blank provided. 1=Strongly agree 2=Moderately agree 3=Neutral 4=Moderately disagree 5=Strongly disagree 6=Don't know

- _____ The best way to handle the crime problem is to make punishments more severe.
- _____ Every state should require students to pass a test of minimal competency as a condition for graduation from high school.
- _____ There should be a constitutional amendment to prohibit abortion under all or almost all circumstances.
- _____ The defense budget should be reduced.

_____ In the long run, busing school children to promote racial balance will prove to be a good thing for the country.

_____ Social Security coverage should be extended to homemakers.

_____ There should be a federal law forbidding mandatory retirement because of age.

_____ A larger share of federal revenues should be returned to the states.

_____ A larger share of federal revenues should be returned to the municipalities.

_____ The federal Equal Rights Amendment should be ratified.

_____ Government should provide child care services to all parents who desire them, with fees charged according to ability to pay.

20. BACKGROUND AND FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS

a. How long have you resided in the community where you now live? _____ years. In the state? _____ years. In which Congressional District do you live? (If you do not know the number of your district, please write the name of your current Congressman/woman, House of Representatives.)

_____ C.D.

b. On the whole, when you were growing up, would you say that your father and mother were:

_____ Father

- _____ Very much interested in politics
- _____ Somewhat interested in politics
- _____ Didn't pay much attention to politics
- _____ Father not living or was not raised by father

_____ Mother

- _____ Very much interested in politics
- _____ Somewhat interested in politics
- _____ Didn't pay much attention to politics
- _____ Mother not living or was not raised by mother

c. What is your age? _____ years

d. What is your current marital status?

- _____ Married _____ Divorced or separated _____ Widowed
- _____ Single, never married

e. How many children have you had? (Include all your children, living or not, and all adopted children.) _____ children (if no children, write "none.")

f. If you have children, how old is the youngest child? _____ years

g. What is your religious preference?

- _____ Roman Catholic _____ Jewish _____ Protestant
- _____ Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____
- _____ No religious preference

h. What is the principal ethnic or racial heritage with which you identify yourself? (e.g., Irish; Afro-American or Black; Chicago; etc.)

i. What was your combined family income (before taxes) last year? _____ under \$5,000

_____ \$5,000-\$9,999 _____ \$10,000-\$14,999

_____ \$15,000-\$19,999 _____ \$20,000-\$24,999

_____ \$25,000-\$29,999 _____ \$30,000-\$39,999

_____ \$40,000-\$49,999 _____ over \$50,000

If you are not currently married, please omit questions about your husband and skip to the end of the questionnaire.

j. Please check below the category which tells how far your husband went in school:

- _____ Grade school or less
- _____ Some high school
- _____ Some high school plus other noncollege training
- _____ Completed high school
- _____ Completed high school plus noncollege training
- _____ Some college
- _____ Completed college (4 years)

- Completed college plus additional training
 Has one or more postgraduate degrees
 k. What is your husband's occupation? _____
 l. On the whole, would you say that your husband:
 Is very much interested in politics
 Is somewhat interested in politics
 Doesn't pay much attention to politics
 m. In general, would you say that your husband:
 Approves and actively encourages your holding office
 Is for the most part approving
 Is mildly opposed to your holding office
 Actively opposes and resists your holding office
 n. Has your husband been an active participant in your political life?
 Yes, he often has participated by doing such things as campaigning, helping to raise money, helping with speeches, substituting for me at public events, etc.
 Yes, he has occasionally participated.
 No, he leaves the political activities and officeholding strictly to me.
 o. Has your husband taken on extra household or other tasks in ways that free you for the work of your office?
 Yes, he has often taken on extra tasks.
 Yes, he has occasionally taken on extra tasks.
 No, it's up to me to find time for all my activities.

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE.
PLEASE ENCLOSE IT IN THE POSTAGE PAID ENVELOPE PROVIDED AND MAIL IT PROMPTLY.

* * *

The following questions were asked only of former officeholders.

