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CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

Purpose and objectives.--When the last census of the population of the United States was completed in 1970, the results indicated that there were over 203 million Americans. Of this number, 104,284,000 were women; 98,882,000 were men. The number of women increased 15% over 1960; the number of men increased 12%. Women constituted 51.3% of the population (U.S. News and World Report, 1971).

Armed with these figures, one notes with some alarm that in the very important dimension of national life, the formal activity of women nowhere parallels their numerical strength in the population. Gruberg (1968) reports that it was not until the national election of 1964 that the proportion of women actually voting equalled the proportion of men.

If women, until recently, have been noticeably absent from the polls, their presence has been even more rare in positions of political leadership. The sociological definition of "political leadership" coined by Maurice Duverger (1955) seems adequate here. According to Duverger,

It is to be taken as covering all people and groups, in any given country, at any given time, who have a de jure or a de facto share in the exercise of authority, and play a part in determining decisions. From this angle the basis of political life is the fact that in each social group, in each human community, there is a body of 'leaders,' of 'governors' who are in control of the group and who direct the community (p.75).

When the 93rd Congress of the United States convened in January, 1973, fourteen women were among the five hundred thirty-five members who took seats in the Congress that day. All were in the House of Repre-
sentatives. Nine had been there before; five were newly elected. Early in this first session they were joined by a sixth who was the victor in a special election held to fill the vacancy caused by her husband's death in a tragic plane crash. Now the women number fifteen, a high not exceeded since 1961.

The number of political leaders who are women is small at every level, and decreases as one approaches the very center of national political life. Relatively few women are candidates for office; fewer are actually in state legislatures; and fewer still are Members of Congress. Therefore, it is obvious that any attempt to measure the influence of women in positions of political leadership in the United States can never be a simply quantitative one. Since, however, in spite of the difficulties involved, some women still do seek these offices and attain them, there seems to be some value in asking who these women are, under what circumstances they have been elected or appointed to Congress, and if the fact that they are women playing the Congressional role affects the way they perceive it. In addition, because they are women, is the role for them perceived differently by their male counterparts? These questions are by no means new. Answers in one form or another are in the existing literature. But what has bothered this writer for some time are the preliminary assumptions about the social setting in which these answers have meaning which serve as a point of departure for many who have studied the subject. Therefore, this writer begins this research with as deep an interest in comprehending more about the essential nature of the interactional processes within the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States as in the social characteristics and the personal responses of the Members who are the subjects of the inquiry.
Survey of the literature and its consequences for the research orientation.---For reasons which are discussed in Chapter V this research concentrates on data derived from the House of Representatives over a twenty year period between 1951 and 1971. A survey of the relevant literature concerning women in political roles generally during this period yields search returns; studies of women in Congressional roles are practically non-existent.

A review of Books in Print indicates one comprehensive numerical and biographical survey of women in American politics (Gruberg, 1968) and one collection of selected portraits of ten American women holding high ranking positions in government in the latter half of the 1960's (Lawson, 1968). One other offering (Chamberlin, 1973) antedates the period of concern, but merits mentioning because of its relevance and the fact that its approach might suggest where recent inquiry into the subject actually is.

Gruber initially takes a broad overview type of position assessing the general accomplishments of women in American political life since the achievement of suffrage in 1920, stressing political party affiliation and activity along with organizational membership and participation. This is coupled with some cross-cultural references to the political activity of women in a variety of other cultures. The last half of Gruberg's book is a statistical survey of the social characteristics and significant accomplishments of women in government since 1920. There is an overview of the placement of women in decision-making positions at all levels of national government with particular attention to biographical sketches of America's Congresswomen from 1917-1967. In
addition, summary statements are made regarding offices held by women at both state and local levels.

Lamson chose ten women, six from Congress, stressing routes of access particularly. Among her conclusions are the suggestions that all the women studies are competitive, possessing at least the degree of ruthlessness which competition requires in any field of endeavor; none is militantly feminist, but some at least might be described as femininely militant. This observation proved particularly valuable to the present writer's point of departure.

Chamberlin also renders a biographical profile. Her work is more exclusive than either Lamson's or Gruberg's in that she concentrates only on Members of Congress. At the same time she has a more comprehensive approach than Lamson, dealing with all the women who have served in Congress from Jeannette Rankin to the five newly elected Members of the present Congress. In Chamberlin's book there seems to be an attempt also to construct a typology of sorts, grouping the women in what seem to be rather arbitrarily chosen characteristics. The categorizations are left without comment, however, and appear to serve more as an organizational device than anything else.

In the periodical literature, apart from the biographical sketches of newly elected Members following each Congressional election, there are a few analyses of women's participation in campaign strategies, not as candidate, but as active workers from the election of candidates (Nat. Municipal Review, 1953; Thornburgh, 1954, 1955; Holtzman, 1960; Erskine, 1971; Buenker, 1971).

In addition, Werner (1966) made an important contribution to the
study of women in the Congressional role by examining the existing biographical material in order to offer some generalizations concerning the experience women brought to Congressional offices, what the normal routes of access were, how satisfied the electorate was with their performance, what happened to them after they left Congress, and what the future prospects might be for women's representation at the national level. Her report dealt with seventy women who had served between 1916 and 1964. Some of her salient conclusions are the following:

Thirty-six states sent women to Congress over the years covered. The remaining which have not were about evenly divided among the regions of the country which Werner used as areas of analysis. Almost half the women studied were not born in the state from which they were elected. Forty were Democrats; thirty were Republicans, a distribution which reflected roughly the division of the electorate along party lines.

During the first two decades after suffrage was granted, the majority of Congresswomen won their seats by virtue of what Werner calls "widow's succession." These were women appointed by their respective state governors or elected by the people to fill a vacancy caused by the unexpected deaths of their husbands. A few stayed to carve out independent careers.

Ninety percent of the women Werner studied were married, another figure corresponding closely to the proportion of married women in the population at large. A rather interesting finding was that married women in Congress numbered more than married women in the professions generally. The age at entry covered a broad range. The youngest during this period was thirty-three; the oldest seventy-seven. The modal age was fifty-two. As was expected, Congresswomen were well educated. Four-
fifths in Werner's study had educational attainment beyond high school; more than half were college graduates. Of these, relatively few were graduated from women's colleges. Two-fifths of Werner's population took some postgraduate work at a university; eight had graduate degrees.

As far as occupational experience before entry was concerned, Werner indicated a cluster pattern. About one-third of all the women she studied had worked at some time in their lives in some phase of education. Teaching outranked law and public service three to one. The latter two are the occupations most typical of male legislators, and so the finding highlights a real difference between men and women in the area of occupational experience before entry. Other occupations of significance represented were farming and some phase of communication.

Routes of access typically embraced service in state legislatures and/or an active part in party organizations at the local, state, or national level.

There was a tendency among Werner's subjects to continue their public service after leaving Congress either in some executive position at the federal or state level or in responsible positions in regular party organizations.

An interesting trend-type finding was that women have been more successful in getting elected in Presidential election years and during World War II. As a corollary, their numbers have dropped in periods of economic depression.

Werner also noted, as a paradox, the fact that during the decade of the 1960s the number of women in Congress dropped steadily from an all-time high of nineteen in 1961, while the number of women in state legis-
latures was very slowly but quite surely increasing, as was the number of eligible female voters (There are indications that this trend is somewhat reversed in the 1970s where the number of women in the Ninety-second and Ninety-third Congresses appears to be once again on the upswing).

Another very creditable attempt to impose some analytical order on the biographical data available on America's Congresswomen is the recent study by Bullock and Hays (1972) of the recruitment of women for Congressional offices. Beginning with the assumption that the regularly elected woman will manifest different background characteristics from the widow who succeeds her husband, these authors hypothesize that the former will possess characteristics strikingly similar to the male members. Specifically, they may be expected to be generally well-educated, possessed of some occupational experience outside the home, and have been politically active before entering Congress. On the other hand, widows would have backgrounds less indicative of political aspirations, less formal education, would more often have housewife as their salient status, and would have less political experience than the regularly elected. Moreover, since the regularly elected had background characteristics and experiences similar to Congressman, their behavior was expected to more closely approximate male behavior than their widow counterparts, specifically in the direction of a Congressional career orientation.

The findings indicate that regularly elected women did, in fact, have backgrounds similar to men in contrast to the backgrounds of widows of former Congressmen. Also the expectation that the regularly
elected were more likely than the widows to see Congress as a career was supported by the frequency with which the regularly elected sought re-election. While some widows did stay to carve out independent political careers, this proved to be the exception rather than the rule.

Two other studies relating, not to women in Congressional roles but to the participation of women in state legislatures, deserve mention here because of the potential for hypothesis formation relative to Congress at some later date.

As part of a series of reports on women in political leadership positions, Werner (1968) focused on women in state legislatures, with an eye to reviewing trends in women's representation and party affiliation in both state legislatures and Congress from 1920 to 1964, to discuss the part geography has played in determining feminine effectiveness in state legislatures, and to explore feminine motivation for seeking office and their evaluation of the assets and liabilities a woman experiences in political life. Some of Werner's findings were that the number of women in state legislatures has grown more rapidly than numbers of women in Congress. However, this growth seems especially concentrated in small states, particularly in New England and the West. States with large populations have proportionately fewer women serving in state capitols. More Republican women sit in state legislatures than Democrats. But since Republicans are frequently the minority party, these women seldom have access to prestigious leadership positions and their tenure is frequently short-lived.

The female state legislator is likely to be a multi-faceted individual, frequently combining the roles of wife, mother, business or professional woman, and politician. Her typical age at entry varied a great
deal, but most often she enters the legislative arena after her child-rearing tasks are completed. These women are caught up in social welfare concerns, but Werner does not attribute this to a unique feminine perspective. She notes, rather, that such concerns are often the "stuff" of the legislative process generally at the state level.

Primarily, women's assets are thought to be their social conscience and relative freedom from outside pressures. Liabilities center around adverse public opinion on the part of both voters and politicians and the barriers created by social customs governing female participation.

Like the Chamberlin work cited previously, a study by Costantini and Craik of California politicians (1972) suggests what some of the relevant questions are and indicates the state of contemporary inquiry.

By their own admission Costantini and Craik set out to advance understanding regarding what it takes in terms of background and personality for women to make their way in party politics and to identify any distinctive roles female political leaders might play in modern political life.

Data were collected by mail from leaders of both major parties in California, male and female, between August of 1964 and March of 1965. Significant findings regarding social background were that, while both men and women were generally higher than the population in socio-economic status, contrary to expectations, male leaders were significantly better educated than the women and had higher annual family incomes. Costantini and Craik interpret this to suggest that party elites are fairly representative of the differential socio-economic opportunities and achievement levels of men and woman in the
society at large. The authors further suggest that women party leaders, probably already handicapped by engaging in activity considered a male domain, operate in politics with whatever disadvantages accompany lower class achievement generally.

When ascribed characteristics such as ethnicity, social origin, religion, etc. are compared to achieved characteristics, something of a balance seems to be struck in the case of the women. Women, for instance, were more likely than men to be affiliated with Protestant denominations and were more likely than men to come from old American stock. Regarding this finding, the authors suggest that there may be a greater persistence of traditional sex roles among Catholics, Jews, and those of more recent immigrant stock, thereby discouraging partisan political activity for women from these origins.

Women leaders tended to be older than their male counterparts, suggesting, as Werner did, that perhaps there is greater pressure to establish a home and bear children before becoming politically active. Again, some form of male bias is indicated by the suggestion that, since men dominate the political leadership stratum, they may require that a woman serve a longer apprenticeship period.

Regarding personality characteristics, female leaders scored high on self-confidence, dominance, achievement, number of favorable adjectives checked, and counseling readiness.

The number of favorable adjectives checked suggests, that while both men and women leaders are capable, outgoing, socially skilled, and persistent, the women try harder and worry more. Their high scores on self-control and lower scores on nurturance and affiliation were inter-
interpreted to mean that women express their style in a "relatively earnest, sobersided and ambivalent manner (p. 226)," while the male leaders express basically the same style in a more "easy-going, direct, and uncomplicated way (p. 226)."

In general, Costantini and Craik interpret the data on differences in personality characteristics as follows:

... the present findings indicate that female political leaders differ from most other women in their tendency toward a serious and dutiful manner and a fretful uncertainty about themselves and their situation, which is accompanied by a greater degree of anxiety and readiness for psychological change. These factors, which do not characterize male political leaders, may represent accommodations and consequences of dominant dispositions in women, or they may have unrelated antecedents. The issue warrants further research (p. 226).

On the whole, the female leaders in California who had been delegates to the 1960 and/or 1964 national conventions had actually held public office less than the male delegates. In addition, they attributed significantly less importance to the status of public officeholder as a contributing factor to their being selected as convention delegates. For them other avenues were routes of access to that position.

In California, as elsewhere (Jennings and Thomas, 1968), public office is relatively inaccessible to women, which may in part explain their reluctance to seek it in any significant numbers. In passing, mention might be made of the fact that relative inaccessibility of office does not seem to prevail at the local level in the way that it does at the state and national levels. The nature of the offices and the tendency of women to be more locally oriented are just two of the reasons offered by way of explanation.
Short of holding office, the women respondents in California were as likely as the men to have been active for a considerable period of time within the party structures. In fact, more women than men reported involvement of ten years or more.

A final concern of the Costantini and Craik research was an inquiry into motivation for engaging in political activity. This was viewed as a means of understanding why, despite her efforts, the woman politician has not participated in the reward structure associated with partisan political achievement. On the responses concerning motivation which indicated the greatest sex differences, the women granted significantly greater importance to "strong party loyalty" as a reason for getting into politics.

Again, generalizing, Costantini and Craik observe,

Politics for the male leader is evidently more likely to be a vehicle for personal enhancement and career advancement. But for the woman leader it is more likely to be a 'labor of love,' one where a concern for the party, its candidates, and its programs assumes relatively greater importance. If the male leader appears to be motivated by self-serving considerations, the female leader appears to be motivated by public-serving considerations (pp. 234-35).

As almost an afterthought in their final paragraph these authors relate different career styles and different motivational patterns in the political sphere to the sex role differentiation in the family along expressive and instrumental lines articulated by Parsons and Bales in their oft-quoted analysis of family relationships (1955).

Dissertation Abstracts for the period under scrutiny had scattered offerings. Such representative studies as Krushke (1963) and Levitt (1965) have kept alive a general interest in women in political roles.
A work to which a great debt is acknowledged is Foote's study of the role of the Congresswoman (1967), emphasizing role stress and compensating cultural resources. Foote's problem was to determine how women, who were perceived as atypical incumbents of a masculine role, found the ascribed characteristics important in modifying achieved role expectations. Her approach was to conduct an exploratory case study of the women members of the U.S. House of Representatives in the Eighty-Eighth Congress. From the literature six aspects of the legislative role were derived, and an investigation was undertaken to determine if there was blockage in role performance due to differences in the ascribed role. Where blockage was found, Foote wondered whether the women attempted to remove the blockage or to reduce their sense of involvement in the role. Whatever the outcome, the primary concern related to the cultural resources available which would help reduce the stress occasioned by high involvement and high blockage. Some historical data were gathered for comparative purposes. There was some attempt to group the subjects by demographic commonalities in their respective districts. Women members were interviewed as were their staff assistants, members of the news media, and a quota sample of Congressmen. In addition, behavioral data were gathered on legislation introduced, committee appointments, other special positions and election returns. On these same items data from a matched sample of Congressmen were utilized.

Foote found that, contrary to the suggestions in the literature, women do not specialize in the so-called feminine areas of legislation exclusively or even predominantly, but an analysis of legislation introduced indicated they gave more attention to those interests than men.
The areas of greatest blockage and stress emerged in the informal relationships and leadership segments of the role. To relieve these stressful areas, diverse resources were used but were primarily intended to remove blockage rather than reduce involvement.

Additionally, an interesting finding was that the existing structural norms of the formal organization made it easier to sanction violations of political expectations than those emanating from the more ambiguous ascribed female role. As a result Foote found that the political role was modified very little by the woman members. Since she did not explicitly study differences between regularly elected women and the widows of former Congressmen, she did suggest, in conclusion, that on the question of modification of the political role, there might well be a difference between the widows who succeeded their husbands and those women who were elected in their own right. She suspected that role modification and reduction of involvement would be more characteristic of the former.

In the final analysis, this review of the literature raised many questions for this student of the subject. The interest is in politics at the level of the national legislature. The characteristic style and approach of the women who interact there are of major concern. The House of Representatives is the focal setting since only in this arena have women appeared in anything approaching significant numbers.

The assumption, either explicit or implicit, in the existing research is that women are atypical incumbents of political roles primarily because the woman politician trespasses on what is characterized
as a male domain. Politics is a male domain because the expectations (duties and rights) accruing to the political role call forth responses defined as masculine by our society as these are articulated and reinforced by cultural values. An important consequence of this fact is that women may come to political roles having internalized a minority image (in the sociological sense) of themselves in these roles. But it might be that some women who do aspire and do achieve perceive the social system, in this case the House of Representatives of the United States, quite differently. A case can be made for the contention that the ascribed characteristics of femininity in our society do not necessarily place a woman in conflict with the achieved role expectations associated with membership in the national legislature. The reason is that actually there are many significant ways in which ascribed feminine characteristics are quite consistent with the role expectations of the Member of Congress status when the House as a social system is viewed as the source from which the core meaning of the role emanates.

Additionally, because of the very real difficulty of gathering significant information about and from Members of Congress, there is little knowledge available regarding changes over time. It is known, for example, that the incidences of women elected in their own right have increased in the last decade, but it is not known whether women so elected differ in social characteristics, routes of access, or role perceptions from their regularly elected counterparts in the 1950s. Nor is it known how whatever changes might be observed compare with changes in comparable male characteristics over the same period. Finally, it is not
known how the factors of political party affiliation and regional distribution mediate in affecting the shape of the differences which are observed over time.

Therefore, this research, exploratory in nature, is a further inquiry into the social role of the Congresswoman. It is intended to deal with the following questions.

1. Assuming there are differences in the internalization and the enactment of the Congressional role among men and women, to what extent are these differences attributable to gender, and to what extent do such variables as time of entry, geographic region, and political party affiliation intervene?

2. Among women, are there differences in background characteristics and routes of access which relate to any objective role types?

3. When Members of Congress describe role expectations (rights and duties) regarding their relationship with the leadership, their constituents, and/or their colleagues, are there differences attributable to their being simultaneously in different sex roles, or are these mediated by objective role-type (for the women), time of entry, region of the country, and/or political party affiliation?

4. Are there indications in the Members' of Congress perceptions of the role as it relates to the leadership, constituents, and/or colleagues that they are describing the House of Representatives as a system calling forth responses which may be defined in any way as traditionally feminine?
Before proceeding to probe for answers to these questions, a theoretical foundation by way of perspective must be established. This is the task of the three chapters which follow.
CHAPTER II
THE THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

I. Introduction

Crucial to this research is the suggestion that a woman in the House of Representatives actually is enacting simultaneously a role within a role. As a consequence of political election, she becomes one of the 435 members of the House. This role, Member of Congress, has its qualifications, its social circle, and it confers upon the incumbent certain rights of position as it simultaneously exacts conformity to certain expectations. However, the Congresswoman comes to the Member of Congress role as a woman and, as such, is also subject to her society's definition of woman as a social role. It must be said that few of the traditional expectations of woman per se are consistent with what this society says are the expectations associated with the Member of Congress role. Theoretically, social interaction among Members of Congress is geared to the interactional patterns of the typical American male -- aggressive, manipulative, dominating, self-confident, etc., etc.

The House of Representatives is traditionally associated with a more conservative philosophy of government than is the Senate and, as such, it can be hypothesized that the House attracts and selects a high proportion of persons whose view of life, in general, is conservative. Once this contention is made, it can be argued that more conservative or traditional definitions of other roles, including sex roles, are
likely to prevail there. If this is so, a woman may come to Congress anticipating how she is likely to be received in this male-dominated society with a conservative bent. The woman who achieves is not likely to attempt to alter this response through direct confrontation because, after all, she is political. Rather she meets the system where she finds it, which is not necessarily the same as where it theoretically is, and turns what could be a distinct disadvantage into a political asset of considerable magnitude.

As far as the House is concerned, the possession and use of power is surely one of the major components of the Congressional role. A person who comes to Congress comes with power already, at least to the extent that his right to be there is ratified by the whole group of voters he was able to influence back in the constituency. They did what he wanted them to do; they voted for him. To be sure, whether one is a woman or a man has nothing fundamentally to do with Congressional success or failure. The point is that if one happens to be a woman, she can conceive of being a woman as an aspect of her power, even though, as woman, she may think she is defined negatively in the system. Therefore, she can begin to sense situations where it is in her interests to use this, and consequently she does. This kind of sophistication is typical of the person who happens to be Polish or Catholic or Black and who uses that aspect of his identity to influence other people when it seems appropriate to do so. Duverger (1955) said that women legislators tend to be more caught up in humanitarian, that is, "womanly concerns." Is this really so, or is it that someone who observes women expressing a humanitarian concern makes the application, saying something like,
"Isn't that a typically feminine gesture?" And so the actor, who happens to be a woman, who wants to capitalize on whatever aspect of her power seems relevant at the moment, will not contradict this connection. Thus, a kind of mythology or mystique emerges.

There is, however, a very real danger in all of this for the woman who, in the Congressional setting, must be a politician first of all. This is the danger of being too feminine, just as, politically, one can be too Polish, too Catholic, too Black. To reduce all of the facets of one's identity to one is to minimize or even destroy the political potential of all of the others. Therefore, it may be that in the House of Representatives, one must be a woman like Martha Griffiths is, not one like Bella Abzug is or Charlotte Reid was too much. One of the objectives of this research is to clarify the meaning of this statement.

II. Selected Aspects of Role Theory

Within the framework of the foregoing remarks, some general observations about those aspects of role theory out of which the ideas for this research emanate are in order.

Students of the phenomenon of role behavior readily acknowledge their debt to Robert Merton (1957), whose conceptualization of the "structural context of reference group behavior" yielded the theory that a particular social status involves, not a single associated role, but "an array of associated roles (p.369)." He expressed this concept in the term "role-set" which is "the complement of role relationships which persons have by virtue of occupying a particular social status (p.369)."
As further clarification Merton is careful to distinguish the concept "role-set" from the idea of "multiple roles," explaining that the latter term refers to the "complex of roles associated, not with a single social status, but with the various statuses for a given individual (p. 369)." The complement of social statuses is an individual's "status-set" and each of the statuses, in turn, has its distinct role-set.

There are at least two problems connected with this formulation which are relevant. It seems that most of the literature on status assumes the existence of an evaluative component -- inferiority, superiority, equality, etc. without always dealing with the criteria for assignment of status. This writer feels more at ease with the term "position" as the place in the social system which becomes the focal point for the study of role behavior. A social position is culturally derived. As a consequence of an extremely complex interactional process involving cultural definitions, actors acting, that is, initiating action and responding to what has been initiated, and the uncontrolled dynamics of social situations, positions acquire status as do the individuals who occupy them.

Another problem with the Merton conceptualization is that, given neat definitions of terms, it is often very difficult for a social analyst to operate within a dynamic rather than a static frame of reference. A person assumes a role from some point in his life project. He is "there" because chance, personal ambition, motivation, values, chains of events, etc. have converged to make it "right" for him to be there. This would not be terribly complicated were it not for the fact
that it always takes at least two to form a relationship. The multiple
"others" in an individual's newly acquired "role-set" are there because
chance, ambition, values, circumstances, etc. have converged to make
being "there" right for them also. Merton was acutely aware of this.

With reference to it he says,

It would seem that the basic source of disturbance in the
role-set is the structural circumstance that any one oc-
cupying a particular status has role-partners who are
differently located in the social structure. As a re-
sult, these others may have, in some measure, values
and moral expectations differing from those held by the
occupant of the status in question (p.370).

Invaluable as Merton's contributions are to the theory, other
sources yield still more enlightenment. The summary statement of
Florian Znaniecki's life-long concern with the concept of social role
appears in his unfinished Systematic Sociology (1965). Znaniecki sig-
nificantly expanded the theory in his treatment of what he called the
four components of role: person, social circle, duties, and rights.
Especially in his discussion of person, the time factor is extremely
important. The performance of a role is at one and the same time a
consequence of and a confirmation of a selection process. This se-
lection process itself operates according to evaluative standards which
are culturally derived. A person is selected for the role (and actu-
ally selects to be selected) because it is believed he has the necessary
qualifications. These can run the entire gamut of what the word "qual-
ifications" implies: physical, moral, mental, social, or any combination
of these. The question is whether or not the person, interacting with
his social circle (Merton's role-set), can convert the qualifications
identified at the outset into adequate role performance. This is why
role analysis always involves observation of interaction over time.
Another major contribution of the Znaniecki theory is the rightful place which reciprocity as process is given in the treatment of the social circle as the system in which the role is enacted, and the equal right given to both the duties and rights of incumbency.

Beginning with what might be considered the smallest unit of the social role, the social relationship, Znaniecki observed that when "the same individual is a partner in social relations with a number of others, these relations are usually integrated (p. 88)." This statement does not exclude the possibility that many social relations have no connection with one another whatsoever, and that some may actually be in conflict. But when a number of social relations are to become integrated, Znaniecki believed,

There must be cooperation, not only between the individual and each of his partners, but also cooperation among the partners. When such cooperation exists, and the social relations between him and certain of his partners are integrated, they constitute, all together, a social system (p. 88).

Such a system implies that

The individual himself is identified and positively evaluated by all the partners who are supposed to cooperate with him in this respect.... All those cooperating partners compose together what we shall call the social circle, of which he is the center; and he, in turn, is supposed to evaluate all of them positively. Such a person has definite duties which participants in his social circle expect him to perform. But he cannot adequately perform his duties unless the participants perform theirs on his behalf.... The people who compose his social circle assume together the task of having everything done for him which the norms require.... They grant him definite rights and support these rights by applying positive or negative sanctions to the conduct of each member of the circle (pp. 199-200).

