

BRINGING MORE WOMEN INTO PUBLIC OFFICE

WOMEN
APPOINTED TO
STATE
GOVERNMENT

A Comparison with All State Appointees

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY

RUTGERS

CENTER FOR THE AMERICAN WOMAN AND POLITICS

*Women
Appointed to
State
Government*

A Comparison with All State Appointees

Women Appointed to State Government

A COMPARISON WITH
ALL STATE APPOINTEES

Report written by
SUSAN J. CARROLL
and
BARBARA GEIGER-PARKER

with the assistance of
Wendy S. Strimling

This report is part of CAWP's series entitled "Bringing More Women Into Public Office," a project conducted under a grant from the Charles H. Revson Foundation.

CONTENTS

Introduction		vii
Chapter 1	Background and Family Characteristics	1
	Family Environment	
	Education	
	Schools Attended	
	Field of Study	
	Age	
	Race	
	Marital Status	
	Spouse's Attitude	
	Children	
Chapter 2	Political Credentials and Prior Experience	15
	Party Affiliation	
	Partisan Activity	
	Gubernatorial Campaign Activity	
	Previous Public Service	
	Prior Job	
	Role Models and Mentors	
Chapter 3	Recruitment	35
	Reason for Accepting Appointment	
	Person Most Influential in Bringing About Appointment	
	Organizational Assistance	
	Appointees' Efforts	
	Most Important Factor Leading to Appointment	
	Relative Importance of Factors	
	General Perceptions of Factors Influencing Appointments	
	Age Differences in Perceptions	
Chapter 4	A Woman's Perspective?	57
	Perceptions of Sex Differences in Political Opportunities	
	Views on Selected Issues	
	Views on Women's Issues	
	Differences Among Liberals, Moderates, and Conservatives	
	Support of Other Women	
	Membership in Women's Organizations	
Chapter 5	The Future: Beyond the Administration	73
	Desire to Serve in Other Gubernatorial Administrations	
	Desire to Hold Other Positions	
	Highest Position Desired	
	Position Desired Next	

Chapter 6	CONCLUSION	81
	Differences Between Women Appointees and Appointees Overall	
	Implications for Women Who Want a Gubernatorial Appointment	
	Future Research	
Appendix 1	Women State Cabinet-Level Appointees 1981	89
Appendix 2	Women State Cabinet-Level Appointees 1983	99
Notes		111
Selected Readings		117

INTRODUCTION

"An intriguing aspect of the American governorship is the wide array of powers, formal and informal, available to those who serve as governors," wrote Stephen B. Farber, former executive director of the National Governors' Association, in a 1982 issue of State Government.¹ Formulation and control of the budget, organization of state government, and responsibility for appointments all fall within a governor's purview. Among the powers accorded to governors, the power of appointment may be the most important. The budget introduced by the governor is developed with the guidance and direction of cabinet members, many of whom are appointed to their positions by the governor. Executive agencies, which frequently undergo reorganization when a new governor arrives in the state capitol, are headed in most cases by political appointees. A governor's policies and programs become part of the state bureaucracy under the leadership of cabinet and sub-cabinet officials, many of whom serve at the pleasure of the governor.

The significance of a governor's power of appointment becomes evident when we examine selection procedures for state administrative officials. One recent study found that nearly half (46.8%) of 1,992 administrative positions in fifty states are filled by gubernatorial appointment. An additional 38.2% of the positions are appointed by other officials or institutions including boards, agency heads, or the legislature. Only 15% of state administrative officials are elected separately.² Furthermore, a governor's power in the area of appointments may be underestimated if one looks only at the 46.8% of positions filled directly by governors. A large number of the 38.2% of administrators appointed by officials other than governors may receive their appointments through an "agent" of the governor such as a cabinet member appointed by the governor, or they may require an informal endorsement from the governor. Thus, the authority to make appointments may be one of a governor's most powerful tools.³

Despite the obvious power vested in a state's chief executive through control over appointments to cabinet and subcabinet posts, the appointments process at the state level has been subject to little scrutiny. Virtually no research has focused on state cabinet appointees, perhaps because such research presents numerous challenges. These challenges stem from the wide variations among states in numbers of gubernatorial appointees, types of positions, responsibilities associated with particular posts, qualifications for appointive officeholding, and selection procedures for these jobs.

Because there has been very little study of the appointive process in the states, the paths to positions of influence and power in gubernatorial

administrations remain nearly invisible.⁴ In particular, there has been no examination of women's routes to high-level offices in the states. Yet some political analysts have suggested that, especially for women, appointive office may be easier to attain than elective office. At the Conference for Leaders of Organizations of Women Public Officials sponsored by the Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP) in June 1980, Douglas Bailey, a partner in the political consulting firm, Bailey Deardourff Associates, ended his remarks by saying, "It is not easy for women to get appointed to any significant position, but I feel very strongly that it is easier to get appointed from ground zero than it is to get elected, and it's much easier to get elected after you've been appointed."

Whom do governors appoint to their cabinets? How do they select appointees? How many appointees are women? These were among the questions which the Center for the American Woman and Politics set out to answer with a 1981 census and survey of state cabinet-level officials. Under a grant from the Charles H. Revson Foundation, CAWP conducted a study focusing on women appointees serving in cabinet-level positions and comparing them with a sample of all appointees holding such positions. Appointees were surveyed to learn about their personal and political backgrounds and their routes to appointive office.

CAWP's aim was to develop the first comprehensive descriptive profile of all women serving in state cabinet-level positions. Because there was no prior research which could provide a baseline against which we could compare the characteristics and experiences of women, we also collected information on how the appointments process works for all appointees, regardless of sex.

IDENTIFYING THE APPOINTEES

Women and men who were serving in cabinet-level offices in the states in February 1981 were the subject of CAWP's survey. In order to identify individuals in top-level positions in state government, we wrote to the governor of each state asking for a list of his cabinet members (at the time of the survey, no women served as governors). The letter asked the governor to include the names of all officials who regularly participated in cabinet meetings and to indicate whether they were designated as cabinet members by statute, by custom, or at the request of the governor. With some follow-up, we obtained lists from forty-eight of the fifty states.⁵

THE SAMPLES

Two samples were included in our study and are analyzed in this report. The first is technically not a sample; rather, it consists of the

entire population of women who were serving as appointed state cabinet-level officials in February 1981. A total of 126 women, representing all women identified as serving in governors' cabinets as of February 1981, were contacted and asked to participate in our study.

The second sample is a sample of all appointed members of state cabinets, including both women and men in proportion to their presence in the population of state appointees. We drew a systematic sample, consisting of 15% of all people serving in state cabinet appointive positions in February 1981. Of the 145 cases selected for our study, 12 were no longer holding office or were career civil servants, not political appointees, and 2 others were on leave from their jobs because of illness. Thus, the total number of cabinet-level appointees selected for our sample of all appointees and found to be appropriate for our study was 131; this number included 16 women.⁶ Throughout this report, we refer to this sample as the "main sample" in the tables and as "appointees overall" or "all appointees" in the text.

THE SURVEY

Conducting a survey of high-level appointive officials presented some unique challenges. Knowing that they were extremely busy individuals who would nonetheless want to know something about the organization conducting the research and the research itself, CAWP first contacted the participants by letter in order to describe the study and to arrange a convenient time for a telephone interview.

Our letter to participants described the study as the "first comprehensive study of women and men holding high-level appointments in state government." The letter outlined two goals for our research: first, to identify routes of entry into appointive political office; second, to develop a profile of state cabinet officials with special emphasis on how the profile of women was different from or similar to the profile of all appointees. The letters were sent on stationery from CAWP's parent organization, the Eagleton Institute of Politics, in order to minimize any potential biases which might have resulted from using stationery indicating that a women's organization was conducting the study. Each respondent was asked to select a day and time for the interview and to return the schedule in a postage-paid envelope. The telephone survey was conducted between April 27, 1981 and May 7, 1981 by the Eagleton Poll, a unit of the Eagleton Institute of Politics.⁷ The interviews averaged twenty-five minutes in length.⁸

RESPONSE RATE

Of the universe of 126 women who were serving in cabinet-level positions, 112 completed our survey for a response rate of 88.9%.⁹ Of the

131 officials (female and male) selected for the "main sample" representing all state appointees, 110 participated for a response rate of 84.0%.¹⁰

Of the 110 appointees who constituted the main sample, 96 or 87.3% were men. Fourteen respondents in the main sample were women. These 14 women were also included among the 112 respondents who represent the universe of women cabinet-level officials.

DISTRIBUTION OF WOMEN CABINET MEMBERS IN 1981¹¹

In 1981, 987 people served as members of governors' cabinets. This number comprises all officials, including both department heads and members of governors' staffs, who participated in cabinet meetings either by statute, by custom, or at the request of the governor. Of the total number of cabinet members, 91.6% (904 people) headed departments or agencies and 8.4% (83 people) served as members of governors' staffs.

Of the 987 members of governors' cabinets in February 1981, 126 (12.8%) were women. Of these 126 women, 84.1% (106) were serving as department or agency heads and 15.9% (20) were serving as governors' staff members. Among the women who were serving as department heads, the largest proportion (about 20%) headed agencies in the health and human services field. The second largest proportion (10%) served in the field of labor and industrial relations, closely followed by women in the field of human and civil rights and in the field of government services and government administration. Women were least likely to head transportation agencies, with only 1% of women cabinet members serving in the transportation field.

States varied widely in the proportion of women holding appointed cabinet posts. Two states, Arizona and Utah, had no women serving in appointed cabinet-level posts. California had the largest proportion of women in its cabinet, with women comprising 40% of cabinet appointees.¹² Chart 1 lists, alphabetically by state, the proportion of women serving in state cabinets in 1981. These proportions include both appointed agency/department heads and members of governors' staffs with cabinet status. Elected cabinet officials are excluded from these figures.

STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

The body of this report consists of six chapters. Throughout the report we compare women cabinet members with appointees overall, with the latter referred to in tables as the "main sample" of appointees. Additionally, we examine differences between state appointees serving in Democratic administrations and in Republican administrations. The majority of tables present data for appointees in administrations of both parties.

CHART 1: WOMEN AS A PROPORTION OF APPOINTED STATE CABINET-LEVEL OFFICIALS BY STATE, 1981

State	Percent Women	State	Percent Women
Alabama	15%	Montana	5%
Alaska	25	Nebraska	8
Arizona	0	Nevada	8
Arkansas	20	New Hampshire ^b	...
California	40	New Jersey	16
Colorado	11	New Mexico	7
Connecticut	11	New York	15
Delaware	18	North Carolina	22
Florida	17	North Dakota ^b	...
Georgia	8	Ohio	4
Hawaii	12	Oklahoma	12
Idaho	21	Oregon	13
Illinois	7	Pennsylvania	18
Indiana ^b	...	Rhode Island	21
Iowa ^a	...	South Carolina ^b	...
Kansas	9	South Dakota	14
Kentucky	8	Tennessee	21
Louisiana	19	Texas	12
Maine	16	Utah	0
Maryland	8	Vermont	22
Massachusetts	10	Virginia	14
Michigan	6	Washington	5
Minnesota	10	West Virginia	14
Mississippi	12	Wisconsin	9
Missouri ^a	...	Wyoming ^b	...

^aInformation from Iowa and Missouri was not available.

^bThe governors of Indiana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Carolina, and Wyoming do not appoint cabinet members.

However, references in the text are made to party data only where partisan differences exist. Whenever we discuss "Democratic appointees" and "Republican appointees," we are referring to the political party of the governor in whose administration appointees serve and not to the political party affiliation of the respondents.

Chapter 1 examines the personal background and family characteristics of state cabinet-level appointees. It looks at age, race, marital status, and parents' occupations and involvement in politics.

Chapter 2 continues the exploration of appointees' backgrounds by focusing on the political credentials and experience that appointees brought with them to their positions in gubernatorial administrations. We examine partisan activity, campaign involvement, government service, previous employment, and the influence of role models and mentors.

Chapter 3 focuses on the recruitment of state cabinet-level officials. We investigate appointees' stated reasons for accepting gubernatorial appointments, their assessments of their relationships with the governors prior to their appointments, and their efforts and the efforts made by other people and organizations on their behalf to secure positions in gubernatorial administrations. This chapter also examines appointees' perceptions of the most important factors that led to their appointments and their perceptions of the relative importance of several factors in the appointments process.

Chapter 4 examines the ways in which women appointees differed from or resembled appointees overall in their positions on issues and in their perceptions of sex differences in political opportunities and job performance.

Chapter 5 discusses appointees' political ambitions. It examines whether appointees wanted to serve in future gubernatorial administrations and whether they aspired to other elective or appointive positions at various levels of government.

Chapter 6 summarizes the most significant findings from our research. It discusses the implications of our research for women who desire gubernatorial appointments and for those who wish to help women obtain appointments. Finally, we suggest some avenues for future research.

Notes for all chapters appear at the end of the report. Following the notes are two appendices. Appendix 1 lists women serving in state cabinets in 1981. This list is arranged by state and includes the governor of each state and his political party affiliation. Appendix 2 provides data about women state cabinet appointees in 1983. It includes: the overall number and proportion of women serving as appointed state cabinet officials in 1983; a state-by-state breakdown of the proportion of women serving in each state's cabinet; and a list of women serving in state

cabinets in 1983, organized by state. The report concludes with a list of selected readings.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We appreciate the contributions made by many people during various stages of this project. Cliff Zukin and Janice Ballou of the Eagleton Poll helped us translate our ideas into questions appropriate for a survey. Student assistants Sherry Dempsey and Sue Mast helped us locate phone numbers for appointees we surveyed. John Cohen patiently checked the accuracy of the numbers in this report.

Several people took time to review our draft questionnaires. The final questionnaire incorporated many of the changes suggested by Marilyn Johnson, Rita Mae Kelly, Alan Rosenthal, Ida Schmertz, Patricia Sheehan, Betty Wilson, and Betsey Wright.

All projects at CAWP involve a team effort, and this project was no exception. We are especially grateful for the leadership of CAWP Director Ruth B. Mandel, the editorial expertise of Katherine E. Kleeman, and the excellent support services from CAWP's secretaries, Martha Casisa, Claire Schoenfeld, and Patricia Michaels. For the thought and care she gave when typing the final manuscript, we thank Ginny Perrine.

Finally, we are most grateful to the state cabinet officials who participated in our study. CAWP was able to conduct this study only because they were willing to take time out from their hectic schedules to answer our questions.

Kathy Stanwick
Project Director

In designing our research on routes to appointive office, we identified a number of areas of inquiry important to developing a profile of high-level political appointees. Background characteristics such as age, race, education, and marital status are essential components of any such profile. They provide a foundation for our analysis. They also assist in our interpretation of the career paths and patterns of recruitment of political appointees.

We begin this study by describing the personal and family background characteristics of state cabinet-level appointees and discussing the ways in which the backgrounds of women resembled or differed from the backgrounds of appointees overall.¹ Additionally, we examine differences between women who served in cabinet-level positions in Democratic and Republican administrations.²

FAMILY ENVIRONMENT DURING CHILDHOOD

An examination of the occupations and officeholding experiences of appointees' parents provides insight into the family environment in which appointees were raised. We asked appointees about the jobs their fathers and mothers held when the appointees were growing up. We also asked them whether their fathers and mothers had ever served in appointive or elective office in government.

Father's Occupation

A majority of women appointees had fathers with professional or managerial/administrative occupations (Table 1.1). Moreover, compared with appointees overall, women appointees were considerably more likely to have fathers who were professionals and slightly more likely to have fathers who were managers or administrators. Women appointed to Democratic administrations more often than women appointed to Republican administrations had fathers who were professionals and less often had fathers who were managers or administrators.

A smaller proportion of women appointees than appointees overall had fathers who were craftsmen or farmers. Similarly, a slightly smaller proportion of the women's fathers fell into categories other than those specifically listed in Table 1.1, largely because a smaller proportion of the women's fathers were blue collar workers.³ If father's occupation is used as an indicator of social class, women appear to have been more likely than appointees overall to have come from families of middle to high social status.

TABLE 1.1: WOMEN APPOINTEES WERE MORE LIKELY THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL TO HAVE FATHERS WHO WERE EMPLOYED IN PROFESSIONAL AND MANAGERIAL/ADMINISTRATIVE OCCUPATIONS

Father's Occupation	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women ^a %	Main Sample ^b %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Professional ^c	31.3	16.4	35.1	19.0	27.3	13.5
Physician	4.5	2.7	1.8	5.2	7.3	0.0
Teacher/professor	3.6	1.8	5.3	1.7	1.8	1.9
Lawyer/judge	7.1	3.6	8.8	3.4	5.5	3.8
Manager/administrator ^d	29.5	24.5	22.8	25.9	36.4	23.1
Sales worker	8.9	7.3	12.3	3.4	5.5	11.5
Craftsperson	4.5	10.0	7.0	10.3	1.8	9.6
Farmer	7.1	16.4	8.8	20.7	5.5	11.5
Government employee/ civil servant	0.9	2.7	1.8	3.4	0.0	1.9
Elected public official	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.9
Self-employed	4.5	3.6	3.5	1.7	5.5	5.8
Other ^e	11.6	14.5	8.8	13.8	14.5	15.4
Father not living; not raised by father	0.9	3.6	0.0	1.7	1.8	5.8
	100.0 ^f	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total ^g	(112)	(110)	(57)	(58)	(55)	(52)

^a"Women" represents the universe of all women serving in state cabinet-level appointive positions in February of 1981. For further information about the population and response rate, see the INTRODUCTION.

^b"Main sample" is a systematic sample, consisting of 15% of all people who were serving in state cabinet-level appointive positions in February of 1981. The sample represents state cabinet-level appointees overall, including both women and men in proportion to their presence in the population of state appointees. For further information about the sample and response rate, see the INTRODUCTION.

^cIn addition to the three positions listed, the "professional" category includes other health care workers, social workers, writers and journalists, consultants, etc.

^dThe "manager/administrator" category includes public administrators, business executives, military officers, etc. Respondents who indicated that they owned or managed a business are also placed in this category.

^eThe "other" category for the most part consists of two types of positions. Blue collar occupations (operatives, transport equipment operatives, laborers) were reported by 3.6% of the women appointees and 8.2% of the main sample. Service worker positions were reported by 4.5% of the women appointees and 3.6% of the main sample of appointees.

^fIn this and all subsequent tables, percentages may not add precisely to 100 because of rounding.

^gIn this and all subsequent tables, the numbers in parentheses refer to the number of respondents on which proportions are based.

Mother's Occupation

Unlike father's occupation, mother's occupation is rarely used as a measure of social class. Nevertheless, mother's occupation is of interest for other reasons. An appointment to a gubernatorial administration reflects an unusual level of professional accomplishment. One might expect that women who achieved such positions would have come disproportionately from families in which the mother set an example for her daughter by being successful in an occupation outside the home.

An examination of Table 1.2 provides some support for this expectation. Although a majority of the mothers of female appointees were homemakers at the time their children were growing up, women appointees were substantially more likely than appointees overall to have mothers who were employed outside the home. About two-fifths of women appointees, nearly double the proportion of appointees in general, had mothers who worked outside the home.

Only about one of every five women appointees had a mother who held a professional or managerial/administrative position. As was the case for

TABLE 1.2: WOMEN APPOINTEES WERE LESS LIKELY THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL TO HAVE MOTHERS WHO WERE FULL-TIME HOMEMAKERS

Mother's Occupation	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
	Main Sample		Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Professional ^a	15.2	9.1	19.3	8.6	10.9	9.6
Teacher	7.1	6.4	10.5	8.6	3.6	3.8
Manager/administrator ^b	6.3	3.6	1.8	3.4	10.9	3.8
Sales worker	0.9	0.9	1.8	0.0	0.0	1.9
Clerical worker/secretary	9.8	4.5	10.5	5.2	9.1	3.8
Homemaker	58.9	78.2	56.1	75.9	61.8	80.8
Other	8.9	3.6	10.5	6.9	7.3	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(112)	(110)	(57)	(58)	(55)	(52)

^aIn addition to teachers, the "professional" category includes other health care workers, social workers, writers and journalists, consultants, etc.

^bThe "manager/administrator" category includes public administrators, business executives, military officers, etc. Respondents who indicated that they owned or managed a business are also placed in this category.

4 / Women Appointed to State Government

father's occupation, women appointed by Democratic governors more often than women appointed by Republican governors had mothers who were professionals. Republican female appointees more often than Democratic female appointees had mothers who were managers or administrators.

Parents' Officeholding Experience

One might expect many state cabinet-level appointees to have come from politically active families. Table 1.3 presents one measure of political activism--the proportion of appointees whose fathers and mothers had held either elective or appointive governmental office.

Appointees were drawn disproportionately from families in which one or both parents had been officeholders. In the U.S. population as a whole, less than 1% of citizens have served in political office. Yet, among state cabinet-level appointees, 35.7% of the women appointees and 30.0% of appointees overall indicated that at least one parent had held an elective or appointive office. Female appointees were slightly more likely than appointees overall to have a father who had served in public office and were notably more likely to have a mother who had held public office (Table 1.3). However, women in Democratic administrations were slightly less likely than Democratic appointees overall to have a father who had served in public office.

TABLE 1.3: WOMEN APPOINTEES WERE MORE LIKELY THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL TO HAVE PARENTS WHO HAD HELD APPOINTIVE OR ELECTIVE GOVERNMENTAL OFFICE

	<u>State Cabinet-Level Appointees</u>					
			<u>Democratic Administrations</u>		<u>Republican Administrations</u>	
	<u>Women</u>	<u>Main Sample</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Main Sample</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Main Sample</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Father held public office	30.4	28.2	26.3	29.3	34.5	26.9
Mother held public office	8.1 ^a	1.8	7.1 ^b	3.4	9.1	0.0
Total	(112)	(110)	(57)	(58)	(55)	(52)

^aIn this particular case, the total is 111.

^bIn this particular case, the total is 56.

LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Just as state cabinet-level appointees were drawn disproportionately from families with high social status and notably high levels of political activity, they also were drawn predominantly from the ranks of the well-educated. Almost all appointees had college degrees, and a majority had postgraduate degrees (Table 1.4).

Women appointees were more likely than appointees overall to be concentrated at the high end of the educational spectrum. Women were as likely as all appointees to have Ph.D.s and were more likely to have law degrees. Almost one of every six women, compared with fewer than one of every eight appointees generally, had completed law school. Among appointees younger than forty, one-fourth of the women, compared with one-eighth of appointees overall, had earned law degrees.

Women appointed by Republican governors were more likely than all other appointees in our study to have law degrees or Ph.D.s (Table 1.4). Almost one-third of women appointees in Republican administrations had earned one of these degrees.

While women were more highly concentrated at the highest end of the educational spectrum, women were also slightly more concentrated at the lowest end of the spectrum; a slightly larger proportion of women than of appointees overall had no education beyond high school. However, this finding is attributable to the disproportionate number of women serving on governors' staffs (17.0% of women compared with 7.3% of the sample of all appointees).⁴ Excluding gubernatorial staff members from the analysis, we found that similar proportions of women appointees and appointees

TABLE 1.4: WOMEN APPOINTEES WERE MORE LIKELY THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL TO HAVE LAW DEGREES

Highest Educational Degree Completed	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
	Women %	Main Sample %	Democratic Administrations Women %	Democratic Administrations Main Sample %	Republican Administrations Women %	Republican Administrations Main Sample %
High school diploma	14.3	11.8	14.0	15.5	14.5	7.7
B.A. or equivalent	33.9	37.3	38.6	37.9	29.1	36.5
M.A. or equivalent	25.0	30.0	26.3	24.1	23.6	36.5
J.D. or law degree	16.1	11.8	12.3	13.8	20.0	9.6
Ph.D. or other doctorate	10.7	9.1	8.8	8.6	12.7	9.6
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(112)	(110)	(57)	(58)	(55)	(52)

TABLE 1.5: WOMEN APPOINTEES MORE OFTEN THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL HAD UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES FROM PRIVATE COLLEGES

Type of Institution Granting Undergraduate Degree	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Private	50.0	43.8	51.0	45.8	48.9	41.7
In-state ^a	18.8	18.8	14.3	18.8	23.4	18.8
Out-of-state ^b	31.3	25.0	36.7	27.1	25.5	22.9
Public	50.0	56.3	49.0	54.2	51.1	58.3
In-state	33.3	36.5	30.6	35.4	36.2	37.5
Out-of-state	16.7	19.8	18.4	18.8	14.9	20.8
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(96)	(96)	(49)	(48)	(47)	(48)

^a"In-state" refers to an institution located in the same state in which the respondent served.

^b"Out-of-state" refers to an institution located in a state different from the state in which the respondent served.

overall--9.7% of the women and 10.8% of the sample of all appointees--had stopped their education upon completion of high school. Among appointees heading departments and agencies, a larger proportion of women appointees (28.0%) than of all appointees (20.6%) had law degrees or Ph.D.s.

TYPE OF SCHOOL ATTENDED

Not only were state appointees highly educated, but also, sizable proportions had received degrees from private colleges and universities and from schools outside the states in which they served (Tables 1.5 and 1.6). According to preliminary findings of a study by the National Center for Education Statistics of the U.S. Department of Education, only 22% of all college students in 1981 attended private schools.⁵ In comparison, among appointees with college degrees, one-half of the women and more than two-fifths of appointees overall had completed their undergraduate work at private institutions (Table 1.5)--proportions far higher than for the general population. Among those with advanced degrees, slightly less than one-half of both women appointees and appointees overall had received their degrees from private institutions (Table 1.6).