6. LEAVING OFFICE Which of the following describes the circumstances of your leaving office?
 Resigned before the end of my last term and did not serve the remainder of the term (Please answer Part A)
 Completed my term of office but decided not to run for re-election (Please answer Part A)
 Was defeated in my bid for re-election (Please answer Part B)

PART A

- (1) If you resigned before the end of your term or decided not to run for re-election, please indicate which, if any, of the factors below entered into your decision. (Check all factors that apply)
- Health
 Financial pressures
 Family moved to a new area
 Husband needed more of my time
 Children needed more of my time
 Other family members needed more of my time
 Husband was actively opposed to my holding office
 Wanted to go back to school
 Wanted to take a job I felt would be more rewarding
 Demands of a separate occupation
 Felt I could not win re-election
 Disillusionment with what the office could accomplish
 Felt I had done my share and it was someone else's turn

- Lack of interest in the type of work the office entailed
 Felt I lacked the technical expertise for doing a really effective job
 Disillusionment with my colleagues in office
 Felt I had accomplished what I had set out to do
 None of these was a factor in my decision
 (2) Please comment in the space below regarding any other aspects of your leaving office that you consider significant:

PART B

- (1) If you were defeated for re-election, was the election: A primary A partisan general election A nonpartisan election
 (2) How many candidates were running for the same seat? Myself and a single opponent for one seat. Was your opponent: a woman or a man? (indicate number) candidates for one seat. Was the winner: a woman or a man? (indicate number) candidates for seats. How many women won? How many men won?
 (3) Please comment in the space below regarding any aspects of the election that you consider of special significance:
 7. ASSESSMENT OF EXPERIENCE Would you say that your experience as an officeholder is of value to you in your current life and activities? Yes No. Please comment on your answer in the space below:

NUMBERS OF WOMEN IN OFFICE: 1977 STATE SUMMARIES

State	U.S. Congress	State Exec.	State Senate	State House	State Judiciary	County Comsn.	Town- ships	Mayor- alty	Local Councils
Alabama	0	5	0	3	1	6	NA	14	174
Alaska	0	1	1	3	0	10	NA	8	105
Arizona	0	2	6	10	6	4	NA	11	37
Arkansas	0	2	1	2	2	45	NA	23	136
California	2	3	1	5	14	26	NA	46	230
Colorado	1	2	2	12	1	7	NA	17	206
Connecticut	0	10	5	32	1	NA	82	18	57
Delaware	0	3	2	6	0	2	NA	5	37
Florida	0	1	2	16	10	18	NA	19	204
Georgia	0	0	1	10	1	11	NA	15	105
Hawaii	0	2	4	5	0	0	NA	0	3
Idaho	0	1	2	8	0	5	NA	10	61
Illinois	1	3	3	18	7	1	87	8 ¹	-
Indiana	0	1	3	6	3	2	100	2	65
Iowa	0	2	4	13	1	15	NA	37	412
Kansas	1	2	1	10	1	10	49	23	184
Kentucky	0	2	1	7	1	6	NA	14*	141*

¹Incomplete information.

KEY TO INTERPRETING STATE SUMMARY CHART

State Exec. Column: Numbers represent state executive level offices which are filled by statewide election and those appointive positions designated as cabinet level within each state.

State Judiciary Column: Numbers represent all state appellate courts and trial courts of general jurisdiction. (See Appendix)

* Represents expanded coverage over the first edition of *WOMEN IN PUBLIC OFFICE*.

NA Not applicable

- Information not available

PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS (as of January 30, 1978)

108 WOMEN
779 TOTAL APPOINTMENTS

14% WOMEN#

#These figures taken from the Presidential Personnel Plum File include all presidential appointments. Names listed in the body of this directory cover only those appointments which were made before August 1977.