The individual's acceptance of the circle and his acceptance into the circle by the cooperating partners impose upon each the obligation
to perform the duties and confer the rights. What needs to be added is that these choices, in Znaniecki’s words, are not "arbitrary manifestations of individual feelings or volitions; rather they are "based on certain standards of valuation and norms of conduct recognized as binding by participants in the community (p.90)." The role players believe they ought to conform to these standards and norms and Znaniecki believes, to the extent that they do conform, their relation is culturally patterned.

What the above says is that through the exploration of the role concept, the very essence of sociological inquiry, namely the relationship between person, society, and culture, perhaps receives its most sophisticated statement.

The influence of Florian Znaniecki on the thinking of his daughter Helena Znaniecki Lopata, is evident in the fact that not only has she confirmed her father’s basic assumptions through her own research, but she has advanced the theory, making significant contributions of her own.

In most discussions of the role concept an attempt is made to establish some relationship between "role" and "status." The elder Znaniecki was no exception. But in a note to her article on the restatement of the relationship between role and status (1964), Dr. Lopata indicates that by the end of his life, her father had rejected the concept of status, believing that "its confused and static image interfered with the understanding of social roles (p. 67, Note 5)."

Concerning herself with the relationship between the two, Lopata notes that a major difficulty in adequately defining and understanding the two concepts arises from the fact that many contemporary sociologists have been unable to free themselves from the influence of Ralph
Linton, and have assumed that a social role is a consequence of its status. In an effort to restate the relationship, Dr. Lopata suggests a simple reversal of emphasis and a clarification of both concepts in the process.

Rejecting what she considers an oversimplified notion that status is position, Lopata notes that those who adopt this view seldom define the social system of which the position is a part. This results in ignoring the relationships between one position and others in the system, ruling out, for example, any analysis of the power component which is so essential to the discussion in this research concerning women in the Congressional role.

Dr. Lopata goes on to observe that status systems are only one of the systems of positions which society has developed. Status systems are distinguished from others by the fact that they rank items in terms of certain "prestigeful" characteristics. Criteria for deciding what is prestigeful are arbitrary in their inception, but do follow certain cultural determinations made by the status system in question. In this context Lopata is careful to note that the position of any item in any system simply reflects criteria for placement. It defines equals, superiors, inferiors, but it says nothing about the rights and duties of the persons occupying the position (p. 60).

This behavioral aspect is introduced with the role concept. Social roles (defined by Znaniecki as "sets of patterned relations between a social person and a social circle") are placed in status systems after being ranked according to criteria of prestige. Only if the status of the roles persons perform is used as the criterion for placement will
the placement of roles affect the placement of social persons in status scales of persons (p.61).

Observing that it is a sociological fallacy to equate role and status or to consider role as only a consequence of status, Dr. Lopata says,

The placement of an item into a status system may have consequence upon that item and may modify it, but one should never assume that the item has no other characteristics besides those derived from placement. Most social roles have other functions besides the preservation of their status position. It is usually the evaluation of these other functions which form the basis for the role's placement on the status scale, not vice versa (p.61).

In addition, Lopata indicates that "the status of a role is a consequence of the evaluation of that role as compared to other roles," just as "the status of a person is a consequence of the evaluation of that person in comparison to other persons (p.61)." The comparative element, then, according to some culturally established criteria, is always inherent in understanding role placement.

While some social roles do have as their primary function the creation, preservation, or modification of a status position (Lopata refers to these as "status-roles"), there are other kinds of social roles, work roles, for example, which are particularly relevant in our society where pure status-roles are actually rare. This is not to say that all status-roles have disappeared from the American scene. Dr. Lopata concedes that modern societies are influenced by past emphasis on status and have, in fact, often derived new status systems. However, her point is that the bulk of the duties and rights of most social roles arise out of the assigned purpose of the role, and this
purpose is not always the maintenance of status. "Role" is a functional concept; it concerns what people do, and everything a person does in the context of a particular role is not directed to the preservation of a status position. In a sense, if this writer is interpreting Lopata correctly, the sheer dynamics of role behavior can modify the status of the role in specific social settings. For example, everyone in the House of Representatives is a Member of Congress, but because of what they do and how they are as Members of Congress, some members achieve greater status. They become the first among equals, as it were.

What is clear, then, is that a social role is always coming into being, and, at the other end, passing out of being as far as particular persons are concerned. This is verified by Lopata's position that roles have life cycles (1966). So that comments on this point may be clarified, Dr. Lopata's discussion of the life cycle of the social role of the housewife is quoted here in some detail.

Social roles can be located in a variety of systems. They are always assigned positions in status or prestige systems, and, in the case of associational groups, in organizational charts. They can also be seen as having location in clusters of all the social roles carried out by their participants. Each human being performs usually, if not always, several social roles at any stage of his life, each role within a different social circle, but often among the same aggregates of human beings. The role clusters tend to be focused by the individual around a central role, with relative degrees of importance assigned by him to other roles which are placed in different locations from this center. Each role, of course, can take the center stage briefly every time attention is focused on it. However, ... the individual tends to focus on one or at the most two roles in any cluster he maintains. The life cycle of a
human being can be seen as involving shifts in the components of his role cluster when new roles are added and old ones dropped, and shifts in the location of each role in the cluster. Modifications in the characteristics of each role occur as the individual enters different stages of his life cycle or changes his definition of the role, or as a consequence of shifts in the cluster. Changes in the role definition can, of course, be brought about by events external to the person, such as modifications in the components or characteristics of the social circle or in their definitions of the role or of their part in it (p.6).

There is never a time, following from what has been said above, when a woman in a society as complex as ours is performing one role exclusive of all the others she performs. A woman is a wife, a mother, a secretary, a Catholic, etc., simultaneously. Each of these roles has its own social circle, but because human behavior is essentially inter-related, the way one performs the role usually, if not always, has important implications for the performance of all the others. Throughout life the roles frequently shift in being focal for the individual. The "normal" woman "mothers" her children more when they are small than when they have established families of their own. In addition to the above, role clusters tend to form around a central role and an individual ranks the importance of each as they relate to the demands of what he considers the central role. Consequently, the various related roles are invested with a psychological distance from the center. This fact is important to keep in mind not only in the resolution of role-conflict, but in assigning simple priorities in more-or-less integrated role expectations.

Dr. Lopata's position is that at any one time a person tends to focus on a limited number of roles in any cluster, but foci tend to shift and change with time as new roles are introduced and old ones drop off.
Role characteristics change as the individual moves through life, changes his definition of the role, or experiences shifts in the cluster. One controls the response to such changes; one does not always control the initiation of the change. Events and circumstances completely external to the individual may radically alter his relationship with others in his role clusters. Therefore, each role is subject to the vicissitudes of the individual's life cycle and, as a consequence, has a life cycle of its own.

A problem remains, which is extremely difficult to deal with because, essentially, it is so very subjective. Why is it that any role, culturally defined as it is, once it is internalized by a specific person, manifests itself in so many varieties and levels of being? Of all the women on one street who are mothers, no two are mothers in exactly the same way. Yet each mother and each member, in fact, qualifies for the assigned identity.

The explanation is so complex that any research which claims to present it all would be pompous in the extreme. All that can be done is to single out and isolate some small facets of the whole in order to try to make some contribution to the social-psychological dimension of an understanding of role behavior.

In the traditions of the classic explanations offered by Charles Horton Cooley and George Herbert Mead for the emergence of "self", adequate role behavior is either facilitated or hindered by the image of himself a person internalizes as a consequence of how he perceived others are defining and evaluating him in a particular role.

In one of his earliest papers on the rituals of human social inter-
action, Erving Goffman (1955) suggests that in every social encounter an individual tends to act out a "line", that is "a pattern of verbal and nonverbal acts by which he expresses his view of the situation and through this his evaluation of the participants, especially himself (p.5)." By so doing, he assumes a "face", that "positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact (p.5)."

Goffman continues by observing that a person develops an emotional response to the "faces" he develops in the process of social contact. In effect, he "cathects" his face. He becomes attached to it (p.6). At the same time he experiences "feeling" for the faces of others. Goffman observes that one's own face and the faces of others are actually constructs of the same order. He says, "It is the rules of the game and the definition of the situation which determines how much feeling one is to have for face and how this feeling is to be distributed among the faces involved (p.6)."

A person maintains face when his various "lines" present an image which is internally consistent. For Goffman this means that the image is supported by positive evaluations from all the participants and is confirmed by evidence transmitted through impersonal agencies.

From this perspective, social interaction can be said to be a consistent exercise in either projecting "face", maintaining it, or regaining it once it is lost.

III. Role Conflict and Selected Means of Resolution

Social systems remain in existence because actors manage to reconcile whatever differences may arise among them in the process of social
interaction. Some stability in the established patterns of relating is essential to the maintenance of the system. Therefore, sociological thinking has developed a number of frameworks for analysis of the mechanisms by which such stability frequently is achieved and regained once it is lost. Merton (1957) suggests six mechanisms, inherent in systems, for achieving stability. These are not new constructs, but they remain relevant enough to this research to merit consideration. First of all, everyone who relates to others in a particular role-set does so with varying degrees of concern for what is considered adequate behavior for the other in the relationship. Due to the fact that some are usually more concerned than others with the way the relationship is going at any one time, it is possible to reconcile differences when some of the differences, at least, are of peripheral concern. Second, stability is served by the fact that power, the ability to get someone to do one's will, even in the presence of resistance, is constantly shifting. There is a danger in oversimplifying this point, however, because one of the repeated criticisms of analyses of social behavior is that the analyst is often too quick to presume a fixed dominance-subordinance aspect to every relationship. Actually, most relationships are so complex in their dynamics that it is often impossible, at any one moment, to say who is controlling and who is controlled. It is frequently the case that, in the interests of power, it is expedient to appear defeated, to appear controlled, even when one is not. This is emphasized here because in terms of where this writer's thoughts converge regarding women in political roles, this point is crucial.

As a third mechanism for maintaining stability in role relationships,
Merton notes that no status occupant is interacting simultaneously with all of his opposite numbers. Therefore, it is usually possible to go about mending one set of fences without the other interested parties being aware of what is going on. In order to interfere, one has to be aware. For political figures it is important that someone is always aware. The politician can only hope that the concerned parties at any one time do not hold such disparate expectations that what he does alienates some of them irrevocably.

In the Merton scheme a fourth reinforcement for stability occurs when various members of the social circle do themselves become aware that the demands made upon the actor are contradictory and cannot satisfactorily be met. Then, according to Merton, the burden for resolving the contradiction rests with the members of the circle and not with the role-incumbent. This resolution usually is accomplished either through a struggle for power or through some sort of compromise. This is reminiscent of Znaniecki's observation that members of the social circle assume together the duty of providing everything the incumbent needs to perform his duties according to the rules. Therefore, it seems logical to say that the essential part played by the members of the circle in maintaining stability by resolving contradictory demands is one of the rights they bestow upon the incumbent. In this case, instead of being the target of conflicting demands, he becomes a bystander, and eventually, a beneficiary.

The fact that an individual who performs a social role is usually one of many performing the same role is a fifth plus for the maintenance of stability. An individual subject to conflicting demands need not look
upon his situation as a personal matter requiring purely personal solutions. Rather, because others are in similar positions, patterns are established, not only of types of conflicts, but of alternate solutions as well.

Finally, Merton deals with what he calls the "limiting case" in the problem of dealing with incompatible demands from the circle. Certain relationships are broken off; those whose demands are compatible remain. Merton is quick to note, however, that this option is possible only when the incumbent is able to continue performing the role without the cooperation of the cut-off segments of the circle. Far more typical is the situation where this is difficult, if not impossible to achieve (Merton's detailed discussion of the above is on PP. 371-379 of Social Theory and Social Structure).

Neal Gross et al. have contributed a valuable analysis of the role of the School Superintendent (1958). In this work Gross and his associates develop a theory of role conflict which is introduced here for two reasons. First, instead of emphasizing mechanisms inherent in systems for the resolution of conflict, the authors deal with individual responses to conflict, thus rounding out the treatment of the subject begun by Merton. The second reason the theory is included is because of the importance attached to the observation which Gross makes in introducing his theory. He observes that some of the most prominent theories of role conflict are built upon the assumption that conflict occurs because a person occupies multiple positions simultaneously, whereas a great many conflicts arise out of intrarole conflict. If we may take the liberty of imposing the Znaniecki-Lopata terminology on
the Gross text, this means that a person, occupying a single position, interacts with a social circle composed of many other people, any two of whom may present him with conflicting expectations simultaneously. This is precisely the case with the Member of Congress. The circle is as diverse as any which can be envisioned, and it is quite logical to suspect that intrarole conflict is a paramount, if not the primary problem of incumbency. The very nature of the complexity of the Member of Congress role seems automatically to put other roles played by the individual in secondary positions of importance.

Once Gross has established the primacy of intrarole conflict as his primary concern, he and his associates observe that, whenever an actor is exposed to what he perceives to be incompatible expectations from two or more segments of his circle, four alternative responses are available to him in deciding how to resolve the conflict: (1) he can conform to expectation A; (2) he can conform to expectation B; (3) he can perform some compromise behavior which is an attempt to conform to both expectations; or (4) he can try to avoid conforming to either (p. 284). If he chooses the last alternative, the actor attempts to make the problem of resolution one for the circle members to solve. Their demands are incompatible and he considers it part of his due that they resolve these. He does not take upon himself the problem of resolution by choosing to concede to one or another of the demands. Gross' objective in developing the theory was to establish a basis on which to predict which of the four alternatives a given actor would be likely to choose.

To begin with, Gross sees the necessity of determining the actor's
definition of the conflict situation in terms of legitimacy and sanctions. A hypothesis emerging from the first is that actors are predisposed to conformity when the demands of others are perceived as legitimate, and predisposed to nonconformity when expectations are considered illegitimate. If both (or all) conflicting expectations are considered legitimate, the actor will probably attempt compromise. A decision in favor of the legitimate demand is to be expected when the other expectation is considered illegitimate. When both (or all) expectations are defined as illegitimate, then the actor's course is usually an attempt to avoid conformity to either. In the second instance, Gross assumed that, if an actor perceived that failure to conform will result in the application of strong negative sanctions, he is likely to conform; if he feels that nonconformity will elicit slight negative or positive sanctions, the sanction factor will have very little effect on the decision (pp. 285–86).

In real-life situations, however, an actor usually perceives the legitimacy or illegitimacy of the expectations and the relative severity of the sanctions which would accompany nonconformity simultaneously, and must take both into account in making his decision.

When Gross et al. combined the two dimensions of legitimacy and sanctions, they found that predictions regarding how the conflict was likely to be resolved were impossible in over half of their hypothetical situations. From this they concluded that the two factors alone were inadequate since there was no basis for prediction when actors were exposed to role conflicts where the legitimacy and sanctions dimensions predisposed them to different resolutions. Again, starting from the actor's definition of the situation, an assumption that in-
individuals differ according to the primacy of orientation to the legitimacy or sanctions dimension of the conflict situation was introduced. From this perspective, three types of orientations to expectations were presented, accompanied by predictions regarding probable modes of conflict resolution.

There was, first, the person who, in defining the situation, stresses the right of others to have the expectations he perceives they have of him. In so doing he de-emphasizes the sanctions he thinks might accompany nonconformity. Gross characterized this person as having a moral orientation to expectations (p.289). The prediction made for such a person was that, in role conflict situations, his behavior can be predicted according to what might be expected if legitimacy were the only dimension he was considering. He will choose conformity to what he perceives is the legitimate expectation. If both are legitimate, he will seek compromise; if both are perceived as illegitimate, he will attempt avoidance.

Then there is the person who is characterized as expedient. For him the severity of the threatened sanctions for nonconformity are of primary concern. The prediction was that he will conform to that expectation which he perceives is associated with the strongest negative sanctions for nonconformity. If negative sanctions are equally strong for both, compromise will be attempted. If sanctions are perceived as slight in effect, or negligible, the sanctions dimension is of no value in predicting behavior (p.291).

It was supposed, then, that a person with a moral orientation would be predisposed to emphasize the legitimacy of expectations; those
with an expedient orientation would be predisposed to emphasize the sanctions for nonconformity when trying to arrive at conflict resolution.

Again, in visualizing hypothetical situations of role conflict, the authors were aware that it was quite possible for a person to have both a moral and an expedient orientation. Such a person would "take both dimensions into account with the perceived 'net balance' of the two dimensions (p.293)." This was referred to as an M-E orientation.

Concerning this type, the major question referred to the prediction which might be made when equal emphasis on the legitimacy and sanctions dimensions led to opposite conclusions. It was hypothesized that, if expectations A and B are both perceived as legitimate, but the actor expects greater sanctions for nonconformity to be associated with A (or B, as the case may be). If the sanctions dimension is equivalent for both, a decision is likely to be based on the legitimacy criterion and the actor will conform to what he considers the most legitimate expectation.

The question of what prediction could be made when the two dimensions would lead the actor to conform to the opposite expectations still remains. For example, a situation could be conceived of where the legitimacy dimension would require conformity to A, but the sanctions dimension would counsel conformity to B. Gross and his associates believed that, since the person being considered was an M-E, he would opt for some compromise behavior because this would be perceived as the best balance of the two dimensions. What is left, however, still to be disposed of, is a situation where neither of the expectations is perceived
as legitimate, but nonconformity to both is associated with strong negative sanctions. The moralistic aspect of the actor's orientation suggests avoidance; the sanctions aspect, compromise. The prediction was that he would attempt compromise, which again would be an effort to achieve a balance by partly avoiding and partly conforming to both expectations.

Gross concluded that, given the three dimensions of legitimacy, sanctions, and orientation for moral expedients, reliable predictions could be made concerning a person's probable behavior in attempting to resolve role conflicts.

As a final word to this presentation of those aspects of role theory which seem most relevant to this research, a note is added. What this discussion of theory has done is to articulate what is considered necessary to a comprehensive analysis of the Congressional role. The adequate exploration of these theoretical constructs could well be the concern of a professional lifetime. In no way will this research claim to be such an analysis. It is approached as a probing attempt, a first step. Therefore, it will be necessary to select certain aspects of this theory to apply to the subject at hand.

It is this writer's belief that the logic of what is appropriate to apply by way of theory can be derived only after some consideration is given to the nature of the social system in which the role in question has its meaning. Therefore, the specific application of theory to the Member of Congress role will be considered following a description of the House of Representatives as the social setting in which the behavior in question is to be analyzed, interpreted, and evaluated.
CHAPTER III
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AS SETTING

An analysis of the specific social system which is the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States necessitates recognizing, first of all, that the House functions as one unit in a much larger system comprehensively labeled "political", involving parties, pressure groups, the press, and diverse constituencies, to say nothing of the Senate and all other governmental units, national, state, and local.

The House as a unit functions in the legislative branch of national government and shares with the Senate the bicameral character of the legislative branch. Distinct from many other legislative systems throughout the world which declare themselves bicameral, Congress (the collective name for the national legislature) is not just bicameral in theory but is so in fact. This is to say that each House has its own leaders, draws from different bases of support, and that to become a law, proposed legislation must pass the House and the Senate in identical form. In addition, certain powers, inherent in the legislative process, are reserved exclusively to each of the units. Essentially, one cannot arbitrarily be overridden by the other unit nor by any other branch of government. Illustrative of this point is the fact that all revenue bills originate in the House, while executive appointments and treaties with other nations can be made only with the "Advice and Consent" of the Senate (Froman, 1967, p.7).
I. Political Functions of Both Houses

Since the House and the Senate form the legislative unit of the national government, they share certain common functions. Essentially, they exist to legislate, that is, to formulate and to convert into law the formal rules by which our life as a nation is to be governed. In each of the units this is accomplished through a formal structure, namely the elaborate rules and procedures by which the legislative process is enacted, and an informal structure, namely the application of personal power and the highly individualized processes of compromise, bargaining and coalition-building. Since the unit of focus in this inquiry is the House of Representatives, the nature of both the formal and informal structures of the House will be the specific concern of this analysis.

By extension, the legislative function includes overseeing the implementation of legislation. Thus, an investigative function is incorporated into the process. Worthy of note here is the observation that through the investigative function either or both the units of Congress may interfere with or hinder, as well as facilitate, the implementation of legislation once it has become law. In this aspect of the process, particularly, evidence of Congressional dependence on the influence of diverse constituencies is most apparent. The mode of hindrance, interference, or facilitation is fundamentally a reflection of societal values brought to bear through pressure upon political functionaries at a particular moment in our national history.

A student of the legislative process recognizes at the outset that while we are speaking, generically, of a social institution ("social" in
the sense that the family, the church, and the school are "social" institutions), a legislature is a social institution which is essentially political, that is, it operates fundamentally within the context of the acquisition, distribution, and management of power. As such, therefore, it shares certain political functions with every other social institution labeled political.

In a book which has been described as required reading for every freshman Member of Congress, Donald Tacheron and Morris Udall (1966) identify what they consider to be the political functions of Congress. The first of these is that Congress exists, along with the other branches of government, political parties, interest groups, the press, etc., (1) to help in the resolution of conflict. Because of its cumbersome machinery, which it can use as an excuse for inaction, it often performs this first function by actually postponing or evading an issue which the society is really not able to face. Often it does this by giving "half a loaf" or by seeming to take action while actually doing nothing at all.

Another political function identified by Tacheron and Udall is that Congress serves as (2) a catharsis for the politically powerless. Individuals with causes that they cannot convert into majority social movements find some relief for their frustrations by identifying with a political hero who incorporates a position on a minority cause into his image and seems to speak for those who believe themselves otherwise powerless to effect change.

The third and final political function presented to Congressional aspirants and professionals alike is what Tacheron and Udall call (3) the "errand-boy" function. Regardless of how a particular Member of Congress...
defines himself, most of his constituents send him to Washington to represent their interests and meet their needs (p.6). This explains, in part, the phenomenal amount of time a Member of Congress or a Senator actually spends courting his district: the guided tours, the favors, the timely phone call to Internal Revenue or Selective Service.

This common observation among Members of Congress that they devote a major portion of their time and energy to the nonlegislative aspects of their job is reinforced by Tacheron and Udall when they observe, "While Congress is known as a law-making body, the actual enactment of legislation may be a relatively small function in comparison with the others which it performs...." And as a justification for the above, they continue, "It is well to remember that the representative assembly is one of the great creations of free men, and that its historic mission is not efficiency in government but the maintenance of freedom (p.6)." Some may quarrel with the last statement but, in fact, it has often dictated the modus operandi of the Congress.

II. Routes of Access to Membership in the House of Representatives

Seldom does a person seeking to represent a Congressional district in the House of Representatives decide to do this on his own. Campaigning is simply too costly an enterprise, not just in the monetary sense, but in the risk to one's reputation, one's political and professional future, and one's status in the entire community. The chances of embarking upon a political campaign as a loner out of nowhere are extremely slim.

An aspirant is inspired to make a first time race for many reasons.
For some it is simply a family tradition. The right of succession to political positions is established much as it was in medieval Europe. The Longs of Louisiana, the Kees (mother and son) from West Virginia, the Bakers of Tennessee are cases in point. Or the torch carried by one member (husband, brother, etc.) may be dropped unexpectedly through death, sickness, or defeat, and it becomes the responsibility of some other family member to carry on. This has been particularly true of women in Congress, disproportionate to the number of men who have come this route.

For others a Congressional career is in keeping with their overall career plans, and achieved status in particular professions presents the individual almost automatically with Congress as an alternative "next step." This is especially true for the legal profession. Since Congress is a law-making body, it is quite logical that lawyers will be there in significant numbers.

Of course the route from school board to Congress is not an uncommon one. An individual distinguishes himself in some respect politically on the local scene, is noticed by some group of local "king-makers" and moves from one office to another. Often a city official moves to a county position, and from there to the state legislature in that sequence or some variation of it.

Less likely, but nevertheless possible, is the chance that a person may distinguish himself in some strictly nonpolitical enterprise; events converge so that his experience and expertise become politically marketable and he is tapped to run. Sometimes this can have disastrous effects as in the case of the astronaut, John Glenn, who, after achiev-
ing great prestige as the first man to orbit the earth in space, went
down to defeat in trying to achieve Congressional election. In this
same vein there may also be the person who, through his business and
associational contacts becomes so frustrated with the political process
with which he frequently interacts, decides, at the prompting of some
group of supporters, to try to "right the mess."

In other very rare instances, a person may emerge who simply is
charismatic politically and directs his charism to participation at
the national level. This type of individual is a difficult opponent
for more conventional types of politicians.

Whatever the actual reason for running, an individual is as
strong at the outset as the support that he has and always enters the
race with the conviction that he has as good a chance as anyone else
of winning. The person who seeks office is always conceived of by his
supporters as the person who comes as close to anyone to having the
characteristics for the job, many of which are predefined. An affirm-
ative judgment may be made because he has achieved an acceptable "image"
in a role having similar requirements, or his experience in a previous
role may be assumed to have taught him all he needs to know to success-
fully enter the legislative arena at the national level.

The means employed in waging a Congressional campaign are as varied
as the personalities of the contenders, the nature of the district and
its people, and the available means of communication which are consid-
dered feasible. In the Brookings' Institute's analysis of the Con-
gressional role, one of the topics discussed by incumbent Members of
Congress was the problem of the campaign (Clapp, 1964, pp. 373-396).
In every instance discussed the sheer cost of campaigning is prohibitive. Organization, essential to the enterprise, is time-consuming and expensive. Mobilizing an army of committed, intelligent volunteers is frequently difficult.

The first rule of campaigning is that the candidate must put himself in touch with the voter. How this is to be accomplished is determined by the nature of the district. There may be no substitute for personal appearances and a great deal of old-fashioned "flesh-pressing." Television is costly but invaluable if the boundaries of the district should coincide with the range of the local station, of questionable value when several stations cover not only the district but the entire metropolitan area as well. Other substitutes for personal appearances in larger districts are radio spots on local stations, billboards, newspaper advertising, bumper stickers, placards, buttons, etc., all exposing the voter to the face and the message. Out of all of this an image emerges which, according to the testimony of many who have been the route more than once, often blurs the issues. In fact, some would contend that image-building is one essential feature of successful modern campaigns.