Appointees also were notably more likely than the general population to have attended out-of-state institutions. A fall 1979 study of first-time college students by the National Center for Education Statistics found

TABLE 1.6: WOMEN APPOINTEES AND APPOINTEES OVERALL RECEIVED GRADUATE DEGREES FROM SIMILAR TYPES OF UNIVERSITIES

Type of Institution Granting Graduate Degree	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Private	48.3	46.4	48.1	44.4	48.4	48.3
In-state ^a	19.0	21.4	14.8	22.2	22.6	20.7
Out-of-state ^b	29.3	25.0	33.3	22.2	25.8	27.6
Public	51.7	53.6	51.9	55.6	51.6	51.7
In-state	31.0	25.0	33.3	25.9	29.0	24.1
Out-of-state	20.7	28.6	18.5	29.6	22.6	27.6
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(58)	(56)	(27)	(27)	(31)	(29)

^a"In-state" refers to an institution located in the same state in which the respondent served.

^b"Out-of-state" refers to an institution located in a state different from the state in which the respondent served.

that only 13% of college students attended out-of-state colleges and universities.⁶ In contrast, much higher proportions of appointees (47.9% of women appointees and 45.4% of appointees overall) had received B.A.s from institutions in states other than those in which they served. This figure may include people who went to college in the state where they grew up and who subsequently settled in another state; however, the very high proportion of appointees who attended college in states other than those in which they served suggests that many appointees attended college in states other than those in which they were raised.

FIELD OF ADVANCED STUDY

Among appointees with advanced degrees, women reported fields of study which were similar to those reported by appointees overall (Table 1.7). While law was the most common area of study for both women appointees and appointees overall, the most striking difference is that a larger proportion of women than of appointees overall had earned law degrees. Women in Republican administrations were twice as likely as Republican appointees overall to have studied law. In contrast, women in Democratic administrations were slightly less likely than Democratic appointees overall to have law degrees.

B / Women Appointed to State Government

TABLE 1.7: AMONG APPOINTEES WITH ADVANCED DEGREES, WOMEN MORE OFTEN THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL HAD STUDIED LAW

Field of Study	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Law	31.0	23.2	25.9	29.6	35.5	17.2
Political science/public administration	17.2	19.6	22.2	18.5	12.9	20.7
Economics	1.7	3.6	0.0	3.7	3.2	3.4
Business/finance/accounting	3.4	10.7	3.7	7.4	3.2	13.8
Mathematics/sciences	13.8	8.9	18.5	7.4	9.7	10.3
History	5.2	5.4	7.4	3.7	3.2	6.9
Social work/counseling	5.2	7.1	7.4	7.4	3.2	6.9
Humanities	8.6	1.8	3.7	0.0	12.9	3.4
Education	6.9	7.1	7.4	11.1	6.5	3.4
Other	6.9	12.5	3.7	11.1	9.7	13.8
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(58)	(56)	(27)	(27)	(31)	(29)

Table 1.7 provides little evidence of significant sex stereotyping in field of study. In keeping with sex role stereotypes, women were slightly more likely to have completed graduate work in the humanities and slightly less likely to have majored in business, finance, and accounting. However, proportionately more women appointees than appointees overall had graduate degrees in mathematics and science--traditionally fields with few women.

AGE

Research on women holding elective positions in government generally has found women to be older or about the same age on the average as their male counterparts.⁷ In light of this finding, the data in Table 1.8 are significant because they show that women state appointees actually were somewhat younger than state appointees in general. Two-fifths of the women--compared with less than one-fourth of appointees overall--were in their thirties. Moreover, less than one-twentieth of the women--about half as many women as appointees overall--were sixty or older. The average age of women appointees was 42.1 years, while the mean age of appointees overall was 46.6 years.

State cabinet-level appointees overall in Republican administrations were somewhat younger on the average than appointees overall in Democratic

TABLE 1.8: WOMEN APPOINTEES WERE YOUNGER THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL

Age	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Under 30 years old	5.4	4.5	5.3	3.4	5.5	5.8
30-39 years old	41.1	23.6	38.6	17.2	43.6	30.8
40-49 years old	28.6	31.8	29.8	36.2	27.3	26.9
50-59 years old	20.5	28.2	22.8	27.6	18.2	28.8
60 years old or older	4.5	11.8	3.5	15.5	5.5	7.7
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(112)	(110)	(57)	(58)	(55)	(52)
Mean age	42.1	46.6	42.8	47.8	41.5	45.3

TABLE 1.9: MOST WOMEN APPOINTEES, LIKE APPOINTEES OVERALL, WERE CAUCASIAN

Race	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Caucasian	91.1	90.9	93.0	86.2	89.1	96.2
Black	5.4	5.5	5.3	8.6	5.5	1.9
Hispanic	0.9	0.9	0.0	1.7	1.8	0.0
Asian	0.9	1.8	1.8	3.4	0.0	0.0
Native American	1.8	0.9	0.0	0.0	3.6	1.9
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(112)	(110)	(57)	(58)	(55)	(52)

administrations (Table 1.8). Nevertheless, women in administrations of both parties were notably younger than their counterparts among appointees overall. Women in both Democratic and Republican administrations far more often were between the ages of thirty and thirty-nine than were appointees overall.

It should be emphasized that the data in Table 1.8 reflect age in early 1981 at the time of our interviews with appointees. Most of the

participants in our study actually received initial appointments to gubernatorial administrations between 1977 and 1980. Thus, at the time of their appointments, respondents were actually slightly younger than our data show.

RACE

The vast majority of women appointees, like state cabinet-level appointees overall, were Caucasian (Table 1.9). Members of minority groups were vastly underrepresented among appointees relative to their presence in the general population of the United States. For example, according to 1980 U.S. Census figures, blacks constitute 11.7% of the American population.⁸ Yet, blacks constituted less than half this proportion of appointees overall. Democratic governors were more likely than Republican governors to appoint blacks; however, equal proportions of black women were appointed to Democratic and Republican administrations. The implication is that Democratic governors were more likely than Republican governors to appoint black men, but Democratic governors were no more likely than Republican governors to appoint black women.

MARITAL STATUS

Although about two-thirds of women appointees were married at the time of our survey, women appointees were much less likely than appointees overall to be married (Table 1.10). Women were more than three times as likely to have never been married and almost twice as likely to be divorced or separated as appointees overall.

TABLE 1.10: WOMEN APPOINTEES WERE MUCH LESS LIKELY THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL TO BE MARRIED

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>State Cabinet-Level Appointees</u>	
	<u>Women</u> %	<u>Main Sample</u> %
Married	67.0	85.5
Single, never married	16.1	4.5
Divorced/separated	11.6	6.4
Widowed	5.4	3.6
	100.0	100.0
Total	(112)	(110)

SPOUSE'S ATTITUDE

Those respondents who were married at the time of the survey were asked to characterize their spouses' attitudes toward their work in politics and government (Table 1.11). While large majorities claimed that their spouses were "very supportive," women were more likely than appointees overall to make this claim. None of the women and a small minority of appointees overall had spouses whom they perceived as "somewhat resistant."

TABLE 1.11: WOMEN APPOINTEES MORE OFTEN THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL REPORTED THAT THEIR SPOUSES WERE VERY SUPPORTIVE OF THEIR WORK IN POLITICS AND GOVERNMENT

Spouse's Attitude Toward Appointee's Work	State Cabinet-Level Appointees	
	Women %	Main Sample %
Very supportive	85.1	70.2
Somewhat supportive	12.2	24.5
Indifferent	2.7	3.2
Somewhat resistant	0.0	2.1
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(74)	(94)

TABLE 1.12: AMONG APPOINTEES WHO HAD BEEN MARRIED, WOMEN HAD FEWER CHILDREN THAN DID APPOINTEES OVERALL

Number of Children	State Cabinet-Level Appointees	
	Women %	Main Sample %
None	19.1	10.5
1	19.1	12.4
2	28.7	27.6
3 or more	33.0	49.5
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(94)	(105)

TABLE 1.13: AMONG APPOINTEES WHO HAD BEEN MARRIED, WOMEN MORE OFTEN THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL HAD YOUNG CHILDREN OR NO CHILDREN

<u>Age of Youngest Child</u>	<u>State Cabinet-Level Appointees</u>	
	<u>Women</u> %	<u>Main Sample</u> %
Under 6 years old	16.1	9.5
6-11 years old	14.0	15.2
12-17 years old	18.3	21.0
18 years old or older	32.3	43.8
No children	19.4	10.5
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(93)	(105)

TABLE 1.14: AMONG APPOINTEES UNDER AGE FORTY, SIMILAR PROPORTIONS OF WOMEN AND APPOINTEES OVERALL HAD YOUNG CHILDREN

<u>Age of Youngest Child</u>	<u>State Cabinet-Level Appointees</u>			
	<u>Under Age 40</u>		<u>Age 40 or Older</u>	
	<u>Women</u> %	<u>Main Sample</u> %	<u>Women</u> %	<u>Main Sample</u> %
Under 6 years old	38.9	38.5	1.8	0.0
6-11 years old	25.0	23.1	7.0	12.7
12-17 years old	11.1	7.7	22.8	25.3
18 years old or older	0.0	0.0	52.6	58.2
No children	25.0	30.8	15.8	3.8
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(36)	(26)	(57)	(79)

CHILDREN

Just as women appointed to cabinet-level positions were less likely than all appointees to have ever been married, women were less likely to have children. However, even among appointees who were or had been married, women were less likely to have children (Table 1.12). Moreover, when they had children, they had fewer of them.

Table 1.13 indicates that among appointees who were or had been married, women were more likely than appointees overall to have children under six years old. However, this difference is due primarily to the

fact that women were younger on the average than appointees in general. Among appointees with children, more of the women had preschool children because more of the women were at that stage of the life cycle. Among state cabinet-level appointees under forty years of age, identical proportions of women appointees and appointees overall had children under age six (Table 1.14). Among appointees forty years old or older, only one appointee had a child under six years old.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Perhaps the most important finding regarding the backgrounds of state cabinet-level appointees is the overall similarity between women appointees and appointees overall. Women, like appointees in general, most frequently had fathers who were professionals or managers/administrators and mothers who were homemakers. Approximately one of three appointees, among women appointees and among appointees generally, had at least one parent who had held an elective or appointive office in government. Both groups were extremely well educated and attended similar types of schools. Law was the most common field of study for both. Women appointees, like appointees overall, were predominantly Caucasian and concentrated between the ages of thirty and fifty. A majority of both groups were married, and those who were married tended to have spouses who were very supportive of their work in politics and government. Overall, then, the number and extent of similarities between women appointees and appointees overall are striking.

Yet, the few differences that emerge are quite interesting. Perhaps the most surprising difference is that women appointees tended more often than appointees overall to have law degrees. This finding is surprising since, until recently, very few women have attended law school.

In at least two other respects, women state appointees more often than appointees overall had characteristics traditionally associated with governing elites. More women came from families with relatively high social status as measured by father's occupation. Also, a larger proportion of female appointees had undergraduate degrees from private, rather than public, institutions.

Women state cabinet-level appointees are clearly a distinctive breed of political women. Relative to women holding various elective offices in recent years, women cabinet-level appointees were younger, better educated, and more likely to be trained in such traditionally male-dominated fields as law, science, and mathematics.⁹ Because the women interviewed for this study were at the forefront during the 1970s of women breaking from traditional roles for women, it is not surprising that their family situations differed in important ways from the norm for appointees generally. Women appointees were less likely to be married and more likely to be single.

separated, or divorced. They also were less likely to have children. Among appointees who were married, women almost uniformly perceived their husbands as very supportive of their political and governmental activities while appointees overall gave less uniform assessments of their spouses' attitudes.

The data on family situations suggest that women appointees more often than appointees overall delayed marriage or chose not to marry and raise children. Perhaps those who married and remained married were able to do so, in part, because they perceived their husbands to be fully supportive of their governmental work and political activities. While most appointees viewed their spouses as very supportive, the greater uniformity among female appointees suggests that lack of spousal support may more often pose a barrier to women's than to men's public careers.

The issue of women's appointments has been a source of recurring tension in the appointments process. According to press reports, at least two former presidents--Richard Nixon and Jimmy Carter--publicly bemoaned the difficulty of finding qualified women to fill federal positions.¹ Carter claimed difficulty despite the fact that the Coalition for Women's Appointments, an ad hoc coalition representing more than fifty women's organizations and formed under the leadership of the National Women's Political Caucus, had screened and compiled the names of hundreds of women whom they considered qualified.

While we have no record of similar statements from governors, "difficulty" in finding qualified women for top positions apparently occurred at the state level as well. In 1981, women held only 12.8% of appointed positions in state cabinets.²

This chapter focuses largely on the political credentials and experience that appointees brought to their positions in gubernatorial administrations. We examine experience in a variety of spheres--partisan activity, campaign involvement, government service, and previous employment. We also assess the influence of role models and mentors in helping appointees develop the credentials necessary to receive major appointments. Implicit throughout the analysis in this section is the underlying question of whether governors were, in fact, able to find "qualified" women for their administrations. In the conclusion to this chapter, we return to this question and address it directly.

POLITICAL PARTY AFFILIATION

One of the factors that undoubtedly is considered in selecting appointees to a governor's administration is party affiliation. One would anticipate that a governor and those who recruit for a gubernatorial administration would show a strong preference for individuals who share the chief executive's partisan identification. It is not surprising, then, that most cabinet-level appointees serving in both Democratic and Republican administrations identified themselves as members of the governor's party (Table 2.1).

Those appointed to the administrations of Democratic governors were considerably more likely to share the governor's party identification than those appointed to Republican administrations. Four-fifths of all appointees who served in Democratic administrations were Democrats while only half of all appointees in Republican administrations were Republicans.³ However,

TABLE 2.1: WOMEN APPOINTEES WERE MORE LIKELY THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL TO BE MEMBERS OF THE SAME PARTY AS THE GOVERNOR WHO APPOINTED THEM

	State Cabinet-Level Appointees	
	Women %	Main Sample ^a %
Within Democratic administrations, respondents who were Democrats	87.5	80.7
Total	(56)	(57)
Within Republican administrations, respondents who were Republicans	61.7	50.0
Total	(54)	(50)

^a"Main sample" is a systematic sample, consisting of 15% of all people who were serving in state cabinet-level appointed positions in February 1981. The sample represents state cabinet-level appointees overall, including both women and men in proportion to their presence in the population of state appointees. For more information, see the INTRODUCTION.

within administrations of both parties, women more often than appointees overall were members of the same party as the governor (Table 2.1). Thus, party affiliation appears to be somewhat more important in the selection of female appointees than it is in the selection of male appointees.

PARTISAN ACTIVITY

One might expect gubernatorial appointees not only to belong to the same party as the governor but also to be active and to show leadership within the party. A common assumption is that gubernatorial appointments are used to reward those who have made significant contributions to the party. As Table 2.2 shows, among appointees who belonged to the same party as their governor, more than three-fifths of women appointees and appointees overall were or had been active in the party. Appointees in Democratic administrations were more likely than appointees in Republican administrations to have been active in their party. Women in Democratic administrations did not differ much in party involvement from appointees overall in those administrations. Among appointees in Republican administrations, however, women were more likely than appointees overall to have been active in their party.

TABLE 2.2: AMONG APPOINTEES WHO WERE OF THE SAME PARTY AS THE GOVERNOR, SIMILAR PROPORTIONS OF WOMEN AND APPOINTEES OVERALL HAD BEEN ACTIVE IN THEIR PARTY

Party Activity	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Presently or formerly active in political party	64.6	62.9	67.3	68.9	60.6	52.0
Had held elective or appointive party position	34.1	32.9	34.7	40.0	33.3	20.0
Had served as delegate to national party convention	13.4	8.6	14.3	11.1	12.1	4.0
Total	(82)	(70)	(49)	(45)	(33)	(25)

Two more specific measures of partisan involvement and leadership--service as party officials and service as national party convention delegates--show a similar pattern of differences between appointees in Democratic and Republican administrations (Table 2.2). Among appointees who were of the same party as the governor, similar proportions of women appointees and appointees generally--about one-third--had held elective or appointive party positions in their parties. However, women in Democratic administrations were somewhat less likely than appointees overall in those administrations to have held party positions while women in Republican administrations were more likely than Republican appointees overall to have served in party posts.

Women appointees were slightly more likely than appointees overall to have served as delegates to national party conventions. Among women appointees who were members of the governor's party, more than one-eighth had been delegates to a national party convention. Women appointed by Republican governors were notably more likely than Republican appointees overall to have served as delegates.

Women appointees' level of partisan activity varied by age as well as by party (Table 2.3). Older women appointees were more likely than younger women appointees to have been involved in all forms of partisan activity. Also, while the partisan involvement of female appointees under age forty was similar to that of all younger appointees, a larger proportion of women

TABLE 2.3: AMONG APPOINTEES WHO WERE OF THE SAME PARTY AS THE GOVERNOR, OLDER WOMEN MORE OFTEN THAN OLDER APPOINTEES OVERALL HAD BEEN ACTIVE IN PARTY AFFAIRS

Party Activity	State Cabinet-Level Appointees			
	Under Age 40		Age 40 or Older	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Presently or formerly active in political party	57.9	60.0	70.5	64.0
Had held elective or appointive party position	23.7	20.0	43.2	38.0
Had served as delegate to national party convention	5.3	0.0	20.5	12.0
Total	(38)	(20)	(44)	(50)

age forty or over than of older appointees overall had been active in the party, had held party office, and had served as delegates.

GUBERNATORIAL CAMPAIGN ACTIVITY

Working in a successful political campaign can potentially lead to a government appointment. Edwin Meese and William Casey from the Reagan campaign and Hamilton Jordan and Jody Powell from the Carter campaign are visible examples of individuals who followed this route into federal appointive positions. To test the importance of campaign activity on the state level, we asked respondents if they had worked for the election of the governor who subsequently appointed them.

Similar proportions of women appointees and appointees overall had worked in gubernatorial campaigns (Table 2.4). Slightly more than one-fourth of the women compared with slightly less than one-fourth of appointees overall had worked in governors' primary campaigns. Somewhat larger proportions, more than one-third of the women and slightly less than one-third of appointees generally, campaigned in general elections for the governor who subsequently appointed them. Overall, 37.5% of women state appointees, compared with 33.6% of appointees in general, had worked in either the primary or general election campaigns of their governors.

While the campaign involvement of women appointees was not vastly different from that of all appointees, important differences emerged

TABLE 2.4: SIMILAR PROPORTIONS OF WOMEN APPOINTEES AND APPOINTEES OVERALL HAD WORKED IN THEIR GOVERNORS' CAMPAIGNS

	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Worked in governor's primary campaign	27.0	23.1	28.6	23.2	25.5	23.1
Total	(111)	(108)	(56)	(56)	(55)	(52)
Worked in governor's general election campaign	36.6	32.7	38.6	36.2	34.5	28.8
Total	(112)	(110)	(57)	(58)	(55)	(52)

TABLE 2.5: OLDER WOMEN WERE MORE LIKELY AND YOUNGER WOMEN WERE LESS LIKELY THAN THEIR COUNTERPARTS AMONG APPOINTEES OVERALL TO HAVE WORKED IN THEIR GOVERNORS' CAMPAIGNS

	State Cabinet-Level Appointees			
	Under Age 40		Age 40 or Older	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Worked in governor's primary campaign	23.1	29.0	30.5	20.8
Total	(52)	(31)	(59)	(77)
Worked in governor's general election campaign	34.6	38.7	38.3	30.4
Total	(52)	(31)	(60)	(79)

across age groups (Table 2.5). Women under age forty were slightly less likely than younger appointees overall to have worked in their governors' campaigns. In contrast, women age forty or over were notably more likely than older appointees overall to have taken an active role in their governors' primary and general election campaigns.

TABLE 2.6: AMONG APPOINTEES WHO HAD WORKED IN THEIR GOVERNORS' CAMPAIGNS, WOMEN WERE MORE LIKELY THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL TO HAVE WORKED IN SALARIED POSITIONS

Campaign Position	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
	Main Sample		Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Salaried	19.5	11.1	13.6	9.5	26.3	13.3
Voluntary	78.0	86.1	81.8	90.5	73.7	80.0
Both salaried and voluntary	2.4	2.8	4.5	0.0	0.0	6.7
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(41)	(36)	(22)	(21)	(19)	(15)

Women appointees were more likely than appointees overall to have served in salaried campaign positions (Table 2.6). Women appointees in Republican administrations were especially likely to have been employed in such positions; one-fourth of Republican female appointees involved in campaigns had been employed in salaried positions.

PREVIOUS PUBLIC SERVICE

Previous research on political appointees at the federal level has found that most served in government at some time prior to their appointments.⁴ To determine whether this type of experience was common at the state level, we asked appointees whether they had previously held appointive, administrative, or elective positions at federal, state, county, or local levels (Table 2.7).

Federal Government Experience

Women state appointees were similar to all state cabinet-level appointees in federal government experience. About one-fifth of women appointees and appointees overall had held administrative or appointive positions at the federal level (Table 2.7). However, notable party differences were evident. Women appointed by Democratic governors were more likely than Democratic appointees overall to have held federal posts while women appointees in Republican administrations were less likely than Republican appointees overall to have served in federal government positions.

Among appointees under forty years old, women were notably more likely than younger appointees overall to have served in federal positions (Table 2.8). Older women appointees were as likely as older appointees overall to have held federal government posts.

TABLE 2.7: WOMEN APPOINTEES HAD LESS PRIOR GOVERNMENT EXPERIENCE THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL

Type of Experience	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Had held federal appointive or administrative post	21.6 ^a	19.1	26.8 ^b	15.5	16.4	23.1
Had held appointive position in a previous gubernatorial administration	25.9	31.8	31.6	32.8	20.0	30.8
Had held appointive or administrative position in county or local government	25.9	37.3	24.6	36.2	27.3	38.5
Had held elective government office	11.6	21.8	14.0	29.3	9.1	13.5
Total	(112)	(110)	(57)	(58)	(55)	(52)

^aIn this particular case, the total is 111.

^bIn this particular case, the total is 56.

TABLE 2.8: OLDER WOMEN APPOINTEES WERE AS LIKELY AS OLDER APPOINTEES OVERALL TO HAVE HAD PREVIOUS APPOINTIVE EXPERIENCE IN COUNTY OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Type of Experience	State Cabinet-Level Appointees			
	Under Age 40		Age 40 or Older	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Had held federal appointive or administrative post	15.7 ^a	3.2	26.7	25.3
Had held appointive position in a previous gubernatorial administration	21.2	22.6	30.0	35.4
Had held appointive or administrative position in county or local government	15.4	45.2	35.0	34.2
Had held elective government office	5.8	3.2	16.7	29.1
Total	(52)	(31)	(60)	(79)

^aIn this particular case, the total is 51.

State Government Experience

Women appointees were somewhat less likely than appointees overall to have held appointive positions in previous gubernatorial administrations (Table 2.7). One-fourth of women appointees, compared with slightly less than one-third of all appointees, had previously held a state appointive position. The smaller proportion of women appointees in Republican administrations with state government experience largely accounts for this difference between women appointees and appointees overall. Women appointees in Democratic administrations were about as likely as Democratic appointees overall to have held positions in previous gubernatorial administrations. The only notable difference between women appointees and appointees overall of similar ages was that among older appointees, women were slightly less likely than older appointees overall to have held a previous state appointive post (Table 2.8).

County and Local Government Experience

A smaller proportion of women appointees than appointees overall, about one-fourth of the women compared with more than one-third of all appointees, had held appointive or administrative positions at county or local levels (Table 2.7). Women serving in both Democratic and Republican administrations were less likely than their counterparts among appointees overall to have appointive experience in county or local government.

However, women's lesser experience in county and local government was confined to appointees in younger age groups (Table 2.8). While women under age forty were only about one-third as likely as younger appointees overall to have served in county or local appointive positions, women age forty or over were equally as likely as their counterparts among all appointees to have held county or local positions. Thus, although older appointees overall less often than younger appointees overall had experience in county or local government, older women more often than younger women had experience in these positions.

Elective Officeholding

In addition to asking about prior experience in appointive and administrative government posts, we asked appointees if they ever had held an elective public office at any level. As Table 2.7 shows, women appointees had less elective officeholding experience than appointees in general. Only about one-tenth of women appointees, compared with one-fifth of appointees overall, had held elective office.

Elective officeholding experience was more common among appointees in Democratic administrations than among appointees in Republican administrations (Table 2.7). Nevertheless, the gap between women appointees and appointees overall was greater among Democratic than Republican appointees, with only half as many women as appointees overall in Democratic administrations having served in elective office.

Few young appointees of either sex had previously held an elective office (Table 2.8). However, among appointees forty years old or older, a much smaller proportion of women than older appointees overall had served in elective office.