NUMBERS OF WOMEN IN OFFICE (Continued)

State	U.S. Congress	State Exec.	State Senate	State House	State Judiciary	County Comsn.	Town- ships	Mayor- alty	Local Councils
Louisiana	1	3	1	1	0	15	NA	12	74
Maine	0	0	2	25	0	0	NA	19	169
Maryland	3	0	3	18	3	12	NA	11	81
Massachusetts	1	3	4	16	0	4	NA	17	133
Michigan	0	0	0	8	6	84	1548 ²	23	298
Minnesota	0	1	2	10	1	13	NA	28	332 ²
Mississippi	0	1	0	2	1	4	NA	10	116
Missouri	0	1	2	14	0	8	-	39	303
Montana	0	1	2	12	0	2	NA	9	68
Nebraska	1	1	2 (uni-cameral)		0	3	-	17	99
Nevada	0	1	2	5	0	5	NA	2	7
New Hampshire	0	1	4	110	0	4	NA	7	41
New Jersey	2	4	1	12	2	16	NA	19	269
New Mexico	0	2	1	4	0	5	NA	9	44
New York	2	7	3 ²	6	7	42	256 ³	30 ³	244 ³
North Carolina	0	2	4	19	2	28	NA	16	171
North Dakota	0	0	3	16	0	0	NA	7	82
Ohio	1	2	1	7	8	7	64	28	449 ²
Oklahoma	0	0	1	6	3	4	NA	21	148
Oregon	0	1	3 ⁴	9	4	11	NA	11	189
Pennsylvania	0	0	1	10	12	7	NA	19	452 ²
Rhode Island	0	3	4	7	2	NA	NA	0	18

²At the beginning of 1978 Carol Bellamy resigned her N.Y. Senate seat to become N.Y.C. Council President.

³These figures were taken from Newsvane 6 (November 1977). Newsvane is published regularly by the Department of State of New York. The number of biographical listings for women holding local office in New York in the body of this book varies from the Newsvane figures due to inaccuracies in original lists received from the state of New York.

⁴At the beginning of 1978 Betty Roberts was appointed to the judiciary in Oregon and resigned her Senate seat.

NUMBERS OF WOMEN IN OFFICE (Continued)

State	U.S. Congress	State Exec.	State Senate	State House	State Judiciary	County Comsn.	Townships	Mayor-alty	Local Councils
South Carolina	0	2	0	10	0	9	NA	7	71
South Dakota	0	4	2	6	1	5	NA	10	49
Tennessee	1	2	1	2	1	57	NA	10	50
Texas	1	0	1	10	1	21	NA	29	322
Utah	0	1	1	5	0	0	NA	4	50
Vermont	0	1	2	25	0	3	48	3	13
Virginia	0	1	0	9	0	20	NA	11	114
Washington	0	3	7	16	4	8	NA	17	186
West Virginia	0	3	0	12	0	5	NA	7	115
Wisconsin	0	3	2	10	1	85	NA	9	-
Wyoming	0	1	1	6	0	5	NA	4	43
Washington DC	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	NA	NA	4
TOTAL NUMBER OF WOMEN ⁵	18 ⁶	97	102	594	110	660	2234	735	6961
			6967				9930		
TOTAL NUMBER OF OFFICEHOLDERS	535	904	1975	5583	5940	20973 ⁸	126772 ⁹		
			7558						
PROPORTION OF OFFICEHOLDERS WHO ARE WOMEN	3.4%	10.7%	9.2%		1.8%	3.1%	7.8%		

⁵Totals listed are current for August 1977, with one exception (see note 7).

⁶In 1977 18 women served in the U.S. House of Representatives (4.1% women of 435 U.S. Representatives). There were no women serving in the 100 member U.S. Senate. In early 1978 Muriel Humphrey of Minnesota was appointed to fill a Senate vacancy created by the death of Hubert Humphrey.

⁷This figure reflects the results of November 1977 State Legislative races in Kentucky, New Jersey and Virginia.

⁸Figure taken from State and Local Government Special Studies No. 68: Governing Boards of County Governments, 1973 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office).

⁹Numbers are estimates arrived at by adjusting figures given in the U.S. Census of Governments, Vol. 6, Popularly Elected Officials of State and Local Governments (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967) p.7. They reflect the changes in total numbers of governing bodies as shown in the U.S. Census of Governments, Vol. 1, Governmental Organization (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972) p.1. A breakdown of figures for the individual totals of townships, mayors, and city councils was unavailable.