Whatever the route and whatever the means, the elected individual, no matter how astute a campaigner he proved to be, is immediately cast in the role of novice. To go to Congress for the first time is to embark upon an educational experience which makes most others seem simple by comparison.
III. Procedures in the House of Representatives

A. Differences between the House and the Senate

As already established, the House of Representatives is the specific arena for this inquiry. Therefore, in the interests of brevity and relevance, the discussion of the formal and informal structures through which legislative business is accomplished will be confined to the House since many House and Senate procedures differ considerably. However, the informal structure relates as much to the Congress as a whole as it does to the House in particular. Therefore, much of what is said about the informal structure of the House will certainly be applicable to the Senate as well.

Before discussing the differences in rules, strategies, and procedures between the House and the Senate in a general context, it seems valuable to refer to two general characteristics of Congress which Froman (1967) believes are actually institutional in nature.

The first of these is that power in Congress is institutionally decentralized. Through the committee system the division of labor gives individual committees and especially committee chairmen tremendous power to alter legislation significantly. This is done by amendment, suppression, etc. In addition, strengthening the effect of the dispersion of power through the system is the relatively weak political party structure. Froman acknowledges the fact that the single most important factor explaining legislative outcomes is party affiliation, but he also notes the considerable number of deviations from this pattern in legislative session, often better than a third of the time. The effects of the two -- a decentralized institutional structure through the com-
mittee system and a relatively weak party structure -- do not make concentrations of power impossible, but these concentrations are difficult to maintain (pp. 5-6).

The second institutional characteristic cited by Froman is of special interest to this writer since it has to do with the fact that while the House and the Senate are similar in many respects, there are important differences between the two. The similarities noted are two: both are relatively decentralized political institutions with a very sophisticated division of labor through the committee system and both are equal in power (p. 7).

The most important differences cited by Froman are also two, two from which most of the procedural and philosophical differences between the House and the Senate derive. These are the fact that the House is nearly four times larger than the Senate and that Senators represent sovereign states while Members of Congress represent small, relatively homogeneous sections of states (p. 7).

These two differences have important implications. Only a few will be mentioned here. Sheer size in the House necessitates more formal rules of procedure and a much more elaborate stratification system in which the leadership wields great power in relation to the membership, more than in the Senate. As a simple example, hearings in the House are often scheduled at the convenience of the Chairman without checking with the members, whereas in the Senate the time and place of hearings and even floor votes are frequently changed at the request of one or two members.

There is an anonymity about House membership which can be a po-
itical drawback. Politicians thrive on public exposure, the larger the public, the better, especially for those who aspire to other offices. Not only do Members of Congress not know each other, but they are little known outside their own constituency, even in their own state.

It has often been said that, on the whole, Congress is more conservative than the President and that, within the system, the House is more conservative than the Senate. One of the more common reasons given for this is aptly stated by Froman.

Congressional districts overrepresent conservative interests in any case simply because they are composed of small homogeneous areas. In general, the larger and more heterogeneous the areas represented, the more liberal will be the representation (p.4).

Formality, complexity of procedure, expedition of business, anonymity, and conservatism -- these are some of the consequences of the structuring of the House of Representatives. However, for the full meaning of these to be clarified, it is necessary to discuss particularly the formal and informal structures of the House of Representatives.

8. The Formal Structure

It seems worthwhile to preface these remarks on formal procedure with the observation that anyone who really wants to make his way in the House should know the formal rules of procedure. The fact is that all but a handful in any given Congress do not. What actually seems more important is to achieve a facility in "working the system," in the sense that Erving Goffman has used the term (1961). This means that the Member of Congress needs to make the formal structure of the organization serve his political purposes. The use of the rules ac-
tually effects the distribution of power in the House. While sub-
mitting to the rules, the powerful member learns to manipulate them
to such an extent that, ultimately, he achieves his political goals,
whatever these may be. This kind of procedural expertise requires
that a person actually become a student of the system. At the same
time he must make himself so acceptable to his role partners that they
will not only allow him to manipulate the rules but even facilitate
his doing so -- an extremely important aspect of the modus operandi of
political systems, reciprocity. The end result is that all grant each
other the right to "work the system." Some of the most powerful sug-
gestions for Congressional reform have come out of an awareness of the
importance of the informal structure.¹ Ultimately, whether or not any
reform suggestions prevail depends not on their own merit, neces-
sarily, but rather on how well they serve the uses of power which have become
institutionalized over the years.

Nowhere is power or the lack of it more evident than in the inter-
action involved in the delicate gestation process by which a bill be-
comes a law.

Any member of the House may introduce any number of bills at any
time. Bills and resolutions are categorized in a number of ways, but
two are considered most important: Is the bill sent by the Adminis-
tration?; and Who is the Member introducing the bill? Administration

¹ For example, Congress: The First Branch of Government, ed. by
Alfred de Grazia, Garden City N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1967, and
We Propose: A Modern Congress, Selected Proposals by the House Repub-
lican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing, chaired
by James C. Cleveland, M.C., ed. by Mary McInnis, New York: McGraw-Hill,
1966.
bills are ordinarily given priority because it is in this realm that an Executive in opposition to the majority can accuse Congress of inaction and indecisiveness -- powerful weapons, especially in an election year. If the bill is introduced by the leadership or a powerful member, it is likely to be channeled to a committee immediately also. In connection with the preceding observation, it is well here to highlight the awesome power of the Speaker and committee chairmen.

Although the power of the Speaker has been radically redefined since the 1910 House revolt against the tyrannical rule of "Uncle Joe" Cannon, the Speaker still is considered to rank second to the President in actual governmental power at the national level. His first formal intervention into the legislative process is in the privilege of committee referral. In many cases a historical precedent has been set for referring certain types of bills to certain standing committees, but the Speaker retains the right of referral, regardless. With this right goes the possibility of referring the bill to a committee which the Speaker believes will be most in sympathy with his evaluation of the proposed legislation. Froman presents some interesting uses of the power of referral (pp. 36-37), and Tacheron and Udall discuss the styles of some of the more famous Speakers (pp. 12-15).

After a bill or resolution has been referred to a committee (there are twenty standing committees in the House), its fate is in the hands of the committee. There are formal ways by which a committee can be by-passed, but these are rarely used and successful under only the most astute mode of political maneuvering.

In the initial referral process the power of the Speaker has been
referred to. Once in committee, the power of the committee chairman is brought to bear. In committees which have regular sub-committees (all but Rules, Ways and Means, District of Columbia, House Administration, and Internal Security do), a bill is usually referred to the sub-committee concerned most, in the opinion of the chairman, with its content. Again, there are important deviations from this practice in which sub-committee referral is associated with the chairman’s wishes for the fate of the legislation.\(^2\)

The chairman has the prerogative of deciding if there will be sub-committees, who the chairman will be, how many members there will be, and who the majority members are. Therefore, through the power of assigning significant sub-committee positions, a chairman can reinforce his own bias regarding the viability of a piece of legislation much as the Speaker does through the power of referral. A sub-committee unfavorable to a bill is likely to report it unfavorably to the full committee and so on to the House floor. Because the House as a whole respects the results of what formally is regarded as a specialized scrutiny of a bill, a successful floor fight against an unfavorable committee report is another one of those very difficult things to carry off, demanding a great deal of sophistication in the informal working of the system.

Once a bill is reported from committee it is ready for consideration and is ordinarily placed on one of three Calendars: the Union Cal-

\(^2\)This point is illustrated by Froman in three separate examples taken from the mid-60s (Froman, 1967, pp. 40-43). Concerning legislation on Appropriations, the chairman took over the sub-committee concerned; on anti-poverty, a special ad hoc committee was created, and on the Appalachia question a more "favorable" sub-committee was chosen.
endar (bills raising revenue, general appropriations bills, and bills of a public character directly or indirectly appropriating money or property); the House Calendar (all bills of a public character not raising revenue nor directly or indirectly appropriating money or property); and the Private Calendar (bills which affect named individuals) (Froman, 1967, p. 43).

While it is possible to expedite the consideration of proposed legislation through the Consent Calendar, Suspension of the Rules, or by making the most of certain days of the month established by the Rules on which particular legislation is "privileged," once a bill is reported from committee, it is usually channeled to the House through the powerful Rules Committee. The real importance of the Committee on Rules is understood when one considers the number of bills reported out of committee each year as compared with the number which are actually considered on the floor of the House. The Rules Committee clears time on the House floor for consideration by special order. The order, if adopted by the House, establishes the time for debate, allotting portions of it to both the majority and the minority. The Rules Committee can demand a change in a bill as a condition for bringing it to debate. It can limit debate, prevent amendments except by the committee in charge of the bill, and can set aside points of order which might be raised. In addition, it must grant a special rule before conferees from the House can meet with the Senate conferees to iron out disagreements between the two houses on pending legislation.

Some grasp of the complexity of floor rules and procedures -- the quorum call, the objection, the call for the question, the motion to
recommit -- all illustrate quite clearly in practice how the rules, once internalized, do serve the interests of the members. Froman observes, for example, that any single rule may be used by the membership for multiple purposes, some not intended by the formal procedural code, many used simultaneously. The rules serve individual members or groups of members with special interests. Opposing groups may use the same rule for conflicting purposes (pp. 62-89). One of the reasons rules have been so difficult to change over time is that the existing ones have served the members so well, all things considered. There is always the danger of some loss in a substantive change, and the diverse membership yields its time-worn political prerogatives only after it assures itself that the change affords the entire system with even greater flexibility. In the light of what already is, this is very difficult to achieve, especially until a rules change has been subjected to the test of time and the ingenuity of the members.

If a bill and its attending amendments are successfully steered through what seems to the uninitiated to be the morass of House Rules by the Floor Manager (usually the chairman of the committee to which the bill was referred or the chairman of the sub-committee which gave it special attention), and is passed by the membership, either it goes to the Senate for consideration (if it originated in the House) or to a joint House-Senate Conference committee if there are substantial differences in content and intent in the separate House-Senate versions, or to the President for his signature or his veto.

From a sociological perspective the formal procedures by which bills become law illustrate many points, two of which are salient. One
is that the informal structure shapes and molds the formal at a num-
ber of important decision points. Successful legislation is the conse-
quence of putting together, many times in the process, a majority co-
alition. As Froman notes, there must be a majority in the sub-committee,
a majority in the committee, a majority in the Rules Committee, a ma-
ajority to defeat floor amendments, a majority against a possible re-
committal motion, and a majority on final passage. What is important
to note is that each of these majorities involves "different people in
different situations at different points in time (p. 19)."

The second important consequence of understanding the formal pro-
cedure is that what the members decide in joining or refusing to join a
particular coalition is a function of perceived expectations and pres-
sures which are inherent in the whole political process, and often do not
originate directly from within the House itself.

In order to illustrate some of the points described above and to
prepare the reader for the subsequent discussion of the informal struc-
ture, a very interesting case involving the all-powerful Rules Committee
is presented here.

Throughout this century attempts have been made in every Congress
to modify the power of the Committee on Rules. It is important not only
because of its tremendous power but because it has no direct counterpart
in the Senate. A case in point covered by many authors gives one of the
best insights into the actual importance of this committee and, by ex-
tension, a profound insight into the intricacies of the legislative pro-
cess. The primary source is the Cummings and Peabody analysis of the
1961 decision to enlarge the Rules Committee (1969).
On January 31, 1961, by enactment of House Resolution 127, the Committee on Rules was enlarged from twelve to fifteen members. The vote was 217-212. At stake was the power and prestige of John Kennedy, newly elected President of the United States, who came to office prepared to ask Congress for a wave of "liberal" legislation unprecedented since the early days of the Roosevelt era. Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House, and the chairman of the committee, Howard W. Smith of Virginia, also had crucial career interests in the outcome. The issue of enlargement actually concerned who was to control the awesome power of the committee: the Speaker, and through him the President as leader of the majority party, or the chairman, symbol of the conservative Southern Democratic-Republican voting bloc on the committee as it was constituted at that time.

What is of special concern in the Cummings-Peabody analysis is their discussion of the vote itself, especially the behavior of sixty-four Democrats and twenty-two Republicans who bolted party lines to vote as they did on the resolution. This is important because it has a distinct bearing on the kinds of pressures which exist and the complex considerations which are at stake in the explanation of legislative behavior which transcends party affiliation. Further, it illustrates the complex manner in which the informal structure, coalescing with the formal structure, shapes procedural outcomes.

Basically, the decision to enlarge the committee was a party-line vote. Cummings and Peabody report that three-fourths of the House Democrats supported the Rayburn resolution, and approximately seven-eighths of the Republicans opposed it. In states above the Mason-Dixon
line, every Democrat who voted supported the Speaker. These were joined by all but two of the Democrats from Border States. The Republicans were slightly less cohesive, but in thirty-one of the thirty-nine non-Southern states, the House divided along party lines; the Democrats gave support, the Republicans were in opposition (p. 265).

Among the Democrats the Southern votes reveal the most. Cummings and Peabody summarize the shape of this vote:

In that one vote were etched most of the basic lines of political cleavage that exist within the South today -- state delegations vs. state delegations, rural Congressmen vs. urban Congressmen, Black Belt representatives vs. House Members from districts where the Negro population is relatively small; economic liberals vs. economic conservatives, and committee chairmen vs. those Southern members in the House with less formal authority and seniority (p. 266).

In the South, state delegations were divided, but what was more significant was a key correlation between certain characteristics of a representative's district and his vote on the legislation. One of the cleanest-cut indices was the Negro percentage of the population of the districts in question. In general, Congressmen from districts with a high percentage of Negroes were less likely to support the change than those whose districts had fewer Negroes (p. 267). The reason was that the move to enlarge the committee was prompted by an attempt to break the reigning conservative bloc in order to facilitate House consideration of the more liberal domestic legislation planned by the Kennedy administration. At stake was white minority rule in the South.

Irregularities in the correlation between the characteristics of a district and that district's representative's vote highlight factors other than the race issue which were also involved in this vote.
"Liberal" Southern Democrats ("liberalism" determined by ADA liberalism scores during the 86th Congress) were more likely to support the resolution than "conservatives." However, when the vote, Negro percentage of the population, and liberalism score are correlated simultaneously, the importance of the race issue enjoys a slight edge.

Ten of the twelve Southern Democrats with ADA liberalism scores of 40-59.9%, who also came from districts with relatively small Negro populations -- the median for Southern House districts in 1960 was 27% -- supported the change in the committee's composition. Not one of their six colleagues with similar records of support for liberal domestic programs who came from districts with Negro populations larger than 30% supported Rayburn (p.270).

Still other variables emerge as significant, and Cummings and Peabody relate the most important of these to those special factors which prevailed in the final hours before the roll-call vote. For example, the relationship between committee chairman and the Speaker is an especially symbiotic one. Chairmen depend upon the Speaker in the matter of referral, but even more in the tremendous force the personal power of the Speaker is in moving the creaking wheels at every step of the legislative process. For his part, the Speaker is his party's man in the House and his political future depends upon his ability to deliver the goods. To do this he has an absolute need for the good will and cooperation of his chairmen, members of his own party who can make or break him politically. Four, or half of the Southern committee chairmen with ADA scores of less than 30% supported the Rayburn resolution to enlarge the committee. Only one in twenty of their non-chairmen colleagues with comparable ADA scores did so. Among the liberals, chairman
supported the Speaker by the same two-to-one ratio as other liberal representatives (p. 271). For the chairmen it seems their loyalty to the Speaker and their assessment of their own position in the House took priority over any objections they might have had from other relevant constituencies.

To summarize the forces explaining the Democrats who bolted party to oppose the enlargement resolution: racial composition of the home district, "liberal" orientation on domestic legislation, and relative fixed position in the House seem the most significant.

Rayburn could never have won on the enlargement resolution, however, had not some Republicans voted with the Democratic "loyalists." Twenty-two of them did. Again, certain key variables emerge. Concerning these, Cummings and Peabody observe,

Most of the twenty-two Congressmen were a special type of Republican. With several notable exceptions, these Republican dissenters differed markedly from most of their party cohorts -- in the areas they represented, in their support for domestic welfare legislation, and in the enthusiasm which President Kennedy's candidacy had evoked in their home districts (p. 273).

The first two of these characteristics are not surprising in those who bolted party lines to vote for enlargement; the last is especially interesting. In all of the districts these Republicans represented, each was closely fought for at the Presidential level in 1960. In fact, in half of them, Kennedy won over Nixon. The hypothesis is therefore sustained that the larger the Kennedy vote in a Republican district, the more likely that Republican Congressman was to bolt Republican party lines to support Rayburn on House Resolution 127.
These examples from the case involving the enlargement of the Rules Committee in 1961 have been presented at some length to illustrate quite clearly that the formal structure or the rules by which business is carried on in the House of Representatives is a lifeless bag of parliamentary phrases which come alive only when they are hammered at, utilized, manipulated, and interpreted by the incumbent membership. On any one issue the members are motivated by a complex web of interests to which they must assign priority in terms of their own personal perceptions of where they are, politically. Then they "work the system." Some are successful and some are not, but what each does in this regard individually and collectively constitutes the informal structure of the House at any given time in history. To this aspect of the legislative process attention is now directed.

C. The Informal Structure

Every social organization has an informal structure through which the participants spontaneously interact with one another on a personal basis in order to move the organization toward the accomplishment of its goals and to make the burden of the requirements of the formal structure easier to bear. In a political system, the primary goal is the ability to make concrete decisions. As we have begun to see, the interrelationship between the formal and informal structures of the House of Representatives is especially complex. Consider the situation in the House. A Member of Congress is one of 435 voting members. He is part of the "leadership" or he is not. He is a Democrat, a Republican, or
Independent. His political philosophy is described as "liberal", "conservative", or "moderate." His constituents are homogeneous or heterogeneous in their social characteristics. They are urban or rural. In their interests they reflect basic societal cleavages or they do not. He has been elected by his constituents easily each time he has won or he has fought for each primary and general election right down to the wire. In presidential election years his constituents often like him, but they do not accept the rest of his party. In addition, he has a personal code of values by which he lives. In the House the demands upon his time are such that he is considered eminently successful if he becomes a "subject-matter expert" in some narrowly defined field of legislation. The above is just a sampling of the kinds of considerations which must be kept in mind and sorted out at every decision-making point in the legislative process. The list in its entirety would be virtually endless.

An essential point of being in Congress is to be, ultimately, on the winning side. To win, in this context, does not mean standing triumphant with the numerical majority on every issue. To win means to constantly improve or maintain intact one's acceptability to each of one's significant reference groups. Seldom is it easy to assign priorities to these.

One thing a Member of Congress recognizes early in the game is that every other person in the House who has any intention of staying or of moving on to higher places in government is defining winning in exactly the same way, so the fundamental informal norm which serves as the key-
stone for the entire informal structure is reciprocity. "I'll scratch your back today because tomorrow or later today, or six months from now I'm going to need you to scratch mine and I expect you to be there."

The fact that Congress is a highly decentralized system in which the indispensable resource, power, is widely dispersed has already been noted. Legislative battles are won because certain people manage to put together winning coalitions of power sources.

What increases the complexity of this process is that putting together a winning coalition is never a one-shot affair. Legislative decision-making is a serial affair. It takes place in stages and each decision point requires its own majority coalition.

In an overall atmosphere of reciprocity and courtesy, the key question to answer in understanding the internal workings of the House is, How are winning coalitions formed? Again, reference is to Froman (1957) since his treatment of the bargaining process is a most concise and complete one (Chapter 2, pp. 16-33).

Actually, the House is best suited to handle issues which are non-controversial. When controversy does arise, the coalition-building machinery must go into action. Where there is opposition, the first point the proponents must determine is how intense the opposition is, because the degree of intensity in the opposition determines how intense the supporters must be to succeed.

The fact that intense majorities seldom arise is noted by Froman, and he has an interesting analysis of why they do not.

On most bills majorities are the result of the legislative process, not a pre-condition for it. It is during the ... process that the wide
variety of interests and personalities bargain and compromise on a bill and its provisions, which make it acceptable to at least a majority of the members (p. 19).

Furthermore, Members of Congress differ in their backgrounds and interests and they differ also in what they consider important legislation. Different bills affect different people in different ways. Seldom does a bill embody just one issue, and often a single issue is really important to only a few members.

What is even more important in understanding the relative absence of intense majorities in the House is that Members have many values and play many games simultaneously. Seldom is one game or one value given absolute priority over all the rest. An example chosen from the Senate but pertinent and applicable to House procedure because it is simply political, is presented by Evans and Novak in their analysis of the power of Lyndon Johnson (1966).

In 1954 Johnson was minority leader in the Senate and was running for re-election to that body from Texas. Several days before the July 24 Texas primary, the Senate was locked in intense debate over an atomic energy bill. The Senate was in twenty-four hour sessions in an attempt by William Knowland, the majority leader, to break a filibuster spearheaded by Democratic liberals. At issue was an attempt by the Eisenhower administration to introduce private industry into the atomic energy market. The liberal filibuster was intended to force Knowland to permit votes on amendments which would give Washington regulatory jurisdiction over the future sale of atomic energy.

Throughout the filibuster period Johnson had remained silent to the
extent that he was being accused by the press of being unable to control the Democrats. Late in the evening of July 24 the word came to Johnson that he had won the Texas primary by 3-to-1. Almost immediately he rose on the Senate floor, proposing a unanimous consent motion to end the filibuster. A single objection can block such a motion and that objection came from Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon. What the Johnson proposal did was signal that his sympathies were with Knowland and the conservatives. Even before his public proposal Johnson had conspired with Knowland to help him plan the round-the-clock sessions to break the filibuster. In this behind-the-scenes move he had been the beneficiary of the advice of one of his most powerful Senate mentors, Richard Russell of Georgia.

For the dissident Democrats to oppose Johnson was to be associated by the press and the public with Morse, a maverick "untouchable" at this time. Johnson had already calculated that fifteen Democrats were ready to vote for the Eisenhower bill. For the liberals to ultimately go down in defeat at the side of Wayne Morse was political suicide. His conclusion was that to save the Democratic Party, the filibuster had to be broken. In order to appease the liberals, he issued one of his "appeals to reason" which were to characterize his style so frequently in the years to come.

Through many decades my party has been the truly responsible party. These are times that call for reasonable action by reasonable parties made up of reasonable men.... This is the hour for each of us to search our hearts and souls and ask the question, 'Are we exercising the responsibility of which we are capable?' (Evans and Novak, p.80).

Quite rightly Evans and Novak observe that these words were the
expression of Johnson's public view of himself and his party. Privately there was a great deal more explaining his behavior. As a Texan, to join the liberal filibuster would have been to alienate his constituency, a risk he could not take in an election year. As Democratic leader, he had lost control and was being sharply criticized for it. To survive politically, he had to join the Republicans and Southern Democrats in ending the filibuster.

What was of greater long-range importance was the concern of the Southerners, led by Russell, that the longer the filibuster ran, the more likely it became that frustrated Midwestern Republicans might lead some attempt to liberalize Rule XXII, making it easier to end filibusters as standard procedure. Far more important to the Southerners than the atomic energy bill was the upcoming civil rights legislation on which they intended to draw heavily on the power of the filibuster. So more than his concern for the relegation of the liberal Democrats to political limbo with Wayne Morse, what really motivated Johnson was his political alliance with Russell and the Southern Democrats and his sensitivity to press criticism that he had lost control of his party. These "games" he simply could not afford to lose.

As a further tribute to his genius Johnson partially retrieved his status with the liberals when he later fought to restore many public-interest amendments to the legislation which had been lost in the process of House-Senate conference (Evans and Novak, p. 81).

The case is eminently illustrative, it seems, of the fact that legislative behavior is motivated by so many diverse variables that intense alignments are extremely rare primarily because they are politi-
call untenable.

Even in the absence of intense majorities, the astute legislator realizes that, on controversial issues, some kind of hostility is likely to be met at any point along the line. Given the probability of this state of affairs, it is absolutely essential that some mechanism exist for the resolution of conflict. Since the main objective of a political system is competitive decision making, there must be means for integrating the behavior of members whose interests, by their very nature, are extremely diverse. If reciprocity is the most important norm undergirding the informal structure, bargaining, as the mechanism for coalition building and conflict resolution, is its operational arm.

In the Froman analysis bargaining is given its widest possible meaning. One very important distinction which separates two types of bargaining from the others is whether or not negotiation (actual interchange between two or more people) is involved. Including non-negotiated bargaining in his overall definition of the term, Froman makes the further distinction that all bargains are either explicit or implicit; that is, the "pay-offs" are either known and specific or they are not known and extremely vague (pp. 22-23).

With these two distinctions clarified, what follows is Froman's typology of bargaining with descriptions of the terms used (pp. 23-27).

**TYPOLOGY OF BARGAINING**

**Non-negotiated:**

1. Unilateral action: a decision maker simply takes action without regard for consequences or other decision makers. The payoff is always implicit.

**Negotiated:**

3. Simple log-rolling: "You give me what I want and I'll give you what you want." Occurs when there are a number of smaller projects to be put into one bill. Pay-off is explicit and occurs for both at the same time.
Typology of Bargaining

(Cont.)

Non-negotiated:

2. Anticipated reaction: does not involve actual interchange with others, but the possible reactions of others are taken into account in the decision. Pay-off may be either explicit or implicit.

Negotiated:

4. Time logrolling: "You support me now; I'll support you sometime in the future." Pay-off may be implicit or explicit.

5. Compromise: "You want X; I want Z; let's settle on Y." Pay-off is explicit. This type is rarely used in the early stages of the process.

6. Side-payments: "You support me and I will reward you," or "Support me or I will punish you." Side payments are non-policy rewards and punishments. Pay-offs may be either implicit or explicit.

The precise mode of bargaining chosen at any particular decision point is, again, never an arbitrary choice. Existing conditions must be assessed and dealt with accordingly. For example, in operating in certain committees over time, a member discerns if any mechanisms for integration or any bargaining processes prevail on a fairly consistent basis from issue to issue.3 Also, the very structure of the group is important. Different kinds of bargaining work best depending on whether the group is highly decentralized, bi-polar in essence, or hierarchically structured. In addition, one's status in the group is important. The more resources a member has at his disposal, the better position he is in to bargain flexibly. Further, what process is chosen

is largely a function of the bargainer's identification of the types of people who are the key decision makers on the issue. Froman observes that "statesmen" favor compromise, but often find it personally repugnant to logroll; highly moralistic individuals find it difficult to deal in side-payments and so forth.