Among appointees with elective officeholding experience, women were more likely than appointees overall to have served in county and local offices and were less likely to have served in state legislatures. Among appointees with elective experience, 46.2% of women appointees compared with only 29.2% of appointees overall had held county and local posts; in contrast, only 15.4% of women appointees compared with 37.5% of appointees overall with elective experience had served as state legislators.⁵

JOB PRIOR TO APPOINTMENT

A person's occupation may be an important credential for obtaining an appointment to a gubernatorial administration. Expertise in a particular field, reputation in a policy area, or contacts through one's profession may help an individual be identified as a potential appointee and subsequently be appointed.

We focused our questions about occupational background on each appointee's most recent job. We assumed that, in most cases, this position would be the one that would have had the greatest impact in influencing an appointment.

As Table 2.9 shows, most appointees had held high-level professional positions immediately prior to their appointments. The largest source of employment for appointees overall was the public sector. Women appointees were less likely than appointees overall to have been employed in government positions immediately prior to their appointments; only 48.4% of the women compared with 60.9% of all appointees had last held government jobs.

Women appointees differed from the norm for all appointees in other ways as well (Table 2.9). Larger proportions of women appointees than of appointees overall were last employed as consultants and as professors or administrators in universities. Women appointees were less likely than appointees overall to have been self-employed immediately prior to their gubernatorial appointments.

Despite these differences, however, the types of jobs held by women appointees were very much like those held by state cabinet-level appointees generally. Women appointees resembled appointees overall in the proportions employed as attorneys, county or city government executives, administrators or teachers in elementary and secondary schools, federal government employees, and executives either in the private sector or in public affairs and nonprofit organizations.

TABLE 2.9: WOMEN APPOINTEES WERE LESS LIKELY THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL TO HAVE HELD GOVERNMENT JOBS IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO THEIR APPOINTMENTS

Job Prior to Gubernatorial Appointment	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
	Main Sample		Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Sample %	Women %	Sample %	Women %	Sample %
Government Positions						
Federal government employee ^a	2.7	1.8	5.3	1.7	0.0	1.9
State government employee ^a	17.9	22.8	15.8	22.4	20.0	23.1
State legislator	0.0	0.9	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0
State legislative employee	4.5	0.9	3.5	1.7	5.5	0.0
Governor's campaign or transition staff	4.5	0.9	1.8	0.0	7.3	1.9
County or city government executive	7.2	10.9	8.8	13.0	5.5	9.6
Government employee, ^a level of government not specified	10.7	20.0	10.5	22.4	10.9	17.3
Other government position	0.9	2.7	0.0	1.7	1.8	3.8
Nongovernment Positions						
Executive in private sector/public affairs organization/nonprofit organization/foundation	15.2	11.8	17.5	8.6	12.7	15.4
Attorney	8.9	5.5	10.5	5.2	7.3	5.8
University/college administrator or professor	8.1	1.8	0.0	0.0	16.4	3.8
Noncollege school administrator or teacher	3.6	3.6	3.5	5.2	3.6	1.9
Consultant	5.4	0.9	8.8	0.0	1.8	1.9
Self-employed	0.9	8.2	1.8	6.9	0.0	9.6
Clerical worker/secretary	3.6	0.9	5.3	1.7	1.8	0.0
Other	6.3	6.3	7.0	8.6	5.5	3.8
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(112)	(110)	(57)	(58)	(55)	(52)

^aThese positions generally have a significant level of responsibility and authority.

In general, the differences between women appointees and appointees overall were greater among those in Democratic administrations than among those in Republican administrations. Within Republican administrations, only a slightly smaller proportion of women (51.0%) than appointees generally (57.6%) were last employed in government positions. Within Democratic administrations, in contrast, a much smaller proportion of women (45.7%) than appointees generally (64.6%) had last held government posts. Among those serving under Democratic governors, women were twice as likely as Democratic appointees overall to have last worked in executive positions in the private sector or in public affairs organizations, nonprofit organizations, and foundations. Among those appointed by Republican governors,

TABLE 2.10: A LARGER PROPORTION OF YOUNGER WOMEN THAN OF OLDER WOMEN HAD HELD GOVERNMENT JOBS IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO SERVING AS APPOINTEES

Job Prior to Gubernatorial Appointment	State Cabinet-Level Appointees			
	Under Age 40		Age 40 or Older	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Government Positions				
Federal government employee ^a	5.8	0.0	0.0	2.5
State government employee ^a	19.2	22.6	16.7	22.8
State legislator	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
State legislative employee	7.7	3.2	1.7	0.0
Governor's campaign or transition staff	7.7	3.2	1.7	0.0
County or city government executive	1.9	19.4	11.7	7.6
Government employee, ^a government not specified	9.6	19.4	11.7	20.3
Other government position	1.9	0.0	0.0	3.8
Nongovernment Positions				
Executive in private sector/ public affairs organization/ nonprofit organization/foundation	11.5	16.1	18.3	10.1
Attorney	11.5	6.5	6.7	5.1
University/college administrator or professor	7.7	0.0	8.3	2.5
Noncollege school administrator or teacher	1.9	6.5	5.0	2.5
Consultant	3.8	0.0	6.7	1.3
Self-employed	0.0	0.0	1.7	11.4
Clerical worker/secretary	1.9	0.0	5.0	1.3
Other	7.7	3.2	5.0	7.6
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(52)	(31)	(60)	(79)

^aThese positions generally have a significant level of responsibility and authority.

women were slightly less likely than Republican appointees overall to have served in these executive positions. The most striking difference between women appointees and appointees overall who served in Republican administrations is that one of every six women compared with far fewer Republican appointees overall were last employed as professors or administrators in colleges and universities.

Although we expected to find differences in the employment history of younger women and older women, the occupations of the two groups of women appointees were strikingly similar (Table 2.10). Nevertheless, a few differences did emerge. First, a larger proportion of women appointees under age forty (53.8%) than of women forty or over (43.3%) had held government positions immediately prior to their appointments. However, within each age group, women were less likely than appointees overall to have been last employed in government. A second difference between older and younger women was that a larger proportion of younger women had last worked as attorneys. Finally, women under forty were less likely than older women to have been employed as executives in the private sector or in public affairs organizations, nonprofit organizations, and foundations.

ROLE MODELS AND MENTORS AS CRITICAL INFLUENCES

This chapter has thus far been concerned with assessing the political credentials and prior experience of state cabinet-level appointees. However, the inspiration, encouragement, and assistance of other people also may have affected appointees' motivation for public service and their level of achievement. While previous research on political appointees has not explored the influence of role models and mentors, we thought it might be useful to examine whether particular individuals played critical roles in developing appointees' interest in public service and in helping them gain prerequisite levels of experience and achievement.

Role Models

To ascertain whether appointees had role models, we asked them, "Has there been one political leader whom you particularly admired and whose example inspired you to become active politically?" Slightly less than one-half of female appointees, compared with slightly more than one-half of appointees generally, answered affirmatively (Table 2.11). Among appointees in Democratic administrations, women were similar to appointees overall in the proportion who had role models. Among appointees in Republican administrations, however, women appointees less often than appointees overall had role models.

Among appointees who had role models, more than one-fourth of women appointees, compared with less than one-tenth of all appointees, had women as their role models (Table 2.12). Since men hold the overwhelming majority

TABLE 2.11: WOMEN APPOINTEES WERE SLIGHTLY LESS LIKELY THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL TO HAVE HAD ROLE MODELS

	<u>State Cabinet-Level Appointees</u>					
			<u>Democratic Administrations</u>		<u>Republican Administrations</u>	
	<u>Women</u>	<u>Main Sample</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Main Sample</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Main Sample</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Had a role model ^a	49.1	54.1	52.6	51.7	45.5	56.9
Total	(112)	(109)	(57)	(58)	(55)	(51)

^aThe precise wording of the question officeholders were asked is the following: "Would you say there has been one political leader whom you particularly admired and whose example inspired you to become active politically?"

TABLE 2.12: MORE THAN ONE-FOURTH OF WOMEN APPOINTEES WITH ROLE MODELS HAD WOMEN AS THEIR ROLE MODELS

	<u>State Cabinet-Level Appointees</u>					
			<u>Democratic Administrations</u>		<u>Republican Administrations</u>	
	<u>Women</u>	<u>Main Sample</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Main Sample</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Main Sample</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Had a woman as a role model	27.3	8.5	30.0	13.3	24.0	3.4
Total	(55)	(59)	(30)	(30)	(25)	(29)

of positions in the public sphere, it is striking that women had provided inspiration for so many female appointees.

We also asked appointees with role models to indicate the positions their role models held at the time they provided inspiration. As Table 2.13 shows, the largest proportion of state appointees, although a smaller proportion of women appointees than of appointees overall, reported that their role models had been state or local elected officials. Federal elected officials were the second most important source of role models for appointees, but women also were less likely than state cabinet-level appointees overall to report that their role models had served in elected office at this level. Since one-fourth of women looked to their own sex

TABLE 2.13: AMONG APPOINTEES WITH ROLE MODELS, WOMEN WERE LESS LIKELY THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL TO HAVE HAD ROLE MODELS WHO WERE ELECTED OFFICIALS

Role Model's Position When She/He Served as a Role Model	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
State or local elected official ^a	36.4	42.4	46.7	43.3	24.0	41.4
Federal elected official ^b	16.4	27.1	10.0	30.0	24.0	24.1
State agency or depart- ment official	14.5	5.1	16.7	6.7	12.0	3.4
Federal agency or depart- ment official	1.8	8.5	3.3	0.0	0.0	17.2
Presidential, gubernatorial, or legislative staff member	5.5	1.7	3.3	3.3	8.0	0.0
Judge or attorney	7.3	3.4	6.7	3.3	8.0	3.4
Family member	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0
Other	14.5	11.9	13.3	13.3	16.0	10.3
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(55)	(59)	(30)	(30)	(25)	(29)

^aIncludes governor, lieutenant governor, state senator, state representative, and mayor.

^bIncludes president, vice-president, U.S. senator, and U.S. representative.

for role models, it is not surprising that fewer women than appointees overall reported elected officials as their primary source of inspiration. Prior to the mid-1970s less than 5% of all elected officials were women.⁶

Fewer women had agency or department officials than elected officeholders as their role models. Nevertheless, in contrast to appointees in general, women appointees were much more likely to have had role models who were state agency or department officials than to have had role models who were federal administrators.

The role models of women in Democratic and Republican administrations varied from those of their partisan counterparts. Women in Democratic administrations were much less likely than Democratic appointees overall to have had federal elected officials as role models. This was not true among appointees in Republican administrations, but women in those administrations were notably less likely than Republican appointees overall to have had state and local elected officials as their role models. Women in Republican administrations also differed notably from all appointees in

TABLE 2.14: WOMEN APPOINTEES WERE MORE LIKELY THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL TO HAVE HAD MENTORS

	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Had a mentor ^a	50.9	42.7	50.9	41.4	50.9	44.2
Total	(112)	(110)	(57)	(58)	(55)	(52)

^aThe precise wording of the question officeholders were asked is the following: "Would you say there has been one political leader or activist who has helped your political career along in some significant way?"

TABLE 2.15: ABOUT ONE-SIXTH OF WOMEN APPOINTEES WITH MENTORS HAD WOMEN AS THEIR MENTORS

	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Had a woman as a mentor	17.5	6.5	17.2	8.3	17.9	4.5
Total	(57)	(46)	(29)	(24)	(28)	(22)

those administrations in the proportion who reported that their role models were federal administrators. None of the Republican women, compared with almost one of every five Republican appointees overall, had a role model who was a federal executive official.

Mentors

To determine whether cabinet-level appointees had mentors, we asked them, "Was there one political leader or activist who helped your career along in some significant way?" While as we have discussed, women were slightly less likely than appointees overall to have had role models, women were more likely to have had mentors. One-half of the women, compared with slightly more than two-fifths of all appointees, had mentors (Table 2.14).

Although the majority of appointees with mentors reported that their mentors were male, about one-sixth of women appointees compared with a

small proportion of appointees overall had female mentors (Table 2.15). Again, with the traditional lack of women in positions of influence in politics, the fact that even a few of the female appointees had been aided by women is noteworthy.

Table 2.16 indicates the highest positions which state appointees' mentors had held. Although a majority of women appointees and appointees overall had mentors who were state or local elected officials, women appointees were less likely than appointees overall to have had mentors who held these positions. Women appointees differed little from all appointees in the frequency with which they reported mentors who were federal elected officials, state agency or department officials, or federal agency or department officials.

A sizable number of women, about one-tenth, reported that their mentors had been members of gubernatorial or presidential staffs. This proportion of women was larger than the proportion of appointees overall with presidential or gubernatorial staff members as mentors.

TABLE 2.16: AMONG APPOINTEES WITH MENTORS, WOMEN WERE LESS LIKELY THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL TO HAVE HAD MENTORS WHO WERE ELECTED OFFICIALS

Highest Position Mentor Has Held	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
State or local elected official ^a	50.9	63.0	48.3	60.9	53.6	65.2
Federal elected official ^b	8.8	10.9	3.4	21.7	14.3	0.0
State agency or de- partment official	10.5	8.7	13.8	0.0	7.1	17.4
Federal agency or de- partment official	3.5	0.0	6.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Presidential or guber- natorial staff member	10.5	4.3	10.3	4.3	10.7	4.3
Judge or attorney	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0
Officer of political organization, interest group, union, or lobbying organization	8.8	8.7	10.3	8.7	7.1	8.7
Other	5.3	4.3	6.9	4.3	3.6	4.3
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(57)	(46)	(29)	(23)	(28)	(23)

^aIncludes governor, lieutenant governor, state senator, state representative, and mayor.

^bIncludes U.S. senator and U.S. representative.

In administrations of both parties, the mentors of women differed from those of appointees overall. Women appointed to Democratic administrations were less likely than Democratic appointees overall to have federal, state, or local elected officials as their mentors, but some Democratic women appointees compared with no appointees overall in Democratic administrations had federal or state agency department officials as their mentors. Women appointed to Republican administrations less often than Republican appointees overall had state or local elected officials or state agency officials as their mentors, but about one-seventh of Republican women appointees, compared with no Republican appointees overall, had federal elected officials as their mentors.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Our data clearly demonstrate that women appointees were well qualified to hold cabinet-level positions in state government. Women did not differ greatly from the norm for all appointees in their partisan involvement. Women state appointees were equally as likely as state appointees overall to have held elective or appointive party positions, and they were more likely than appointees overall to have served as delegates to national political party conventions. Proportionately more women than appointees overall had worked for their governors both in primary and general election campaigns. The occupational profiles of female appointees, as measured by the last job held prior to appointment to a gubernatorial administration, were quite similar to those of appointees in general. Although they had less experience in elective office, women were almost as likely as all appointees to have held appointive or administrative positions at the state level and were just as likely to have held federal positions. Only at the local and county levels did women have notably less experience. Since women appointees did not differ greatly from the norm for all appointees on most measures of previous experience, we conclude that governors were able to find qualified women to serve in state administrations.

Our findings also suggest that Republican and Democratic governors may weigh various types of experience differentially in recruiting for their administrations and may evaluate the credentials and experience of potential female appointees somewhat differently from those of potential male appointees.⁷ Although Republican governors were less likely than Democratic governors to recruit people who shared their party identification, being a Republican appears to be more important for a woman than for a man who wants an appointment to a Republican administration. Moreover, involvement in the party seems to have been more important for Republican women than for Republican men. While Republican women were less likely than Republican appointees overall to have appointive or elective office-holding experience, they were more likely to have been active in their

party, to have served in party positions, and to have been delegates to Republican national conventions. Also, women appointed to Republican administrations were more likely to have worked in their governors' election campaigns, particularly in salaried positions. Thus, it appears that Republican governors may have given more weight to party and campaign work when recruiting women than when recruiting men.

Women appointed to cabinet-level positions in Republican administrations, like their male counterparts, most often had held government positions immediately prior to their appointments. However, Republican women appointees were much more likely than their male counterparts to have come from positions in higher education. This finding suggests that, when recruiting women, some Republican governors looked to universities and colleges to find appointees with the requisite substantive expertise or managerial experience.

Women appointed to Democratic administrations, like those appointed to Republican administrations, were more likely than appointees generally to share their governors' party affiliation. However, unlike Republican women, Democratic women serving in Democratic administrations had not been more active in their party than their male counterparts. Thus, the acquisition of party experience, while as common among Democratic women as among Republican women, does not appear to have played a more important role in the appointment of women than of men to Democratic administrations.

Women serving in Democratic administrations differed most from the norm for all appointees in Democratic administrations in their campaign and officeholding experience. Women in Democratic administrations more often had worked in governors' election campaigns. Moreover, while they less often had held elective offices and county or local appointive positions, they more often than Democratic appointees generally had held appointive positions at the federal level. Also, while women in Democratic administrations most often were recruited from positions in government, they were more likely than Democratic appointees overall to have been working as executives in the private sector or in public affairs or non-profit organizations. It appears, then, that Democratic governors may have given greater weight to federal administrative experience, campaign work, and experience in executive positions in business, nonprofit, or public affairs organizations when recruiting women than they did when recruiting men.

Age differences in credentials and experience suggest that different sets of factors may have helped older and younger generations of women appear qualified for appointments. Larger proportions of older women than younger women had demonstrated loyalty, through campaign and party work, and had served in previous appointive administrative and elective posts at

all levels of government. In contrast, larger proportions of younger than older women were last employed in government jobs or as attorneys--positions traditionally viewed as stepping stones to political office. Moreover, as noted in Chapter 1 of this report, younger women were more likely than older women to have Ph.D.s or law degrees. Governors probably found a smaller pool of candidates with outstanding professional credentials among older women; as a result, previous government experience and loyalty factors may have figured more importantly in governors' decisions when older women were considered for appointments. Because younger women had more opportunities than older women to develop strong professional credentials, educational and occupational credentials may have had more of an impact on the appointments of younger women.

While political credentials and prior experience are important in helping to establish an individual as qualified for a political appointment, many other factors undoubtedly affect whether an appointment is offered and accepted. In this chapter, we continue our examination of the recruitment of state cabinet-level appointees by looking beyond background and qualifications to the more immediate factors that may have influenced appointments to state administrations.

We begin the chapter with an investigation of appointees' stated reasons for accepting gubernatorial appointments and their assessments of their relationship with the governor prior to being appointed. We then examine the efforts which individuals and organizations made on appointees' behalf and the efforts which appointees themselves made to secure positions in gubernatorial administrations. Finally, we look at appointees' perceptions of which factors are most important in the appointments process.

REASONS FOR ACCEPTING STATE CABINET-LEVEL APPOINTMENTS

Public officials almost always report that they seek or accept government positions because of a desire to serve the public. In order to gain insight into other reasons why appointees chose to work in gubernatorial administrations, we asked, "Aside from a desire to serve the public, what were the one or two most important reasons you accepted an appointment to the governor's administration?"

Previous research on political elites has suggested that the factors which motivate women's and men's participation in politics may differ. As Edmond Costantini and Kenneth H. Craik noted in their study of political party activists in California, "If the male leader appears to be motivated by self-serving considerations, the female leader appears to be motivated by public-serving considerations."¹

When women appointees in administrations of both parties were examined jointly, we found little support for the notion that men (who constitute 87.3% of the sample of all appointees) might more often be motivated by self-serving considerations and women by public-serving ones (Table 3.1). About one-half of women appointees--only a slightly smaller proportion of women than of appointees generally--gave reasons related to their careers as the one or two most important reasons for accepting an appointment. An almost identical proportion of women appointees--nearly one-half--offered public-serving reasons related to interest in policy issues and interest in state government as most important. Women differed most from appointees overall in the proportion who gave reasons related to the governor or his²

TABLE 3.1: WOMEN APPOINTEES WERE MORE LIKELY THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL TO GIVE A REASON RELATED TO THE GOVERNOR AS THE MOST IMPORTANT REASON FOR ACCEPTING AN APPOINTMENT

Most Important Reason(s) for Accepting Gubernatorial Appointment ^a	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample ^b %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Reason related to career	51.8	58.7	45.6	49.1	58.2	69.2
Reason related to governor ^c	33.9	21.1	36.8	29.8	30.9	11.5
Interest in policy area or issues	25.9	23.9	31.6	24.6	20.0	23.1
Interest in state government	21.4	21.1	24.6	15.8	18.2	26.9
Reason related to personal life	8.0	10.1	5.3	10.5	10.9	9.6
Concern with management	8.0	6.4	5.3	1.8	10.9	11.5
Opportunity for public service	6.3	9.2	7.0	12.3	5.5	5.8
Reason related to women	3.6	0.0	1.8	0.0	5.5	0.0
Opportunity for broadening experience	2.7	1.8	1.8	1.8	3.6	1.9
Other	4.5	1.8	3.5	0.0	5.5	3.8
Total	(112)	(109)	(57)	(57)	(55)	(52)

^aTotal percentages do not add to 100 because each respondent could give one or two reasons.

^b"Main sample" is a systematic sample, consisting of 15% of all people who were serving in state cabinet-level appointive positions in February 1981. The sample represents state cabinet-level appointees overall, including both women and men in proportion to their presence in the population of state appointees.

^cThe category "reason related to governor" includes the following reasons: opportunity to work with the governor in her/his administration; support for the governor's policies; the governor asked respondent to serve; loyalty to or friendship with the governor.

program. About one-third of women, compared with one-fifth of appointees in general, said they accepted appointments largely because of reasons related to the governor or the governor's program. While these reasons clearly were not self-serving, neither were they in all cases public-serving, since many responses reflected personal devotion to the governor rather than consideration for the general public.

An examination of appointees in Democratic and Republican administrations shows that within administrations of each party, women differed from appointees generally in their reasons for accepting appointments. Women in Democratic administrations were only slightly less likely than Democratic appointees overall to point to career-related reasons as most important to

TABLE 3.2: WOMEN APPOINTEES WERE LESS LIKELY THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL TO HAVE BEEN CLOSE PERSONAL FRIENDS OF THE GOVERNOR PRIOR TO THEIR APPOINTMENTS

Relationship with Governor Prior to First Appointment	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Close personal friend	7.3	22.0	8.8	31.0	5.7	11.8
Knew fairly well	30.0	33.0	31.6	27.6	28.3	39.2
Knew slightly	35.5	28.4	38.6	27.6	32.1	29.4
Never met	27.3	16.5	21.1	13.8	34.0	19.6
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(110)	(109)	(57)	(58)	(53)	(51)

their acceptance of appointments. However, the women were notably more likely to cite public-serving reasons related to interest in policy issues and interest in state government. In contrast, women in Republican administrations were less likely than Republican appointees overall to give either career-related reasons or reasons related to issues or state government. A larger proportion of women in Democratic than in Republican administrations gave reasons related to the governor, but the gap between women and appointees overall was larger among those appointed by Republican governors than among those appointed by Democrats. While a reason related to the governor was the second most frequent reason women in Republican administrations gave for accepting their appointments, this reason was only fourth in importance for Republican appointees overall.

Since women were more likely than appointees overall to mention reasons concerning the governor as most important to their acceptance of appointments, the findings presented in Table 3.2 are somewhat surprising. A much smaller proportion of women than of appointees overall had been close personal friends of the governor prior to being appointed to his administration. Less than one-tenth of the women, only about one-third as many women as appointees overall, reported that the governor had been a close personal friend. Women were also less likely than appointees overall to have ever met the governor; more than one-fourth of the women, compared with about one-sixth of appointees generally, had never met the governor before receiving their appointments.

Even among appointees who said they had accepted an appointment largely because of the governor or his program, very few women, compared with a substantial proportion of appointees overall, had been close personal friends

TABLE 3.3: AMONG APPOINTEES WHOSE MOST IMPORTANT REASON FOR ACCEPTING AN APPOINTMENT WAS RELATED TO THE GOVERNOR, WOMEN LESS OFTEN THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL HAD BEEN CLOSE PERSONAL FRIENDS OF THE GOVERNOR

Relationship with Governor Prior to First Appointment	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
	Main Sample		Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Close personal friend	7.9	43.5	9.5	47.1	5.9	33.3
Knew fairly well	36.8	30.4	38.1	29.4	35.3	33.3
Knew slightly	36.8	21.7	42.9	17.6	29.4	33.3
Never met	18.4	4.3	9.5	5.9	29.4	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(38)	(23)	(21)	(17)	(17)	(6)

of the governor prior to their appointments (Table 3.3). Among appointees in Democratic gubernatorial administrations who accepted their appointments largely for reasons related to the governor, only one-tenth of women appointees compared with almost one-half of appointees overall described themselves as close personal friends of the governor. Similarly, women appointees in Republican administrations were much less likely than Republican appointees overall to have been close personal friends of the governor. Remarkably, of the women appointed to Republican administrations who named the governor or his policies as most important to their acceptance of an appointment, almost one-third had never met him. Thus, women appointees who mentioned the governor or his program as one of the most important reasons for accepting their appointments seldom did so because of personal friendships with the governor.

PERSON MOST INFLUENTIAL IN BRINGING ABOUT RESPONDENTS' APPOINTMENTS

The majority of state appointees, 88.4% of women appointees and 90.0% of appointees overall, claimed they were appointed by the governor, but much smaller proportions named the governor as the person most influential in obtaining their appointments (Table 3.4). Proportionately fewer women than appointees overall viewed the governor as having had the greatest impact in bringing about their appointments; about one-third of the women compared with about two-fifths of appointees overall named the governor as most influential. In contrast, a larger proportion of women appointees than of all appointees mentioned gubernatorial staff members as most

TABLE 3.4: WOMEN APPOINTEES LESS OFTEN THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL CITED THE GOVERNOR AS THE PERSON MOST INFLUENTIAL IN BRINGING ABOUT THEIR APPOINTMENTS

Title of Person Most Influential in Bringing About Respondent's Appointment	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Governor	32.7	41.0	34.0	42.6	31.5	39.1
Gubernatorial staff member	21.5	13.0	20.8	14.8	22.2	10.9
Director of state department	9.3	14.0	11.3	13.0	7.4	15.2
State legislator	6.5	4.0	7.5	3.7	5.6	4.3
Chair/member of state board or commission	1.9	5.0	1.9	3.7	1.9	6.5
County or city official	3.7	2.0	3.8	1.9	3.7	2.2
Federal legislator	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0
Other government administrator	2.8	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	6.5
University professor/administrator	1.9	1.0	1.9	1.9	1.9	0.0
Political party/campaign official/activist	3.7	4.0	3.8	1.9	3.7	6.5
Private sector executive/attorney	4.7	10.0	5.7	13.0	3.7	6.5
Editor or journalist	0.9	1.0	0.0	1.9	1.9	0.0
Other	8.4	2.0	9.4	1.9	7.4	2.2
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(107)	(100)	(53)	(54)	(54)	(46)

influential in their appointments. These differences between women appointees and appointees overall probably result from differences in prior relationships with the governor. Women, who were not as well known to the governor, may more often have come to the attention of the governor through the efforts of staff members.

A somewhat smaller proportion of women appointees than of all appointees named directors of state government departments as most influential in bringing about their appointments. Among those appointed to Republican administrations, women were only half as likely as appointees overall to identify a department director as most influential. However, among those serving in Democratic administrations, similar proportions of women and appointees overall named department directors as most important.

We asked appointees about the sex as well as the title of the people who they considered had been most important in helping them receive appointments (Table 3.5). Women appointees were more likely than appointees

TABLE 3.5: WOMEN APPOINTEES WERE MORE LIKELY THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL TO NAME A WOMAN AS THE PERSON MOST INFLUENTIAL IN BRINGING ABOUT THEIR APPOINTMENTS

	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Named a woman as the person most influential in bringing about appointment	9.4	5.0	11.5	3.7	7.4	6.4
Total	(106)	(101)	(52)	(54)	(54)	(47)

TABLE 3.6: FEW APPOINTEES REPORTED THAT AN ORGANIZATION HAD ASSISTED THEM IN OBTAINING APPOINTMENTS

	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Received direct or indirect assistance from an organization	22.5	18.3	21.4	15.5	23.6	21.6
Total	(111)	(109)	(56)	(58)	(55)	(51)

overall to name another woman as the person most responsible; almost one-tenth of the women said another woman was influential in their appointments. Among appointees in Democratic administrations, women were three times more likely than appointees overall to have been aided by women, but women in Republican administrations were not assisted by women more often than were Republican appointees overall.

ORGANIZATIONAL ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING APPOINTMENTS

In addition to examining which individuals were most influential in bringing about appointees' positions, we wanted to determine whether particular organizations were viewed as having played a critical role. As Table 3.6 demonstrates, few appointees viewed the efforts of organizations

as important in the appointments process. However, a slightly larger proportion of women appointees than of appointees overall reported that an organization other than a political party had assisted them directly or indirectly in obtaining an appointment to a gubernatorial administration.

Among those appointees who had received organizational assistance, 29.2% of the women, compared with none of the sample of all appointees, reported that women's organizations had assisted them. Of the women in Republican administrations who received organizational assistance, 38.5% had received assistance from women's organizations; of the women in Democratic administrations who received organizational support, a smaller proportion, 18.2%, reported women's organizations as having been helpful.³

Groups clearly related to appointees' previous employment, excluding women's groups, less often played a role for women appointees than for appointees overall. Among appointees who received organizational assistance, 37.5% of women appointees compared with 70.0% of all appointees reported that they were assisted by organizations clearly related to their last jobs.⁴ These differences between women appointees and appointees overall were even larger among appointees in Democratic administrations.⁵

These findings suggest that employment networks were less important in helping women to obtain appointments than they were in helping appointees in general. However, women's relative lack of assistance from

TABLE 3.7: A LARGER PROPORTION OF WOMEN APPOINTEES THAN OF APPOINTEES OVERALL HAD MADE SOME EFFORT TO OBTAIN THEIR APPOINTMENTS

Level of Involvement of Respondent in Pursuing an Appointment	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
	Main Sample		Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Made no effort and had to be convinced to accept an appointment	14.7	26.4	16.1	24.1	13.2	28.8
Made no effort but was receptive to the idea of serving	44.0	38.2	42.9	44.8	45.3	30.8
Made some effort but did not actively pursue an appointment	22.9	20.9	26.8	19.0	18.9	23.1
Actively sought an appointment	18.3	14.5	14.3	12.1	22.6	17.3
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(109)	(110)	(56)	(58)	(53)	(52)

organizations connected to previous employment was compensated for, in part, by the support women received from women's organizations.

APPOINTEES' EFFORTS ON THEIR OWN BEHALF

We also asked appointees about the efforts they had made on their own behalf to secure state cabinet-level appointments. As Table 3.7 shows, a larger proportion of women than of appointees overall had exerted some effort to obtain their appointments; more than two-fifths of the women, compared with about one-third of all appointees, either had made some effort or had actively sought their appointments. A notably smaller proportion of women appointees than of appointees overall had needed to be persuaded to accept positions. In administrations of both parties, women appointees had made greater efforts on their own behalf than had appointees overall.

MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR LEADING TO APPOINTMENT

In addition to asking appointees about the individuals and organizations that helped them to obtain their positions, we asked each respondent

TABLE 3.8: LARGE MAJORITIES OF WOMEN APPOINTEES AND APPOINTEES OVERALL VIEWED THEIR PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS AND REPUTATION AS THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR THAT LED TO THEIR APPOINTMENTS

Most Important Factor Leading to Appointment	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Professional qualifications/reputation	65.2	73.6	70.3	74.1	60.0	73.1
Sex-related factor	7.1	1.8	3.5	0.0	10.9	3.8
Relationship with governor/support of governor's policies	7.1	2.7	7.0	1.7	7.3	3.8
Professional or personal contacts	4.5	7.3	3.5	6.9	5.5	7.7
Former officeholding experience	2.7	2.7	1.8	5.2	3.6	0.0
Party activism	1.8	0.9	1.8	1.7	1.8	0.0
Campaign or transition work for governor	1.8	2.7	1.8	3.4	1.8	1.9
Being the right person at the right place at the right time	2.7	0.9	1.8	1.7	3.6	0.0
Other	7.1	7.3	8.8	5.2	5.5	9.6
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(112)	(110)	(57)	(58)	(55)	(52)

to indicate the single most important factor that led to her or his appointment (Table 3.8). Large majorities of appointees, but a smaller proportion of women appointees than of appointees generally, viewed their professional qualifications and reputation as most important. Women appointees in Republican administrations were less likely than either women appointees in Democratic administrations or Republican appointees overall to rate their professional qualifications and reputations as critical to receiving their appointments.

No factor other than professional qualifications and reputation was cited by more than a handful of respondents. A small proportion of women appointees, less than one-tenth, did report factors related to being a woman as most important. Women in Republican administrations more often than those in Democratic administrations said that their sex was the single most important factor leading to their appointments.

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF VARIOUS FACTORS IN INFLUENCING APPOINTMENT

In addition to asking about the single factor most important to their appointments, we asked appointees to assess the importance of a large array of factors that we thought might be critical. Appointees were asked to indicate whether each factor was very, somewhat, slightly, or not at all important in influencing their appointments. Table 3.9 presents the proportions of respondents who reported that each factor was "very important."

The largest proportions of both women appointees and appointees overall reported that managerial abilities, professional credentials, work in last job, technical expertise, and occupational or professional contacts were very important. With the exception of occupational or professional contacts, which were rated as very important by almost one-half of the women, each of these factors was rated as very important by a majority of both women state appointees and state appointees in general.

Nevertheless, on many of these factors that a majority of appointees viewed as "very important," women's ratings differed from those of appointees overall. Women were considerably less likely than appointees overall to evaluate managerial abilities as critical to their appointments. This finding might be due to the fact that women traditionally have had few opportunities to function as managers and develop their managerial abilities. Women less often reported that technical expertise was a very important factor, perhaps because they believed they lacked such expertise or perhaps because they more often had appointments that require less technical proficiency. Women also were somewhat less likely than appointees overall to evaluate their work in their last job and their professional contacts as very important.

TABLE 3.9: THE LARGEST PROPORTIONS OF WOMEN APPOINTEES AND APPOINTEES OVERALL RATED THE SAME FIVE FACTORS AS VERY IMPORTANT

Rated Very Important in Obtaining Appointment	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Managerial abilities	58.0	70.9	59.6	72.4	56.4	69.2
Professional credentials	58.0	56.4	66.7	53.4	49.1	59.6
Work in last job	57.1	64.5	57.9	62.1	56.4	67.3
Technical expertise	54.5	65.5	61.4	62.1	47.3	69.2
Occupational or pro- fessional contacts	46.4	51.8	49.1	56.9	43.6	46.2
Contacts with governor's close associates	40.2	37.3	38.6	39.7	41.8	34.6
Former officeholding experience	36.6	47.3	29.8	50.0	43.6	44.2
Political party activities	12.5	3.6	17.5	6.9	7.3	0.0
Campaign work for governor	8.9	7.3	10.5	5.2	7.3	9.6
Activity of organizations on appointee's behalf	6.3	9.1	7.0	10.3	5.5	7.7
Activity of state and national party leaders on appointee's behalf	8.3	2.7	10.5	5.2	5.5	0.0
College contacts	4.5	4.5	3.5	6.9	5.5	1.9
Total	(112)	(110)	(57)	(58)	(55)	(52)

Differences between women appointees and appointees overall also appeared on factors other than the five ranked as very important by a majority of appointees (Table 3.9). More than one-third of women appointees evaluated contacts with the governor's close associates and former officeholding experience as very important in influencing their appointments. Women were slightly more likely than appointees overall to view contacts with governor's close associates as important, but women were somewhat less likely to view former officeholding experience as important, probably because they had less often served in elective or appointive positions (see Chapter 2, Table 2.7). Party activities were rated as very important by much smaller proportions of women appointees and appointees overall, but nevertheless, women more often than appointees overall thought their party involvement had had an important effect on their appointments.

The top five factors rated as very important by appointees overall--managerial abilities, professional credentials, work in last job, technical expertise, and occupational or professional contacts--were also the factors

that women appointed to Democratic administrations most often evaluated as very important. Democratic women resembled Democratic appointees overall in most often evaluating these five factors as critical. Women in Democratic administrations were in fact notably more likely than Democratic appointees overall to evaluate their professional credentials as very important; however, they were notably less likely than Democratic appointees overall to rate managerial abilities as very important. In another difference between women and appointees in general in Democratic administrations, women were notably less likely than appointees overall to rate former officeholding experience as very important.

Women appointed to Republican administrations were less likely than women in Democratic administrations to attach importance to several of the top five factors, notably professional credentials, technical expertise, and occupational or professional contacts. Also, smaller proportions of women in Republican administrations than Republican appointees overall rated the top five factors--managerial abilities, professional credentials, work in last job, technical expertise, and occupational or professional contacts--as very important. However, equal or larger proportions of Republican women than Republican appointees overall viewed contacts with the governor's associates and former officeholding as critical to obtaining their appointments.

There was another notable difference between women appointees and appointees in general in administrations of both parties. Women serving under governors of both parties more often than their partisan counterparts evaluated political party activities as very important (Table 3.9).

GENERAL PERCEPTIONS OF FACTORS INFLUENCING THE APPOINTMENTS PROCESS

As another means of determining the important factors in the recruitment of state appointees, we read appointees a list of statements that people have made about the gubernatorial appointments process. We asked them to tell us, based on their observations and experiences, whether each statement was generally true, sometimes true, or hardly ever true. The results are presented in Table 3.10. To put these results in a broader context, we have included the views of several current and former governors as expressed in Reflections on Being Governor.⁶

Loyalty

Former Governor Jerry Apodaca of New Mexico:

You can't overemphasize the importance of having the right person [in the cabinet] to begin with because so much depends on trust and loyalty.... Loyalty is a very important ingredient, but it shouldn't be blind loyalty. Loyalty is also the ability to look the Governor right in the eye and say, "Look, that's the wrong thing to do for these reasons." If this loyalty exists between the Governor and the cabinet officer or

TABLE 3.10: WOMEN APPOINTEES DIFFERED FROM APPOINTEES OVERALL IN THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE THE APPOINTMENT PROCESS

Factors Influencing Appointment Process	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
	Main Sample		Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Loyalty to the governor is critical to being selected for a major appointment						
Generally true	73.6	68.2	73.2	72.4	74.1	63.5
Sometimes true	20.9	28.2	21.4	25.9	20.4	30.8
Hardly ever true	5.5	3.6	5.4	1.7	5.6	5.8
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(110)	(110)	(56)	(58)	(54)	(52)
Managerial experience is critical to being selected for a major appointment						
Generally true	50.0	60.9	49.1	63.8	50.9	57.7
Sometimes true	36.6	37.3	33.3	34.5	40.0	40.4
Hardly ever true	13.4	1.8	17.5	1.7	9.1	1.9
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(112)	(110)	(57)	(58)	(55)	(52)
Having technical expertise in a relevant policy area is critical to being selected for a major appointment						
Generally true	35.5	52.3	40.0	63.8	30.9	39.2
Sometimes true	59.1	44.0	52.7	34.5	65.5	54.9
Hardly ever true	5.5	3.7	7.3	1.7	3.6	5.9
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(110)	(109)	(55)	(58)	(55)	(51)
Holding an important position on a winning gubernatorial campaign staff guarantees a gubernatorial appointment						
Generally true	17.0	20.4	14.0	22.4	20.0	18.0
Sometimes true	61.6	52.8	61.4	50.0	61.8	56.0
Hardly ever true	21.4	26.9	24.6	27.6	18.2	26.0
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(112)	(108)	(57)	(58)	(55)	(50)

TABLE 3.10 (Continued)

Factors Influencing Appointment Process	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women <u>2</u>	Main Sample <u>2</u>	Women <u>2</u>	Main Sample <u>2</u>	Women <u>2</u>	Main Sample <u>2</u>
Gubernatorial appointments are more likely to be decided on the basis of "who you know" rather than "what you know"						
Generally true	16.4	13.9	14.5	17.2	18.2	10.0
Sometimes true	57.3	40.7	56.4	43.1	58.2	38.0
Hardly ever true	26.4	45.4	29.1	39.7	23.6	52.0
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(110)	(108)	(55)	(58)	(55)	(50)
Being viewed as a representative of a special constituency is critical to being selected for a major appointment						
Generally true	12.6	11.2	12.3	15.8	13.0	6.0
Sometimes true	55.9	57.0	59.6	50.9	51.9	64.0
Hardly ever true	31.5	31.8	28.1	33.3	35.2	30.0
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(111)	(107)	(57)	(57)	(54)	(50)
Given two people with equal qualifications, a woman is more likely to receive an appointment than a man						
Generally true	7.5	19.6	5.5	19.6	9.6	19.6
Sometimes true	27.1	45.4	25.5	43.1	28.8	47.8
Hardly ever true	65.4	35.1	69.1	37.3	61.5	32.6
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(107)	(97)	(55)	(51)	(52)	(46)

whoever the decision maker is, then there is probably more said there than whether the information is correct or not.⁷

We asked appointees to respond to the statement, "Loyalty to the governor is critical to being selected for a major appointment." Most appointees viewed loyalty as important. Similar proportions of both women appointees and appointees in general--at least two-thirds--evaluated this

statement as generally true (Table 3.10). Women appointed to Democratic administrations were as likely as Democratic appointees overall to view loyalty as critical to being selected for an appointment. While women in Republican administrations were about as likely as Democratic women to evaluate the statement on loyalty as generally true, they were notably more likely than Republican appointees overall to do so.

Managerial Experience

Governor Michael S. Dukakis of Massachusetts:

Well, more and more, all of us are looking for good managers. Now I don't say that in a kind of sterile, businesslike, machine-efficiency sense. Obviously, in the public sector you are looking for people who can manage well and also have a commitment to policy and issues, and a sensitivity to people and constituencies and legislatures. But there isn't any question--and I'm sure I'm not the only Governor to say this--that these days you need good managers. You just cannot survive, in this world with Proposition 13 fever and fiscal constraints and all these things, with people who are great policy makers but can't run the corner store.⁸

We asked appointees to respond to the statement: "Managerial experience is critical to being selected for a major appointment." Women appointees attached less importance to managerial experience than did appointees generally (Table 3.10). One-half of women appointees, compared with three-fifths of all appointees, viewed the statement on managerial experience as generally true. More than one-tenth of women appointees, but almost no one among appointees generally, claimed that the statement was hardly ever true. About one-half of women in administrations of both parties viewed managerial experience as critical; these proportions are smaller--especially among appointees in Democratic administrations--than the proportions of appointees overall in administrations of both parties who thought that managerial experience was critical.

Technical Expertise

Former Governor Reubin O'D. Askew of Florida:

Well, first of all you are interested in a person of integrity and a person of professional competence in the particular field that you are putting him in, if any is required specifically.... So I guess as much as anything, I really looked for people who I felt were committed to the substantive area of their charge.⁹

Slightly more than one-third of women appointees, compared with more than one-half of appointees in general, viewed the following statement as generally true: "Having technical expertise in a relevant policy area is critical to being selected for a major appointment." A majority of women, but less than one-half of all appointees, felt this statement was sometimes true. Women appointed to Democratic administrations more often than women appointed to Republican administrations viewed technical expertise as

critical, but the gap between women and appointees overall was larger among those in Democratic administrations than among those in Republican administrations.

Campaign Experience

Former Governor James B. Edwards of South Carolina:

The people who get you elected to office, particularly to the governorship, are not necessarily good people to run the government after you're elected. One reason is they are too partisan.¹⁰

Former Governor Dan Walker of Illinois:

The first year, when you're coming in, you desperately need people who know you and whom you know. If you bring in a bunch of strangers at that point, it's going to be very, very difficult. So, maybe it's best to take people from the campaign or the world that you've lived in before for the first year or so, and then gradually bring in other people to get the benefit of a change.¹¹

Women appointees and appointees overall gave fairly similar responses to the statement: "Holding an important position on a winning gubernatorial campaign staff guarantees a gubernatorial appointment" (Table 3.10). The responses of appointees seem to reflect the disagreement in the comments of Governors Edwards and Walker since more than one-half of appointees thought that the statement was "sometimes true." More appointees perceived the statement to be "hardly ever true" than to be "generally true."

Contacts

We asked appointees their opinions of the following statement: "Gubernatorial appointments are more likely to be decided on the basis of 'who you know' rather than 'what you know.'" Less than one-sixth of appointees overall thought this statement was "generally true" (Table 3.10). However, women clearly differed from appointees in general in their evaluation of the importance of "contacts." More than one-half of all women claimed the statement was "sometimes true"--more than double the proportion who thought it was "hardly ever true." In contrast, among appointees in general, more viewed the statement as "hardly ever true" than as "sometimes true." Women serving in Democratic administrations did not differ much in their response from women serving in Republican administrations; however, the gap in perceptions between women and appointees overall was greater among those serving in Republican administrations than among those serving in Democratic administrations.

Representatives of Special Constituencies

Women appointees were very similar to appointees overall in their evaluations of the statement: "Being viewed as a representative of a special constituency is critical to being selected for a major appointment." A majority of appointees thought this statement was "sometimes true," and more felt that the statement was "hardly ever true" than thought that it was "generally true" (Table 3.10).

Being a Woman

Women appointees differed notably from appointees overall in their responses to the statement: "Given two people with equal qualifications, a woman is more likely to receive an appointment than a man" (Table 3.10). Women appointees overwhelmingly declared that this statement had little validity; two-thirds said it was "hardly ever true." Among appointees overall, however, two-thirds viewed this statement as "generally true" or "sometimes true." Women serving under Democratic governors were slightly more likely than women serving under Republican governors to claim that the statement was "hardly ever true." However, in administrations of both parties, women differed significantly from appointees overall in their assessments of the role of gender in the appointments process.

AGE DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS OF FACTORS INFLUENCING APPOINTMENTS

In Chapter 2 of our report, we concluded that various credentials and experiences appear to carry different weights for younger and older women. Specifically, professional credentials appeared to play more of a role in the appointments of younger women while previous government experience and loyalty appeared to be more important in the appointments of older women. In this section we examine whether younger and older women in fact had different perceptions of the impact of these factors on their appointments.

Younger women's and older women's evaluations of the most important factor leading to their appointments were very similar. Professional qualifications and reputation were reported as most important by so many appointees that there was little variance between the age groups. Among women under age forty, 65.4% cited their professional qualifications and reputation as the factor of greatest importance; among women forty or older, an identical proportion--65%--listed this factor as most influential. Despite the similarity in the proportions citing their professional credentials, however, older women were slightly more likely to emphasize being a woman and their support of the governor or his policies. Ten percent of women forty or older, but only 3.8% of women under forty, cited each of these as the factor most important to their appointments.

While older and younger women resembled each other in their assessments of the most important factor which led to their appointments, they differed in their evaluations of the impact of a variety of specific influences on their appointments (Table 3.11). The most striking difference between younger and older women was the differential importance of their work in their last job. More than two-thirds of women appointees under age forty, compared with less than one-half of those age forty or over, viewed their work in their last job as critical to obtaining their appointments. This difference probably stems from the fact that a larger

TABLE 3.11: YOUNGER WOMEN WERE MORE LIKELY THAN OLDER WOMEN TO RATE THEIR WORK IN THEIR LAST JOBS AS VERY IMPORTANT TO OBTAINING THEIR APPOINTMENTS

Rated Very Important in Obtaining Appointment	State Cabinet-Level Appointees			
	Under Age 40		Age 40 or Older	
	Women	Main Sample	Women	Main Sample
Managerial abilities	51.9	61.3	63.3	74.7
Professional credentials	50.0	38.7	65.0	63.3
Work in last job	69.2	61.3	46.7	65.8
Technical expertise	46.2	54.8	61.7	69.6
Occupational or professional contacts	38.5	54.8	53.3	50.6
Contacts with governor's close associates	44.2	61.3	36.7	27.8
Former officeholding experience	32.7	35.5	40.0	51.9
Political party activities	3.8	3.2	20.0	3.8
Campaign work for governor	9.6	19.4	8.3	2.5
Activity of organizations on appointee's behalf	7.7	6.5	5.0	10.1
Activity of state and national party leaders on appointee's behalf	5.8	0.0	10.0	3.8
College contacts	0.0	0.0	8.3	6.3
Total	(52)	(31)	(60)	(79)

proportion of younger women were employed in government or law jobs immediately prior to their appointments (see Chapter 2, Table 2.10), positions which traditionally have been stepping stones to public office.

The perceived importance of professional credentials in affecting younger women's appointments is also reflected in differences between younger women and younger appointees overall. Younger women were more likely than younger appointees overall to rate both work in their last job and professional credentials as very important in obtaining their appointments. At the same time, they were less likely than younger appointees overall to attach importance to other factors such as occupational or professional contacts, contacts with the governor's associates, managerial abilities, and campaign work for the governor.

In contrast to the pattern for younger women, older women appointees attached importance to a variety of factors, with no one single factor standing out as more critical than others. Older women were more likely

TABLE 3.12: OLDER WOMEN WERE MORE LIKELY THAN YOUNGER WOMEN TO VIEW LOYALTY TO THE GOVERNOR AS CRITICAL TO SELECTION FOR A MAJOR APPOINTMENT

	State Cabinet-Level Appointees			
	Under Age 40		Age 40 or Older	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Loyalty to the governor is critical to being selected for a major appointment				
Generally true	68.6	74.2	78.0	65.8
Sometimes true	23.5	22.6	18.6	30.4
Hardly ever true	7.8	3.2	3.4	3.8
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(51)	(31)	(59)	(79)

than younger women to rate managerial abilities, professional credentials, and technical expertise as very important in obtaining their appointments, but these differences between older and younger women also occurred among older and younger appointees generally.

For two factors, age differences were apparent only among women. Older women were more than four times as likely as younger women to evaluate their political party activities as having been critical; they were also more likely to attach importance to the efforts party leaders had made on their behalf. Differences in evaluations of these party-related factors did not occur among younger and older appointees generally.

Consistent with our conclusion in Chapter 2 that governors seemed to place greater emphasis on loyalty factors in selecting older women as appointees, older women were more likely than younger women to view the following statement as generally true: "Loyalty to the governor is critical to being selected for a major appointment" (Table 3.12). Also, a larger proportion of older women than of older appointees overall thought this statement was generally true.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The process of recruitment to cabinet-level positions in state government was in some ways quite similar and in other ways notably different for women appointees and appointees overall. The pattern of similarities and differences was evident in the reasons women appointees and appointees

overall gave for accepting their positions and in the factors they cited as critical to obtaining appointments. Differences between women in Democratic and Republican administrations and between older and younger women also surfaced.