Another point to be noted is that in the total decision-making process, all things being equal, types of bargaining almost naturally emerge in a fairly predictable time-sequence, with side payments usually last in the sequence, resorted to only after the usual process of some sort of log-rolling has proven inadequate. This is logical in the total context of the use of power in any system where the ultimate test of the existence of real power is the effectiveness of the "Do this ... or else" position (Berger and Berger, 1972).

Finally, the type of bargain chosen depends a great deal on the kind of issue to be resolved, a key characteristic of which is the intensity of the opposition. Froman observes that opposition itself is dependent upon a number of factors. For instance, the newer the program or the more "ideological" the program, especially on a "liberal-conservative" continuum, the more intense the opposition is likely to be. Also, programs which touch on cleavages in the society at large (race and religion, for example) and are unacceptable to those most affected by them frequently elicit strong opposition. In addition, programs which deviate considerably from past programs in the same legislative area are strongly opposed in many instances.

What is clear, in summary, is that the House of Representatives is
an extremely complex social system functioning through an elaborate conglomeration of formal rules and regulations set in operation under the informal norm of reciprocity which itself is operationalized through the various manifestations of the bargaining process.

One final word on the subject of in-group socialization seems appropriate. The tradition of Congress is such that it is widely held by the membership of both houses that no new member comes adequately prepared to participate in the process. Therefore, one enters Congress, not as a fully defined legislator; one enters as an apprentice. In the first term, at least, the electorate actually confers the right of apprenticeship. It is for the membership, that is, the peer group, to decide when the period of apprenticeship ends and when, if ever, full acceptance to the total workings of the system is conferred. The rites of passage are nowhere formally defined, but there is no doubt that they exist, and their accessibility to the "elect" bears no fixed relationship to the number of terms returned. They are usually offered, however, sometime during the second term. In a sense, then, it can be said that a Member of Congress is actually elected twice. Through the political process in his district he achieves the office in name; through the political process of Congress, he achieves the office in fact. It is the second "election" which, of course, is crucial. Actually, it is a series of small elections at various times -- acceptance by the informal groups, the "inner circles," the leadership, the opposition, etc. In recent years, it is true, the time of apprenticeship has been shortened considerably due to the pressing need the House has for utilizing its
membership in the complex and demanding process of legislating as fully as possible, but there still remains a recognizable apprentice role. An apprentice is expected to learn from the masters. Learning demands hard work, listening, observation, and an openness to suggestion and advice. Rarely does it involve active participation. During the apprenticeship period, the fledgling legislator does begin to acquire those resources of power which are indispensable to full membership. One of the major ways in which he does this is through cementing relationships in the formal and informal work groups to which he is assigned or to which he is drawn by natural ability or interest.

D. Social Controls

Znaniecki placed the concept of social control squarely within the interaction frame of reference, observing,

Social control denotes actions of which human individuals or groups are the objects... It applies only to those whose social actions are intended to make other human agents conform with certain cultural patterns. Social control, in this sense, is inapplicable when an individual performs culturally patterned actions without any active interference from others (1965, pp. 100-101).

The Znaniecki perspective is the one adopted for this discussion.

In the House of Representatives the formal controls are elaborately detailed in the Rules. Included are the negative sanctions for non-conformity, the ultimates of which are public censure and expulsion. The formal sanctions, however, are more honored in the breach than in the practice. Outside keepers of the Congressional conscience constantly berate the "insiders" for not enforcing the rules. The targets for this
moral inclination are generally the Ethics Committees of both houses.

The fact that the formal negative sanctions are seldom, and always reluctantly, invoked only highlights the importance attached to the mores of the House and the sanctions associated with these, since some norms must be enforced if the system is to maintain itself. It might be said it is far more risky, politically, to deviate from these informal norms than it is to violate the formal Rules. 4

Some allusion to what is to follow has already been introduced. The purpose of repeating is to illustrate, collectively, the controls operating in the House to pressure for conformity.

The first and probably the most important of these informal norms is reciprocity. Hundreds of times in the course of a Congressional career of any length, a member is in a position to do a favor for one of his colleagues, and usually he is most willing to do so. Doing a favor for a fellow member gives one the unqualified claim to a favor in return. The crucial arena for reciprocity is in the matter of votes. Not only does reciprocity facilitate achievement, it also, ironically, serves as a check upon achievement. In the interests of what he legitimately owes another member or members or of what he legitimately expects to get from them, a legislator frequently refrains from using all his resources of power on a given issue. To deprive an opposing colleague of every vestige of his political clout, the source of his prestige, serves very little purpose in the long run because, once stripped of this, the opponent is politically dead as a potential ally on some

4 The discussion concerning ways of getting around the ceiling placed on campaign spending by the Rules is enlightening in this regard in Clapp (1964, pp. 376-393).
future issue.

A second informal rule is that no matter what his previous experience has been, a new member is expected to serve an apprenticeship. Courtesy among the members and an unswerving loyalty to the institution itself are among the unwritten rules also.

In the legislative aspect of his job, a member is expected, as they say in the trade, "to do his homework." This means he is expected to be knowledgeable on every aspect of legislation for which he has any responsibility. This is where a truly professional staff and expeditious use of the research resources available to Congress are indispensable. Along these same lines, the sheer volume of House business necessitates specialization among the members and an important norm resulting is that a member is expected to become a "subject-matter expert." In some narrow field of legislation he should become known to others as the one to whom they go when they need information or advice concerning the subject.

For the Congressman who conforms, rewards abound: the prestigious committee assignment, the newsworthy trip abroad, the special project, the friendship of the powerful, to name only a few. Fundamentally, members who conform are held in high esteem by their colleagues and are generally the most powerful. This is not to say, however, that there is no room at all for that non-conformity so necessary for social change. One of the most influential members of the House at the present time with whom we spoke had this to say about a rule which does not always appear in the standard works, but which is considered extremely important.

If a person does not follow the rules, but still he
is intelligent and he knows what he is talking about and he doesn't try to mislead you, he, too, will gain respect.... Perhaps it could almost be said that a rule is, 'Don't misinform the House.'

The negative sanctions for unacceptable non-conformity are more-or-less subtle, but utterly devastating. Actually, there are many reasons for non-conformity. Matthews (1960) mentions four in connection with the Senate which are equally applicable to the House. Frequently, some, because of their previous experience, simply find it impossible to start at the foot of the class and work up. For one reason or another they had prima donna status at home and are out of voice in the back row reserved for newcomers in the Congressional chorus. Usually, the more impatient they are for a starring role, the more likely they are to be left longer in the back row. For others, their political ambitions transcend the House and time is of the essence. They need prestige and visibility early if they are to move on quickly. The youngest who come are frequently well into their thirties, and in our present society, with its accent on youth, this is relatively late for launching a high-powered career of any sort. A third motivation for non-conformity is a competitive two-party, or a large and complex, constituency. The member from an active two-party district often feels his tenure is likely to be short-lived. Therefore, in his eagerness to achieve and produce, he becomes impatient with the seniority system and its burdensome folkways. Finally, non-conformity often arises out of a personal political ideology. Matthews makes a statement about the Senate which is probably even more true of the House since the House is generally conceived of as the more conservative body. "The folkways of the
Senate ... buttress the status quo in the chamber, and the distribution of power within the chamber results in moderate to conservative policies (p. 113)." Therefore, those of a more liberal political philosophy are more likely to challenge the folkways than are the more conservative.

If esteem is the mother's milk on which a successful legislative career is reared, loss of respect is its gall. How does a member know he has lost respect? How does he know negative sanctions are being applied to him? Since respondents were asked to comment on these very questions, an analysis of answers is the concern of later chapters. Suffice it to say here that, in general, the informal controls present in any system apply to the House: ostracism, ridicule, gossip -- in the form of a political leak, loss of influence, etc. These are all signs that respect has been lost and with it any hope of significantly influencing outcomes.

The single unit through which the House accomplishes its task is the committee. An understanding of the committee system adds still another dimension to this discussion of the structure of the House of Representatives.

IV. The Committee System: The Functional Work Groups of the House

The beginning weeks of the first session of every Congress are dominated, first of all, by the election of key members to the positions of formal leadership (majority and minority leaders, Speaker, party whips, etc.), and the assignment of the total membership to the standing
committees. Seniority plays a large part, to be sure, in assuring a member a continuing position on a committee once he has been assigned to it, but plays a much smaller part in determining transfer from one committee to another and, of course, figures not at all, in the assignment of Freshmen.

The committees charged with making these assignments work with several pre-determined limitations. They are guided, first of all, by the number of vacancies and the number of applications for transfer. In addition, geographic distribution, the experience and training of legislators, attempts to maintain balance among party factions, and a desire to defer to the wishes of the leadership and other powerful internal groups are important determining factors.

One of the important consequences of the reorganization of Congress in 1911 was that each party created a committee-on-committees which was charged with distributing committee assignments. Each party has such a committee now but their methods of selecting members differ and therefore require separate treatment. Masters' study of committee assignments (1969) is a valuable source for this information.

By custom, the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means, together with the Speaker and the majority leader (the minority leader when Democrats are in the minority) constitute the Democratic Committee-on-committees. Masters notes that this practice probably grew out of a time when the majority leader was the chairman of Ways and Means.

Each member is assigned a geographic zone within which his district lies. Requests from Congressmen aspiring to specific committees are referred to their zone committeeman. Committee deliberations are closed
but the procedure is fairly standard. Each zone representative, speaking in order of seniority, nominates members from his zone for the various vacancies. The nomination is accompanied by supporting arguments. The committee then votes on the nominations and the winner is designated to fill the vacancy. These selections are subsequently ratified by the party caucus.

The Republican committee-on-committees is specially created for its function. It is composed of one member from each state having Republican representation in the House. The member is chosen by the state delegation. By precedent, this is usually the dean of the delegation, that is, the senior member. The Republicans allow each representative to cast as many votes for an aspirant as there are Republicans in his delegation. The result is that there is a concentration of power over committee assignments in the hands of the senior members from large delegations. Theoretically, as a further decentralization of power, the Republican assignments are handled by a sub-committee appointed by the minority leader (or by the Speaker if Republicans are in the majority). In fact, the sub-committee members are almost always those with the greatest leverage in the larger committee with one or two added as somewhat of a token gesture. In the sub-committee each has one vote. Choices are subject to ratification by the larger committee and the party caucus.

As in every discussion of the Congressional process, what has been described above is the formal structure. The informal structure is much

---

5 Masters observes that in the 86th Congress, members from seven states—California, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania—controlled 97 of the 153 committee votes. (p.234)
more complex and, in effect, makes the difference in deciding who gets what position and why.

Among the thirty-six Members of Congress (the list included only two women) who participated in the Brookings Institute’s Round Table Conference on the House (reported in Clapp, 1964, pp. 207-240), there was consensus among both Democrats and Republicans concerning the "bases" which must be touched in competing for a committee assignment. When his party is in the majority, a freshman Democrat needs to make his preferences known to the Speaker, the majority leader, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, his zone man on Ways and Means, and the chairman of any committee in which he is interested. Allowing for differences in the formal structure of the Republican committee-on-committees, the route for a freshman in that party would be basically the same: the leader of his party in the House, key Republicans on the committee of his choice, his representative on the committee-on-committees, and all members of the special sub-committee of that group, especially those representing large Republican delegations. In addition, contact with the party whips, and soliciting the influence of powerful members of either party outside the House who may directly or indirectly influence choices are valuable assets for the aspirant. The active opposition of any one of these, but especially the most powerful ones, can cost a person his chance of being in a position which he considers advantageous.

In the final analysis, however, there is really no substitute for being in the right place at the right time. Illustrations of this abound in the answers which individual respondents gave regarding how they went about getting the committee assignments of their choice.
These are forthcoming in later chapters where these responses are elaborated upon and placed in perspective.

Occasionally, the entire process is challenged by a newcomer. When this happens, one of three conclusions can be reached: either the newcomer is unbelievably naive, a political genius, or simply reckless or aggressive. In any case to challenge one's committee assignment is always a high-level risk. The most publicized case in recent years, which is a matter of public record detailed by the challenger herself (Chisholm, 1970), was the challenge made by Representative Shirley Chisholm of New York. When Mrs. Chisholm came to the 91st Congress, she requested a position on the House Education and Labor Committee, believing this was most appropriate in terms of her experience and professional training. As a second choice, she aspired to Banking and Currency since, in her words, "It holds the purse strings for housing construction, and next to education and employment, housing is a major need for poor people, black and white (p. 81)." In addition, she saw Post Office and Civil Service and Government Operations relevant to her interests and the needs of her constituents. The route she initially took was the conventional one. She contacted her representative on the Democratic committee-on-committees, who was Representative Jacob Gilbert of the Bronx. In addition, she sent letters to every Democrat on the Ways and Means Committee.

Through the grapevine she learned before the assignments were published that she had been given the Agriculture Committee which, in her opinion, had little relevance for her particular interests or background.
She might have accepted this appointment, however, since the committee did have jurisdiction over food stamp and surplus food programs, and is concerned with migrant labor -- issues most relevant to the constituency she represents, until she learned her sub-committee assignments: rural development and forestry. She called the Speaker, John McCormack.

The Speaker was sympathetic but immovable. He stressed the point that patience would be rewarded and her time would come. For now she should be a "good soldier" and abide by the decision. When she informed him that, in the event the assignment was not changed she would have to do "her thing", he told her he would consult with Mr. Mills. Mills, according to the Chisholm account, was angered that she had gone over his head to the Speaker, but did agree to see Agriculture Chairman Poage of Texas to see if she could have another sub-committee assignment. The answer was negative. Because of a great deal of courage and tenacity, she was able to state her objections to the Democratic caucus publicly and offer a resolution removing her from the Agriculture Committee and directing the committee-on-committees to come back to the next monthly caucus with an assignment for her. The resolution passed and subsequently she was assigned to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs (Chisholm, 1970, pp. 82-87 has the entire account).

In her challenge, Mrs. Chisholm had something going for her which she utilized to best advantage and which, for her, minimized the risk involved. She was black. In her speech objecting to her assignment, she turned this fact into a distinct asset.

I pointed out there were only nine Black members of the House, although in terms of the percentage of the population, there should be more than forty
(I underestimated ... I should have said fifty-five). So, I said the House leadership 'has a moral duty to somewhat right the balance by putting the nine members it has in positions where they can work effectively to help the nation meet its critical problems of racism, deprivation, and urban decay' (p. 84).

In the closing years of the stormy decade of the 1960s none of the "political animals" present was about to rise to argue with the implications of that logic.

In conclusion, this research is an attempt to get at some idea of the ways in which the Member of Congress role is defined as it applies to women. Data are sought both from the women themselves and from certain of their male colleagues who play a significant part in the evolution and maintenance of this role definition. To do this with any degree of accuracy, the social system in which this defining takes place must be put before the reader. This has been the purpose of this chapter. The discussion has been extensive; examples have been introduced. What emerges is a point of reference for the role analysis which will follow a discussion of specific applications of general theory to the role in question.
CHAPTER IV
APPLICATION OF GENERAL THEORY TO THE MEMBER OF CONGRESS
ROLE AND HYPOTHESES

An understanding of the Congressional role necessitates making some distinctions from the outset. In discussing the House of Representatives as the social setting for the role behavior in question, the observation was made that a Member of Congress is actually elected twice. First of all, he is elected by the majority of the voters in his district to represent their interests in Congress. This gives him a foot in the door only, as it were. Once in this far, he is subject to another "election" which is crucial, not only to the advancement of his own career, but to those whom he represents and the whole body of those whom he joins as legislator. This second "election" is bestowed by his superiors and peers in the House through full admission to the duties and rights of membership. This is to say, that before one is a member in the full sense of the term, one is a candidate for membership. These are distinct roles but so intimately interrelated that, once membership is achieved, candidacy is assimilated into the member role to the extent that it is one of the components of the member role and the candidate's circle is incorporated into the member's circle.

In the discussion, then, two roles are focal: candidate and member. At some point in time, namely the point at which the candidate achieves membership, he still does not cease to be a candidate because he is a member. Rather, as long as he is a member, he is continuously a candidate and this fact operates at both levels of "election."
also needs to be returned to office by his constituency at home in order to achieve the seniority which enables him to participate ever more completely in House membership.

With these observations as preface, the reader is asked, again, to attend to the four components essential to role analysis: person, social circle, duties, and rights, articulated by Znaniecki (1965, Chapters 10 - 14). On these points precisely, theory is to be applied to the Member of Congress role generally, and to the Congresswoman's role specifically.

Role Component 1: Person

Primarily, a person is chosen for candidacy to the House of Representatives of the United States because, in the judgment of those who do the selecting, he or she has the qualifications necessary to satisfactorily enact the rights and duties associated with the role. It seems important to note if there is any sense in which women have had special background characteristics which distinguish them from male candidates. Women members in the decades under consideration manifest three distinctive objective role-types (these roles and their meaning will be clarified and explained fully in Chapter V): The Widow Turned Politician, the Married Woman Politician, and the Place Holder. Regarding the background characteristics of the first two types, research findings are in existence. Bullock and Heys have already shown that women elected in their own right do manifest different background characteristics from the widow who succeeds her husband (1972). In addition, their research has established that the women elected in their own right do possess background characteristics strikingly similar to male members.
Specifically, these were explored in the areas of education, occupational experience, and political involvement.

If the woman elected in her own right approximates the male norm in background characteristics, what needs to be explored is the extent to which she also approximates the male norm in routes of access.

**Hypothesis 1:** In terms of routes of access to the Congressional role, the experience of Married Women Politicians will approximate the male norm.

This position implies that the precise nature of the atypicality of routes of access for the other two objective role-types is worthy of investigation.

**Hypothesis 2:** In terms of routes of access to the Congressional role, the Widow Turned Politician and the Place Holder are atypical.

Finally, the mediating variables of political party affiliation, geographic region, and decade of entry have not been previously analyzed in terms of their relationship to background characteristics and routes of access. Therefore,

**Hypothesis 3:** Background characteristics and routes of access for the three objective role-types are mediated by political party affiliation, geographic region, and/or decade of entry.

**Role Component 2: The Social Circle**

A woman who becomes a candidate for House membership has probably never assumed the role of housewife and mother exclusively. In some sense (even as her husband’s alter ego), she has been an active participant in "public life." What complicates the candidate role for a woman is often the necessity of "proving" that, as a "public" figure,
she has not neglected her "primary" role (if married) of wife and mother. Ironically enough, it has been said, however, that in recent years some men have given, as a reason for leaving Congress, the fact that it imposes too much of a strain on family relations (U.S. News and World Report, June 12, 1972). This may represent the beginning of a trend, but since we are concerned with the here-and-now, the woman candidate still must show the electorate that she has reconciled these potentially conflicting roles more than the male candidate does.

In her comprehensive analysis of the housewife role, Helena Lopata (1971) discusses the various stages through which a person passes in the process of becoming involved in a social role (pp. 77-78). A brief summary of these stages is appropriate as preface to the description of the social circle of the Member of Congress.

In the first place, an individual must establish contact with those who, potentially, are members of her social circle. The contact is made specifically for the purpose of creating social roles. What follows is a period of testing between the social person and all of the potential members of her social circle in an attempt to verify, in each, the qualities which have already been defined as necessary for adequate role performance. During the testing period the duties and rights, as well as the actions of the social person and the potential members of the circle, are defined as these are assumed to be inherent in the set of relations about to be initiated among them. The bases for the testing are fairly patterned. They are drawn from traits already defined as desirable in similar existing roles, or as these have been predefined if the role in question is a new one. Rarely does one find the "ideal
other", so the process is rich with bargaining and compromise in order to approach the "ideal" as nearly as possible. The processes of bargaining and compromise, therefore, account for a great deal of the variation found in real-life relationships.

If the potential partners pass the tests, a series of announcements are made to all those who will involve themselves in the new role. This is kind of a validation of an acceptance of the relationship, with its rights and duties, on the part of all concerned. It is the contract entered into by the participants, sometimes written, sometimes in the form of a "gentlemen's agreement."

In the fourth stage of role involvement some method is devised for acquiring that knowledge and those skills which the person and his circle may not have had prior to beginning the relationship. Dr. Lopata notes that sometimes the "announcement" stage actually follows this, the "training" stage.

The fifth stage of the process often, but not inevitably, requires that the participants acquire some material objects to be used as "symbols or facilities of action." Finally, the person and his circle internalize the role's behavior and identities to such an extent that these become integrated into their personalities.

Figures 4.1 and 4.2 graphically illustrate the "candidate" and "member" components of the Member of Congress role. In Figure 4.2 the inclusion of the candidate circle into the member's circle is indicated. These figures are simply illustrative of the segments of each circle. There is no attempt, through varying segment sizes, to indicate the primacy of any one over the others.
Figure 4.1: THE SOCIAL CIRCLE OF A CANDIDATE FOR CONGRESS

*Note:* The larger of the center circles in the Lopata scheme is devoted to "Generalized Duties"; the smaller to "Self-maintaining Duties." These are explained in Occupation: Housewife, p. 137. They do not concern us, specifically, here.
FIGURE 4.2
THE SOCIAL CIRCLE OF A MEMBER OF CONGRESS

* Components of the Candidate's Circle incorporated into the Member's Circle

N.B. The two inner circles are indicative of the "Generalized Duties" and the "Self-maintaining Duties" utilized by Lopata as indicated in the text accompanying Figure 4.1. Not of consequence here.
Repeatedly, this research has been defined as exploratory on a selective basis. Except for what has been indicated in the first hypotheses, no further attention will be paid to the candidate component of the role at the level of the first "election." It must be emphasized, however, that an important aspect of membership involves the incorporation of the candidate's circle into the member's circle. The segments of the member's circle which have been chosen for analysis are the constituent segment and two additional segments which may be considered the inner circle of the system itself: the leadership and peer groups. The peer group includes the member's state delegation, party colleagues, colleagues of the opposition, and committee colleagues. In terms of hypotheses there will be an attempt to trace some of the lines of the "face" which a Congresswoman assumes as she interacts with each of these circle segments in terms of what she perceives are the duties and rights accruing to her as a Member of Congress.

The particular social circle of member is especially unique because initial entrance does not require testing by all of the parties involved. When a new Congress is convened, those who constitute the membership are there because they already have interacted successfully with their other social circle in the political aspect of their lives as candidate. Now the candidate circle is connected with the larger circle solely through the candidate-turned-member. One of the consequences of this is that it becomes extremely difficult for participants from all segments of the member's circle to interact with one another. This point is especially significant as it relates to the resolution of intra-role conflicts.
An underlying assumption in discussing a woman in the Member of Congress role is that she comes to the role both as woman and as politician. The strongest support for the existence of her political expertise is her ability, politically, to transfer the woman component of her identity into working capital. She enters a system where reciprocity is the fundamental informal norm. To unduly antagonize the predominantly male membership is to commit political suicide. By long-standing definition, the membership of the House, on the whole, is more "conservative" than "liberal" politically. A fair assumption seems to be that political conservatism is associated with conservatism in other areas of personal life. As a corollary then, by-and-large, the male membership can be expected to define "woman" conservatively, that is, traditionally. Therefore, the woman's task is to act out of the traditional definition, politically.

Specific hypotheses emerge from the foregoing assumptions.

**Hypothesis 4:** In terms of basic role perceptions, what differences there are between men and women will stem from personal choice among institutionalized options and will not be based on sex identity.

**Hypothesis 5:** Men and women will posit different role expectations for women in the House of Representatives.

**Hypothesis 6:** What men and women choose to emphasize in positing differences in role expectations for women in the House of Representatives may well be attributed to sexual identity.

**Role Components 3 and 4: Duties and Rights of Incumbency**

What does the leadership expect of a Member of Congress? In the concept of leadership is included the Speaker, the majority or minority
leader, depending upon whether the member's party is in the majority or not, the party whips, the dean of the member's state delegation, and the chairmen of the committees and sub-committees to which he is assigned. If the member is new, he is expected to serve the appropriate apprenticeship. This means being silent and observant most of his first term. It means being docile and respectful of his elders. It means accepting the assignments which they, in their "wisdom", give him. It means supporting them in their major legislative efforts, and it means being loyal and faithful. Fidelity includes doing his homework and being where he's supposed to be when he's supposed to be there.

What do senior members expect to give in return? What does the member now have a right to expect from them? Fundamentally, in return for his cooperation, they assure him in all important matters they will take care of him. He will have the committee assignments best suited to his talents and qualification -- as they define these. They will see that he receives the "right" invitations and the "right" information when he needs it. They will spare him the "wrong" confrontations. In addition, they will all autograph photographs for his office wall so that all who come to call can know in what high esteem he is held.

Ideally, if the member's social circle could be reduced to the expectations which prevail in his relations with the leadership, the role would be tailor-made for any woman socialized to the traditional definition of what a woman should be in our society -- docile, supportive, retiring, sacrificial, etc. In return, her men will care for her. Men, on the other hand, socialized to "maleness" in our society, fre-
quently chafe under the "feminization" of their relations with Con-
gressional leaders.

If a member does not find a path strewn with roses, it can be be-
cause participants in other segments of the circle have quite different
expectations and are willing to confer a quite different set of rights.
If the member is a woman, her peers do expect her to be feminine (as a
whole they are a fairly conservative group), but they expect her to be-
come adept at the game they play -- the game called the acquisition,
distribution, and manipulation of power -- or politics. If any member
does not play this game, he is useless to his peers and dead weight in
the system. As a political person then, every member, man or woman,
must stock his own larder of resources for bartering purposes because,
if he does not, he has nothing to bring to the process of reciprocity
which is another name for the game. Resource building demands asser-
tiveness, sometimes even aggression. Issues are seldom black or white
in the legislative arena. An acceptable compromise (which is almost
always the mode of resolving conflict in this system) is the end-product
of a long and arduous period of bargaining. Bargaining is a nose-to-
nose kind of exercise. The docile, reserved, and shy often do not suc-
cceed at it. The dogged, the determined, the pragmatic, and the self-
assured frequently do. In addition to these expectations, one's peers
expect one to be something of what the leadership expects; namely, re-
spectful, a "subject - matter expert", a person who diligently does his
homework. In return, what do they offer? They grant their colleague
the right to expect trust, respect, and, above all, the assurance that
they will keep their part of the bargains entered into with him. In
short, they will reciprocate.

With constituents, a slightly different interplay of duties and rights prevails. To understand this difference, it is necessary to recall the "two election" concept. The constituents determine the kind of qualifications they want in a representative, or at least they ratify the acceptance of those qualifications if these have been determined by party officials or by influential supporters. They decide what kind of representation they think they want; then they go about selecting a person for the role. They expect their choice to embody their notion of representation. Of course representation can have as many definitions as there are clusters of constituents capable of becoming majorities on election day. Included in any definition of representation, however, is accessibility, responsibility, accountability, and a certain intangible quality of moral decency. In return for his representing them fairly, constituents offer their representative security. This is the link between the district and the Congress itself, between the candidate and member components of the Member of Congress role. Achieving membership in the fullest sense requires seniority, since the system, as it is presently structured, reserves its choicest fruits for the long-term member. Figure 4.3 illustrates the duties and rights inherent in the contract between the Member of Congress and the peer, constituent, and House leadership segments of his social circle.

From the description of the social circle of a Member of Congress, two final hypotheses may be applied to the woman member.

Hypothesis 7: More than any other category of member, the Married
Woman Politician elected between 1950 and 1970 comes uniquely equipped with the resources necessary for integrating the expectations of the three segments of the member's social circle selected for analysis: the House leadership, her peers, and her constituents.

**Figure 4.3: Duties and Rights Inherent in the Relations Between the Member of Congress and the House Leadership, Peer, and Constituent Segments of His Social Circle**

**Hypothesis 8:** Among married Women Politicians elected between 1950 and 1970, integration of the expectations of the three segments of the
member's social circle selected for analysis will derive from a woman's willingness to utilize some or all of the resources with which she comes uniquely equipped.

Role Conflict

The composition of the relationships just described is full of potential for conflict. Each segment of the circle is essential to the Member of Congress in the performance of the role. He cannot alienate any of the social partners irrevocably. Compromise, then, becomes the modus operandi for the Member of Congress. For the woman compromise operates uniquely at two levels. Politically the legislative process demands it. But she comes to the system as politician and woman. The system tends to define her in both roles traditionally. Therefore, the Congresswoman is constantly reconciling what seem to be contradictory societal definitions. She does this, as has been suggested, by using the feminine aspect of her identity, politically; that is, she makes it serve her interests in the system. Prestige accrues to the role of Congresswoman to the degree that one is able to effect the balance. This writer is fully aware of the fact that many other components of an individual's identity must be balanced in the eventual internalization of a role, but the emphasis in this research will focus on the two just discussed.
CHAPTER V
METHODOLOGY

From its inception an underlying hypothesis informing this re-
search has been that being a woman does affect the way one is able to
function as a Member of the United States' House of Representatives.
Not only does sex affect the way the member conceives of herself in the
role, but also it affects the very nature of the reciprocity which is
so essential to her in her relations with her social circle. To some
extent, at least, her sex establishes boundaries and presents guidelines
for routes of access, for acceptance into the informal network of re-
lationships which constitutes the very heart of the legislative pro-
cess, and for her ability to establish credibility regarding her talent
and expertise as a legislator, to mention only a few of the implications
of sexual identity.

This chapter is designed to explain how the data related to the
concern of this research were gathered, organized, and analyzed, and
to explain the evolution of those insights by which additional hypoth-
eses were developed and explored.

Since Jeannette Rankin of Montana took her seat in the House March
4, 1917, seventy-six women have been elected or appointed to member-
ship up to and including the 1972 election. The Congressional Direc-
tory and The Congressional Quarterly were the primary sources for
this information. These listings were cross-checked with others (Con-
gressional Handbook, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Gruberg,
1968; Werner, 1966; Chamberlin, 1973). Finally, the listing was sent
to the National Committees of both major parties for confirmation. One difficulty in determining the accuracy of such a listing stems from the fact that many women over the years have been interim appointees whose tenure has been short-lived. A case in point is Corinne Riley, wife of John Riley of Sumter, South Carolina, whose name does not appear in the Congressional Directory, since she was an interim appointee serving only eleven months following her husband’s death. Other listings fall short of being accurate simply through oversight. For instance, Chamberlin (1973) does not include Elizabeth Farrington of Hawaii, who succeeded her husband in July, 1954, but ran for election in her own right in November of that year. These oversights are mentioned because any listing is complete to the extent that the sources of information are up-to-date and accurate.

The first problem to present itself was to establish a rationale for drawing a meaningful sample from this population. Doing so was deemed necessary for two reasons. First, a Congressional career has been associated traditionally with the middle years of one’s life. This means that, except for the exceptionally long-lived, women serving in the 1920s and 1930s are now deceased. A second reason for concluding that a sample was necessary was the problem of locating non-incumbents for purposes of interviewing, as interviewing was to be an integral part of my research. Financial resources simply ruled out the possibility of personally interviewing all living Congresswomen, past and present.

With respect to the problem of sample selection, the war years (1941-1945) were intriguing because the almost total mobilization of
of the nation for the war effort brought many women into the work force for the first time. On a nation-wide basis this period marked a significant stage in the modernization of the work role for women. It might be said that working on the part of women became institutionalized. Their motives would be probed endlessly in the literature of the 1950s and 1960s, but the fact that large numbers of women, single and married, were leaving their homes to work was established once and for all.

In terms of this analysis, then, a decision was made that a twenty-year study spanning the decades of the 1950s and the 1960s could be rewarding because, for one thing, it was feasible to the extent that the majority are still alive and likely to be well enough still to be cooperative. In addition, the careers of these women would reflect the larger transition going on in the work role for women in general which was launched in force in the post-World War II decades. Therefore, the Freshman Class of 1951 became the year of entry into this study, and since the questions to be asked presupposed some Congressional experience, 1971 was designated the boundary at the opposite end. Initial inquiry yielded the information that five of the women entering the House between these dates are now dead. This left twenty-four women, still living, who had entered the House of Representatives between 1951 and 1971. This number represents approximately 30% of all the women who have served since 1917.

The location of non-incumbents became especially tedious since, as of January 3, 1971, only twelve were incumbents. For the remaining twelve, snatches of information were gleaned from a number of sources: the standard biographical indices, the National Party Committees, staff
members of the incumbents presently representing the districts these
women had served. By far the most helpful source of information turned
out to be an organization which is Washington-based, calling itself
Former Members of Congress, Inc. They provided current mailing ad-
dresses for all those who were no longer in Congress.

After the women had been identified and located according to the
rationale described above, some initial order was imposed upon the list.
Geographical region seems to have had some bearing, historically, on
the kinds of people who have come to Congress, especially in differences
between the South and the rest of the country. Therefore, two regions
were identified as the first category into which the women were placed:
South and Non-South.¹

In addition, it has been said by some over the years that the Dem-
ocratic Party has given greater encouragement to women seeking politi-
cal office. This is, of course, disputed by the opposition, but it
does suggest that political party affiliation may be relevant to role
internalization. The second break-down was in terms of party affiliation.

¹Regional divisions utilized in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOUTH</th>
<th>NON-SOUTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitudes toward role concepts are affected, too, by one's era and the cultural attitudes prevalent during one's "time" of involvement. Accordingly, the women were categorized by their year of entry and tenure.

Early in the groping period for this research, this writer had the privilege of presenting some very unformed ideas about the subject to Dr. Duncan MacRae, Jr., then of the University of Chicago. In two lengthy conversations Dr. MacRae conveyed an objective typology of American Congresswomen which has proved most valuable. What this was, basically, was a conferring of labels on women with rather distinct characteristics which were already described in the existing literature. Three types applicable to the group in question were identified: (1) The Place Holder was and is an interim appointee, usually called upon to fill an unexpired term until a man more oriented to career and power can be found and groomed for the position. Southern constituencies have been disproportionately represented by this type. (2) The Widow-Turned-Politician initially often shares many of the characteristics of the Place-Holder. Frequently she has been called upon to run in a special election following her husband's death in office. Unlike the Place-Holder, however, these women have tended to stay in Congress, carving out independent political careers of their own. Finally, (3) The Married Woman Politician has typically worked her way up through the ranks of the party organization in her district, pursuing a political career while her husband identified with either business or one of the professions. This may seem to be a more "modern" role since an occupational trend for women in recent years has been to combine involvement in an occupation or profession with marriage and family.
With regard to what has been said so far, a generalization can now be formulated. Sex difference, as an independent variable, does in fact affect the routes of access an individual has to the House of Representatives and the concept of the member role which he or she develops through interaction with selected members of his or her social circle. This simple relationship may well be affected, however, by other variables, the more significant of which may be the region of the country from which the member comes, party affiliation, the era of entry as well as length of tenure in office. For the woman member, her objective role-type may well be a mediating factor.

It has already been established that the theoretical foundation for this research is in the realm of role theory, especially in the tradition of Florian Znaniecki and those who have built upon his theoretical bases. The necessity of placing the Congresswoman's role in a social circle and of applying the thesis, that the ease with which a person can act out of a particular social role depends upon some agreement between the role incumbent and his social circle regarding duties and rights, called forth the need of identifying more people as relevant foci for this analysis.

Since not only Congress itself, but society at large, considers the system one in which relevant norms for appropriate behavior have been articulated by men, male members are the logical others. Attempts to develop a matched sample of men were ruled out. One reason for this is that what is required, once sex differences are assumed, is contrasting patterns between male and female assessments concerning what is pertinent to the "member" role. Identifying patterns does not neces-
sitate one-to-one matching. What does seem to be required is a male group to serve as a purposive sample on which to build a comparative analysis.

In the interests of choosing men who shared some common characteristics with the women their responses would be compared to, it was deemed necessary to establish criteria for selecting the men who would serve as the purposive group. Since geographic region, party affiliation, and year of entry had already been determined as logical means of categorizing the women, these were the criteria adopted for the male group.

This decision raised problems of its own. For two of the women, one Republican and one Democrat, no male counterparts, using the established criteria, were available. For two others the potential counterparts are now deceased. This finding reduced the male field of eligibles to twenty.

Adding still further to complications associated with the male group was the discovery, after the data had been collected and absolutely all resources had run out, that one man who should have been a Republican is, in fact, a Democrat. Year of entry and geographic region are as they should be, however.

Biographical data were gathered for all potential respondents in order to identify common and variant background characteristics and to specifically describe the process of becoming a member, pinpointing differences in routes of access patterns for men and women. These data were organized around the approach used by Matthews (1953). Appendix II contains a copy of the form.
An interview schedule was devised to probe the more subjective problem of role conceptualization in line with relevant theory. The questions were designed to bring to the surface feelings about expectations concerning relations among selected members of the social circle. A vital core of these questions centered around what female respondents thought male colleagues expected of them in their day-by-day relations in the system, and what male respondents thought their expectations actually were. In addition, the questions, which were open-ended were designed to identify patterns of actual behavior, stressing what members of the circle actually do to facilitate or hinder role performance on the part of women. Appendix III contains the interview schedule.

Appointments were made with all incumbent respondents. With the respondent's permission, all interviews were taped. Only one refused taping. In this case answers were recorded in writing. The interviews averaged from forty-five minutes to an hour. In a few cases they ran for approximately two hours.

Non-incumbents presented a special problem. Because finances ruled out travel and even complete telephone coverage, the decision was made to send non-incumbents a copy of the questionnaire with a cassette tape, requesting that they record their answers for me. In cases where they would not do this, I attempted telephone contact. The successes and failures of this approach are evident in the analysis. The letter sent requesting interviews and one soliciting mailed responses will be found in Appendix IV.

The willingness to respond patterns must be noted in conclusion.
Letters were sent to nineteen incumbent Congressmen and thirteen incumbent Congresswomen over the period during which the interview data were collected. The first requests were sent in the Spring of 1970; the last were sent in the Spring of 1973. In all, five visits to Washington were made, each of from ten days to two weeks' duration. The process proved tedious, to say the least. The stages became fairly predictable. A letter was received expressing the member's willingness to be interviewed, but requesting a call when the interviewer arrived in Washington. The follow-up call generally yielded a day and an hour for an appointment, subject to other demands on the member's time. In the majority of cases a new time had to be scheduled. At least two of the Washington trips were disappointing with only two or three interviews completed. Women were the hardest to see. From some there was initial hostility. Women in Congress have been interviewed to death, and more than one expressed personal dissatisfaction with the way interview data were used. It might be noted that, in post-Watergate Washington, interviews are even more rarely granted unless the interviewer comes extremely well recommended.

In all, sixteen men granted personal interviews; three were never able to see me. Twelve women granted personal interviews; one was not able to see me.

At the same time attempts were being made to set up personal interviews in Washington, mailed questionnaires with cassette tapes were sent to one man who is no longer an incumbent and to eleven women. The inclusion of the tape with the questionnaire was intended to give the respondent the option of either responding in writing or recording his
responses. As expected, the results were somewhat less rewarding. In the first return, only two women responded with a mailed questionnaire. There was no response at all from the rest. A second letter was sent. The request was basically the same with the addition that I would be happy to make a telephone call at a time convenient for them. To this letter two women responded, one through her secretary, the other through her attorney, that neither was well enough to comply with the request. Two additional women completed the questionnaire on tape. A third letter was sent to the one man and five women who had still not been heard from. In this letter, the willingness to telephone was reiterated and emphasized. After two months of no response from these six, no further attempts at contact were made.

In terms of total response, then, sixteen men were personally interviewed for an 80% return on interview requests. Twelve women were personally interviewed and four responded by mail for a total of sixteen or better than 66%.
CHAPTER VI
MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN THE STUDY SAMPLE:
BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS AND ROUTES OF ACCESS

Between January 3, 1951, and January 3, 1971, twenty-nine women took seats for the first time in the House of Representatives of the United States. During their era the number of women in the House reached its all-time high. The Eighty-seventh Congress, convening January 3, 1961, included seventeen women members. With their two counterparts in the Senate, this brought the number of women in Congress to nineteen as the decade of the '60s began. They represented every region of the country as the elected representatives of constituents in eighteen states. An analysis of their characteristics supports the caveat impressed upon this writer by one of the members currently serving. She said, "It is a mistake to treat women in Congress as one unrefined category. There is no stereotype. One never studies men in Congress. Why women?" The all too obvious answer is that women are so few among so many so the search for a "type" seems almost irresistible.

The search is indeed abortive if it is confined solely to the group in question. Perhaps this is an overriding weakness of a great deal of the research currently being done on the "woman question." Odious as some comparisons are to the more radical wings of the feminist movement, the only way we can determine if women in a given occupation or profession do, in fact, have special qualifications or characteristics is to collect some comparative data from men in the same fields, provided some areas of commonality can be identified.
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Since three to four times as many men as women enter the House in any given election year, the selection of a male group as a purposive sample seemed relatively easy at the planning stage of this research. However, it proved to be a rather complicated operation. Problems of sample selection among the males have been detailed in Chapter V, and a review of that section will be helpful in interpreting the data distribution here. Suffice it to say that we are dealing with a group of twenty-four women and twenty men for a total of forty-four present and past Members of Congress.

Regions and Political Parties Represented

Table 6.1 shows the distribution of the entire group into the two geographical regions, South and Non-South, according to sex differences and party affiliation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region Represented</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20% (N=4)</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-South</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>80 (N=16)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70% (N=14)</td>
<td>30% (N=6)</td>
<td>67% (N=16)</td>
<td>33% (N=8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: D refers to Democrat; R refers to Republican
20% of the men are from the South; all are Democrats. 25% of the women are from the South; 21% are Democrats, 4% are Republicans. The remaining men are Non-South in origin. Of these, 50% are Democrats, 30% are Republicans. 75% of the women are Non-South; 46% are Democrats, 29% are Republicans. Since the women represent all women living who were Members of the House of Representatives during the two decades studied, generalizations are in order and are significant. Twice as many women who were Democrats entered the House among this group. Also, only six of the twenty-four were from the South.

Twenty-three states are represented by the sample. The state-by-state distribution is presented in Table 6.2. States electing a woman to the House for the first time in history during this period are marked with an asterisk (*). In this Table data are presented in whole numbers so that the reader has some idea of the actual geographic distribution of the sample.

**Ethnic Identity and Religious Affiliation**

At many points in the process a person who sets out to interview Members of Congress is asked to wait for his prey in the bustling Rayburn Room off the House floor. This is a large, rather dignified, chandeliered room furnished with two large conference tables, several smaller tables boasting lamps and telephones, and enough leather chairs and couches to accommodate approximately sixty people. Here, when the House is in session, Mr. and Mrs. America come to look, meet, congratulate, complain, and exploit. Here and there one sees an eager-faced aide, always young, armed with letters to be signed in haste, press releases for approval, word of a phone call which must be returned. As
### TABLE 6.2
MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN STUDY SAMPLE: STATES REPRESENTED BY SEX AND PARTY AFFILIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States Represented</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* States having a woman representative for the first time

One sits waiting, a steady stream of the representatives of the people comes for transfusions of their life blood, contact with their constituents. All are clean and scrubbed. Shoes are shined. There are few black faces. There are few young faces. There is an occasional beard, some modest sideburns, some hair curling at the collar line, none long.
There are few women. On the whole, the men and women the people have
sent to Washington often appear in marked contrast to the people who
sent them. As one witnesses the passing parade, one wonders if, in
spite of all the writing and talking about the absolute need for a
legislature which, in fact, mirrors a cross-section of all the people,
this will ever be the case. Or does the complex process of designating
a field of eligibles from whom the people choose on election day, rule
out most except those who embody the label which is "right" and "safe"
for the legislative role in the minds of a vast majority of the Ameri-
can people -- White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant?

To establish the first characteristic as valid requires little
science. Blacks in Congress are far from reaching numbers equivalent
to their proportion of the population at large. Ronald Dellums and
Shirley Chisholm to the contrary, many who are there are accused re-
peatedly of greater devotion to the interests of the white establish-
ment, whose creations they are, than to any cries of protest from the
"black brothers" in the large cities from which they come.

Ethnic identity is not as obvious and, indeed, is rather hard to
come by. Twice the Queries Department of The Congressional Quarterly
told the writer by phone that, while biographies of all the newly e-
lected are published in the weekly report following Congressional e-
lections, no attempt is made to determine ethnicity. Unless given in
other biographical sources, it has to be derived from family surnames
and one's ability to associate those with particular ethnic groups.
The following assessment of ethnic identity is presented as a combi-
nation of both these means of derivation -- information specifically
given in official biographies and some personal sophistication in knowing the national origin of certain common surnames. In the interests of accuracy the broadest categories have been used, following the lines of the ordinary distinction between the "old" and the "new" immigration from Europe, plus "black" and "Oriental."

Table 6.3 shows the ethnic identity of the forty-four Members of Congress whose biographies are pertinent to this research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Identity</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern and Western European (old immigration)</td>
<td>90% (N=18)</td>
<td>83% (N=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central and Eastern European (new immigration)</td>
<td>10% (N=2)</td>
<td>9% (N=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4% (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4% (N=1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was expected, the chances of a member tracing his family tree to its roots somewhere in northern or western Europe are exceptionally great. In the case of all the persons concerned, ethnic placement was finally decided upon for those whose biographies did not give it only after data were gathered on the mother's maiden name. Only two exceptions
to the rule appear in the male sample. One, a Democrat, is a Jew with origins in Eastern Europe; the other, a Republican, is Polish. 83% of the women are of northern and western European stock. However, concerning the remaining 17%, three interesting points can be made. First, the one black woman and the one Oriental woman are Democrats as are the Jew and the Italian. Second, all four "deviants" are from Non-South portions of the country. Finally, all four have been elected to the House since 1960.

In the area of social image one question remains. If Members of Congress are usually white and Anglo-Saxon, are they also Protestant? Here the answer is not so clear-cut. Table 6.4 shows the religious affiliation of the Members of Congress in the study sample by sex.

### Table 6.4

**RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN STUDY SAMPLE BY SEX (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>65% (N=13)</td>
<td>58% (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>30% (N=6)</td>
<td>21% (N=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>5% (N=1)</td>
<td>4% (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>17% (N=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The similarities between men and women are strong in the distribution
among Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Jews. One interesting point, worthy of note is that, for four of the women, religious affiliation was impossible to find. Whether this indicates agnostics, or atheists, oversight or irrelevance, is impossible to say.

Table 6.5 shows what happens to religious affiliation when it is related to party affiliation.

TABLE 6.5

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN THE STUDY SAMPLE, BY PARTY AFFILIATION (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>63% (N=19)</td>
<td>57% (N=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>23% (N=7)</td>
<td>29% (N=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>7% (N=2)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>7% (N=2)</td>
<td>14% (N=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100% (N=30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100% (N=14)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It comes as no surprise to find that over half of each party represented is Protestant. What is interesting is that slightly more are Roman Catholic in the Republican segment of the sample than in the Democratic (29% R; 23% D). This may make this group slightly atypical in terms of the whole House, but in the absence of verifying data, it remains a somewhat unexpected distribution for this group.

Table 6.6 presents religious affiliation on the basis of geographic region. What is not surprising at all is that there are no Roman Cath-
olics or Jews representing the South among this particular group.

### TABLE 6.6

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN STUDY SAMPLE BY GEOGRAPHIC REGION (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Non-South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90% (N=9)</td>
<td>53% (N=18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33 (N=11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (N=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>10% (N=1)</td>
<td>8 (N=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (N=10)</td>
<td>100% (N=34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to the denominations represented among Protestant members, the women are far more diversified than their male counterparts. On the whole, however, more Protestant members are Methodists, Episcopalians, and Presbyterians than anything else. The distribution of men and women among the Protestant denominations represented appears in Table 6.7. It is interesting that, when major religious groups in the United States were ranked by the income level and the educational achievements of their members in the very middle of the decades under consideration, the order shown in Table 6.8 emerged.

Using either income or education as a measure of the status of religious groupings, the Episcopal and Presbyterian churches rank highest among the Protestant denominations. On the basis of income,
TABLE 6.7
PROTESTANT DENOMINATIONS REPRESENTED AMONG PROTESTANT MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN THE STUDY SAMPLE BY SEX (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protestant Denominations</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4% (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregationalist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7 (N=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopal</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23 (N=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27 (N=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23 (N=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100% (N=12)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100% (N=14)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100% (N=26)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Methodists are superseded by the Lutherans but follow the Episcopalians and Presbyterians on the basis of educational attainment. The data presented regarding the religions of the Members of Congress who are the subjects of this study seem to indicate a significant representation from the high status denominations, since 73% of the Protestants are members of one or the other of the three.

**Educational Attainment**

A glance at history serves to show that formal presence in an academic setting over many years is not necessarily a prerequisite for statesmanship, but if the careers of today's legislators do, in fact,
personify those goals which Americans aspire to regardless of whether or not they actually achieve them, then the acquisition of knowledge beyond the three "Rs" should emerge as one of the characteristics of national legislators. Table 6.9 indicates that, while the educational attainment of one male subject is unknown, it is true that all the rest, with the exception of one woman, have had formal education beyond high school which places them above the average American in this respect. In addition, it is reasonable to assume that the membership of a legislature, or law-making body, will be heavy with professional students of the law, namely lawyers. Matthews (1960) found this to be true in his study of Senators. He explains the reason for this predominance to be due, in part, to the rather specialized skills attributed to the professional lawyer.
TABLE 6.9
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN STUDY SAMPLE BY SEX (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Level of Schooling</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade School only</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School only</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2 (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some work done</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23 (N=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate degree</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15 (N=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Law</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30 (N=13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and/or Professional school</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7 (N=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some work done</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7 (N=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9 (N=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7 (N=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (N=20)</td>
<td>100% (N=24)</td>
<td>100% (N=44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the erosion of the historic view that a lawyer is an officer of the court, the modern American conception developed that the lawyer is the paid servant of his client, justified in using any weapon that the law supplies in his client's interests.... In filling this new role, the lawyer has become a 'mediator of forces', a 'specialist in human relations.' The lawyer, in his everyday occupational role develops not only ability in interpersonal mediation and conciliation but also skill in verbal manipulation.... With the development of these skills in the normal course of a legal career, the lawyer has a substantial
advantage over the average layman who decides to enter politics (pp. 33-34).

It is not surprising, then, to find that among the Members of Congress studied here 30% have law degrees.

The question still remains, however, whether women or the men in the purposive group are actually better prepared for the job they are called upon to do. A simple answer is not forthcoming because much depends upon the perspective from which one approaches the task.

If, in drafting sensible legislation, it would seem to be more important for one to be a "subject-matter expert" in the areas of legislative content rather than a master of the legal process, including expertise in precedent, procedure, etc., then one might argue that a body with a more diversified educational and experiential background would prove to be the better law-making body. If this is the position one adopts, then considering the men and women entering the House in the 1950s (Table 6.10), the women will be given a slight edge over their male counterparts. For, of the twelve, only 8% (N=1) were lawyers, but 25% (N=3) had done some graduate work beyond the undergraduate degree in their respective fields, and 8% (N=1) had a graduate degree. Among the men, 30% (N=3) were lawyers, 20% (N=2) had undergraduate degrees, and the remaining 50% (N=5) had finished their educations before achieving a specific degree. A word of caution is in order here as elsewhere, however, in interpreting the male data. All that can be said is that what is indicated is true of these men and cannot be extended to apply to all the men entering the House in the 1950s.