The most striking similarity between women state cabinet-level appointees and appointees overall was the importance in the appointments process of occupation-related factors, including career aspirations, substantive expertise, and professional experience. A majority of both women appointees and appointees overall cited reasons related to their careers as the most important reason for having accepted their appointments. Well over one-half of women appointees, like appointees in general, said that their professional qualifications and reputations were the single most important factors leading to their appointments. Also, for women appointees and all appointees alike, the same five factors--managerial abilities, professional credentials, work in last job, technical expertise, and occupational or professional contacts--came out on top in response to a question about the importance of a whole variety of factors.

Within the context of the weight accorded to professional qualifications, however, women differed in some significant ways from appointees overall. A smaller proportion of women than of all appointees, particularly among those in Republican administrations, pointed to their professional qualifications and reputations as the most important factor that led to their appointment. Also, although majorities or near majorities of women and appointees overall mentioned the same five factors from among several factors as very important to obtaining their appointments, smaller proportions of women than of all appointees viewed these top five factors, except for professional credentials, as very important.

Differences in the importance accorded to professional expertise were also evident between women in Democratic and Republican administrations and between younger and older women. Democratic women were more likely than Republican women to attach importance to professional credentials, technical expertise, and professional contacts. Professional credentials and technical expertise emerged as the top two factors for Democratic women, while work in previous jobs and managerial abilities were the top two factors for Republican women. Work in previous jobs was also viewed as very important by over two-thirds of the women under age forty compared to a much smaller proportion, less than one-half, of women age forty or older. Also, while older women were about equally as likely as older appointees overall to rate professional credentials as very important, younger women were notably more likely than younger appointees overall to do so. These differences between younger and older women suggest that younger women in particular viewed their professional work as critical to their appointments.

Consistent with the finding that women less often than appointees overall thought that their professional backgrounds had been instrumental in leading to their appointments, women more often than appointees overall mentioned other factors as having been important. Not surprisingly, women appointees more often than appointees overall said that their sex was the most important factor leading to their appointments. This difference was especially pronounced among appointees in Republican administrations. Nonetheless, in administrations of both parties, only small proportions of women cited being a woman as the most important factor.

Women were also much more likely than appointees overall to report that their party activities were very important to their appointments. Party involvement was especially important for older women appointees. One-fifth of women age forty or older--more than four times the proportion of older appointees overall--rated their political party activities as very important in obtaining their appointments.

The governor, the governor's associates, and the governor's policies also appeared to play a different role in the appointments of women than in the appointments of appointees in general. Support for the governor or his program was the second most frequent reason women gave for accepting their appointments; one-third of the women compared with one-fifth of all appointees gave this reason. However, since women were less likely to have known the governor prior to accepting a cabinet position, women's acceptance of appointments does not appear to have been rooted in close personal friendships with the governor.

Differences between women and appointees overall in their prior relationship with the governor also were evident in their responses to the question of who had been most influential in bringing about their appointment. Both women appointees and appointees overall were most likely to name the governor as most influential; however, women less often than appointees overall mentioned the governor and more often than appointees overall named gubernatorial staff members.

Women were also slightly more likely than appointees overall to evaluate their contacts with the governor's close associates as having been very important to obtaining their appointments. However, this difference between women and appointees overall was restricted to appointees in Republican administrations and older appointees.

Our data also suggest that some women within gubernatorial administrations were particularly critical in helping other women gain appointments. Female appointees were much more likely than appointees overall to name another woman as the individual most influential in bringing about an appointment. Women appointed to Democratic administrations were particularly likely to have received support from women.

The pattern of women supporting other women also was evident in organizational support. Among women who received critical assistance from organizations, about three-tenths cited the support of women's organizations. A larger proportion of women appointed to Republican administrations than of women appointed to Democratic administrations received assistance from women's organizations.

Women also differed notably from appointees in general in another aspect of organizational support. Women were less likely than appointees overall to have been assisted by organizations related to their last jobs. This finding suggests that employment networks were less helpful for women than for appointees generally.

Women differed from all appointees in the effort they made on their own behalf to secure appointments, with women appearing to have made greater efforts. A smaller proportion of women than of appointees overall reported they had made no effort to receive an appointment and had needed to be persuaded to accept the position; more women than appointees overall claimed that they had actively sought an appointment or at least had made some effort. Women appointees serving under Republican governors more often had actively sought an appointment than had those serving under Democratic governors.

Many of these differences between women appointees and appointees overall were reflected in their evaluations of how well several general statements characterize the appointments process in general. A larger proportion of women appointees than of all appointees believed that contacts play a role in the appointments process while a smaller proportion of women than of all appointees perceived that managerial experience and technical expertise are critical. Women appointees in Democratic administrations were more likely to view technical expertise as critical than were women in Republican administrations. Consistent with the conclusion drawn in Chapter 2 that loyalty factors seem more important when older women are considered for appointments, older women more often than younger women viewed as generally true the statement that loyalty to the governor is critical to selection for a major appointment.

The greatest difference between women and all appointees emerged in response to the statement: "Given two people with equal qualifications, a woman is more likely to receive an appointment than a man." A much smaller proportion of women state cabinet-level appointees than appointees overall thought this statement was sometimes or generally true. Apparently, women far less often than their male counterparts think that women receive special consideration in the appointments process.

Historically, many feminists have argued that the increased involvement of women in the governance of society, whether as citizens or as leaders, would result in changes in public policy.¹ These changes would come about because the socialization, social roles, and experiences of women differ in important ways from those of men. As a result, according to this argument, women's and men's perceptions and attitudes often are not the same.

Did the political views of women state cabinet-level appointees differ from those of appointees in general? This section of our report will examine appointees' perceptions of sex differences in political opportunities and job performance, their issue orientations, and their activities in support of other women. We will attempt to determine whether a distinctive woman's perspective was evident among women who received appointments to gubernatorial administrations.

PERCEPTIONS OF SEX DIFFERENCES IN POLITICAL OPPORTUNITIES AND JOB PERFORMANCE

We asked state appointees four questions designed to measure their perceptions of women's access to positions of public leadership and their capabilities when occupying such positions. Two of these questions focused on political opportunities for women while the other two dealt with women's performance on the job (Table 4.1). Differences between women appointees and appointees generally were apparent on all four questions.

A larger proportion of women than of appointees overall saw political opportunities for women as severely constricted. Two-thirds of the women, but less than one-half of appointees generally, disagreed with the statement that "women have just as much opportunity as men to become political leaders."

Those responsible for making appointments often argue that they have difficulty finding qualified women, and a majority of women state cabinet-level appointees and all appointees believed that identifying women who are qualified for high-level appointments is more difficult than identifying qualified men. However, a slightly larger proportion of the women than of appointees overall--more than one-third--thought that finding qualified women was less difficult. Women in Democratic administrations were especially likely to believe that identifying qualified women was an easier task than finding qualified men. Democratic women far more often than either Democratic appointees overall or Republican women expressed this view.

TABLE 4.1: WOMEN APPOINTEES DIFFERED SOMEWHAT FROM APPOINTEES OVERALL IN THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF WOMEN'S POLITICAL OPPORTUNITIES AND CAPABILITIES

Perceptions of Political Opportunity ^a	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women	Main Sample ^b	Women	Main Sample	Women	Main Sample
Women and men have equal opportunity to become political leaders						
Agree strongly	17.9	29.4	15.8	29.3	20.0	29.4
Agree mildly	15.2	24.8	17.5	24.1	12.7	25.5
Disagree mildly	28.6	32.1	28.1	27.6	29.1	37.3
Disagree strongly	38.4	13.8	38.6	19.0	38.2	7.8
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(112)	(109)	(57)	(58)	(55)	(51)
Identifying qualified women for appointive positions is more difficult, less difficult, or the same as identifying qualified men						
More difficult	62.5	67.0	52.6	63.2	72.7	71.2
Same	0.9	3.7	0.0	5.3	1.8	1.9
Less difficult	36.6	29.4	47.4	31.6	25.5	26.9
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(112)	(109)	(57)	(57)	(55)	(52)
Perceptions of Job- Related Performance ^a						
Men make better managers than women						
Agree strongly	1.8	5.6	3.5	3.5	0.0	7.8
Agree mildly	7.1	13.0	7.0	14.0	7.3	11.8
Disagree mildly	17.9	28.7	14.0	29.8	21.8	27.5
Disagree strongly	73.2	52.8	75.4	52.6	70.9	52.9
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(112)	(108)	(57)	(57)	(55)	(51)
Women in office devote more, less, or the same amount of time to the job as men do						
More	60.7	36.4	63.2	31.6	58.2	42.0
Less	1.8	4.7	1.8	5.3	1.8	4.0
Same	37.5	58.9	35.1	63.2	40.0	54.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(112)	(107)	(57)	(57)	(55)	(50)

^aFor precise wording of questions, see NOTES, Chapter 4, Note 8, at end of report.

^b"Main sample" is a systematic sample, consisting of 15% of all people who were serving in state cabinet-level appointed positions in February 1981. The sample represents state cabinet-level appointees overall, including both women and men in proportion to their presence in the population of state appointees. For more information, see the INTRODUCTION.

Appointees also differed in their perceptions of each sex's relative capabilities for holding office. As Table 4.1 shows, almost all appointees regardless of sex disagreed with the statement that "men make better managers than women." However, women had more intense reactions to this statement. Almost three-fourths of the women "disagreed strongly" in contrast to about one-half of appointees generally.

There was a large difference of opinion between women appointees and appointees overall on the question of whether "women in office generally devote more, less, or about the same amount of time to the job as men do." A majority of women appointed to cabinet-level posts claimed that women devote more time while a majority of appointees overall claimed that women and men devote equal time to their work.² Differences in perceptions were especially pronounced among appointees in Democratic administrations.

VIEWS ON SELECTED SALIENT ISSUES

We asked state cabinet-level appointees for their views on several issues that were the focus of considerable public attention and debate during the second half of the 1970s. Since we were able to include only a small number of issue-related items, we decided to focus on issues that were both politically significant during the late 70s and likely to show that women bring a unique perspective to public policy issues. Table 4.2 presents the policy-related items included in our study and appointees' views on those items.

Public opinion polls traditionally have found women to be more pacifistic and less supportive of the use of military force than men.³ While we did not ask directly about the use of military force, we did ask appointees whether they thought that the military strength of the United States should be superior to that of the Soviet Union. Most appointees--more than two-thirds--agreed that the United States should have military superiority. However, women were slightly more "liberal" in their views on this issue. More women than appointees overall either gave a neutral response or disagreed with the goal of United States military superiority. In administrations of both parties, women were somewhat less likely than their partisan counterparts among all appointees to favor superiority in military strength.

While a majority of women appointees gave the hard-line response regarding U.S. military strength, the majority of women appointees stood clearly on the liberal side of the capital punishment issue. Our findings parallel the findings of public opinion surveys of the general population; women more than men are opposed to imposing the death penalty.⁴ Almost two-thirds of the women compared with only one-half of appointees overall disagreed with the statement, "Persons convicted of murder should receive the death penalty under most circumstances."

TABLE 4.2: WOMEN APPOINTEES WERE MORE LIBERAL ON FOUR CONTEMPORARY ISSUES THAN WERE APPOINTEES OVERALL

Issue Item ^a	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women	Main Sample	Women	Main Sample	Women	Main Sample
The military strength of the United States should be superior to that of the Soviet Union						
Agree ^b	70.4	78.7	64.8	76.8	75.9	80.8
Neutral	14.8	11.1	22.2	12.5	7.4	9.6
Disagree ^c	14.8	10.2	13.0	10.7	16.7	9.6
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(108)	(108)	(54)	(56)	(54)	(52)
Convicted murderers should receive the death penalty						
Agree ^b	28.6	41.6	20.0	41.2	38.0	42.0
Neutral	9.5	7.9	3.6	0.0	16.0	16.0
Disagree ^c	61.9	50.5	76.4	58.8	46.0	42.0
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(105)	(101)	(55)	(51)	(50)	(50)
No more nuclear power plants should be built						
Agree ^b	33.0	15.2	41.2	16.7	25.0	13.7
Neutral	15.5	11.4	15.7	11.1	15.4	11.8
Disagree ^c	51.5	73.3	43.1	72.2	59.6	74.5
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(103)	(105)	(51)	(54)	(52)	(51)
The private sector can find ways to solve our economic problems						
Agree ^b	34.0	44.7	16.7	42.9	51.9	46.8
Neutral	6.6	10.7	5.6	12.5	7.7	8.5
Disagree ^c	59.4	44.7	77.8	44.6	40.4	44.7
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(106)	(103)	(54)	(56)	(52)	(47)

^aFor precise wording of issue items, see NOTES, Chapter 4, Note 9 at end of report.

^bIncludes both "agree strongly" and "agree" responses.

^cIncludes both "disagree strongly" and "disagree" responses.

A much larger proportion of women in Democratic administrations than those in Republican administrations were opposed to the death penalty. Moreover, women in Democratic administrations were much more likely than Democratic appointees overall to oppose capital punishment; women in Republican administrations did not differ much in attitude from their partisan counterparts among all appointees.

Like military force and capital punishment, nuclear power is an issue on which public opinion polls have shown sex differences in the general population, with women more likely to favor cutting back the operations of nuclear power plants, to favor shutting down existing plants, and to oppose building new plants.⁵ Like their counterparts in the population, women appointees more often were opposed to the construction of new nuclear power plants than were appointees generally. However, about half of the women and almost three-fourths of all appointees disagreed with the statement, "No additional nuclear power plants should be built."

Women in administrations of both parties were more likely than their counterparts among all appointees to oppose the building of additional nuclear power plants. Also, as with the capital punishment issue, women serving under Democratic governors showed substantially greater opposition than did Republican women.

The final general issue item included in our study focused on appointees' faith in the private sector's ability to devise solutions to our economic problems. Women appointees more often than appointees overall said they did not believe that the private sector alone could cure our economic woes. Women in Democratic administrations in particular did not think that answers lie in private sector initiatives; more than three-fourths disagreed with the statement, "If left alone, except for essential federal regulations, the private sector can find ways to solve our economic problems." This proportion was substantially larger than the proportion of Democratic appointees overall who disagreed with the statement. In contrast to appointees in Democratic administrations, only slight differences existed between women and appointees overall in Republican administrations in their views on this issue.

VIEWS ON WOMEN'S ISSUES

In addition to the issues discussed above, we measured state cabinet-level appointees' attitudes on several issues that have become closely associated in the public's mind with the feminist movement. Our concern in doing so was to determine whether female appointees were more supportive of "feminist" positions on these issues than were appointees generally. The issue items and appointees' responses are presented in Table 4.3.

TABLE 4.3: ALTHOUGH APPOINTEES OVERALL WERE GENERALLY SUPPORTIVE OF FEMINIST POSITIONS ON WOMEN'S ISSUES, WOMEN APPOINTEES WERE EVEN MORE SUPPORTIVE

Issue Item ^a	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women	Main Sample	Women	Main Sample	Women	Main Sample
Government should provide child care						
Agree strongly	20.2	10.3	23.2	16.4	17.0	3.8
Agree	21.1	21.5	17.9	21.8	24.5	21.2
Neutral	9.2	7.5	12.5	7.3	5.7	7.7
Disagree	29.4	33.6	28.6	30.9	30.2	36.5
Disagree strongly	20.2	27.1	17.9	23.6	22.6	30.8
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(109)	(107)	(56)	(55)	(53)	(52)
There should be a constitutional amendment to prohibit abortion						
Agree strongly	0.9	6.9	0.0	9.4	1.9	4.1
Agree	1.9	7.8	3.7	7.5	0.0	8.2
Neutral	6.6	8.8	9.3	7.5	3.8	10.2
Disagree	9.4	20.6	5.6	24.5	13.5	16.3
Disagree strongly	81.1	55.9	81.5	50.9	80.8	61.2
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(106)	(102)	(54)	(53)	(52)	(49)
The Equal Rights Amendment should be ratified						
Agree strongly	57.1	38.1	54.4	35.7	60.0	40.8
Agree	23.2	21.9	28.1	28.6	18.2	14.3
Neutral	8.9	14.3	7.0	12.5	10.9	16.3
Disagree	6.3	19.0	7.0	19.6	5.5	18.4
Disagree strongly	4.5	6.7	3.5	3.6	5.5	10.2
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(112)	(105)	(57)	(56)	(55)	(49)
The women's movement has gone too far in fight for equality						
Agree strongly	5.4	3.8	7.1	3.6	3.6	4.1
Agree	10.8	11.3	8.9	8.8	12.7	14.3
Neutral	4.5	11.3	5.4	10.5	3.6	12.2
Disagree	30.6	41.5	26.8	43.9	34.5	38.8
Disagree strongly	48.6	32.1	51.8	33.3	45.5	30.6
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(111)	(106)	(56)	(57)	(55)	(49)

^aFor precise wording of issue items, see NOTES, Chapter 4, Note 10 at end of report.

One issue closely associated with the feminist movement is child care. About two-fifths of the women, compared with about one-third of all appointees, agreed that "government should provide child care services to all parents who desire them, with fees charged according to ability to pay." The fact that a sizable minority of women appointees and of appointees overall favored this proposal is striking given that appointees were asked the question in early 1981 when the tide was definitely running against an expanding role for the federal government.

Unlike the pattern of views on the issues examined in Table 4.2, women appointed to Republican and Democratic administrations had strikingly similar attitudes on the child care issue. Women appointed to Republican administrations were just as likely as those appointed to Democratic administrations to favor government provision of child care. Moreover, while women in Democratic administrations held attitudes that differed only slightly from those of their partisan counterparts, women in Republican administrations were much more likely than Republican appointees overall to support government provision of child care services.

As with child care, women differed from all appointees in their attitudes on abortion. Nine of every ten women and three-fourths of all appointees were opposed to a constitutional amendment that would prohibit abortion under all or almost all circumstances.⁶ Because the reactions of appointees to the abortion statement were so one-sided, the differences in proportions who expressed strong sentiments were most revealing. More than four-fifths of the women, compared with just over half of appointees overall, expressed strong disagreement with a constitutional prohibition on abortion. Thus, while most appointees regardless of sex shared the views of the feminist movement on this issue, the women were more intense in their views.

Among appointees in administrations of both parties, women were stronger in their opposition to a constitutional amendment prohibiting abortion than were appointees generally. As with child care, attitudes on abortion were strikingly similar among women in Democratic and Republican administrations.

Differences also were apparent in appointees' support of the Equal Rights Amendment, with women again showing higher levels of support for the feminist position. Four-fifths of women appointees, compared with only three-fifths of all appointees, agreed that the ERA should be ratified. Differences were particularly apparent in the intensity of support for the ERA. Almost three-fifths of the women, compared with less than two-fifths of appointees in general, strongly supported ratification of the ERA. This difference in the intensity of views suggests that the ERA was an issue of greater concern for women than for appointees generally.

Within both Republican and Democratic administrations, larger proportions of women than of appointees overall supported ERA ratification. However, women in Republican and Democratic administrations were again remarkably similar in their levels of support.

As a final measure of support for feminist goals, we asked appointees to respond to the statement: "The women's movement has gone too far in pushing for equality between the sexes." More than three-fourths of women appointees and slightly less than three-fourths of all appointees disagreed with the statement. Again, the largest differences appeared in the intensity of appointees' views. Almost one-half of the women, compared with only about one-third of all appointees, strongly disagreed with the view that the women's movement has gone too far. Thus, while most appointees regardless of sex voiced general support for the feminist movement, the women were more emphatic in their support.

Similar to the pattern on the other women's issues, women in Democratic and Republican administrations differed little in their views on the women's movement. Women serving in administrations of both parties were more likely than their partisan counterparts among all appointees to take strong objection to the notion that the women's movement has gone too far.

ISSUE DIFFERENCES AMONG LIBERALS, MODERATES, AND CONSERVATIVES

Although women appointees differed somewhat from all appointees in their views on a variety of issues, differences in political ideology

TABLE 4.4: WOMEN APPOINTEES WERE MORE LIKELY THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL TO IDENTIFY THEMSELVES AS LIBERAL OR VERY LIBERAL IN POLITICAL IDEOLOGY

Political Ideology ^a	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
	Main Sample		Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Very liberal	5.4	1.9	8.8	3.5	1.8	0.0
Liberal	39.3	18.7	43.9	22.8	34.5	14.0
Middle-of-the-road	33.0	43.9	35.1	42.1	30.9	46.0
Conservative	18.8	30.8	10.5	29.8	27.3	32.0
Very conservative	3.6	4.7	1.8	1.8	5.5	8.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(112)	(107)	(57)	(57)	(55)	(50)

^aThe precise wording of the question used to measure political ideology is the following: "On most contemporary issues, do you generally think of yourself as very conservative, conservative, middle-of-the-road, liberal, or very liberal?"

between women appointees and appointees overall also were quite substantial (Table 4.4). More than two-fifths of the women, about twice the proportion of appointees in general, described themselves as liberal or very liberal in political ideology. Moreover, in administrations of both parties, women much more often than their partisan counterparts viewed themselves as liberal. In fact, women in Republican administrations were more likely than appointees overall in Democratic administrations to identify as liberals.

At the other extreme, only one-fifth of the women, compared with about one-third of all appointees, described themselves as conservative or very conservative in political ideology. Women appointed to Republican administrations, while more likely than women in Democratic administrations to identify themselves as conservatives, were not notably more likely than Democratic appointees overall to label themselves conservatives.

Were the differences on issues found earlier in this chapter due simply to the fact that women appointees were more likely to be liberals and less likely to be conservatives than were appointees generally? Or did women appointees differ in their views on specific issues from those appointees overall who shared their general political ideologies?

Table 4.5 presents the four general issues and Table 4.6 presents the women's issues on which differences were found earlier in this chapter. Both of these tables show the proportions of women appointees and appointees overall among the three ideological groupings--liberals, moderates, and conservatives--who gave various responses to the issue items.

As one would expect, liberals gave more liberal responses to the questions than did moderates, and moderates gave more liberal responses than did conservatives (Table 4.5). However, at both ends of the ideological spectrum, women usually gave more liberal and less conservative responses than did liberal and conservative appointees generally. Compared with liberal appointees generally, women who identified themselves as liberals were more liberal on the issues of military superiority and nuclear power, although they were less liberal on the issue of a private sector economic solution and equally liberal on the issue of capital punishment. Among conservatives, women were less conservative than appointees in general on all the issues except for military superiority; on this issue, the views of conservative women mirrored the views of conservative appointees overall.

Women who considered themselves moderates most often deviated from the general pattern of greater liberalism among women across different ideological identifications. Moderate women less frequently than moderate appointees overall had liberal views on the issues we examined. Only on the issue of a private sector economic solution were women who identified

TABLE 4.5: LIBERAL AND CONSERVATIVE WOMEN APPOINTEES EXPRESSED MORE LIBERAL VIEWS ON SEVERAL CONTEMPORARY ISSUES THAN DID THEIR COUNTERPARTS AMONG APPOINTEES OVERALL

Issue Item ^a	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
	Liberals		Moderates		Conservatives	
	Women	Main Sample	Women	Main Sample	Women	Main Sample
The military strength of the United States should be superior to that of the Soviet Union						
Agree ^b	46.9	66.7	88.2	69.6	92.0	94.7
Neutral	20.4	23.8	11.8	13.0	8.0	2.6
Disagree ^c	32.7	9.5	0.0	17.4	0.0	2.6
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(49)	(21)	(34)	(46)	(25)	(38)
Convicted murderers should receive the death penalty						
Agree ^b	22.4	20.0	34.3	28.6	33.3	70.3
Neutral	2.0	5.0	14.3	14.3	19.0	2.7
Disagree ^c	75.5	75.0	51.4	57.1	47.6	27.0
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(49)	(20)	(35)	(42)	(21)	(37)
No more nuclear power plants should be built						
Agree ^b	53.1	30.0	18.8	17.0	9.1	5.7
Neutral	14.3	20.0	18.8	12.8	13.6	2.9
Disagree ^c	32.7	50.0	62.5	70.2	77.3	91.4
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(49)	(20)	(32)	(47)	(22)	(35)
The private sector can find ways to solve our economic problems						
Agree ^b	19.1	5.3	33.3	40.9	65.2	73.0
Neutral	4.3	10.5	5.6	15.9	13.0	5.4
Disagree ^c	76.6	84.2	61.1	43.2	21.7	21.6
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(47)	(19)	(36)	(44)	(23)	(37)

^a For precise wording of issue items, see NOTES, Chapter 4, Note 9 at end of report.

^b Includes both "agree strongly" and "agree" responses.

^c Includes both "disagree strongly" and "disagree" responses.