Data from the 1960s show that, on the whole, the educational level
TABLE 6.10

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS
IN STUDY SAMPLE BY SEX AND DECADE OF ENTRY (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Men 1950s</th>
<th>Men 1960s</th>
<th>Women 1950s</th>
<th>Women 1960s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school only</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some work done</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Law</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and/or</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some work done</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (N=10)</td>
<td>100% (N=10)</td>
<td>100% (N=12)</td>
<td>100% (N=12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of incoming legislators has risen. Furthermore, the women seem to have answered the question regarding what kind of education is the best prerequisite for a legislative career another way by bringing their educational histories more into line with their male counterparts. 33% of the women entering in the 1960s had law degrees as compared to only 8% of their sisters in the 1950s. 17% have graduate degrees in other
fields. Speculations concerning the reasons for this influx of lawyers abound (one speaks of "influx" only when the numbers four and one are placed in fields of eligibles numbering twelve). Are more women lawyers available because law schools have been accepting more women in the last decade? Have women themselves come to the conclusion that to be effective in the legislative arena, the law degree is a distinct asset, and therefore more lawyers now choose to run than in the previous decade? Or is it that people vote for lawyers over non-lawyers, operating on the theory that lawyers must be good legislators since there are so many of them legislating? An aside here is irresistible. The Watergate and its aftermath seem bound to damage credibility in the worth of having lawyers at the highest levels of government. It will be interesting to see if any skepticism regarding the calibre of the service of lawyers in government will spill over onto those seeking election to Congress. These are all questions deserving of further inquiry but must be laid to rest for now.

**Occupational Experience**

Regarding the educational attainment of the Members of Congress, a generalization that they rank above the level of the common man is in order. In this society, the status of one's occupation frequently follows closely upon one's educational achievements. If this is the case, Members of Congress should be drawn from high status occupations commensurate with their education.

In order to avoid the trap of positing status hierarchies based on occupation with too much emphasis, the principal occupation of each of the Members of Congress in the study sample is presented alphabetically
by sex in Table 6.11. Where applicable, the listing is the one used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Occupation</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business or Banking</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18% (N=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service/Politics</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10 (N=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 (N=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30 (N=13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14 (N=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7 (N=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100% (N=20)</td>
<td>100% (N=24)</td>
<td>100% (N=44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

by The Congressional Quarterly in reporting occupational data. "Principal Occupation" is defined simply as that occupation to which the individual devoted the greatest number of years before entering the House of Representatives.

The data show that, while the presence of men in business and banking exceeds the presence of women in these fields prior to entry, women outnumber men in civil service and non-elective political positions. In law men have the edge but women are well represented. The other cluster, teaching, seems to be a woman's domain prior to entry with 21% of the
women represented.

One's occupational class is a recurring subject in discussions of occupational placement, and so for the moment we choose to operate within the assumption that in the minds of most Americans there is still a distinction between "head" work and "hand" work and that a position requiring the use of one's intellect primarily is more prestigious than one requiring less intelligence. This is so, partially, at least, because of the rote nature of many of the tasks involved in so-called "hand" work. Furthermore, within this assumption one frequently concludes that the upwardly mobile person aspires to move into the "head" work categories. To see if this might be true for the subjects of this study, occupational class distribution by stage of career was considered. The three pertinent stages are the ones used by Matthews (1960) in his study of the Senate: First Occupation after Schooling, Principal Occupation, and Occupation at Election to the House. A note of caution is in order here. These are occupations in the usual sense of the word. Elective offices are not included. They will be dealt with in another context. This is significant especially where women are concerned, which will soon be made clear. Table 6.12 shows the occupational class distribution of the sample by sex and stage of career. For the men, since most began in a professional or proprietary position, there is actually little change over time. What happened was that at the time of election all were classified as either professionals, proprietors and/or officials. The last period evidenced a shift of only three persons from lower level positions over time.

The career stages of the women present a somewhat different picture
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Class</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Occupation after Schooling</td>
<td>Occupation at election to House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Occupation</td>
<td>Principal Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietors and Officials</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-salaried workers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Wage Earner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total 100% (N=20)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100% (N=24)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and raise a question of some importance. The only career stage at which women kept pace with men was the period immediately after the completion of formal schooling when all except the two "unknowns" were employed and, like the male sample, heavily placed in the professional and proprietor/official categories. From there on the picture changes. Given the traditional categories, a class of women emerges who eventually achieve election to the Congress of the United States but who, regarding their principal occupation and their occupation at the time of election, were not employed. At the time of election they are 33% of the women. This is explained by the fact, as is already well known, that many of the women who were the widows of Congressmen did not themselves aspire to political careers until their husbands died in the midst of campaigning or before the expiration of their terms of office. What is interesting is that the ordinary occupational class hierarchy affords no category for this position, relegating a woman who is a housewife to the ranks of those who are not employed. It is probably a matter of cultural lag since the accomplishments of women in these positions have been correlated with their market value on numerous occasions, but the fact remains that the occupation, housewife, is outside the realm of the common occupational class hierarchies. Some of these women did hold elective office but, as mentioned, this fact is not included in the usual occupational listings either.

Marital Status

Every one in this sample of Members of Congress is now or has been married. A few are widows and widowers. Some have been divorced and
remarried, but in no way are bachelors and spinsters normative in the House of Representatives. The few exceptions over the years only seem to prove the rule.

The Constitution places very few impediments in the way of those who aspire to legislate for the rest of the nation, but for those who succeed, the Club is exclusive indeed. If the men are few, the women are infinitely fewer, since in the entire history of the Republic fewer than 100 women have merited the title, Member of Congress.

In exploring routes of access, the first point to be made is that for many women the paths are few and well worn. To a far greater degree, proportionate to their numbers, the door to the House opens to a woman when it closes in death on a man who served before. Of the twenty-four women studied here, twelve are in this category. Five carried on for a short time only, to give the organization at home time to regroup after the loss. These have been referred to as Place Holders. The remaining seven stayed, carving out careers of their own. In speaking of the careers of these women, their peers, especially men, apply the adjective "distinguished" more than to any other group. The rest are the Married Women Politicians who began to carve out political careers for themselves early in life independent of their husbands and other relatives. For most of these the route is through state legislatures. Even those who have gained some distinction in law or education seem to use their respective state legislatures as stepping stones to Congress. Often men in their business associations experience frustrations in dealing with the federal bureaucracy and so are prevailed upon by local backers to run for national office. Therefore, a
Congressional seat is frequently the first public office these gentlemen achieve. A few of the women elected in their own right have held important appointive or elective positions at the state level but, at least in the last twenty years, these seem the exception rather than the rule.

Objective Role Types: Party, Region, and Decade of Entry

It is difficult to say which political party favors women most at the national level. The willingness of women to seek political office is one imponderable which these data do not allow for. A party's willingness to sponsor women is, of course, dependent upon the women's willingness to run. Table 6.13 shows the objective role types by party affiliation.

**TABLE 6.13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Role Type</th>
<th>Democrats (%)</th>
<th>Republicans (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place Holder</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21 (N=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow Turned Politician</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29 (N=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Woman Politician</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50 (N=12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the incidences of Married Women Politicians are indicative of a party's willingness to encourage women to seek national legislative office, then the edge would have to be given to the Democratic Party if...
the willingness of women to run could be proved equal for both parties. This qualified conclusion may be strengthened, however, by noting that of the five Democrats who entered the House for the first time in 1972 (not included in this study for reasons already explained) four came independently through grassroots party organizations; one succeeds her husband; none is a Place Holder. The widow's staying, of course, will finalize these labels.

Table 6.14 looks at the objective role types from a slightly different point of view using geographic region as the distinguishing feature. It seems to be clear that the Place Holder is a Southern phenomenon. The widows who have become politicians in their own right, on the other hand, seem to be a Northern phenomenon. It can also be said that the Married Woman Politician is a product of the Non-South since eleven of the twelve are from the Northern part of the country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Role Type</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Non-South</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place Holder</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21% (N=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow Turned Politician</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29% (N=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Woman Politician</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50 (N=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (N=6)</td>
<td>100% (N=18)</td>
<td>100% (N=24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As far as the Married Woman Politician is concerned, decade of entry seems to make little difference. Table 6.15 shows the objective role types by decade of entry. 50% of the Married Woman Politicians came in each decade. It is interesting to note that 41% of the women entering in the 1950s were widows who stayed to carve out careers; in the 1960s only 17% were in the same category. Just one Place Holder took office in the 1950s while the remaining four were products of the 1960s. Since these were "firsts" for their respective areas of the country, one wonders if the Place Holder as a viable type is in the ascendency in recent years when such a need has arisen.

Relatives in Politics

A legitimate question for any profession is to determine how much people are influenced by others significant to them who have gone before? How many of the Members of Congress in this sample, for example, have had relatives in politics? Table 6.16 presents the relevant information.
findings. 35% of the male group did indicate having relatives in pol-

TABLE 6.16
MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN STUDY SAMPLE WITH RELATIVES IN POLITICS BY SEX (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relatives in Politics</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One or more</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>45% (N=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>55% (N=24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

itics, but only one man succeeded a relative (his father) in Congress. The others had relatives active at the local level only. When women are in focus the objective role types have already established that half the women studied did have an association with politics through a relative. In the data presented above one more joins this group from the Married Woman Politician category. This woman's relative can only be considered remotely political, however. It seems that one Republican Married Woman Politician's grandmother was the foundress of her state's W.C.T.U. On the strength of these findings it seems fair to say that selection of the Congressional role, as far as women elected in their own right are concerned, does not depend upon the influence or example of relatives who were so employed.

Career Stages

If it is true that membership in Congress is an occupation reserved to those in middle life, then it seems safe to assume that the role may
be conceived of as a stage in a series of public offices in the context of a career in public life. Some determination of whether or not this was so was attempted by looking at the careers of the members in the sample according to the first public office achieved and the last office achieved before election to the House. There was a feeling that some shifts might be discernible when decade of entry was considered, the data are presented with this distinction in mind. Table 6.17 deals with the first public office achieved by the male group by decade of entry. Of note is the fact that the spread is similar whether entrance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of office</th>
<th>1950s</th>
<th>1960s</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Representative</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15% (N=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Legislator</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30 (N=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide Elective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Elective Official</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20 (N=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement Official</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 (N=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Official</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25 (N=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (N=10)</td>
<td>100% (N=10)</td>
<td>100% (N=0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is in the 1950s or 1960s. One interesting point is that in the 1950s
20% entered their respective state legislatures as their first public office, while among those entering the next decade 40% indicate this as the first public office achieved.

For the women, a somewhat different picture emerges. Table 6.18 presents this distribution by decade of entry and objective role type.

**TABLE 6.18**

FIRST PUBLIC OFFICE ACHIEVED BY CONGRESSWOMEN BY OBJECTIVE ROLE TYPE AND DECADE OF ENTRY TO HOUSE (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of office</th>
<th>1950s</th>
<th>1960s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PH</td>
<td>WP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Legislator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide Elective Official</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Elective Official</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement Official</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Official</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (N=12)</td>
<td>100% (N=12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, somewhat different options are indicated. Excluding the 25% for whom membership in the House is the first public office, most of the
What happens when the last public office before election to the House is considered? For both men and women, very little. This seems to indicate some persistence in the first public office achieved. There are a few shifts, to be sure, but not enough in any sense to be significant.

**Age at First Election**

Election to the House of Representatives has traditionally been the prerogative of those in middle life. One of the recurring criticisms of Congress as a whole is that it is an old man's club whose members are psychically distant from the concerns, the aspirations, and the struggles of those they have been elected to serve. Although the influx of younger people has been significant in recent years, their presence has done relatively little to alter this image or the overall fact of middle-aged incumbency. This study does little to challenge this. However, what is interesting is a comparison between men and women when age at first election is considered. Table 6.19 looks at this phenomenon by decade of entry. Regarding age distribution, the women are older entering the House than the men in the sample. The range is from thirty-five to sixty-nine and the median age is fifty. For the men the range is from thirty-two to fifty-eight and the median is 42.5. These are placed in a perspective when one recalls the number of women who have succeeded their husbands in office after the husband's death.

To see if the incumbents are getting older or younger as this society's value on youth increases, data from each of the decades for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall age distribution</th>
<th>1950s</th>
<th>1960s</th>
<th>Overall age distribution</th>
<th>1950s</th>
<th>1960s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N=24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 6.19**

**AGE DISTRIBUTION OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN STUDY SAMPLE BY SEX**
both men and women were considered. The men in the sample who entered the House in the 1950s had a range of age at entry from thirty-two to fifty-three with a median of 41.5. The women entering in the 1950s yielded a range of age from forty-two to sixty-seven with a median age of forty-seven. Even though the distance between the median ages of men and women entering in the 1950s was less than six years, the youngest woman was ten years older than the youngest man and the oldest woman was fourteen years older than the oldest man.

If the 1960s saw increasing political involvement among the young, is it logical to expect that this involvement will be reflected in a surge of younger national legislators? As far as women are concerned, this is not the case. Although the decade of the 1960s brought the youngest woman to Congress to come in the two decades, it also brought the oldest. The range of age was from thirty-five to sixty-nine. Of significance is the fact that during the 1960s the median age for women has actually risen four years, from forty-seven to fifty-one. If women chosen for public office at the national level have become older, the men in the sample have also, to a very slight degree. For the men who entered in the 1960s the age range is from thirty-two to fifty-eight with the median fixed at 43.5, or two years older than the median for the 1950s.

**Circumstances of Entrance**

Earlier in this narrative it was suggested that for Members of Congress, as for any other occupational or professional group, initial entrance into the system depends upon the fact that the right person...
knows the right people in the right place at the right time. Therefore, an analysis of the routes of access must include a discussion of the actual circumstances of entrance. Perusal of the data indicates that these circumstances fall roughly into five categories. First, an incumbent dies and for continuity to be sustained, someone must be found to take his place. For almost 50% of the women entering in the decades studied, this was the circumstance which made entry possible. Second, there is the circumstance of an open election and this actually takes two forms. An incumbent may retire, creating the climate for an open race among fresh candidates from all parties concerned, or a brand new district may be formed as a consequence of Congressional reapportionment. Third, the opposition party may be firmly entrenched in what is known as a one-party district. This situation may be of many years duration. To preserve the integrity of the democratic process, theoretically, the ritual of challenge is enacted each election year. As long as the incumbent remains strong, the challenge remains token, and the person prevailed upon to make the challenge must either be expendable or otherwise secure so that an abortive Congressional challenge will not have a deleterious effect on one's primary career orientation. Frequently, the willingness to be the "sacrificial lamb" is rewarded with an appointive "plum" at the local, state, or even national level. The process endures and the interests of all are essentially served. Sometimes, by a fluke of circumstance, the tables are turned and the challenger defeats the "unbeatable" incumbent. This is what makes it possible to say that circumstances for entry can originate in a sacrificial gesture. Two other circumstances of entry are more common. An
incumbent may lose his grip in a constituency when his position on a particular issue or issues becomes intolerable to the voters. The local organization, sensing this, may launch an all-out effort to find a challenger who is more in tune with voter sympathies. This may result in an intra-party struggle for nomination or it may surface at election time when the opposing parties face off on the issue. In any event, the challenger is chosen for what is perceived by his backers to be his ability to win. Finally, there is the circumstance of the independent challenge which succeeds. There are relatively few of these, but the fact that there are any necessitates its inclusion as a category. The candidate who wins this way usually explains his victory in terms of his responsiveness to the "voice of the people." The implication is that the local party organization has become self-serving and therefore out of touch with the real needs of the constituents.

Table 6.20 reports the circumstances of entrance for the Members of Congress in the sample by sex. It is not surprising to find that the heaviest concentration of women (46%) depended upon the death of an incumbent for entry. These are the Widows Turned Politician and the Place Holders with one exception. One Widow Turned Politician actually did not succeed her husband immediately. Initially, she was defeated in the special election following her husband's death, but came back two years later as an independent challenger to defeat the man who defeated her. Neither is it surprising that men most often are the candidates of their party in the traditional manner. 60% are. A pattern is visible linking the Married Woman Politician to the male norm. All the women who were their party's candidate to challenge the incumbent...
bent are from the Married Woman Politician category, as are two of the three independent challengers. It is interesting that the independent challenge is not a male prerogative since 13% of the women are in this category as compared to 15% of the men. This may argue for the fact that some women, at least, are not embraced by party organizations but are politically sophisticated enough to accurately assess the presence and quality of voter support.

Tenure

For a Member of Congress length of service is extremely important. It is indicative of two factors which serve the individual as indices.
of prestige. To be returned to office term after term is indicative either of the confidence the electorate has in the incumbent, or the viability of his local organization vis-à-vis the opposition, or both. In the House itself, in spite of repeated attempts on the part of dissenters to change the process, prestige depends, for the most part, on time spent in office. Inevitably committee chairmen have been chosen from among senior members of the majority party. All committees are not considered to have equal prestige, and seniority does facilitate movement to the more prestigious in the course of one's career.

Table 6.21 attempts to show how seniority or tenure is distributed between men and women along party lines. Only 18% of the women in the Democratic party have served longer than fifteen years. 36% of the men who are Democrats have tenure exceeding fifteen years. On the other hand roughly 50% of the Democratic women have tenure of five years or less, while this is a condition for only 21% of the Democratic men. On the strength of these findings, it seems safe to say that among the Democrats studied, the men are more long-lived in the House than the women. This is hardly surprising since two categories of women are either Place Holders and their tenure was expected to be short, or they are widows succeeding their husbands and likely to be older when they take office. The expectation here would be that, even if they did stay to carve out independent careers, advancing years would force them into retirement sooner than other legislators who began national careers earlier. The point is that, given the people involved, tenure is not necessarily an index of effectiveness, but it does relate to conditions of and age at entry.
### TABLE 6.21

**TENURE IN HOUSE FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN STUDY SAMPLE BY SEX AND POLITICAL PARTY AFFILIATION (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5% (N=1)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20 (N=4)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30 (N=6)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15 (N=3)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25 (N=5)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (N=1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N=14</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=6</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=20</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=16</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the Republican side more equity seems to prevail between men and women in terms of tenure. 17% of the men have tenure exceeding fifteen years as do 17% of the women. 34% of the Republican men have tenure of less than five years while 38% of the Republican women fall into the same category.

Table 6.22 presents the same data by geographic region. As expected, the South is the point of interest. No Southern Democrat in the sample has tenure of less than six years, while only two of the Southern women have tenure exceeding six years. This is explained by the fact that the Place Holder for women remains a Southern phenomenon.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Non-South</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Non-South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5% (N=1)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20 (N=4)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30 (N=6)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15 (N=3)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25 (N=5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (N=1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=6</td>
<td>N=14</td>
<td>N=20</td>
<td>N=6</td>
<td>N=18</td>
<td>N=24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reasons for Leaving**

The last question of concern in this section of the inquiry has to do with trying to determine under what circumstances individuals leave the House. Therefore, the data were examined relative to reasons for leaving applicable to the persons in the sample who are no longer incumbents. Table 6.23 contains the results. In general, there are three reasons for leaving. First, one is an active candidate for renomination or re-election and is defeated. 40% of the men and 20% of the women in the sample are in this category. Second, one resigns in order to accept another position in government. For none of the men
TABLE 6.23
NON-INCUMBENTS: REASONS FOR LEAVING BY SEX (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for leaving</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defeat</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25% (N=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resignation to accept another position in</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a candidate for renomination</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70 (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (N=5)</td>
<td>100% (N=15)</td>
<td>100% (N=20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and for 7% of the women is this the case. Or one "retires" and does not seek re-nomination. This is the most common mode of leaving for both the men and women in the sample who are no longer Members of Congress. 60% of the men are in this category and 73% of the women are also. Reiterating again that a Congressional career is an activity of middle life for most, this finding is not at all surprising.

Conclusions

This chapter has been concerned with the background characteristics and the routes of access to the House of Representatives for the forty-four Members of Congress who are the subjects of this research. All regions of the country are represented as are both political parties. The representatives of constituencies in twenty-three states are included. Eight of these states sent women to Congress for the first time during the two decades studied.
By and large the subjects trace their ancestry to Northern and Western Europe. Some findings regarding Congresswomen seem pertinent. The four women who deviate from the Northern and Western European norm are all Democrats, women elected to the House in their own right, from the non-South region of the country, and all four have been elected to the House since 1960.

While most of the subjects give their religious affiliation as Protestant, 30% of the men and 21% of the women are Roman Catholic while only 5% of the men and 4% of the women are Jewish. The Protestant denominations represented are for the most part those with high status in the society at large.

With few exceptions the men and women studied have a great deal of education. 30% have law degrees; 9% have graduate degrees in other fields. On the whole the women come from a broader educational spectrum than the men.

The high occupational placement of most regardless of stage of career is commensurate with their general level of advanced education. Attention was given to the fact that, as women advance through occupational stages, some assume a position for which there is no traditional rank, and these move into the national legislative arena from this position. They are housewives.

Marriage was the norm for the group studied.

Regarding routes of access, approximately 50% of the women who came to Congress between 1950 and 1970 succeeded their husbands who had either died in office or while seeking office. For purposes of
In this research, these have been labeled Widows Turned Politicians or Place Holders depending upon their staying or not staying to carve out independent political careers. One additional objective role type can also be identified. The Married Woman Politician approximates what is normative for men in the sample when career stages are concerned. She is more likely to have held public office immediately before entrance than the other two types and often, these offices are elective at the state or local level. In addition, her age at entrance is closer to the male norm even though, in general, women enter the House at a later age than did the men in the sample. She is also more likely to stay longer than her Widow and Place Holder sisters.

Death of an incumbent is a prevailing mode of entering for women. As far as other circumstances of entry are concerned, there is remarkable similarity between men and women.

The most striking difference in tenure in the House is found between men and women in Southern states.

Of all the reasons given for leaving the House by men and women in the sample who are no longer incumbents, failure to seek re-election is by far the most common.
CHAPTER VII

THE CONGRESSIONAL ROLE: A MASCULINE IDEOLOGY

Introduction

From the beginning, working within the framework of the formulation of the role concept chosen as the theoretical base, this writer has believed it necessary to acquire some data from the subjects of this study through personal interviews. In the discussion of theory the point was made that, if a person is to enact a role satisfactorily, there must be some agreement between her (in this case) and the members of her circle as to what common expectations there are regarding the duties and rights of role incumbency. Therefore, the interview questions were designed to find out how the men and women concerned conceived of their roles, what they believed the expectations to be, what their aspirations were regarding committee assignments, other roles to be played in the Congressional setting, etc. In addition, there was an attempt through the questions to ascertain their beliefs regarding the informal structure of the House in its day-by-day operations, the ways they related to their colleagues, the House leadership, and their constituents as selected components of the intricate social circle which encompasses a Member of Congress. By far, the most important consideration in question design was the hope that some insight might be gained into understanding whether in fact men have different expectations of women and whether the women perceived different expectations of them as women which might suggest on their part the necessity of approaching the le-
legislative process with an awareness of themselves as women in a minority status. To facilitate this analysis, some questions were designed to determine for all the members, but particularly for the women, whether they sense a particular spirit of helpfulness or hindrance as they attempt to enact the Congressional role on the part of some of those who interact with them in this social circle. The next four chapters report the results of these interviews. Chapters VII and VIII deal with the role itself as the respondents conceived of it, first men, then women. Chapters IX and X report the results when both groups were asked to discuss the expectations the House had of women. At the conclusions of Chapters VIII and X there are attempts to put the responses in some perspective regarding what was common to men and women and where any differences between them lay.
Undoubtedly the question as to how Members of Congress became interested in politics and how they became candidates for Congress has been asked of them so many times that many of them readily submit a verbal biographical resume upon request. The responses were interesting and entertaining, because the men, particularly, sprinkled their accounts with anecdotes and reminiscences which they relished once again in the telling. These responses are not of particular concern here because they relate primarily to routes of access and their gist has been incorporated in the preceding chapter. This opening question of the interview is mentioned here because it was followed immediately by a query concerning the member's intention of staying. In general, the answer was affirmative but with qualifications which suggested some of the uncertainty of projecting any long-term future in a political milieu. Many referred to the fact that the desire was there but the reality hinged on the continued good will of the electorate, so that voter desire became the primary factor in any answer they might give. Two of the older men referred to their age as a problem. One Democrat from the West, a chairman, eighty years old, put it this way, indicating his desire to rest awhile.

On the 15th of January I was eighty years old. I have a daughter; she has three children. Maybe it's time I turned this job over to someone else and I went home and enjoyed myself. I still think I am capable of serving, but I'll answer about a year from August, but I don't think I'll run again.

Another spoke of the relationship between age, seniority, and the sheer volume of work which a long Congressional life involves, and how difficult managing this becomes for the older member. This man, a Repub-
lican from a Northern state, the ranking member of his party on his major committee, said,

It's just like /referring to a powerful long-time member from his state/ said to me the other day... A lot of us don't realize it but we're playing the second nine. When you get to the top of your committee, the load is tremendous... and it just keeps increasing every year.

Neither of these men was a candidate for re-election in 1972.

Just as the layman frequently suspects that the Senatorial aspirant, in his Walter Mitty moments, dreams of having his mail addressed to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, it is not illogical to expect Congressmen to regard membership in the House as a stage in a political career, not necessarily the epitome of it. To the surprise of this writer, however, among the respondents here, such was not the case. Not all summed it up as succinctly as the Democrat from a large Northern state who said in response to the question concerning his aspirations for any other position in government,

No, I just want to be chairman. When I reach that, that's it. You can do so many things for so many people when you've reached that rank.

With the exception of one Democrat from the South, all said they were not really interested in changing. Their reasons for ruling out such a move differed, however. They also differed regarding the kinds of positions referred to. For one, as far as moving to the Senate is concerned, the prerogatives and privileges associated with seniority in either Chamber simply cannot be overrated. A man with a decade or so of service behind him who perhaps is in his late 40s or early 50s when the possibility of a move to the Senate is presented to him, has many
things to consider. Not the least of these is the very fundamental ques-
tion of whether becoming a freshman Senator at the cost of giving up
some privileged or near-privileged position in the House, which is his
as a consequence of many years service, is worth it in the long run. The
most active House members often do not think it is. A Republican from
a Northern state said,

I'm getting to be a classic case where I'm getting
to be a big fish in a small pond because of my
experience and leverage here. To transfer to the
Senate and start at the bottom, while it seems
more glamorous, isn't quite so practical. Theo­
retically, I think I'd like to do it. For prac­
tical reasons, I'm not working at it.