TABLE 4.6: ACROSS THE IDEOLOGICAL SPECTRUM, WOMEN MORE OFTEN THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL EXPRESSED FEMINIST VIEWS ON WOMEN'S ISSUES

Issue Item ^a	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
	Liberals		Moderates		Conservatives	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Government should provide child care						
Total agree ^b	45.8	57.9	48.6	31.9	20.8	21.1
Agree strongly	27.1	26.3	21.6	8.5	4.2	5.3
Total	(48)	(19)	(37)	(47)	(24)	(38)
There should be a consti- tutional amendment to prohibit abortion						
Total disagree ^c	94.0	85.7	88.6	71.1	85.7	75.8
Disagree strongly	90.0	71.4	77.1	53.3	66.7	45.5
Total	(50)	(21)	(35)	(45)	(21)	(33)
The Equal Rights Amendment should be ratified						
Total agree ^b	92.0	86.4	83.8	64.4	52.0	34.3
Agree strongly	82.0	72.7	45.9	33.3	24.0	17.1
Total	(50)	(22)	(37)	(45)	(25)	(35)
The women's movement has gone too far in fight for equality						
Total disagree ^c	90.0	90.9	80.6	77.3	56.0	59.5
Disagree strongly	64.0	54.5	47.2	25.0	20.0	24.3
Total	(50)	(22)	(36)	(44)	(25)	(37)

^aFor precise wording of issue items, see NOTES, Chapter 4, Note 10 at end of report.

^bIncludes both "agree" and "agree strongly" responses.

^cIncludes both "disagree" and "disagree strongly" responses.

themselves as moderates more likely than moderate appointees overall to take a liberal stance.

Although differences between women appointees and all appointees diminished when liberals, moderates, and conservatives were examined separately, nevertheless, women within various ideological groupings more often than not took more liberal positions than did their counterparts among all appointees. It appears, then, that the greater liberalism of

women appointees was not due simply to the fact that women more often than appointees overall identified themselves as liberals.

As one might expect, liberals were more "feminist" in their views on issues associated with the feminist movement than were conservatives (Table 4.6). However, women across the ideological spectrum generally were more likely to express feminist positions on these issues than were their counterparts among appointees overall. Whether among liberals, moderates, or conservatives, larger proportions of women than of appointees overall supported the feminist stance on abortion and ERA. On the child care issue, the pattern was less clear cut. Moderate women were more likely to agree with government provision of child care than were moderates among appointees generally. However, conservative women were equally as likely, and liberal women were less likely, than their counterparts among appointees overall to support government provision of child care. Similar proportions of women and appointees overall across all ideological groupings disagreed with the view that the women's movement has gone too far in pushing for equality between the sexes. However, among liberals and moderates, women were more likely than their counterparts among all appointees to disagree strongly.

Overall, then, on these issues commonly associated with the feminist movement, it appears that there were several sex-related differences that transcended ideology. It is not simply because more women appointees than appointees overall were liberals that women, as a group, appeared more supportive of feminist positions.

SUPPORT AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF OTHER WOMEN

Women can work to bring about political change not only by supporting feminist policies, but also by encouraging other women to become involved in politics. We asked women state cabinet-level appointees a series of three questions in order to ascertain the extent to which they engaged in activities that would help to involve other women in politics; their responses are presented in Table 4.7.

First we asked women about the frequency with which they tried to recruit women when hiring staff. Almost all of the women appointees claimed they made an effort at least sometimes to hire women as staff members, and seven of every ten said they did so frequently. A larger proportion of women serving under Republican governors than of those serving under Democratic governors reported they frequently recruited women for staff positions.

A large majority of women appointees also claimed that they encouraged individual women to become active in politics. Slightly more than half of the women said they did this frequently. Women in Democratic and Republican

TABLE 4.7: A MAJORITY OF WOMEN APPOINTEES TRIED TO INVOLVE MORE WOMEN IN POLITICS

Frequency With Which Appointee Undertook the Following Activities	State Cabinet-Level Appointees		
	Women %	Democratic Administrations Women %	Republican Administrations Women %
Actively recruited women when hiring staff			
Frequently	70.1	63.0	77.4
Sometimes	18.7	24.1	13.2
Almost never	11.2	13.0	9.4
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(107)	(54)	(53)
Encouraged individual women to become active in politics			
Frequently	55.0	52.6	57.4
Sometimes	36.0	36.8	35.2
Almost never	9.0	10.5	7.4
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(111)	(57)	(54)
Spoke to various groups of women, urging them to become active in politics			
Frequently	36.9	29.8	44.4
Sometimes	38.7	43.9	33.3
Almost never	24.3	26.3	22.2
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(111)	(57)	(54)

administrations were about equally as likely to have provided encouragement to other women.

The activity which women undertook least often was speaking to groups of women, encouraging them to become active in politics. Nevertheless, almost two-fifths of women appointees claimed they frequently spoke to women's groups, and another two-fifths stated they did so sometimes. While similar proportions of women appointees in both Democratic and Republican administrations said that they spoke to groups of women urging them to become active in politics, women appointed by Republican governors were more likely to report that they frequently engaged in this activity.

These measures of reported behavior suggest that women state cabinet-level appointees were quite active in trying to increase the involvement of other women in the political process.

MEMBERSHIP IN FEMINIST AND OTHER WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS

The organizational memberships of women state cabinet-level appointees also suggest high levels of interaction with other women and support for feminist goals. Table 4.8 indicates that women appointees, like other women among political elites, were "joiners."⁷ More than three-fifths belonged to labor unions or professional associations, and a similar proportion belonged to college or alumni groups. More than half were members of a church or religious group, and more than two-fifths belonged to a parent/teacher organization.

Large proportions of women appointees also belonged to "women's groups"--those groups whose members were exclusively or primarily women.

TABLE 4.8: LARGE PROPORTIONS OF WOMEN BELONGED TO FEMINIST ORGANIZATIONS AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Belonged to the Following Organization or Type of Organization	Women %	State Cabinet-Level Appointees	
		Democratic Administrations Women %	Republican Administrations Women %
Women's Organization			
Business or professional organization	52.3	56.1	48.1
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs (BPW)	15.3	17.5	13.0
Feminist organization	40.0 ^a	39.3 ^b	40.7
National Organization for Women (NOW)	25.2	21.1	29.6
Women's Political Caucus (WPC)	37.8	36.8	38.9
General social service organization	27.9	26.3	29.6
American Association of University Women (AAUW)	21.6	22.8	20.4
Junior League	7.2	7.0	7.4
League of Women Voters (LWV)	26.1	24.6	27.8
Organization of women public officials	22.5	21.1	24.1
Nonwomen's Organization			
Church group	55.9	54.4	57.4
College or alumni group	61.3	59.6	63.0
Labor union or professional association	62.2	59.6	64.8
Parent/teacher organization (e.g. PTA)	45.0	49.1	40.7
Total	(111)	(57)	(54)

^aIn this particular case, the total is 110.

^bIn this particular case, the total is 56.

More than one-half belonged to women's professional or business organizations, and about one of every seven belonged specifically to the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs (BPW). Approximately one-fourth belonged to one or more women's social service organizations, and almost that many belonged to an organization of women public officials. Specifically, more than one-fourth of women appointees belonged to the League of Women Voters (LWV), and more than one-fifth belonged to the American Association of University Women (AAUW).

Consistent with the high levels of support for feminist issue positions and the reported high levels of activity encouraging other women to become active in politics, women state cabinet-level appointees reported high levels of membership in feminist organizations--those organizations whose sole or primary purpose is to improve the status of women in politics or society. Two-fifths belonged to one or more feminist organizations, and sizable proportions belonged to each of two of the largest feminist organizations in the country. More than one-third were members of the National Women's Political Caucus (NWPC) and/or one of its state or local affiliates, and about one-fourth of women appointees were members of the National Organization for Women (NOW).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Women appointees did, in fact, view the political world somewhat differently than did appointees generally. Nevertheless, the variations are best characterized as differences of degree rather than as fundamental conflicts between women appointees and appointees overall.

Women were more likely than appointees overall to think that opportunities to become political leaders are more limited for women than for men. Among appointees as a whole, most did not think men make better managers than women, and most felt that women devote as much time to the job as do men. However, far more of the women felt strongly about the managerial capabilities of women relative to men and expressed the view that women, in fact, devote more time to the job than men do.

Differences also were apparent on several contemporary political issues, with women showing more liberal tendencies. Women were less likely than all appointees to support capital punishment. Compared with appointees in general, women were more opposed to building new nuclear power plants and expressed less faith in the ability of the private sector to develop solutions to our economic problems. These differences were not simply a result of the fact that women were more likely than appointees overall to identify themselves as liberals. On most issues, liberal and conservative women (although not moderate women) took more liberal stances than did their counterparts among appointees in general.

It is important to reiterate that we asked about those issues on which we thought the emergence of a woman's perspective was most probable. As a result, the findings of this section cannot be read as indicating that on all, or even most, issues women appointees were more liberal than the norm for all appointees. However, the findings do suggest that there were some issues on which women appointees did have a distinctive perspective--a perspective that was slightly more liberal in nature than that of appointees generally.

Just as women appointees appeared more liberal than appointees overall on certain issues, they also appeared more "feminist" in their views on issues associated with the women's movement. The majority of appointees overall opposed an amendment to prohibit abortion, favored the ERA, and disagreed that the women's movement had gone too far in pushing for equality between the sexes. With the exception of support for universal child care, a majority of all appointees also appeared to espouse feminist views. Nonetheless, even larger proportions of women endorsed the feminist position on all four women's issues. Moreover, women generally seemed to hold their feminist views with greater intensity than did appointees overall. The differences between women appointees and appointees overall in support for feminist concerns and/or in intensity of that support crossed party and ideological lines. It is perhaps in their stronger feelings of support for feminist concerns and issue positions that women appointees most appropriately can be said to have had a distinctive "women's perspective."

The data collected in our study suggest that many women appointed to state cabinet-level posts could be characterized as feminists, although they were not asked directly how they felt about that label. Not only were female appointees overwhelmingly supportive of feminist issue concerns, but also they reported high levels of membership in feminist organizations and high levels of activity devoted to encouraging individual women and groups of women to become involved in politics. Large majorities reported that they tried to hire women as staff members, encouraged individual women they knew to become politically active, and spoke to groups of women in order to urge them to become more involved in politics.

The tenure in office of those who accept appointments to gubernatorial administrations is generally short-lived. Because state appointees serve at the pleasure of the governor, they can be removed from office at any time. Moreover, many administrations come to an end after a two-year or four-year term. Did state cabinet-level appointees plan to leave public service permanently when their present appointments ended? Would appointees be willing to accept an appointment to another gubernatorial administration at some time in the future? Did they aspire to other elective or appointive positions at various levels of government? These questions are central to our examination of the political ambitions of state appointees.

DESIRE TO SERVE IN OTHER GUBERNATORIAL ADMINISTRATIONS

We asked appointees about the likelihood that they would accept an appointment to a future gubernatorial administration (Table 5.1). About one-third of women appointees and all appointees claimed they were unsure about whether they would do so. Although many appointees were uncertain, women were more likely than appointees overall to say that they would be "very likely" to accept an appointment in the future if one were offered. Women appointees less often than appointees overall claimed that they were "not at all likely" to accept an appointment.

Among appointees in Democratic administrations, women were more likely than appointees overall to report that they were "very likely" to accept appointments to future administrations. Democratic women were also more likely than women in Republican administrations to be very favorable to accepting a future appointment. Nonetheless, only one woman in a Republican administration compared with more than one-tenth of women in Democratic administrations and about one-fifth of Republican appointees overall completely ruled out the possibility of joining a future administration. A substantial proportion of women in Republican administrations, a larger proportion than of either Republican appointees overall or of women in Democratic administrations, said they were unsure about whether they would accept an appointment to a future gubernatorial administration.

DESIRE TO HOLD OTHER APPOINTIVE OR ELECTIVE POSITIONS

We also asked cabinet-level appointees whether there were any other appointive positions or elective offices at any level of government that they would like to hold. Table 5.2 presents appointees' responses to these questions.

TABLE 5.1: WOMEN MORE OFTEN THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL SAID THEY WOULD BE VERY LIKELY TO ACCEPT AN APPOINTMENT TO A FUTURE GUBERNATORIAL ADMINISTRATION

Probability That Appointee Would Accept Appointment in Future Gubernatorial Administration	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample ^a %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Very likely	32.1	22.7	35.1	19.0	29.1	26.9
Somewhat likely	23.2	27.3	19.3	29.3	27.3	25.0
Not at all likely	7.1	16.4	12.3	13.8	1.8	19.2
Unsure	37.5	33.6	33.3	37.9	41.8	28.8
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(112)	(110)	(57)	(58)	(55)	(52)

^a"Main sample" is a systematic sample, consisting of 15% of all people who were serving in state cabinet-level appointed positions in February 1981. The sample represents state cabinet-level appointees overall, including both women and men in proportion to their presence in the population of state appointees. For more information, see the INTRODUCTION.

TABLE 5.2: WOMEN WERE MORE LIKELY THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL TO ASPIRE TO ELECTIVE OFFICES AND OTHER APPOINTIVE POSITIONS

	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Aspire to another appointive position at any level of government	54.5	40.9	56.1	34.5	52.7	48.1
Aspire to an elective office at any level of government	46.4	42.7	49.1	34.5	43.6	51.9
Total	(112)	(110)	(57)	(58)	(55)	(52)

Women were considerably more likely than appointees overall to want to serve in other appointive positions. More than one-half of the women aspired to another appointive office, compared with only two-fifths of the sample of all appointees. The difference between women appointees and

appointees overall was especially pronounced among those serving in Democratic administrations.

Women were only slightly more likely than appointees overall to aspire to an elective office in government. More than two-fifths of both women appointees and appointees overall expressed a desire to hold an elective office. These proportions were considerably larger than the proportions (11.6% of the women and 21.8% of appointees overall) who actually had held elective office prior to joining a gubernatorial administration.¹ Women were more likely to want to hold an appointive office than an elective office while appointees as a whole were slightly more likely to desire an elective office than an appointive office.

Among appointees in administrations of both parties, women were more likely than their partisan counterparts to desire other appointive offices, although the difference was small among Republican appointees (Table 5.2). Women serving under Democratic governors were also much more likely than Democratic appointees overall to aspire to elective office while Republican women were less likely than Republican appointees overall to have such aspirations. Women in Democratic administrations had greater office-holding aspirations than did women in Republican administrations--a pattern which was the reverse of the pattern for Democratic and Republican appointees in general.

HIGHEST POSITION DESIRED

We asked those appointees who expressed some interest in serving in another appointive or elective position to name the highest office they would like to hold. This measure provides some indication of where appointees would like to be at the pinnacle of their public careers. As Table 5.3 indicates, women were quite similar to appointees overall in their aspirations.

About one-half of both women appointees and appointees overall who aspired to another office named a position at the state level. State legislative office represented the highest officeholding aspiration of the largest proportions of both women appointees and appointees in general; slightly fewer than one of every five hoped to hold this office at the pinnacle of their careers. The office of governor was the second most popular choice, with about one-sixth of women appointees and appointees overall naming this office. Almost one-sixth of women and slightly more than one-tenth of all appointees listed the directorship of a state government department, agency, or bureau as the highest office they would like to hold.

About one-third of women appointees and appointees overall who desired another office aspired ultimately to an office at the federal level.

TABLE 5.3: AMONG APPOINTEES WHO SAID THEY WANTED TO HOLD APPOINTIVE OR ELECTIVE POSITIONS IN THE FUTURE, WOMEN DID NOT DIFFER GREATLY FROM APPOINTEES OVERALL IN THE HIGHEST POSITION TO WHICH THEY ASPIRED

Highest Position Aspired To	State Cabinet-Level Appointees					
			Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
Federal						
President	8.8	2.0	3.0	0.0	16.7	3.6
U.S. senator	10.5	15.7	9.1	13.0	12.5	17.9
U.S. representative	5.3	5.9	6.1	13.0	4.2	0.0
Federal cabinet secretary	5.3	7.8	3.0	13.0	8.3	3.6
Federal ambassador	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1
Other federal position	3.5	2.0	6.1	4.3	0.0	0.0
State						
Governor	15.8	17.6	12.1	13.0	20.8	21.4
State legislator	17.5	19.6	15.2	13.0	20.8	25.0
Director of state department, agency, or bureau	15.8	11.8	21.2	8.7	8.3	14.3
Assistant to governor	0.0	2.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0
Other state position	1.8	3.9	3.0	4.3	0.0	3.6
Judge	1.8	3.9	0.0	4.3	4.2	3.6
Elected city official	7.0	0.0	12.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	7.0	3.9	9.1	8.7	4.2	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(57)	(51)	(33)	(23)	(24)	(28)

The only office at this level named by more than one-tenth of appointees was that of U.S. senator. Although women appointees were slightly less likely than appointees overall to aspire ultimately to a seat in the U.S. Senate, they were, surprisingly, slightly more likely to aspire to the presidency.

Table 5.3 also shows that almost all those women who desired to be president at the height of their public careers served in Republican administrations. Republican women were much more likely than either Republican appointees overall or women in Democratic administrations to aspire to the presidency. Women serving under Democratic governors, in contrast, were much more likely than Democratic appointees overall or Republican women to aspire to head a state department, agency, or bureau. Like the pattern among appointees overall in Democratic and Republican administrations, women in Democratic administrations were more likely than women in

Republican administrations to view the governorship as their ultimate aspiration.

POSITION DESIRED NEXT

We also asked those appointees who said they were interested in serving in other elective or appointive offices to name the office they would like to hold next. Similar to the pattern for highest officeholding ambitions, most appointees named an office at the state level (Table 5.4). Appointees most often mentioned the office of state legislator, with about one-fifth of both women appointees and appointees overall naming this office. The office which women mentioned second most frequently was that of director of a state department, agency, or bureau; this office was mentioned by about one-sixth of the women, a slightly larger proportion than

TABLE 5.4: AMONG APPOINTEES WHO SAID THEY WANTED TO HOLD APPOINTIVE OR ELECTIVE POSITIONS IN THE FUTURE, WOMEN LESS OFTEN THAN APPOINTEES OVERALL NAMED THE OFFICE OF GOVERNOR AS THE POSITION THEY WANTED TO HOLD NEXT

Next Position Aspired To	Main Sample		Democratic Administrations		Republican Administrations	
	Women %	Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %	Women %	Main Sample %
<u>State Cabinet-Level Appointees</u>						
Federal						
U.S. senator	4.6	3.6	5.9	4.0	3.2	3.2
U.S. representative	9.2	10.7	11.8	8.0	6.5	12.9
Federal cabinet secretary	1.5	3.6	0.0	4.0	3.2	3.2
Federal subcabinet post	1.5	3.6	0.0	4.0	3.2	3.2
Other federal position	3.1	5.4	2.9	0.0	3.2	9.7
State						
Governor	7.7	16.1	5.9	8.0	9.7	22.6
Lieutenant governor	4.6	5.4	5.9	8.0	3.2	3.2
State legislator	20.0	17.9	14.7	16.0	25.8	19.4
Director of state department, agency, or bureau	16.9	12.5	14.7	16.0	19.4	9.7
Assistant to governor	6.2	5.4	11.8	12.0	0.0	0.0
Other state position	9.2	5.4	11.8	8.0	6.5	3.2
Judge	3.1	1.8	0.0	4.0	6.5	0.0
Elected city official	4.6	3.6	8.8	0.0	0.0	6.5
Other	7.7	5.4	5.9	8.0	9.7	3.2
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(65)	(56)	(34)	(25)	(31)	(31)

that of appointees overall. Women were notably less likely than all appointees to report that they next wanted to be governor; less than one-tenth of the women, half as many as appointees generally, said they would like to be elected to the governorship as their next step in politics. The only office at the federal level to which significant proportions of appointees aspired next was the office of U.S. representative; about one-tenth of both women appointees and appointees overall wanted next to be elected to a seat in the U.S. House.

Women serving in Democratic administrations did not differ much from Democratic appointees overall in the offices they next wanted to hold. However, among appointees in Republican administrations, women were much less likely to aspire next to the position of governor and were much more likely to aspire to the directorship of a state department, agency, or bureau than were Republican appointees overall. Republican women were also somewhat more likely than Republican appointees overall to want to serve next as a state legislator; in this desire, they also differed notably from Democratic women who were much less likely to name state legislator as the next position they would like to hold.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Most appointees did not intend for their public careers to end with their present cabinet-level positions. Rather, majorities claimed that it was somewhat likely or very likely that they would accept an appointment to a future gubernatorial administration if one were offered. Moreover, more than one-half of the women and two-fifths of appointees overall expressed an interest in holding an appointive office at some level of government. Even though only a handful of women and appointees overall had served in elective office prior to joining a gubernatorial administration, more than two-fifths claimed that they would like to hold an elective position in the future.

Previous research has been divided over the question of whether women among elites are less ambitious than their male counterparts. On the one hand, a number of studies, focusing mostly on party elites, have concluded that female elites have lower levels of ambition for public officeholding than male elites.² On the other hand, data from CAWP's 1977 study of women in public office indicated that female officeholders are at least as ambitious politically as their male counterparts.³ Our data comparing women appointees with all appointees who were serving in state cabinet-level posts would seem to support the latter position in the controversy. Women appointees more often than appointees overall claimed that they would be "very likely" to accept an appointment to a future gubernatorial administration. Women also were considerably more likely to express a

desire to hold appointive posts at other levels of government and were slightly more likely to claim that they would like to serve in elective office. For those appointees who expressed some interest in serving in another appointive or elective position, women appointees differed little from appointees as a whole in their views of the highest position and the next position that they would like to hold. The small differences that existed did not point consistently in the direction of higher ambition for either women or appointees in general. Thus, the conclusion we drew for public officeholders in 1977 seems appropriate for gubernatorial appointees as well: women are at least as ambitious for future public officeholding as are men.

In this final chapter of our report, we first highlight the most significant findings from the previous sections. Second, we discuss the implications of our findings for women who desire appointments to gubernatorial administrations and those who wish to help women obtain appointments. Third, we suggest some avenues for future research.

MAJOR FINDINGS OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WOMEN APPOINTEES AND APPOINTEES OVERALL

The most noteworthy findings of similarities and differences between women appointees and all appointees serving in cabinet-level posts in gubernatorial administrations are briefly summarized below.

Overall, the backgrounds of women appointees and appointees in the main sample (e.g. parents' occupations and public officeholding experience, education, age, race, marital status, number and age of children) were quite similar. The major differences between women appointees and appointees overall were:

Women were more likely to have grown up in families where the father had a professional or a managerial/administrative occupation. This suggests that women were more uniformly from families with a relatively high social status.

Women were more likely to have mothers who were employed outside the home.

Women were more likely to have law degrees.

Women were more likely to have received their undergraduate degrees from private, rather than public, colleges and universities.

Women were younger.

Women were less likely to be married, and more likely to be single, divorced, or separated.

Women more uniformly perceived their spouses as "very supportive" of their governmental work and political activity.

Among those appointees who had married, women were less likely to have children.

Overall, women appointees were as qualified for cabinet-level positions in gubernatorial administrations as were appointees in general. Nevertheless, with respect to experience and credentials, several interesting differences are apparent between women appointees and all appointees:

Women appointees more often were of the same political party as the governor.

Women who were members of the governor's party were slightly more likely to have been delegates to national political party conventions.

Although women were only slightly more likely to have worked in their governors' election campaigns, women who had campaigned for the governor were more likely to have served in salaried campaign positions.

Women were less likely to have held appointive or administrative positions in state, county, or local government and were also less likely to have held elective government offices.

Despite overall similarities in the occupational profiles of women appointees and appointees in general, women were less likely to have come to gubernatorial administrations from jobs in government; women were more likely than appointees overall to have been working as consultants or as college professors and administrators immediately before receiving their appointments.

Women were slightly less likely to have role models and were more likely than appointees overall to have mentors.

Women far more often had female role models and mentors.

Women less often had role models and mentors who were elected public officials. Women more often than appointees overall had role models who were state administrative officials.

There were important differences between women and appointees overall in the circumstances surrounding their selection as appointees and their acceptance of positions in gubernatorial administrations. The most interesting of these differences between women and the sample of all appointees were the following:

Women were more likely to cite the governor or his program as their most important reason for accepting appointments. However, women less often knew the governor prior to their appointments.

Women appointees less frequently named the governor as the individual most influential in bringing about their appointments.

Women more often than appointees overall reported that gubernatorial staff members were the people most influential in bringing about their appointments.

Women were more likely to indicate that other women were the most influential in helping them obtain appointments.

Among those who reported receiving assistance from organizations, almost one-third of the women but no one among appointees overall cited women's organizations.

A greater proportion of women appointees exerted some effort to obtain their appointments.

While a majority of both women appointees and appointees overall cited their professional qualifications and reputations as the most important factor leading to their appointments, women were slightly less likely to name this factor.

Women were less likely to rate their managerial abilities, technical expertise, work in last job, professional contacts, and former officeholding experience as very important in their appointments. Women more often than appointees overall rated political party activities as very important.

In evaluating factors which may in general influence gubernatorial appointments, women less often thought that managerial experience and technical expertise in a relevant policy area are critical.

Women appointees more often agree with the observation that appointments are more likely to be based on who you know rather than what you know.

The biggest difference between women appointees and appointees overall in their evaluations of factors that influence gubernatorial appointments was in their evaluations of whether women receive special consideration in the appointments process. Much smaller proportions of women than of appointees overall thought that a woman is likely to be chosen over a man if the two are equally qualified.

Women appointees viewed the political world somewhat differently than appointees in general, although the differences were often differences of degree rather than fundamental conflicts. The following differences between women appointees and appointees overall suggest the existence of a distinctive "women's perspective":

Women showed greater intensity in their beliefs that women lack equal opportunity to become political leaders, that the managerial abilities of women are equal to those of men, and that women in office devote more time to the job than men do.