A Democrat, very visible in the media on banking and currency interests
here and abroad said,

At this stage of the game, even if a Senate oppor­
tunity came up, I don't think it would be worth
my while to become a freshman Senator.

Another consideration with regard to the Senate is that it involves a
state-wide race, and the costs of campaigning increase accordingly. In
addition, it is sometimes possible for a Congressman to be elected be­
cause he is the first to run from his party in a district created as a
result of reapportionment. If he happens to be of the majority party
in his state legislature which does the reapportioning, in the "best"
traditions of gerrymandering, much can be structured to his advantage.
But a Senate aspirant never seeks office from a district tailor-made to
his political specifications. He must either challenge an incumbent,
which a member of his own party is often reluctant to do, or he must seek
to succeed a retiring or deceased predecessor, in which case party in­
fighting may be something to contend with. In either case the costs are
great.

As far as positions in the executive or judiciary are concerned, at least two strains of thought emerged in rejecting them. One is wondering whether a change would actually be a promotion. In discussing two chances to move by presidential appointment, one twenty-year veteran Republican from the North said.

I probably would be interested if I was ever out of Congress. Otherwise, I don't think I'd be interested. I've had two chances, one to a judgeship and one as chairman of one of the commissions. ... I didn't visualize either one of them as a promotion because in some ways a federal judgeship is a very trying kind of thing. And the chairman of this particular commission was in some kind of a tangle.... It would have been a difficult job, and I would have had to work as hard as I do here.

This response seems to suggest that, at least for this respondent, the attractiveness of moving hinges on some lessening of pressure in the job to be done.

Another Republican, also from a Northern state, speaks of an ambassadorship as an appealing prospect for retirement years.

The only other office I might be interested in because I have a rather acute interest in foreign affairs, and being a bit of a linguist, I might, as a retirement role, be interested in an ambassadorship in a French-speaking country.

Neither of these seems to suggest that an appointment to the other two branches is particularly attractive in the sense of being any kind of a promotion.

When a person defines what is his most important task in the job he has, he necessarily identifies other people, significant in his occupational circle. These are significant to the extent that their inter-
action with the role incumbent serves to invest his particular social position with an associated role. The interactional modes identified clothe the positional bones with behavioral flesh and blood, the life source for social positions.

When the Congressmen of concern were asked what they considered the most important aspect of the job, Member of Congress, to be, their responses fell rather neatly into three categories. It must be said that all saw themselves serving the people, so the people were significant others. However, the major distinction hinged on whether service to the people was to be taken specifically, directly, namely service to John and Mary Doe, by name and by face, from such-and-such a town in such-and-such a county in the district from which the member came. This approach seemed to place emphasis on the "errand-boy" aspect of the Congressional role which Tacheron and Udall (1966) refer to. Or service to the people may be viewed generically, that is, Mr. and Mrs. Citizen of the United States of America are served by a conscientious legislator importantly, but more indirectly, who participates actively and intelligently in that process which culminates in the passage of responsible legislation affecting the lives of millions. This makes the "legislator" aspect of the role primary. A third group of respondents acknowledged both of these as legitimate, but found it impossible to assign a priority.

Another way of understanding the essential distinction made here is to recall Merton's classic analysis of influentials in "Rovere" in terms of "the Local" and "the Cosmopolitan" (1957). Merton explained his meaning of these categories.

The chief criterion for distinguishing the two is
their orientation toward Rovere. The localite largely confines his interests to this community. Rovere is essentially his world. Devoting little thought or energy to the Great Society, he is preoccupied with local problems, to the virtual exclusion of the national and international scene. He is, strictly speaking, parochial.

Contrariwise with the cosmopolitan type. He has some interest in Rovere and must of course maintain a minimum of relations within the community since he, too, exerts influence there. But he is also oriented significantly to the world outside Rovere, and regards himself as an integral part of that world. He resides in Rovere but lives in the Great Society. If the local type is parochial, the cosmopolitan is ecumenical (p.393).

The Congressman who sees direct service to constituents as the primary component of his Congressional task can be said to be performing kind of an ombudsman's role (a term used by two of the legislators interviewed) operating out of a local orientation. On the other hand, the legislative emphasis bespeaks a more cosmopolitan view of the world of involvement.

These orientations do not seem affected by party or region or decade of entry. Nor are they consistent with type of constituency. Coming from a small rural town does not serve to make one "local", nor does an urban constituency always produce a "cosmopolitan" type. It is interesting, however, that all but one operating in the latter mode, are lawyers by profession.

Responses which can be characterized as coming from "locals" were expressed in different ways.

From a Democrat elected in the 1950s from a Northern state,

Government is so large and it's getting larger and larger and people have only one person to turn to and that is their Congressman. I help at least ten families a day and I have been doing that as long as I have been here.
Another Democrat from the South, also elected in the 1950s, said much the same thing.

We perform a lot of individual services for constituents that I think are important because the problems between the citizens and the agencies of government become more and more complicated and have more and more effect on their lives....You can't turn around now without being involved in government and so this aspect of the Congressman's job has become much more important over the years, even though technically it isn't even our job, but I think it is.

Nor did Democrats have a priority in this kind of a response. A Republican from the West, also elected in the 1950s, echoed the same message.

Helping people I think is the most satisfying part of the job. People call and they usually don't call until they are at their wit's end. They usually have tried everything else. When they can get no satisfaction, then they turn to us as a last hope ....

A Democrat from the South, elected in the 1960s, placed value on such an approach, not so much for what is actually accomplished, but what such service does for people.

One of the responsibilities I feel and I think a lot of Congressmen feel, in spite of what helps them in their re-election bid, is giving people reason to believe they still amount to something even though our population is well over 200 million and we're just a giant country....Possibly I'm doing some missionary work in making people proud to be Americans.

Those of the other persuasion frequently spoke in terms of specific legislation which they had a part in seeing come to law. A young Democrat from the Midwest was especially proud of his part in the 1965 Voting Rights Act.
I know the most important thing I've done is vote for the 1965 Voting Rights Act....That is the most significant, historical, moral, and all the rest....Obviously I'm answering you generally in the Constitutional role of the Representative, but that is the most significant, the most far-reaching legislative role....

Others spoke along the same lines, but in even broader terms. A Democrat from the West, elected in the 1960s ...

The most important thing is the participation in and the enactment of laws to benefit the society. That's the major thing.

And another Democrat from the West, about ready to retire ...

I think the most important obligation we have is to preserve the American form of democracy which has been handed down to us. Today there are attacks on it from the right and the left....

A third group recognized the importance of both these aspects of the role, but found it impossible to assign a priority of one over the other. This group, more than the others, alluded to their having internalized a certain political philosophy and feeling committed to weigh issues in its light. A second term Congressman from New York said,

I think my responsibility is a number of things... to try to create legislation that would implement the thinking ... my philosophical thinking ... that would improve the quality of life in this country.

And a Republican from the Midwest put the same point another way.

After a while you get to be a spokesman for a point of view which over the years you articulate ....

Still a third, a Republican, also from the Midwest, associated philosophy with party policy, recognizing the shortcomings of this approach.

I try to look at things from a philosophical point
of view. Is this what our party said we'd do? Some of it may not even come under the policies of the Republican Party and we may have to try to adopt some policy. But then you can't always take your party position either. Your decision on these matters has to be consistent with your philosophy. You can't always agree with your President.

Characteristic of the inability to assign priorities was an expression of frustration with the Jack-of-all-trades approach. One eighteen year veteran from the West ended a long description of the complexities of the task with,

I think the problem with being a Member of Congress is that you're constantly learning less and less about more and more things. You're simply spreading yourself thinner and thinner.

And that seemed to say it very well for those who try to be legislator and ombudsman in equal measure all of the time.

Upon reflection it becomes increasingly clear that the Congress of the United States is one of the most enigmatic institutions of modern times. Democratic in its mode of operation by theory and by law, in reality it is marked by paternalism and hierarchical authoritarianism to a marked degree. To preserve the delicate balance between the theory and the practice, an elaborate informal structure of unwritten rules and gentlemen's agreements has evolved over time to buttress the formal structure of technicalities and legal dictums. It seemed important in this research to try to determine if there was an consensus regarding the nature of these informal "rules of the game."

From the male respondents two ideas came through repeatedly. Senior members, to a man, contended that Sam Rayburn's philosophy that the best way to get along was to go along, preferably in silence one's first term,
was a relic from an era quickly passing. In its place was a new rule, equally binding. "Speak, by all means, but when you do, be sure you know what you’re taliking about."

I think the most important thing is to keep your foot out of your mouth. If you don’t say anything, you don’t have to apologize for it later on.

was the advice of a Democratic veteran of fifteen years service from the North.

A Republican from the West in his twentieth year pointed out the shift a person must make from campaign strategy with its liberal doses of oratory to the realities of membership.

I think people come here having made a great campaign, having talked about all the issues and they come here to meet some people who have been grappling with these issues for a long time and if they pop off on everything whether they really know anything about the subject or not, very soon they get pretty well discredited in the eyes of the other members....To me the best rule for a new member and I think for an old member too is ‘Don’t take the time of your colleagues unless you really have something to say. Save you bombast for your constituents.’

The same idea was put forth in a slightly different way by another Republican from the Midwest.

Two other senior members stressed the importance of learning the formal rules by being where they are applied, on the floor and in committee every day, especially in one’s first and second term, so that the new member learns procedure first hand, by experiencing the rules.

Younger members (in terms of years of service) were no different in their belief that the fundamental rule of the game was not to take the
House's time by speaking when you have nothing to say.

It is interesting that only one of the men questioned advocated challenging the rules as fundamental to making one's way successfully in the House. His response to this question follows in its entirety, with a few omissions in an attempt to preserve his anonymity, because it presents a point of view which, at least in his case, says that the need to challenge was born of a disillusionment which increasing intimacy with the real workings on the inside brought on.

We made a first march against the powers that be in the House in 1969. I got here in 1965. The problem was that when we came here in 1965, most of us were Goldwater accidents, but we had always wanted to serve in the Congress. We came here awestruck, most of us. What happened was that somewhere along the line the little dog pulled back the curtain and the Wizard of Oz turned out to be a little man pulling levers. And that came during my second term. I began to become incensed about government by one-man-rule which was so rampant here instead of government by law. By 1969...most of us developed the attitude of who's afraid of the big bad wolf and to analyze scientifically what these people over here could do to you. None of them was voting in your district. Power was such a corrupt kind of sound anyway....Why should a chairman be powerful? Why shouldn't he just be a monitor who cleans the erasers and arranges the schedule if democracy works right? When you got right down to it, what you had to fear from some powerful chairman was whether or not you got put on some symbolic commission which didn't amount to a hill of beans. We became disillusioned with President Johnson's national administration too because of the dichotomy between the platform and the performance on the war. All the lofty ideals have to cross the morass of procedure, to get them to a vote, to make them realities. There's something very sick about the procedures when the great debates in the country can't come to a vote.

This speaker is young, the son of a former Congressman. He was de-
feated in the Nixon landslide in 1972. At present he is actively cam-
paigning for re-election in 1974 and may well symbolize the new breed
of Congressional aspirant who does not intend to wait for the rules of
bygone years to die natural deaths, but who intends, if elected, to
move directly to effect social change in this most traditional of in-
stitutions.

All discussions of the legislative role eventually get around to
the question of effectiveness. From the perspective of this research
orientation, an effective role player is one who has discovered diverse
modes of reciprocity with which he can live in order to interact har-
moniously with all the others in his social circle. It would of course
be naive to contend that effectiveness comes with the voters' mandate.
Earlier, at some length, the fact that a member's election at the polls
was simply the first step in the intricate process of acceptance to full
membership was analyzed. In this context of "stages of election" then
it is quite possible that a member might be returned to the House by the
voters, but once there engage in behavior which cripples his effective-
ness in the actual workings of the House. In all fairness to the Amer-
ican electorate, an ineffective member is more often than not eventually
removed from office, but the communications lag between the district and
Washington is frequently considerable, and it may be some time before
the voters catch on to how they are being served.

In an attempt to define the characteristics of the ineffective mem-
ber, the male respondents were asked what kinds of behavior caused an in-
dividual to lose the respect of his colleagues, and, by extension, his
effectiveness.
Quite clearly, a partisan division of opinion marked the responses which transcended regional differences and length of tenure. To a man, the Republicans spoke of losing respect because of a basic inadequacy in carrying out the job. This boiled down to spreading oneself so thin that one is suspect for not really knowing what he is talking about.

Typical of these responses are the following. Both of these men are from the Midwest, one elected in the 1950s, the other in the '60s.

First, the senior member --

You lose respect when you try to express yourself on something you really don't know anything about. You have these guys over there every day doing that. This is why they couldn't get two votes when they get up in front of a mike for an amendment, only because they've been popping off every day and most of the people realize these people don't know what they're doing....

And the junior member --

There's a tendency to lose respect for a person who involves himself in too many issues....A person who tries to be too flippant or too smart-alecky on the floor is one who tends to lose friends rather rapidly.

On the other hand, the Democrats in the sample did not mention inadequacies in job performance, but rather stressed personal characteristics, often moral and ethical in tone. Foremost among these was the matter of personal integrity. One Democrat from the West with eighteen years service expressed rather eloquently what emerged from all the responses which touched on this matter.

The number one thing is a matter of confidence. If a man ever violates his word, then he's pretty well destroyed in the House of Representatives. All in the world you have in political life is your word... your integrity... that's it...nothing else, actually. If a man does not tell you the truth, it's amazing how soon he loses effectiveness.
Others mentioned intemperance, personal peccadilloes, belittling attitudes toward colleagues. One Democrat from the South even mentioned staying too long as a reason for losing respect. This response was interesting.

I definitely criticize a member who through senility, or mental impairment, or physical impairment to the extent that he cannot discharge his duties, his obligations, then that man loses respect if he continues to hang on. And sometimes his constituents go ahead and re-elect him -- for sentimental reasons.

This was interesting because the South perhaps more than any other geographic region, under the one-party system which has prevailed until recently in many states, has specialized in long-term membership.

It is impossible to resist the temptation to editorialize here. This portion of the paper is being written in the midst of the Watergate mania which is sweeping the country. Is it possible to hypothesize from the responses here and from the long hours of testimony before the Ervin Committee that many contemporary Republicans consider efficiency in operation more important than personal integrity? The remark is not intended to be partisan, but the similarity in emphasis is striking and raises a challenging question.

If there were partisan differences regarding what kind of behavior causes a colleague to lose respect, there were no differences whatsoever in determining how a person, who has lost it, knows that he has. Among these men there was complete agreement on the fact that a person who has lost respect knows it because it becomes simply impossible for him to muster any support for the issues he is interested in, either in committee or on the floor. In addition, the members in good standing do not seek
nor do they want his active support on issues of theirs. The informal control of ostracism seems to go into effect completely. The case of Adam Clayton Powell in recent years brings this point home all too well.

An immediate defensive posture was assumed when the male members in the sample were approached with the suggestion that since so much of the literature speaks of some kind of bargaining process as the modus operandi of resolving inevitable conflicts of interest, it must be so. They did not wish to speak of bargains which somehow had a smoke-filled room connotation. In response, the term "bargain" was discarded in favor of "compromise." Perhaps "compromise" describes, in the parlance of statesmanship, what the boys in the back room call a "hard bargain." In any case, more at ease with this, the men proceeded to describe the process, first by justifying it. The rationale for justification was the same for all who touched on it. A Democrat, elected in the 1950s from the West summed up quite succinctly what the gist of all the other responses were.

All good legislation is the result of compromise. No one ever gets everything he's like. As long as you move some way toward your objective, you go ahead and compromise. Never compromise with principle, but you compromise with the method of achieving it.

In elaborating, several made the point stressed by Froman (1967) in his comprehensive analysis of the bargaining process (pp.22-33) that, in the intricate maze of interaction by which some bills eventually become laws, there are all kinds of conflicts to be resolved, and each kind requires its own unique mode of resolution. A Republican member from the West, elected in the '50s spoke to this point from long experience when he said,
For the most part you always end up with some kind of compromise position. The ways are infinite. There are so many kinds of conflicts. Conflicts between committees, conflicts between individuals, conflicts between parties, conflicts between the House and the Senate, conflicts between the administration and Congress. Each one requires a different attempt at resolution.

Another Republican, this one elected in the 1960s from the Midwest, added the idea that, when there is agreement on principle, compromise regarding implementation is much easier to achieve.

Few showed much enthusiasm for discussing what happens if compromise fails. The implication was that, if it does, this is an indication that the entire system is in serious trouble because reconciling differences is what hammering out legislation is all about. The simplest alternative offered in the event that compromise should fail was being reconciled to the fact that the legislation simply could not pass. One very influential Democrat did suggest half-heartedly,

Oh, I suppose you could take it to the floor and see how many votes you'd get.

Another Democrat from an urban Southern constituency was very emphatic about what the alternative was.

Well, if a person continues to feel that everybody is out of step but him, then he ought to leave the Congress. He's a gadfly, one who is constantly the source of discord. Now maybe his particular constituency may love him because that's the way they feel, but he can't be a very constructive, effective member.

This response was interesting in the fact that the alternative was for the unyielding member to leave the House, again suggesting that if compromise fails, a death blow is dealt to the system, and it must be purged of the deviant influence in order to restore its ability to go
about business as usual.

The results of the Brookings Institution's Round Table on Congress (Clapp, 1964) indicated that, while participants in those conferences asserted that a really effective House member should be a specialist in some field of legislation above all, there was disagreement whether an acknowledged specialist in one area can extend his expertise into what might be called a generalist image (p.25). This stance indicates that expertise in one area spills over, by implication, into other areas on which the individual may speak or seek to influence. It seems reasonable to suggest that how a person conceives of himself in this matter will affect his conduct of affairs.

All but one of the men questioned believed they had achieved expertise in some area. But under the umbrella of this broad affirmation there was some interesting diversity. The tendency on the part of most, regardless of other distinguishing characteristics, was to identify their committee orientation and then to cite their areas of expertise in terms of sub-committee involvement. This presented somewhat of a variation on the generalist theme in that the specific area of expertise related to what the member considered his major committee assignment. This is to say that a Foreign Affairs member, for example, was not proclaiming his expertise on flood control. But within the committees of concentration, these men saw themselves as "expert" in several directions.

A relatively young Democrat from the West responded,

Education, elementary and secondary...vocational education, some specialized fields of education, for instance, drug abuse legislation, environmental education.
The same kind of multi-faceted involvement was indicated by a long-term Republican from the Midwest.

Well, Foreign Affairs, Post Office and anything which would be of a suburban, Midwestern relationship...transportation, railroad and air...the revenue or lack of it as such, but primarily Foreign Affairs. That's not only my committee work, but my background as a history teacher.

Another train of thought among those who spoke of their committee involvement as their area of expertise was to be more specific as to their specialization within that field. A young Democrat, elected in the 1960s from the South pondered a moment, then said,

I think if there is one it would be in the field of health legislation.

And still another who has achieved a great deal of visibility through the media's recognition of his expertise on economic questions, tended to underplay his specialization.

Most of the economy, housing, and the environment.

The response of a veteran member from the West who is on the Rules Committee suggested that the demands associated with where one is placed in the system play a part in determining that one, of necessity, must become a generalist.

At one time I thought I had some expertise when I served on a legislative committee because you tend to specialize in those areas which concern your committee....Once having left the legislative field for the Rules Committee, where I've been for the last ten years, you tend to lose that. Today I might deal for a few minutes with legislation on taxes, then I'd move on to education, etc.

Something of an unconventional response was made by a Republican elected in the 1960s who is at present the second ranking minority member
on his major committee, indicating that an area of expertise for some
may be the mastery and refinement of the legislative process itself.
This man has been quite active on his side of the aisle in pushing for
substantial legislative reform. His answer, quoted extensively here,
suggests the nature of and the motivation for the kind of specialization
he has concentrated on.

I have a substantial expertise in the use of auto­
matic data-processing in handling the work of the
Congress regarding procedures and the research
capability of the Congress....My interest in this
developed because my first interest when I came
to Congress was to try to develop the fiscal,
budgetary responsibilities in a better way. I
found out the budgetary problems were handled in
a very sophisticated way at the executive level
and in a very primitive way in the Congress. So
I felt Congress should have skills that matched
executive skills.

"The committee system is still the crux of the legislative process,
far more important to Congressional decisions than activity on the floor.
The assignment to a committee, therefore, becomes the first order of
business for most new Congressman." So begins the chapter on committee
assignments from the Brookings Institution's Round Table Conferences
on Congress (Clapp, 1964, p.207). One by one the subjects of this study
echoed this idea. A freshman is almost overwhelmed by all the concerns
thrust upon him between the time the polls close on election day and the
hour, less than two months later when the gavel falls, signalling the
convening of the next Congress. Problems of where to live, whom to hire,
whether to move the family or leave them at home, are certainly not the
least of these, but overriding them all for most is the question of the
first committee assignment. There have been many noteworthy attempts at
Congressional reform but, to date, the seniority system is basically intact. This means that the ultimate secret of Congressional effectiveness is not only to stay long enough in Congress but, early in the game, to find committee positions that one can live with and operate from for a sufficient period of time so that eventually the coveted title "ranking member" or "chairman" may be bestowed. The committee hopper is always the junior member, regardless of how old he is or how many times his constituents return him to Washington. To be always an adolescent in the committees of the House of Representatives is very much the same as being an adolescent in the society at large. It means one has little power, and power, after all, is what politics is all about.

Because of the importance of committee assignments to the whole meaning of the Congressional role for those who assume it, it was considered important to determine what committees the respondents aspired to when they came, how they went about making their preferences known, how closely what they got matched their aspiration, and what the nature of any changes were which they subsequently made.

It has been suggested that the prestige of any one of the standing committees of the House can be measured over a period of time, by the number of transfers to the committee contrasted with the number of requests for transfers from that committee to others. Matthews (1960) used this technique in his study of the Senate, which yielded what he called the "committee caste system" (pp. 148-150). A comparable analysis of transfers in the House is included in the Tacheron and Udall (1966) analysis of the Congressional role and seems to support the contention that prestige can be measured in terms of transfers from the committees.
in question. A graphic presentation of this type of analysis is presented below.

**TABLE 7.1**

TRANSFERS OF COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS 80TH TO 89TH CONGRESSES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standing Committee</th>
<th>Transfers to</th>
<th>Transfers from</th>
<th>Average years of seniority of non-freshmen new members</th>
<th>Percentage of freshmen among new members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Services</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking and Currency</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Labor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Operations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Administration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate and Foreign Commerce</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judiciary</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Marine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Astronautics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans' Affairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways and Means</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The source for this table in this narrative is Tacheron and Udall (1966), p. 153.

By all objective measures the Big Three -- Appropriations, Rules, and Ways and Means -- are the most important committees in the House.

---

1The Tacheron and Udall source was a study of committee assignments made by Warren E. Miller of the Survey Research Center, University of Mich.
They are so largely because of the matters over which they exercise jurisdiction. A glance at the statistics for these committees seems to bear out the belief that, subjectively, positions on them are important to the membership also. From the 80th to the 89th Congresses only two members transferred from Appropriations, while eighty-five transferred to it. The average years of seniority for nonfreshmen new members was well into the second term (3.6 years) and during this period only 26.3% of the new members were freshman Congressmen. By these measures Rules and Ways and Means are even more prestigious. Only one member requested a transfer from the Rules Committee and thirty-three transferred to it. The average years of seniority of non-freshman new members was 6.2 and the percentage of freshmen among new members was only 6.4%. A comparable picture emerges when one considers Ways and Means. Forty-seven members transferred in. None transferred out. The average years of seniority of non-freshman new members was 6.4 and the percentage of freshmen among the new members over this twenty-year period was 8.2%. These numbers gain even greater significance when the total size of the last two is considered. The membership of the Rules Committee is fifteen; Ways and Means numbers twenty-five. Ways and Means is the rare plum, especially for Democrats, whose members in turn constitute the Democratic committee-on-committees with power to decide committee assignments for all other Democrats in the House.

So much for the three prestigious committees through the mid-1960s. The remaining standing committees of the House are categorized as semi-exclusive and non-exclusive. Theoretically, a person may be a member of one semi-exclusive and one non-exclusive committees or two non-exclusive
committees. We say, "theoretically", because, in practice, there are many deviations. For a variety of reasons, some members belong to two semi-exclusive committees; others, because of the burden of subcommittee responsibilities belong to only one committee. This last situation generally applies to subcommittee chairmen.

Which of the semiexclusive committees are to be considered prestigious if the same criteria applied to the Big Three are used? Reference is again made to the Table. The two semi-exclusive committees which appear especially worthy of note are Armed Services and Foreign Affairs. For Armed Services the data indicate that over the twenty year period there were twenty-six transfers to the committee and only six from. For Foreign Affairs the figures were Thirty-four to and five from. On still another level, if those committees are considered which indicate more transfers to than transfers from, Agriculture, Education and Labor, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Judiciary must be added to Armed Services and Foreign Affairs as having some prestige to the extent that prestige can be measured by stability of membership. It is interesting to note that all these are semi-exclusive committees.

With the above as preface, it may be possible to determine if the initial aspirations of male respondents were dictated by the prestige of the committee or if aspirations were, in fact, motivated by other considerations. Table 7.2 shows the aspirations and the actual assignments of the sixteen male Members of Congress interviewed in connection with this research.

What needs to be said, first of all, is that party, region, or decade of entry seem to make absolutely no difference in dictating choices.
TABLE 7.2
STANDING COMMITTEE ASPIRATIONS AND ASSIGNMENTS OF CONGRESSMEN IN STUDY SAMPLE (%)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standing Committee</th>
<th>Aspired to</th>
<th>Assigned to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Services</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking and Currency</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Labor</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Operations</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Administration</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate and Foreign Commerce</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judiciary</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Marine</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Astronautics</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans' Affairs</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways and Means</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages do not equal 100% because for quick comparative purposes, round numbers were used.