Women expressed more "liberal" views on several contemporary issues including the death penalty, nuclear power, and the ability of the private sector to solve our economic problems.

Women expressed more "feminist" views on several issues associated with the women's movement, including government provision of child care, ERA, and abortion. Moreover, their support for feminist positions on these issues was voiced with greater intensity.

Women appointees reported high levels of membership in feminist organizations and high levels of activity to encourage the political involvement of other women.

The future officeholding ambitions of women appointees and appointees overall were similar in most respects. However, there were some key differences:

Women appointees more often claimed that they would be "very likely" to accept an appointment to a future gubernatorial administration.

Women appointees were more likely to aspire to appointive positions at other levels of government.

IMPLICATIONS FOR WOMEN WHO WANT A GUBERNATORIAL APPOINTMENT

Clearly, the women who participated in our study were a very tiny and exceptional subsample of the American public. The vast majority of citizens, among even politically active individuals, will never receive cabinet-level appointments in state government. However, our research

suggests that women who aspire to such posts can take certain steps to better position themselves for gubernatorial appointments.

Almost all female appointees in our study were either unmarried at the time of their appointments or married to men whom they perceived to be very supportive of their political activity and governmental work. Women who marry men who are somewhat resistant to their wives' participation in politics or government probably will not have the necessary support at home for taking on the responsibilities of a high-level appointment. Despite the fact that almost one-half of women appointees were under the age of forty, less than one-third had children under the age of twelve. This finding suggests that the presence of young children may act as a deterrent to appointive officeholding. Decisions about marriage and the timing of children, while not explicitly political acts, are likely to have important effects on women's decisions about seeking and accepting gubernatorial appointments.

Findings from our study also suggest that a woman who has her eye on a gubernatorial appointment would be well advised to acquire strong professional credentials and experience as a means of enhancing the probability that she will be selected for an appointment. Women appointees were less likely than appointees overall to view managerial abilities and technical expertise as critical factors leading to their appointments, probably because as a group they have had fewer opportunities to acquire such abilities. While government is not the only arena in which women can develop managerial skills and expertise in a policy area, it is one of the primary areas for doing so. A notably smaller proportion of women than of all appointees were working in government positions immediately prior to receiving cabinet-level appointments. The fact that fewer women than appointees overall had government jobs at the time of their appointments may also explain why women were less likely to view their work in their last job and their professional contacts as very important in obtaining cabinet-level positions. Certainly, a woman who desires a high-level appointment in a gubernatorial administration would be well advised to acquire professional credentials, managerial experience, and technical expertise in some sphere, whether it be in government, business, or non-profit/public affairs organizations. Since our findings indicate that cabinet-level appointees most often are drawn from other positions in government, the public sector would perhaps be the best arena for a woman who desires a high-level appointment to develop her expertise and skills while simultaneously making valuable contacts.

Women serving in Democratic and Republican administrations placed differing emphasis on the importance of technical expertise, managerial skills, and job-related experience. Women in Democratic administrations

pointed to professional credentials and technical expertise as the factors most often important for obtaining their appointments. In contrast, work in their previous jobs and managerial abilities emerged as the two factors most often cited as very important by women serving in Republican administrations. Thus, while all these vocation-related factors are important in obtaining appointments, their relative importance may vary between the parties.

Just as women interested in obtaining appointments would be well advised to develop strong professional credentials, technical expertise, and managerial skills, they also might enhance their chances of being chosen for a major gubernatorial appointment through political involvement and activity. Our study shows that most women and men who receive gubernatorial appointments have been active in their political parties. Many have held elective or appointive party positions. Partisan activity is perhaps even more important for Republican women seeking appointments in Republican administrations than for Democratic women seeking appointments in Democratic administrations. Although women in Republican administrations were not notably more active in their party than were women in Democratic administrations, more women than appointees overall in Republican administrations were active in their party.

In addition to their involvement in the parties, sizable proportions of women appointees had worked in their governors' election campaigns and had held other administrative or appointive positions in government. While partisan involvement, work in the governor's campaign, and holding an appointive position will not necessarily lead to a gubernatorial appointment, these activities can both demonstrate a woman's loyalty to her party or its gubernatorial candidate and provide her with visibility and contacts that may help in obtaining an appointment.

Our findings suggest that campaign and party work, as well as previous officeholding experience, may be more important for older women who wish to seek appointments than for younger women. Proportionately more women forty or older had been active in their party, worked in their governors' campaigns, and held previous positions in government than had women under forty. Moreover, older women more often than younger women rated their political activities, the efforts of party leaders on their behalf, and former officeholding experience as very important in obtaining their appointments.

These age differences suggest that there are at least two major routes women might follow in order to acquire experience and visibility that could lead ultimately to a cabinet-level gubernatorial appointment. The first route--the "political" route--appears to be more common for older than younger generations of women. A woman following this route distinguishes herself through work for the party, holding other governmental positions

and perhaps working on the governor's election campaign, preferably in a high-level position. The second route--the "professional" route--is more common for younger than for older generations of women. A woman following this route distinguishes herself through her educational credentials and her work in a professional capacity, perhaps in government or perhaps in some other arena. While there is evidence in our study of women who seemed to follow each of these routes, many examples also exist of women who combined the two types of credentials and experience.

Our study also suggests that women who desire high-level appointments in state government often receive important assistance from other women. Generally speaking, women are not as well integrated into traditionally male networks of influence as are men. For example, women in our study were less likely than appointees overall to know the governor prior to accepting their appointments. They also were less likely to rate their professional contacts as very important in obtaining their appointments, and they less often reported assistance from job-related organizations. However, the assistance of other women can help to compensate for a woman's lesser access, relative to that of her male colleagues, to the "old boys' network." Women appointees in our study were more likely than all appointees to name another woman as the person most influential in bringing about their appointments. Similarly, some women received assistance from women's organizations in their efforts to obtain appointments. While women in positions of influence and women's organizations with political clout could make even greater efforts to insure that women receive appointments, this pattern of women supporting women is an important one. A woman often can enhance her chances of receiving an appointment by enlisting the help of women on the inside and/or women's organizations on the outside who are willing to work to increase the number of women in major policy-making positions.

By learning from the experiences of the female cabinet-level officials who participated in our study, a woman may enhance her chances of receiving a gubernatorial appointment. However, there is no clear-cut formula that will guarantee an appointment. From the many who have the relevant experiences and characteristics, few are chosen. And even among the women in our study, there was as much diversity as similarity.

FUTURE RESEARCH

As the first research project investigating how women differ from appointees in general in the routes they follow into appointive positions at the state level, this study has answered many questions and provided a baseline for future research. However, several questions have arisen that we hope will be addressed in future research. To conclude our profile, we

will outline three of the questions that we consider most in need of attention.

One avenue for future research is an examination of the development of managerial and technical expertise. Because the aim of our study was to provide a broad-based and wide-ranging profile of women serving in high-level appointive positions, we were able to ask only a few questions touching upon technical expertise and managerial skills. Yet, it is clear from our study that many appointees viewed their professional credentials and experience as very important to their appointments. There also are hints in our study that the career paths of female and male appointees are not always similar. (An example suggestive of different career paths is the finding that women were less likely than appointees overall to have come to the administration from jobs in government and were more likely than all appointees to have come through other channels.) A study that traced in detail the career paths of women appointees before their service in an administration, and compared their paths with those of male appointees could contribute a great deal to our knowledge of sex differences in the development of managerial and substantive expertise and in the relationship of such expertise to the process of selecting appointees.

A related concern is the question of what happens to appointees after they leave an administration. Do women have a more difficult time than men finding jobs of comparable salary and status to those they held in the administration? While there is much interest in this question, we were not able to follow appointees after they left office. An in-depth, longitudinal study that followed the careers of former appointees over a long period of time could provide considerable insight into questions relating to the post-administration career patterns of appointees.

Finally, we hope that future research will move beyond the question of how women obtain appointments to ask whether female appointees have a distinctive impact on policy decisions within an administration. The data presented in Chapter 4 of this report suggest that women cabinet-level appointees may have somewhat different views than appointees generally, especially on issues of special concern to women. Whether these different views translate into different priorities and policy decisions when women occupy positions of power is a question that remains for future research.

Appendix 1

WOMEN STATE CABINET-LEVEL APPOINTEES 1981¹

ALABAMA

Governor: Forrest H. James, Jr. (D)

Becky Beasley, Commissioner
Medical Services Administration

Caroline Cavanaugh, Director
State Bureau of Publicity & Information

Lynda Hart, Director
Comprehensive Employment & Training Act

Kay Ivy, Assistant Director
Alabama Development Office

Kay Kelley, Director
Commission on Aging

ALASKA

Governor: Jay S. Hammond (R)

Helen Beirne, Commissioner
Department of Health & Social Services

Carole Burger, Special Assistant
Office of the Governor

Vicki A. Clayman, Special Assistant
Office of the Governor

Jessie Dodson, Deputy Executive Assistant
Office of the Governor

Rebecca Engen, Special Assistant
Office of the Governor

Lee McAnerney, Commissioner
Department of Community & Regional Affairs

Frances Ulmer, Director
Division of Policy Development & Planning

ARIZONA

No women serving in cabinet

ARKANSAS

Governor: Frank White (R)

Peggy Barnes, Acting Director
Labor Department

Rose Crane, Director
Department of Natural & Cultural Heritage

Cherry Duckett, Acting Director
Department of Energy

Jo Luck Wilson, Director
Department of Parks & Tourism

CALIFORNIA

Governor: Edmund G. Brown, Jr. (D)
Mary Ann Graves, Director
Department of Finance
Alice Lytle, Secretary
State & Consumer Services Agency
Mary Nichols, Secretary
Department of Environmental Affairs
Lynn Schenk, Secretary
Business, Transportation & Housing Agency

COLORADO

Governor: Richard D. Lamm (D)
Paula Herzmark, Executive Director
Department of Local Affairs
Gail Klapper, Executive Director
Department of Personnel

CONNECTICUT

Governor: William A. O'Neill (D)
Ella Cromwell, Director
Governor's Information Bureau
Mary M. Heslin, Commissioner
Department of Consumer Protection
Sanchia Spandow, Director
Governor's Southern Office

DELAWARE

Governor: Pierre S. du Pont IV (R)
Christine Harker, Executive Director
Delaware Criminal Justice Planning Commission
Patricia C. Schramm, Secretary
Department of Health & Social Services
Marna Whittington, Secretary
Department of Administrative Services

FLORIDA

Governor: Bob Graham (D)
Lenora H. Harman, Executive Director
Judicial Administrative Commission
Joan Heggen, Secretary
Department of Veteran and Community Affairs
Victoria J. Tschinkel, Secretary
Department of Environmental Regulation
Nancy Kelley Wittenberg, Secretary
Department of Professional Regulation

GEORGIA

Governor: George Busbee (D)
Tina Brown, Administrative Assistant
Office of the Governor
Jean Horwatt, Executive Assistant
Office of the Governor
Jewell Saunders, Executive Director
Office of Fair Employment Practices
Cindy Wright, Assistant Executive Counsel
Office of the Governor

HAWAII

Governor: George R. Ariyoshi (D)
Mary Bitterman, Director
Department of Regulatory Agencies
Georgiana K. Padeken, Chairwoman
Hawaiian Homes Commission

IDAHO

Governor: John V. Evans (D)
Rose Bowman, Director
Office of Aging
Betsey Park, Special Assistant
Office of the Governor
Marilyn Schuler, Director
Division of Human Rights
Barbara Swaczy, Special Assistant
Office of the Governor
Jean Terra, Special Assistant
Office of the Governor
Helen Werner
Deputy State Superintendent of Public Schools

ILLINOIS

Governor: James R. Thompson (D)
Peg Blaser, Director
Department on Aging
Joanne Mitchell, Executive Director
Illinois Commission on Delinquency Prevention
Sandra Nye, Director
Guardianship & Advocacy Commission
Rebecca Schneiderman, Chairwoman
Illinois Industrial Commission
Joyce E. Tucker, Director
Department of Human Rights

INDIANA

Governor does not appoint cabinet members

IOWA

List not received in time to be included in the study

KANSAS

Governor: John Carlin (D)

Sylvia Hougland
Secretary of Aging

KENTUCKY

Governor: John Y. Brown, Jr. (D)

Jackie Swigart, Secretary
Department for Natural Resources & Environmental Protection

LOUISIANA

Governor: David C. Treen (R)

Debra R. Bowland, Secretary
Department of Labor

Mrs. Lawrence H. Fox, Secretary
Department of Culture, Recreation & Tourism

Shirley McNamara, Secretary
Department of Revenue & Taxation

MAINE

Governor: Joseph E. Brennan (D)

Barbara Cottrell, Director
State Development Office

Edith Hary
State Law Librarian

Sharon Lunner, Director
Housing Authority

Jadine O'Brien, Director
Division of Community Services

Patricia Ryan, Executive Director
Maine Human Rights Commission

Jane Weed, Executive Director
State Employment & Training Council

MARYLAND

Governor: Harry R. Hughes (D)

Constance Lieder, Secretary
Department of State Planning

MASSACHUSETTS

Governor: Edward J. King (D)

Eileen Schell, Secretary
Consumer Affairs

MICHIGAN

Governor: William G. Milliken (R)
Ruth Rasmussen, Director
Department of Civil Rights

MINNESOTA

Governor: Albert Quie (IR)
Mary Alice Brophy, Commissioner of Securities
Department of Commerce
Marilyn E.V. McClure
Human Rights Commission
Kris Sanda, Director
Consumer Services
Barbara L. Sundquist, Commissioner
Employee Relations

MISSISSIPPI

Governor: William F. Winter (D)
Janice Ammann, Executive Secretary
Office of the Governor
Lisa Bourdeaux, Special Assistant
Intergovernmental Relations
Office of the Governor
Dr. Jane Duker, Director
Department of Mental Health

MISSOURI

List not received in time to be included in the study

MONTANA

Governor: Ted Schwinden (D)
Ellen J. Feaver, Director
Department of Revenue

NEBRASKA

Governor: Charles Thone (R)
Anne Campbell, Commissioner
Department of Education
Janet L. Pieper, Director
Department of Personnel

NEVADA

Governor: Robert List (R)
Linda Ryan, Director
Office of Community Services
Ann Silver, Executive Director
State Comprehensive Employment & Training Office

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Governor does not appoint cabinet members

NEW JERSEY

Governor: Brendan T. Byrne (D)

Barbara Curran, Commissioner
Board of Public Utilities

Jerry Fitzgerald English, Commissioner
Department of Environmental Protection

Dr. Joanne E. Finley, Commissioner
Department of Health

Marilyn Berry Thompson, Director
New Jersey-Washington Office

NEW MEXICO

Governor: Bruce King (D)

Kay Marr, Secretary
Department of Finance & Administration

NEW YORK

Governor: Hugh L. Carey (D)

Barbara B. Blum, Commissioner
Department of Social Services

Dr. Sheila B. Blume, Director
Division of Alcoholism & Alcohol Abuse

Lou Glasse, Director
Office of Aging

Kitty Carlisle Hart, Chairwoman
New York State Council on the Arts

Muriel F. Siebert, Superintendent
Department of Banking

NORTH CAROLINA

Governor: James B. Hunt, Jr. (D)

Sara Hodgkins, Secretary
Department of Cultural Resources

Dr. Sarah Morrow, Secretary
Department of Human Resources

NORTH DAKOTA

Governor does not appoint cabinet members

OHIO

Governor: James A. Rhodes (R)

Helen W. Evans, Director
Department of Industrial Relations

OKLAHOMA

Governor: George Nigh (D)
Jeannette Edmondson
Secretary of State
Betty Ward, Administrative Assistant
Office of the Governor

OREGON

Governor: Victor Atiyeh (R)
Betty Browne, Chairwoman
Board of Parole
Kristine Gebbie, Administrator
Health Division
Department of Human Resources
Jane Huston, Director
Department of Commerce
Marcia Lowell
State Librarian
Betty Reynolds, Executive Director
Government Ethics Commission
Karen Roach, Administrator
Children's Services
Department of Human Resources
Jody Surgeon-Houghton, Executive Director
Administrative Services Agency

PENNSYLVANIA

Governor: Richard L. Thornburgh (R)
Shirley Dennis, Secretary
Community Affairs
Helen O'Bannon, Secretary
Department of Public Welfare
Diana Rose, Chairwoman
Pennsylvania Council on the Arts
Helen Seager, Executive Director
Commission for Women
Susan Shanaman, Chairwoman
Public Utility Commission

RHODE ISLAND

Governor: J. Joseph Garrahy (D)
Mary C. Hackett, Director
Department of Employment Security
Lorraine Silberthau, Director of Public Information
Office of the Governor
Anna Tucker, Director
Department of Elderly Affairs
Fay Zipkowitz, Director
Department of Library Services

SOUTH CAROLINA

Governor does not appoint cabinet members

SOUTH DAKOTA

Governor: William J. Janklow (R)

Judith Meierhenry, Secretary
Department of Labor

Marcella Prue, Coordinator
Office of Indian Affairs

Helen Wegner, Secretary
Department of Commerce

TENNESSEE

Governor: Lamar Alexander (R)

Julia Gibbons, Legal Counsel
Office of the Governor

Mrs. Marc Lavine, Assistant
Office of the Governor

Martha Olsen, Commissioner
Department of Revenue

Virginia Parker, Executive Assistant
Office of the Governor

Debby Patterson, Deputy Press Secretary
Office of the Governor

Sammie Lynn Puett, Commissioner
Human Services

Susan Richardson
Office of the Governor

TEXAS

Governor: William P. Clements, Jr. (R)

Polly Sowell, Deputy Director
Personnel and Appointments
Office of the Governor

Kay Woodward, Director of Scheduling
Office of the Governor

UTAH

No women serving in cabinet

VERMONT

Governor: Richard A. Snelling (R)

Sister Elizabeth Candon, Secretary
Department of Human Services

Nancy K. Knox, Special Assistant
Office of the Governor

VIRGINIA

Governor: John N. Dalton (R)

Dr. Jean L. Harris, Secretary
Department of Human Resources

WASHINGTON

Governor: John Spellman (R)

Karen Rahm, Director
Planning and Community Affairs

WEST VIRGINIA

Governor: John D. Rockefeller IV (D)

Phyllis Arnold, Commissioner
Department of Banking

Gretchen Lewis, Director
Workmen's Compensation Fund

Virginia Roberts, Commissioner
Department of Motor Vehicles

WISCONSIN

Governor: Lee S. Dreyfus (R)

Ann Haney, Secretary
Department of Regulation & Licensing

WYOMING

Governor does not appoint cabinet members

Appendix 2
 WOMEN STATE CABINET-LEVEL APPOINTEES 1983¹

CHART A: WOMEN AS A PROPORTION OF APPOINTED STATE CABINET-LEVEL OFFICIALS
 BY STATE, 1983

State	Percent Women	State	Percent Women
Alabama	4%	Montana	6%
Alaska	14	Nebraska	18
Arizona	0	Nevada	20
Arkansas	16	New Hampshire ^b	...
California	10	New Jersey	9
Colorado	6	New Mexico	33
Connecticut	25	New York	15
Delaware	18	North Carolina	18
Florida	9	North Dakota ^b	...
Georgia ^a	...	Ohio	13
Hawaii	18	Oklahoma	19
Idaho	9	Oregon	11
Illinois	9	Pennsylvania	6
Indiana ^b	...	Rhode Island	24
Iowa	20	South Carolina ^b	...
Kansas	15	South Dakota	21
Kentucky	14	Tennessee	17
Louisiana	15	Texas	33
Maine	13	Utah	13
Maryland	17	Vermont	16
Massachusetts	36	Virginia	29
Michigan	27	Washington	4
Minnesota	21	West Virginia	8
Mississippi	10	Wisconsin	27
Missouri	6	Wyoming ^b	...
Total, all states 15% ^c			

^aInformation from Georgia was not available.

^bThe governors of Indiana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Carolina, and Wyoming do not appoint cabinet members.

^cThis percentage represents 152 women out of 1009 total cabinet-level appointees identified by governors in March 1983.

ALABAMA

Governor: George C. Wallace (D)
Faye S. Baggiano, Commissioner
Medicaid Agency

ALASKA

Governor: William Sheffield (D)
Lisa Rudd, Commissioner
Department of Administration
Esther Wunnicke, Commissioner
Department of Natural Resources

ARIZONA

No women serving in cabinet

ARKANSAS

Governor: Bill Clinton (D)
Phyllis Garnett, Commissioner
Pollution Control and Ecology
Jo Luck Wilson, Commissioner
Department of Parks and Tourism
Betsey Wright, Director
Staff and Government Operations
Office of the Governor

CALIFORNIA

Governor: George Deukmejian (R)
Shirley Chilton, Secretary
State & Consumer Services

COLORADO

Governor: Richard D. Lamm (D)
Gail Schoettler, Director
Department of Personnel

CONNECTICUT

Governor: William A. O'Neill (D)
Elisha C. Freedman, Commissioner
Department of Administrative Services
Norma Glasgow, Commissioner
Department of Higher Education
Mary M. Heslin, Commissioner
Department of Consumer Protection
Mary Ellen Klinck, Commissioner
Department of Aging
Sanchia Spandow, Director
Southern Connecticut Office of the Governor

CONNECTICUT (Continued)

Audrey M. Worrell, Commissioner
Department of Mental Health

DELAWARE

Governor: Pierre S. du Pont IV (R)
Eleanor Craig, Chairwoman
Delaware Economic and Financial Advisory Council
Patricia C. Schramm, Secretary
Department of Health and Social Services
Marna Whittington, Director
Office of the Budget

FLORIDA

Governor: Bob Graham (D)
Victoria J. Tschinkel, Secretary
Department of Environmental Regulation

GEORGIA

Information not available

HAWAII

Governor: George Ariyoshi (D)
Mary Bitterman, Director
Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs
Georgiana K. Padeken, Chairwoman
Hawaiian Homes Commission
Donnis Thompson, Superintendent
Department of Education

IDAHO

Governor: John Evans (D)
Rose Bowman, Director
Office on Aging
Marilyn Shuler, Director
Human Rights Commission

ILLINOIS

Governor: James R. Thompson (R)
Peg Blaser, Director
Department on Aging
Olive S. Foster
State Historian
Ann Kiley, Executive Director
Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities
Sandra Klubeck, Director
Guardianship and Advocacy Commissioner

ILLINOIS (Continued)

Sue Massie, Executive Director
Illinois Abandoned Mined Lands Reclamation Council

Joyce E. Tucker, Director
Department of Human Rights

INDIANA

Governor does not appoint cabinet members

IOWA

Governor: Terry Branstad (R)

Mary Ellis, Director
Department of Substance Abuse

Sue Follon, Director
Commission on Status of Women

Kathryn Graf
Administrative Rules Coordinator

Lois J. Kalleen
Board of Architectural Examiners

Betty Minor, Director
Credit Union Department

Anne Mowery
Nursing Board

Nancy Norman
Commission for the Blind

Artis Reis
Civil Rights Commission

Colleen Shearer
Department of Job Service

Karen Tynes
Commission of the Aging

Fran Van Winkle
Merit Employment

Kay Williams
Campaign Finance Disclosure Committee

Willis Ann Wolff
College Aid Commission

KANSAS

Governor: John Carlin (D)

Sylvia Hougland, Secretary
Department on Aging

Barbara Sabol, Secretary
Department of Health and Environment

KENTUCKY

Governor: John Y. Brown, Jr. (D)

Jackie Swigart, Secretary
Natural Resources and Environmental Protection

KENTUCKY (Continued)

June Taylor, Chief of Staff
Office of the Governor

LOUISIANA

Governor: David C. Treen (R)

Mrs. Lawrence H. Fox, Secretary
Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism

Shirley McNamara, Secretary
Department of Revenue and Taxation

MAINE

Governor: Joseph E. Brennan (D)

Constance Ireland, Commissioner
Office of Energy Resources

Sharon Lunner, Director
Maine State Housing Authority

Jadine O'Brien, Director
Community Services

MARYLAND

Governor: Harry R. Hughes (D)

Constance Lieder, Secretary
Department of State Planning

Ruth W. Massinga, Secretary
Department of Human Resources

MASSACHUSETTS

Governor: Michael S. Dukakis (D)

Amy Anthony, Commissioner
Department of Communities & Development

Paula W. Gold, Commissioner
Department of Consumer Affairs

Evelyn F. Murphy, Commissioner
Department of Economic Affairs

Sharon M. Pollard, Commissioner
Department of Energy Resources

MICHIGAN

Governor: James J. Blanchard (D)

Elizabeth Howe, Director
Department of Licensing and Regulation

Agnes Mary Mansour, Director
Department of Social Services

Olivia Maynard, Director
Office of Services to the Aging

Gloria Smith, Director
Department of Public Health

MINNESOTA

Governor: Rudy Perpich (DFL)

Lynn Anderson, Deputy Chief-of-staff
Office of the Governor

Sister Mary Madonna Ashton, Commissioner
Department of Health

Barbara Beerhalter, Commissioner
Department of Economic Security

Sandra Gardebring, Executive Director
Pollution Control Agency

Irene Gomez-Bethke, Commissioner
Department of Human Rights

Sandra Hale, Commissioner
Department of Administration

Sally Martin, Director
Department of Public Service

Nina Rothchild, Commissioner
Department of Employee Relations

Juanita Satterlee, Commissioner
Public Utilities Commission

MISSISSIPPI

Governor: William F. Winter (D)

Janice Ammann
Executive Secretary to the Governor

Lisa Bourdeaux
Special Assistant to the Governor

Dr. Jane Duker, Director
Department of Mental Health

MISSOURI

Governor: Christopher Bond (R)

Paula V. Smith, Director
Department of Labor & Industrial Relations

MONTANA

Governor: Ted Schwinden (D)

Ellen J. Feaver, Director
Department of Revenue

NEBRASKA

Governor: Robert Kerrey (D)

Helen Boosalis, Director
Department of Aging

Gina Dunning, Director
Department of Welfare

Kandra Hahn, Acting Director
Office of Energy

NEBRASKA (Continued)

Holly Jensen, Director
Department of Motor Vehicles

Donna Karnes
State Tax Commissioner

NEVADA

Governor: Richard H. Bryan (D)

Barbara Bennett, Deputy Administrator
Youth Services Division

C.J. Hadley, Publisher
Nevada Magazine

Marlene Lockard
Executive Assistant to the Governor

Roz Parry, Executive Director
State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee

Linda A. Ryan, Director
Office of Community Services

Ann D. Silver, Executive Director
Comprehensive Employment and Training Office

Leslie Sluman, Director
Department of Economic Development

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Governor does not appoint cabinet members

NEW JERSEY

Governor: Thomas H. Kean (R)

Jane Burgio
Secretary of State

Barbara Curran, President
Public Utilities Commission

Catherine Randlett, Director
New Jersey-Washington Office

NEW MEXICO

Governor: Toney Anaya (D)

Judith M. Espinosa, Secretary
Transportation Department

Vickie Fisher, Secretary
Taxation and Revenue Department

Denise Fort, Secretary
Department of Finance & Administration

Shirley Hill Witt, Secretary
Natural Resources Department

NEW YORK

Governor: Mario M. Cuomo (D)

Karen Burstein, President
Civil Service Commission

Lillian Roberts, Commissioner
Department of Labor

Yvonne S-Leftwich, Commissioner
Division of Housing and Community Renewal

Gail Shaffer
Secretary of State

NORTH CAROLINA

Governor: James B. Hunt, Jr. (D)

Sara W. Hodgkins, Secretary
Department of Cultural Resources

Sarah T. Morrow, Secretary
Department of Human Resources

Betty Owen, Senior Policy Advisor
Office of the Governor

Jane Smith Patterson, Secretary
Department of Administration

NORTH DAKOTA

Governor does not appoint cabinet members

OHIO

Governor: Richard F. Celeste (D)

Dr. Minnie Johnson, Director
Department of Mental Retardation

Joanne Limbach, Director
Tax Department

Chris Sale
Office of Budget and Management

Dr. Roberta Steinbacher, Director
Department of Employment Services

OKLAHOMA

Governor: George Nigh (D)

Jeannette Edmondson
Secretary of State

Dr. Joan Leavitt, Commissioner
Department of Health

Cindy Rambo, Director
Department of Economic and Community Affairs

Carolyn Smith, Senior Administrative Assistant
Office of the Governor

OREGON

Governor: Victor G. Atiyeh (R)
Kristine Gebbie, Administrator
Health Division
Felicia Gniewosz, Director
Psychiatric Security Review Board
Hazel Harp, Director
Board of Parole
June Huston, Director
Department of Commerce
Betty Reynolds
Ethics Commission
Karen Roach, Administrator
Children's Services

PENNSYLVANIA

Governor: Richard L. Thornburgh (R)
Shirley Dennis, Secretary
Department of Community Affairs

RHODE ISLAND

Governor: J. Joseph Garrahy (D)
Mary C. Hackett, Director
Department of Employment Security
Dr. Eleanor M. McMahon, Commissioner
Higher Education
Anna M. Tucker, Director
Department of Elderly Affairs
Dr. Fay Zipkowitz, Director
Department of Library Services

SOUTH CAROLINA

Governor does not appoint cabinet members

SOUTH DAKOTA

Governor: William J. Janklow (R)
Judith Meierhenry, Secretary
Department of Education and Cultural Affairs
and Secretary, Department of Labor
Marcella Prue, Coordinator
Office of Indian Affairs
Helen Wegner, Secretary
Department of State Development

TENNESSEE

Governor: Lamar Alexander (R)
Stephanie Chivers, Legislative Assistant
Office of the Governor

TENNESSEE (Continued)

Mrs. Marc Lavine, Ombudsman
Office of the Governor

Martha B. Olsen, Commissioner
Revenue Department

Debby Patterson, Deputy Press Secretary
Office of the Governor

Sammie Lynn Puett, Commissioner
Department of Human Services

Debi Tate
Special Assistant to the Governor

TEXAS

Governor: Mark White (D)

Ann Arnold, Press Secretary
Office of the Governor

Linda Evans, Director of Scheduling
Office of the Governor

Mary Hardesty, Special Assistant for Research and
Policy Coordination
Office of the Governor

Susan McBee, Special Assistant for Legislative Liaison
Office of the Governor

Myra McDaniel, General Counsel, Criminal Justice Division
Office of the Governor

Sue-Jane White, Director
Governor's Office for Volunteer Services

UTAH

Governor: Scott M. Matheson (D)

Martha Dyer
Planning Coordinator

Helen Goddard
Executive Reorganization

Elaine B. Weiss
Financial Institutions

VERMONT

Governor: Richard A. Snelling (R)

Sandra D. Dragon, Commissioner
Department of Employment and Training

Margaret P. Garland, Director
Energy Office

Nancy K. Knox, Special Assistant
Office of the Governor

VIRGINIA

Governor: Charles S. Robb (D)
Betty J. Diener, Secretary
Department of Commerce and Resources
Mrs. Stewart Gamage, Director
Virginia Liaison Office, Washington, D.C.
Judith S. Johnson, Executive Assistant
Office of the Governor
Laurie Naismith
Secretary of the Commonwealth

WASHINGTON

Governor: John Spellman (R)
Karen Rahm, Director
Planning and Community Affairs Agency

WEST VIRGINIA

Governor: John D. Rockefeller IV (D)
Gretchen Lewis, Director
Workmen's Compensation Fund
Virginia Roberts, Director
Department of Motor Vehicles

WISCONSIN

Governor: Anthony S. Earl (D)
Doris Hanson, Secretary
Department of Administration
Barbara Nichols, Secretary
Department of Regulation and Licensing
Linda Reivitz, Secretary
Department of Health and Social Services

WYOMING

Governor does not appoint cabinet members

NOTES

Introduction

1. Stephen B. Farber, "Introduction," State Government 55 (1982): 66.
2. Thad L. Beyle and Robert Dalton, "Appointment Power: Does It Belong to the Governor?" State Government 54 (1981): 7.
3. Ibid., p. 3.
4. In recent years, somewhat more attention has been focused on the appointments process. See, for example, Beyle and Dalton, "Appointment Power,"; Diane Kincaid Blair, "The Gubernatorial Appointment Power: Too Much of a Good Thing?" State Government 55 (1982): 88; and National Governors' Association, Center for Policy Research, Reflections on Being Governor (Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association, 1981).
5. The governors of Iowa and Missouri did not respond in time to our request for a list of their cabinet members and are therefore not included in our analysis. Five states--Indiana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Carolina, and Wyoming--do not appoint cabinet officials; therefore, they also are not included in the analysis.
6. Fourteen of the sixteen women who were selected as part of this sample participated in the study. These fourteen are included both in the sample of all appointees and in the population of women serving in cabinet positions.
7. Since 1971, the Eagleton Poll has been conducting public opinion polls and program evaluation services for local, state, and federal government, interest groups, the media, and others.
8. Copies of the survey instrument (questionnaires) are available from the Center for the American Woman and Politics.
9. Respondents to our survey of female cabinet members were less likely than our sample of all appointees to be heads of departments and were more likely than our sample of all appointees to be members of governors' staffs. Among women appointees, 84.1% were department heads and 15.9% were governors' staff members. Among appointees in general, including both women and men in proportion to their presence in the population of all state appointees, 91.6% were heading departments and 8.4% were serving on governors' staffs.
10. The universe of all state cabinet members includes all officials in the forty-five states that have appointed cabinet members, minus the two states which did not respond to our original request for a list of cabinet members (see note 5 above). Fourteen women who were selected for our sample of all appointees are included in the analysis of all appointees and in the analysis of the total population of women state cabinet-level appointees.
11. The numbers and proportions presented in this section are based on information from forty-three states. Two states--Iowa and Missouri--did not send a list in time to be included in our study. Five states--Indiana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Carolina, and Wyoming--do not have appointed cabinet members.

NOTES

Introduction

1. Stephen B. Farber, "Introduction," State Government 55 (1982): 66.
2. Thad L. Beyle and Robert Dalton, "Appointment Power: Does It Belong to the Governor?" State Government 54 (1981): 7.
3. Ibid., p. 3.
4. In recent years, somewhat more attention has been focused on the appointments process. See, for example, Beyle and Dalton, "Appointment Power,"; Diane Kincaid Blair, "The Gubernatorial Appointment Power: Too Much of a Good Thing?" State Government 55 (1982): 88; and National Governors' Association, Center for Policy Research, Reflections on Being Governor (Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association, 1981).
5. The governors of Iowa and Missouri did not respond in time to our request for a list of their cabinet members and are therefore not included in our analysis. Five states--Indiana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Carolina, and Wyoming--do not appoint cabinet officials; therefore, they also are not included in the analysis.
6. Fourteen of the sixteen women who were selected as part of this sample participated in the study. These fourteen are included both in the sample of all appointees and in the population of women serving in cabinet positions.
7. Since 1971, the Eagleton Poll has been conducting public opinion polls and program evaluation services for local, state, and federal government, interest groups, the media, and others.
8. Copies of the survey instrument (questionnaires) are available from the Center for the American Woman and Politics.
9. Respondents to our survey of female cabinet members were less likely than our sample of all appointees to be heads of departments and were more likely than our sample of all appointees to be members of governors' staffs. Among women appointees, 84.1% were department heads and 15.9% were governors' staff members. Among appointees in general, including both women and men in proportion to their presence in the population of all state appointees, 91.6% were heading departments and 8.4% were serving on governors' staffs.
10. The universe of all state cabinet members includes all officials in the forty-five states that have appointed cabinet members, minus the two states which did not respond to our original request for a list of cabinet members (see note 5 above). Fourteen women who were selected for our sample of all appointees are included in the analysis of all appointees and in the analysis of the total population of women state cabinet-level appointees.
11. The numbers and proportions presented in this section are based on information from forty-three states. Two states--Iowa and Missouri--did not send a list in time to be included in our study. Five states--Indiana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Carolina, and Wyoming--do not have appointed cabinet members.

12. Of the ten cabinet members in the administration of Democratic Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr., four were women.

Chapter 1

BACKGROUND AND FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS

1. Throughout this report, the terms "appointees overall" and "all appointees" refer to our main sample of appointees. The main sample is a systematic sample, consisting of 15% of all people who were serving in state cabinet-level appointed positions in February 1981. The sample represents state cabinet-level appointees overall, including both women and men in proportion to their presence in the population of state appointees. For further information about the sample and response rate, see the INTRODUCTION.
2. Throughout this report, when we discuss "Democratic appointees" and "Republican appointees," we are referring to the political party of the gubernatorial administration and not to the political party affiliation of the respondents.
3. The "other" category for the most part consists of two types of positions. Blue collar occupations (operatives, transport equipment operatives, laborers) were reported by 3.6% of the women appointees and 8.2% of appointees overall. Service worker positions were reported by 4.5% of the women and 3.6% of all appointees.
4. Expertise in a substantive policy area and management skills, which may have been achieved in part through advanced education, are likely to have been more important considerations in the selection of appointees heading agencies and departments than in the selection of appointees serving in more political positions on governors' staffs. Because substantive and managerial training and expertise may be less important for staff positions, one might expect appointees serving on governors' staffs to have less formal education than do appointees serving in department and agency positions.
5. Figure provided by National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education.
6. Ibid.
7. See, for example, Susan J. Carroll and Wendy S. Strimling, Women's Routes to Elective Office: A Comparison with Men's (New Brunswick, NJ: Center for the American Woman and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, 1983), pp. 14-16; James E. Conyers and Walter L. Wallace, Black Elected Officials (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976), pp. 83-84; Paula J. Dubeck, "Women and Access to Political Office: A Comparison of Female and Male State Legislators," Sociological Quarterly 17 (1976): 42-52; Marilyn Johnson and Susan Carroll, Profile of Women Holding Office II (New Brunswick, NJ: Center for the American Woman and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, 1978), p. 16A; Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, Political Woman (New York: Basic Books, 1974), p. 38; and Emily Stoper, "Wife and Politician: Role Strain Among Women in Public Office," in A Portrait of Marginality, ed. Marianne Githens and Jewel L. Prestage (New York: David McKay Company, 1977), p. 323.
8. U.S., Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, USA Statistics in Brief 1981.

9. See Susan J. Carroll and Wendy S. Strimling, Women's Routes to Elective Office, pp. 13-30; and Marilyn Johnson and Susan Carroll, Profile of Women Holding Office II, pp. 7A-20A.

Chapter 2

POLITICAL CREDENTIALS AND PRIOR EXPERIENCE

1. For President Nixon's statements, see Jo Freeman, The Politics of Women's Liberation (New York: David McKay Company, 1975), p. 206. For President Carter's statements, see "Carter and Dr. Kreps Share 2 Verbal Jabs," The New York Times, 21 December 1976. For additional information about the clash between women and President Carter over appointments, see Nancy Hicks, "Feminists Critical of Carter on Jobs," The New York Times, 8 February 1977; and Myra MacPherson, "Catch 22 for Women," The Washington Post, 16 January 1977.

2. This information is from the National Information Bank on Women in Public Office, a service of the Center for the American Woman and Politics. This figure includes members of governors' staffs with cabinet status but does not include elected cabinet officials. Information from Missouri was not available.

3. We suspected that the large number of Democratic and Independent appointees serving in Republican administrations was due, in large part, to holdovers from Democratic administrations in states that had replaced Democratic governors with Republican governors in 1980. However, this was not the case. Only three women appointees and four appointees in the sample of all appointees were serving in such states. In these states, one of the women and all four of the appointees in the main sample were appointed in 1981 by the newly elected Republican governors. Thus, only two appointees in our study, both women, were holdovers from Democratic administrations serving in newly elected Republican administrations. While neither woman was a Republican, the presence of these two women cannot account for the overall difference between Republican and Democratic administrations in the proportion of appointees who shared their governor's party affiliation.

4. See Susan J. Carroll and Barbara Geiger-Parker, Women Appointed to the Carter Administration: A Comparison with Men (New Brunswick, NJ: Center for the American Woman and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, 1983), pp. 19-21; and David T. Stanley; Dean E. Mann; and Jameson W. Doig, Men Who Govern (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1967), p. 41.

5. These positions are the elective positions that appointees had held most recently. The county and local positions mentioned do not include school board positions. The proportions of appointees who had held county and local elective offices do not include those who had held school board positions.

6. Marilyn Johnson and Susan Carroll, Profile of Women Holding Office II (New Brunswick, NJ: Center for the American Woman and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, 1978), p. 4A.

7. While our sample of all appointees includes both women and men in proportion to their presence in the population of state appointees, men make up 87.3% of the sample. As a result, we take the liberty in our conclusions of treating this sample as though it were a baseline for men. In fact, because our sample of all appointees does include some women, the comparisons between women appointees and appointees overall may actually understate rather than overstate differences between the sexes.

Chapter 3
RECRUITMENT

1. Edmond Costantini and Kenneth H. Craik, "Women as Politicians: The Social Background, Personality, and Political Careers of Female Party Leaders," Journal of Social Issues 28 (1972): 236.
2. No women were serving as governors at the time of our study.
3. These percentages are based on the twenty-four women, eleven serving in Democratic administrations and thirteen serving in Republican administrations, who were assisted by an organization in obtaining their appointments.
4. These percentages are based on twenty-four women appointees and twenty appointees in the sample of all appointees. Women's groups are excluded, and all other groups are categorized according to whether they were clearly related, may have been related, or were clearly not related to the appointee's last job.
5. Data are not presented.
6. National Governors' Association, Center for Policy Research, Reflections on Being Governor (Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association, 1981). All quotations from governors are from interviews conducted in 1979.
7. Ibid., p. 13.
8. Ibid., p. 67.
9. Ibid., p. 27.
10. Ibid., p. 90.
11. Ibid., p. 230.

Chapter 4
A WOMAN'S PERSPECTIVE?

1. For an historical review and critique of many of these arguments, see Emily Stoper and Roberta Johnson, "The Weaker Sex and the Better Half: The Idea of Women's Moral Superiority in the American Feminist Movement," Polity 10 (1977): 192-217.
2. Although the format of the questions differed somewhat, women in our 1977 study of public officeholders were more likely than appointees in this study to believe that women in office work harder than their male counterparts. More than 70% of women serving in every category of office at local, county, and state levels in 1977 agreed with the statement, "Women in office generally devote more time to the job than do men." See Marilyn Johnson and Susan Carroll, Profile of Women Holding Office II (New Brunswick, NJ: Center for the American Woman and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, 1978), p. 42A, Table 56.

3. See Gerald Pomper, Voters' Choice: Varieties of American Electoral Behavior (New York: Harper & Row, 1975), pp. 78-82; and Sandra Baxter and Marjorie Lansing, Women and Politics: The Invisible Majority (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1980), pp. 57-59.

4. See, for example, Gallup Opinion Index, Report #158, September 1978.

5. The CBS News/New York Times survey of April 5-7, 1979 found that 49% of women but only 32% of men disapproved of "building more nuclear power plants to generate electricity." See "Opinion Roundup," Public Opinion 2, no. 3 (June/July 1979): 26. For more evidence of sex differences on questions dealing with nuclear power, see Gallup Opinion Index, Report #165, April 1979.

6. This item expresses the idea embodied in the Human Life Amendment considered by Congress during the early 1980s.

7. For example, we found that elected women officials in 1977 reported from three to six current active memberships on the average. See Johnson and Carroll, Profile of Women Holding Office II, p. 11A. We found that a majority of female county commissioners and state legislators serving in 1981 belonged to at least one major women's organization. See Susan J. Carroll and Wendy S. Strimling, Women's Routes to Elective Office: A Comparison with Men's (New Brunswick, NJ: Center for the American Woman and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, 1983), p. 87.

8. The precise wording of the questions in Table 4.1 is as follows:

Do you agree or disagree with the statement, "Women have just as much opportunity as men to become political leaders"?

Would you say that identifying women who are qualified for high-level appointive positions is more difficult, less difficult, or about the same as identifying men who are qualified for appointive positions?

Do you agree or disagree with the statement, "In general, men make better managers than women"?

Do you think women in office generally devote more, less, or about the same amount of time to the job as men do?

9. The precise wording of the issue items in Table 4.2 and Table 4.5 is as follows:

The military strength of the United States should be superior to that of the Soviet Union.

Persons convicted of murder should receive the death penalty under most circumstances.

In the future, no additional nuclear power plants should be built.

If left alone, except for essential federal regulations, the private sector can find ways to solve our economic problems.

10. The precise wording of the issue items in Table 4.3 and Table 4.6 is as follows:

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

There should be a constitutional amendment to prohibit abortion under all or almost all circumstances.

The Equal Rights Amendment should be ratified.

The women's movement has gone too far in pushing for equality between the sexes.

Chapter 5

THE FUTURE: BEYOND THE ADMINISTRATION

1. The number of appointees who had held elective office is shown in Table 2.7, Chapter 2.

2. See Irene Diamond, Sex Roles in the State House (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1977); Barbara G. Farah, "Climbing the Political Ladder: The Aspirations and Expectations of Partisan Elites," in New Research on Women and Sex Roles at the University of Michigan, ed. Dorothy G. McGuigan (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Center for the Continuing Education of Women, 1976); Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, The New Presidential Elite (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976); Maureen R. S. M. Fiedler, "The Participation of Women in American Politics," (Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, 1975); Edmond Costantini and Kenneth H. Craik, "Women as Politicians: The Social Background, Personality and Political Careers of Female Party Leaders," Journal of Social Issues 28 (1972): 217-236; and M. Kent Jennings and Norman Thomas, "Men and Women in Party Elites: Social Roles and Political Resources," Midwest Journal of Political Science 7 (1968): 469-492.

3. See Marilyn Johnson and Susan Carroll, Profile of Women Holding Office II (New Brunswick, NJ: Center for the American Woman and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, 1978), pp. 51A-53A.

Appendix 1

WOMEN STATE CABINET-LEVEL APPOINTEES 1981

1. This list includes women state cabinet-level appointees as identified by governors in February 1981.

Appendix 2

WOMEN STATE CABINET-LEVEL APPOINTEES 1983

1. This list includes women state cabinet-level appointees as identified by governors in March 1983.

SELECTED READINGS

- Aberbach, Joel D.; Chesney, James D.; and Rackman, Bert. "Exploring Elite Political Attitudes: Some Methodological Lessons." Political Methodology 2 (1975): 1-27.
- Adams, Bruce, and Kavanagh-Baran, Kathryn. Promise and Performance: Carter Builds a New Administration. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books/D.C. Heath and Company, 1979.
- Baxter, Sandra, and Lansing, Marjorie. Women and Politics: The Invisible Majority. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1980.
- Beyle, Thad L., and Dalton, Robert. "Appointment Power: Does It Belong to the Governor?" State Government 54 (1981): 2-12.
- Blair, Diane Kincaid. "Gubernatorial Appointments and Legislative Influence." Unpublished paper. University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.
- Blair, Diane Kincaid. "The Gubernatorial Appointment Power: Too Much of a Good Thing?" State Government 55 (1982): 88-92.
- Burch, Philip H., Jr. The New Deal to the Carter Administration: Elites in American History, vol. 3. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1980.
- "Carter and Dr. Kreps Share 2 Verbal Jabs." The New York Times, 21 December 1976.
- Center for the American Woman and Politics. Bringing More Women Into Public Office. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for the American Woman and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, 1983.
- This series comprises seven reports. In addition to this report, Women Appointed to State Government, the series includes the following reports, all available from the Center for the American Woman and Politics:
- Carroll, Susan J., and Geiger-Parker, Barbara. Women Appointed to the Carter Administration: A Comparison with Men.
- Carroll, Susan J., and Strimling, Wendy S. Women's Routes to Elective Office: A Comparison with Men's.
- Kleeman, Katherine E. Women's PACs.
- Stanwick, Kathy A. Getting Women Appointed: New Jersey's Bipartisan Coalition.
- Stanwick, Kathy A. Political Women Tell What It Takes.
- Stanwick, Kathy A., and Kleeman, Katherine E. Women Make a Difference.
- Conyers, James E., and Wallace, Walter L. Black Elected Officials. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976.
- Costantini, Edmond, and Craik, Kenneth H. "Women as Politicians: The Social Background, Personality, and Political Careers of Female Party Leaders." Journal of Social Issues 28 (1972): 217-236.
- Diamond, Irene. Sex Roles in the State House. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1977.

- Dubeck, Paula J. "Women and Access to Political Office: A Comparison of Female and Male State Legislators." Sociological Quarterly 17 (1976): 42-52.
- Dye, Thomas R. Who's Running America? 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1979.
- Dye, Thomas R., and Pickering, John W. "Governmental and Corporate Elites: Convergence and Differentiation." Journal of Politics 36 (1974): 900-917.
- Farah, Barbara G. "Climbing the Political Ladder: The Aspirations and Expectations of Partisan Elites." In New Research on Women and Sex Roles, edited by Dorothy G. McGuigan. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Center for the Continuing Education of Women, 1976.
- Farber, Stephen. "Introduction." State Government 55 (1982): 66.
- 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.
- Freeman, Jo. The Politics of Women's Liberation. New York: David McKay Company, 1975.
- Heclo, Hugh. A Government of Strangers. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1977.
- Hicks, Nancy. "Feminists Critical of Carter on Jobs." The New York Times, 8 February 1977.
- Jennings, M. Kent, and Thomas, Norman. "Men and Women in Party Elites: Social Roles and Political Resources." Midwest Journal of Political Science 7 (1968): 469-492.
- Johnson, Marilyn, and Carroll, Susan. Profile of Women Holding Office II. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for the American Woman and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, 1978.
- Kirkpatrick, Jeane J. The New Presidential Elite. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976.
- Kirkpatrick, Jeane J. Political Woman. New York: Basic Books, 1974.
- Mackenzie, G. Calvin. The Politics of Presidential Appointments. New York: The Free Press, 1981.
- MacPherson, Myra. "Catch 22 for Women." The Washington Post, 16 January 1977.
- National Governors' Association, Center for Policy Research. Reflections on Being Governor. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association, 1981.
- Pomper, Gerald. Voters' Choice: Varieties of American Electoral Behavior. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.
- Stanley, David T.; Mann, Dean E.; and Doig, Jameson W. Men Who Govern. Washington DC: The Brookings Institution, 1967.

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 Company, 1977.

Stoper, Emily, and Johnson, Roberta. "The Weaker Sex and the Better Half: The Idea of Women's Moral Superiority in the American Feminist Movement." *Polity* 10 (1977): 192-217.