What does appear significant is the availability of an opening or some relationship to past business or professional experience. In addition, a committee whose jurisdiction relates to key interest in the district looms attractive to some.

Every one of the respondents had some inclination, although in a few cases a really serious orientation was only vaguely formed. Perhaps a lesson in the pragmatic side of political life is to be learned from the fact that 50% of the respondents actually were assigned to the com-
mittees they requested. 25% of the requests were for committees considered prestigious. In only 12% were the requests honored. In analyzing what was requested, not to be ignored is the fact that three of the eight who initially got what they wanted requested Public Works. Table 7.1 indicates that this is a committee marked by twice as many transfers from as transfers to. Public Works, however, has jurisdiction over flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors, navigational benefits, including bridges and dams; water pollution and power; public buildings and grounds; highways. The most naive student of the Congressional process should not be long in concluding that improvement in any of these areas of jurisdiction is highly visible to constituents and therefore membership on the committee carries with it very real potential for ingratiating oneself with one's constituents quite early in the game. In addition, Public Works is one of the guardians of the proverbial "pork barrel", and since every member of the House has some vested interest in one or another of its areas of concern, membership on it is an ideal place from which to form and later cement bonds with other members which may prove invaluable in years to come. Therefore, it seems fair to say that a request for membership on Public Works is an astute political move, having nothing whatever to do with the inherent "prestige" of the committee. Two of the three men who made this request initially were also the only two interviewed who had formal previous associations with organized labor. What is suggested by this comment is that organized labor frequently has been associated with extremely sophisticated political tactics, and a request on the part of labor men for Public Works may not be the least of these.
There seems to be strong evidence directly from the responses to indicate that possibility of attainment played a large part in dictating initial choices. As one veteran Republican from the West said,

I wanted Armed Services, which I obviously could not have, since there were already two California Republicans on it. I wanted to be on Foreign Affairs, which I couldn't have because there was a California Republican on that committee...I got Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Veterans' Affairs.

A Democrat from the South who had been a local politician and an independent businessman for many years before coming to Congress went into even greater detail.

Of course the aspirations of everyone would be to be on Appropriations or Ways and Means. Ways and Means is impossible, of course, until you've had a number of terms. Then I would have liked the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.... I imagine I have had more experience in the various aspects of that committee's work than more than half the members who are on it .... But there wasn't room for me since there were already two members from my delegation on it at the time. So they put me on Banking and Currency, which was my second choice, and I have considerable experience in banking matters.

It is interesting to observe that those who did not get what they initially asked for often came to realize, as obedient freshmen, that what they got was really more satisfying in the long run. One who wanted Public Works and didn't get it had this to say,

I wanted to be on Public Works....However, I was put on Banking and Currency and Government Operations, which was a blessing in disguise and which were really much more interesting committees.

A second-term Democratic Congressman from a populous, Northern state put the "blessing in disguise" rationale this way:

I tried to get on Education and Labor and Government
Operations. I was assigned to Science and Astronautics and House Administration. I did not make a fuss because it was explained to me that there were no openings on Education and Labor and, if I would accept this assignment and permit some time to elapse, that I would be able to get a more favorable assignment. I did that and found out I didn't want Education and Labor after all and that the committee I really wanted on was Interstate and Foreign Commerce. And last year, at the end of the year, I was assigned to it.

There are many ways of achieving committee positions ranging from silently accepting what one is given or, as some of the respondents indicated, by actively "campaigning", especially for positions which many covet. Among the male respondents, none simply sat and waited for the lists to be posted, content to be subject to the wisdom of the leadership, but neither did any indicate any extensive lobbying activity or application of particular pressure on influential colleagues. When asked how they went about making their preferences known, the majority alluded to some or all of the formal procedures outlined in the earlier discussion of how committee assignments are made in Chapter III. Contrary, however, to what might be expected, their responses indicated a rather low-keyed resignation to ordinary ways of proceeding and an acceptance of what was bestowed, based on the conviction that one day, provided they stayed long enough, their time would come.

Those who do change committees weigh at least one very important consideration. Is changing important enough to give up increasing seniority on the original committee in order to take what may be a junior position on another? One thing is clear. If one is to reap any benefits from changing, it has to be done as quickly as possible. Several factors contribute to an affirmative answer. One of these, of course,
will be the prestige of the committee in question. Another, and perhaps more important, is the question of the significance of the subjects charged to the committee to an individual's district or even to his personal career goals. With regard to the latter, a Republican's experience on the Judiciary Committee serves as a case in point.

When I moved to the Judiciary Committee, I was Number 15; now, after six years I am Number 4 on the Republican side. The principal reason is that so many members of the House Judiciary go on to other jobs. John Lindsay became Mayor of New York. Bill Cahill became Governor of New Jersey. Arch Moore became Governor of West Virginia. Clark MacGregor ran for the Senate against Humphrey but didn't win. It seems to be a committee from which many people go to other offices.

It seems fair to suggest, then, that some committees may be valued precisely in relationship to the bearing membership on them has to future career aspirations. This is perhaps another indication of the long-term view which may prove especially characteristic of male members.

Regardless of how pressing legislative business may be, a Member of Congress is always running for re-election. This means that whether he's from Maryland or Hawaii, assessing the effectiveness of his communication with his constituents occupies a great deal of his time and energy. All acknowledge this to be true. While there are many similarities among them relative to how this is achieved, what differences there are turn out to be largely a matter of individual preference or style. Actually there were few differences concerning how a member thought he best reached his constituents. Among the men there was consensus that one is most effective in this regard when one is home among the people, meeting them on their home ground, listening to them where
they are comfortable; then, if necessary, taking their cases back to Washington for resolution. One Democrat from the South who has been returned to five Congresses in spite of his controversial position on Civil Rights legislation, emphasized the importance of this personal contact.

In the ten years I've been here I doubt seriously that I have spent ten week-ends in Washington. I go home every week-end. I have a district office. My phone at my residence is listed and there is not a week-end that I don't have fifteen or twenty cases called in on a Saturday or Sunday to bring back with me. Knowing what the people think is not a problem when you're there with them ...so I think one of the reasons I've been able to be elected in spite of controversy is the fact that people know I'm available.

A minor difference in style centers around how communication is structured between the district and Washington. There is no substitute for being present, but when one can't be present, how is social presence maintained? In deciding whether one personally presides over the flow of responses to constituent phone calls and mail, the main consideration seems to be how well the staff is tuned to the member. No member who responded to questions on this subject just turned all the responsibility for responding to constituents over to his staff, no matter how talented he believed they were, individually or collectively. However, some do establish comprehensive statements on the major legislative issues before the House, turn these over to a seasoned staff member who then tailors them to produce an adequate response to constituents' requests for information. Routine requests for service are also frequently handled by staff. Here again, unless a member reads all his mail first before distribution to his staff, he has to rely on someone, usually his adminis-
trative assistant cast in the role of an alter ego, so that the correspondence which requires a very personal concern and response from a member will indeed receive it because his attention is called to it. Male respondents indicated a great reliance on staff and emphasized the importance of adequate staffing and the frequent difficulties in achieving it.

Estimates as to how the member's time was distributed relative to constituents and constituents' concerns varied. One Democrat from a district within a few hours driving time from Washington estimated that he spent almost all of his time on these matters.

I would say 65% of my time is spent dealing with constituents here, and then I go home every weekend and I make a couple of speeches. I have three offices in my district, and they are manned five days a week. I go from one office to another .... It's like doctors' hours.

Other estimates indicated 50% of their time was spent on constituents; three men said as little as one-third. Two respondents noted that the emphasis actually varies, depending upon the emergence of certain issues which capture public interest and call forth a great deal of public comment. Another factor determining the allocation of time to constituent matters is the fluctuating pressure of an individual's key legislative responsibilities.

Once a seat in the House of Representatives has been achieved, the political system provides a myriad of institutionalized means of maintaining and solidifying relations with the constituent segment of the member's social circle. These are graphically compiled in Figure 7.1. The two-directional arrows illustrate a structured opportunity for constituent feedback. Few members use all of these. All use some. So
many considerations go in to deciding which ones to use and how to use them that the sorting out process is difficult. Male respondents were questioned regarding their use of the various modes of communicating.

FIGURE 7.1

INSTITUTIONALIZED MODES OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN A MEMBER OF CONGRESS AND HIS CONSTITUENTS

Modes of Communication

| MEMBER | → Mail, phone calls, telegrams messages, etc. |
|        | ← Newsletter, press releases → |
|        | ← Questionnaire → |
|        | ← Speeches, appearances before civic groups → |
|        | ← Television appearances, radio reports → |
|        | ← Returns to the district → |
|        | ← Participation in television and radio talk shows and panel discussions → |
|        | → CONSTITUENTS |

With the exception of one twenty-year Democratic veteran from the West, all used the newsletter. His reason for not using one was,

*My people just know me. When I'm home I try to reach as many as I can. I'm very active.*

For those who did use newsletters, several differences were noted. One was the frequency of mailing. Since newsletters are printed at the member's expense, frequency of publication usually depends upon the member's resources, plus the comprehensiveness of his mailing list. Those
who mail to anonymous "Postal Patrons" at every known address in the district can seldom afford a newsletter more than two or three times a year. The majority seemed to be somewhat discriminating regarding who the recipients were. Again, there were variations regarding how these decisions were handled. One Democrat, a member for ten years from the South, said,

We'll have possibly two postal patron mailings a year. One of them would be in the form of a questionnaire on issues and we break down special mailings to organized labor, union members, to the Chamber of Commerce, to the teachers, the police, the firemen....

Or a Western Democrat, from a constituency quite diverse geographically, made his decision first in terms of people, then of whole counties.

I send to key people in twenty counties; local interest groups mostly. Then there's a special newsletter to each county once a year with items of interest specific to that county.

A republican from the Midwest, who proved rather innovative on other responses, combined the newsletter and press release approach.

I send a newsletter every week to the newspapers and most of them reproduce it. It's a newsy letter; that is, it's an informative type letter, not a partisan political letter. It presents issues pending in Congress with an attempt to present all the sides. Sometimes I will indicate my inclinations on the issue.

The content of the newsletter, when used, also varies considerably. What it is is dependent upon many factors: the personality and personal style of the member, the nature of the constituency, and the mode of dissemination, to mention only a few. Some concentrate exclusively on issues, exploring the complexities of what might be of particular in-
terest to local constituents. Where this approach is used, the member is generally intellectually oriented, and he assumes that there is some political sophistication in the reader or that even the politically naive are interested in in-depth analysis of key questions. Most letters, however, are not of this type. At best they become a mixture of several messages, designed to appeal to all segments of a pluralistic reading public. As one of its purposes, the ordinary newsletter seeks to portray the office holder as vital and involved not only on the home front but on the Washington scene as well. Therefore, the letters are often replete with photographs showing the member presiding over significant events or greeting visiting constituents on the steps of the capitol. Other photos may show him participating with the President or prominent officials of government in some activity relevant to the nation or the district or both. There is frequently a summary of major legislative decisions made since the publication of the last newsletter. These summaries stress that legislation concerning which the member played an active role, either in framing it or supporting it. In some cases his opposition is noted. One Democrat from the South includes in his summaries the way the entire state delegation voted on an issue so that the voters can compare his vote with others from the same area. In addition, the letters frequently contain previews of coming events, indicating where a certain bill, of interest to the district, is in the elaborate machinery of the legislative process, what the legislator's current position regarding the bill is, and often a simply stated rationale attempting to justify the position for the voters. Then there are the little things designed to provide a "just
plain folks" image, so important to so many small town and rural constituencies. Here public congratulations is rendered for any number of achievements from having a new baby to meriting an Annapolis appointment. All of these ways of using a newsletter revolve around one important objective -- the need to keep in touch.

Still another way of opening and sustaining lines of communication between the legislator and his district is the route of personal appearances at public events, and the utilization of radio and television. Every Congressman questioned was completely open to the potential of using all of these, but deciding what to use seemed to depend more on the nature of the area in which the people he wanted to reach lived rather than on the strengths of the legislator in the effective use of any of the media. The response one Republican from a large city in Midwest America gave is illustrative. He had been asked if he were in the habit of making radio and television appearances.

Not too often for the simple reason that when you have an area where the television stations cover twenty-three or twenty-four Congressional districts, you don't send them the tapes like members do when a television station fits beautifully into a district. What you do is when they call you to be interviewed, you are always available....You don't mind the exposure, but probably the various channels cover twenty Congressional districts, so there's no way you could specialize in television. Local radio stations are a little different. You could call up and give them a message or even send them a tape from time to time. Their radius isn't as great so for them and for you it's a little bit better.

Two others, both Democrats, both from urban areas, one from the South, the other from the Midwest, both elected in the '60s, chose to use television as a rather effective arm of their role from Washington.
The Southern member attempts a weekly five-minute radio and TV report from his office. The gentleman from Middle America hails from a city where the press is essentially conservative and monopolized, so radio and television time was extremely important to him. His use of TV took the form he described.

Time-Life has a television station in my town and they have an operation here where they do interviews which I'm sure is very helpful as far as my constituents are concerned.

The older men, those elected in the '50s for the most part, while expressing a great belief in the value of television and radio exposure, seemed to use it much more indirectly than the younger members. This is to say that, while the younger men indicated a more active pursuit of opportunities, the older members were always available when asked, but thought they used other means of communication rather effectively in the absence of such invitations.

Still probing into the individual's manner of keeping in touch with constituents a question concerning priorities was posed. The men were asked: if two invitations for public appearances conflicted, did they personally have any criteria for assigning priorities? In true political fashion, the majority hedged the question of priorities, insisting they would make every effort to structure their schedule in order to meet them all. Only two, both Northern Republicans, admitted to criteria, and these concerned the nature of the occasion and the "mix" of the group. The first, from a suburban district said,

One criterion has got to be, are any of my constituents going to be present? Usually I try to make all of them. I always try to accept invitations to colleges, universities,
and high schools.

The other, a history teacher before he became an independent businessman, cited a few more considerations.

First, I'd determine if it's in the district or somewhere else. In that case you do it in the district first, unless you have some unusual situation like doing something extremely high level. In terms of groups, usually it's first come, first served, except if you have a commitment and then you get an especially attractive second offer, so you try to adjust the schedule so you can get in and out of the first one in order to get to the second.

The last question concerning personal ideas of what the role required was an attempt to determine if the member felt, the longer he served, that he actually spent more time on projects which were essentially non-legislative in character than he did on legislative matters. In addition, it was suggested that this allocation of time would also include private moments, moments alone for reflection about the broader philosophical questions with which specific political issues were concerned. The responses generally indicated an unwillingness to admit that increased responsibilities led to a fragmentation of attention. Rather, increased responsibility necessitated and called forth greater organizational abilities. One Republican, elected in the 1960s from a Midwest state, active in Congressional reform, phrased his negative response to the question this way.

No, the longer I'm here the more I become involved in more problems, the more occupied I become, and I have to find ways to do the same jobs in less time and find shortcuts in handling all the related duties.

A young Democrat from the West, beginning his third term when he
was interviewed, gave some indication of conflict, but articulated his formula for coping.

   It is a fight. You have to be constantly pulled back to the reality that the prime function here is legislation. I think you move away from broad areas of interest to fields of expertise which generally center around your committee work....I don't spend as much time on the floor as I did. I read the reports and make up my mind how I'm going to vote before it ever occurs and very seldom listen to debates unless it's something I'm particularly interested in.

What the preceding pages have attempted to do is describe the responses given by the men interviewed to a broad range of questions. Where patterns seemed to emerge, they have been noted. These are left without comment here except to say that within the framework of this research, what they reveal is considered normative for the system under consideration. The next task is to examine the responses the women made to precisely the same questions with an eye to broad similarities and essential points of difference.
CHAPTER VIII

THE CONGRESSIONAL ROLE: A FEMININE IDEOLOGY

In Chapter V mention was made that women, by and large, were much more difficult to see than men, and that from a few there was a tone of annoyance, even hostility, coupled with a hint of suspicion at the beginning of the interview. In almost every case, however, this broke down quite early in the session and most talked quite freely and at length about their role as they saw it. Only one dismissed the questions as irrelevant, but proceeded to fascinate this writer for almost two hours in the Rayburn Room, on the steps of the Capitol, and in her own office with observations and insights which are woven into this discussion wherever they seem pertinent.

Objective role-type was a constant consideration when assessing the women's responses. Along with party affiliation, geographic region and year of entry it was significant in determining whatever patterns there are.

Generally, the questions put to the women were the same as those put to the men, with adjustments made where their sex required it. So the question of how they became active candidates for Congress was followed by asking each if she intended to stay. In general, the women expressed a willingness to stay, qualified by the voters' will and their own health and general well-being.

One very visible, controversial, Democratic Married Woman Politician from a Northern state, elected in the 1960s, was unsure, but not because of the fear that the people would withdraw their support. Her
response put the condition for staying in a perspective that remained uniquely hers.

I am very much aware of the fact that, because I refuse to play by the rules of the game, I refuse to do things for political expediency, that even sooner or later the people will not be able to save me politically. I am not here to behave myself and keep a seat warm for many years like many people have done. I am here to bring about change in America in whatever way I can, in my own limited framework.

When asked about other positions in government they might aspire to, the majority of the women who responded to this question expressed no desire to move away from legislative concerns. Some of the reasons they gave were to the point. One from the West, a Married Woman Politician, a Democrat, with almost a lifetime in state and national politics, said,

Oh, heavens No. I've always belonged in the elective branch and I wouldn't even contemplate being the hireling of anybody but the people.

Another Democrat, from a Northern state, who succeeded her husband and has stayed for twenty years, spoke of her disappointment with Civil Service as a reason for resisting a move.

No, I'm terribly disappointed in Civil Service. I feel when people get in Civil Service they're locked in their jobs and can't be fired.

If membership in the legislature is looked upon as a career, then for women as well as for men the next stage could well be a Senate seat. Many Members of Congress do not see it that way, however. The most common objections heard from the men were again reiterated by a veteran Democrat from the West, a Married Woman Politician, who said,

During the Kennedy years I was offered different
positions....My conclusion in rejecting these was in terms of as far as moulding and directing legislation I could exercise more influence by remaining in Congress. This was a decision I made again in '66 with reference to running for the Senate. There were two factors which made me reject this: one, the seniority I had in the House, and I have never seen the other body as glamorous the way some people have, and they've gone and they've been ruined.... The second reason was the cost of state-wide campaigning....I find it very distasteful to think of having to be in a position where you have that kind of money invested. I don't have it, and if you get it from others, I don't think you can always remain a free agent.

All do not rule out the possibility of moving, however. The Democrat mentioned earlier who was tentative about staying was also tentative regarding what the future might hold.

Many people have suggested that I give serious consideration to running for the Senate. I was called upon to run for Mayor....I don't know what's going to happen.

Each of the women was asked to consider her own position very carefully and to say what she felt was the most important thing she believed she did as a representative of the people in Washington. Since the Married Women Politicians constituted the majority of the respondents, the search for patterns of response begins with them. Absolutely none could be found as each answer had so many qualifying facets. In the final analysis, each had to be taken as individually unique.

Some points worthy of comment did arise however. To be sure there is a distinction between the "ombudsman" and the "legislator" aspects of the role, but six of the nine Married Woman Politicians placed themselves among those who give the legislative aspect priority. Even here there are variations on the theme.
Those who spoke generally about the importance of effecting sound legislation did not lose sight of that legislation's relationship to the people. The simplest statement of it came from a Republican Married Woman Politician from a Northern state. She believed the most important thing she did as a member was

...to improve the status of all the people in this country. A progressive government looks at the ills and tries to do something about them.

Another woman, this time a Democrat from the West, also a veteran of many years' service enlarged on this idea a great deal.

There are lots of things you do and all of them are important. I think at the top of the list I'd have to put being very careful and conscientious in the consideration of any legislation that's going to affect the lives of perhaps millions of people. It's an obligation you can't regard lightly....So I think the first obligation is to do the very best job you can in gathering the most valid information, do the best research job, weigh the pros and cons and make the best judgment you can with the information you have....

A knowledgeable, long-term Married Woman Politician, also from the West, spoke of the importance of the committee process. A young, Republican Married Woman Politician from a Northern state saw the structure of the district itself calling forth a need for one person to be both legislator and ombudsman in Washington.

I think it's impossible to establish true priorities. I think priorities are in part determined by your district. And I happen to have a district with enormous dissimilarities....In the section where my constituents are very well-informed, my responsibility relating to their needs would be to be the best legislator, to participate in the legislative process as effectively as possible. On the other hand, in the other end of my district...they really need government assistance, and I
have to almost draft proposals for Federal grants and follow a Federal grant every step of the way.

The response of one Married Woman Politician, a Democrat from the Midwest, really defied categorization and may well be illustrative of that blend of femininity and political expertise which, increasingly, this writer believes will be the distinguishing feature of the women who manage to achieve in the Congressional role in this political era. She said,

I think the most important thing you're here to do is to bring your own insight to bear on the issues which come before this House. As Margaret Church once said to me, she considered it roughly the equivalent of earning a Ph.D every year. I think you are here to bring the message of your own district and your own ability and your own insight to bear on issues and to explain those things to your district.

Four widows who remained in Congress to carve out independent careers responded to this question. Among them as well there was diversity with respect to the priorities of the role. Two, both Republicans, one elected in the '60s from the Midwest; the other, a product of the '50s from the West expressed a constituent-oriented perspective. The first spoke in terms of satisfaction.

I suppose the help I give my constituents gives me the greatest satisfaction. I've found there are many people who do have many problems and I certainly try to be as helpful to as many as I can.

The Westerner spoke of constituent orientation on another level.

The job is really two-fold -- to represent the constituency, almost a messenger boy -- and to educate the constituency or lead it to favor legislation that is good for the country as a whole.

The remaining two widows, one a Republican, one a Democrat, both
beginning their careers in the 1950s spoke much as many of the Married Women Politicians had in terms of legislative priorities.

Given the median age of women launching a Congressional career (Chapter VI), this writer was constantly referring to this in assessing the responses of non-incumbents. Many of these are now elderly ladies, and their responses represent their recollections as well as their deep-seated feelings about what the role required. Two of the respondents to this question were Place Holders. One is a Republican, the other a Democrat. Both are from the South. Each served in the House less than a year. At the time they responded to the question they were well into their 70s. The answer of one, especially, is illustrative of the social distance between this role and the role of a woman elected in her own right. It also shows what recollection chooses to emphasize.

I answered every letter every day and voted my convictions, which, by the way, did not include deficit spending!

The emphasis is the respondent's.

Many times throughout this paper the suggestion has been made, as indeed it is frequently made in other papers on this subject, that a grasp of what constitutes the informal norms governing appropriate behavior in the House is as essential as having expertise in the formal rules, if not moreso. The women were confronted with the fact that the literature is full of allusions to the "rules of the game", and they were asked what these were. Again, the individuality of the respondents emerged, but traces of some patterns are recognizable.

Two Republican members, both from the East coast, both Married Woman Politicians, one elected in the '50s and about to retire when she
was interviewed, and the other elected in the 1960s, relatively young and considered a "comer" by many on her side of the aisle, spoke very much along the same lines with respect to this question. First, the older woman --

Of course the people who have been here a long time feel that freshmen do not know enough about legislation and the legislative process, and when they have gotten up on their feet on the floor you could see the senior members smile to themselves and say, 'They'll learn.' This is gradually disappearing. We're having a new breed of Congressman on both sides of the aisle who are getting up as freshmen and they don't care what the senior members think, and I'm glad they don't because they are elected by the people; and if they want to get up and express themselves, they have a perfect right to.

In speaking of informal rules, the younger woman said,

One is you are never defeated by what you did not say. I think a lot of these have to change ....Today I think silence is probably the most damaging thing. Not to speak out is a greater sin in public life today. Many of the new members did not come to Congress with the idea that they would be here for forty years ....They just want to be effective for the people they represent.

Both saw the norm of silence for freshmen as decreasing in strength somewhat. The young woman considered this essential, because she believes many of the young do not see House membership as a lifelong occupation and there is no time for waiting. Both believed the people are ill-served by silent members.

The comment of the older of the two mentioned above was echoed by two other women as different as the preceding two were from one another in basic characteristics. The younger woman, a Democrat, a Married Woman Politician elected in the '60s insisted that the House expectation
in this regard was no different from the rest of society.

I don't know of any rules of the game.... I don't think the House is any different from society, your community, your PTA, your neighborhood association. Whatever commands respect for people in their community are the very same codes by which one should conduct oneself in politics. If you're going to speak out irrationally on every subject on which you have no knowledge, obviously the respect you're held in diminishes.

Two women, both Democratic Married Women Politicians, noteworthy because of their political backgrounds and the prestige associated with their present committee assignments put the question of informal rules of the game on a moral plane. The one from the West, who came to Washington in 1960 with almost thirty years experience in politics at the state level, insisted upon the basics of human civility.

I think you have to be a decent human being, and I don't think you cut your fellow members' throats. You treat them as you would wish to be treated. You're very careful of personal feelings....I can't give you the recipe. Some people get along in the legislative process and some people don't, and the ones who don't are the ones who scream "Reform" the loudest. And the only reform they want is to get themselves into an advantageous spot, and they could get in that if they were acceptable.

The other, an eighteen year veteran from the Midwest, was more specific.

One of the first things I learned Sam Rayburn taught me. He gave us all a little talk when we were freshmen and he said, 'You are really on trial for two years. This House will watch you and at the end of that time their judgment will be made and nothing you are going to do after that will change it.' It would take years of effort to change it. They're a very good jury....One of the things I think you cannot do is attack other members of the House.
This same moral tone was struck by another woman, also a Democrat from the Midwest, who came after her husband died in the early '50s and who has managed to carve out a very secure position in the House. Her comment was,

"Right down here in your heart and in your conscience. If you are thinking only of material gain, and that's whether it's monetary or something else, and that motivates a lot of people, then I don't think you have what we would call the ideal person who is to guide this country."

Here while certain ideas about informal rules were repeated, they seem to indicate a shared legacy of such norms in the House itself, among which individual preference dictates priority. Objective role-type, party affiliation, region, or decade of entry matter very little as far as what is important to individual members. There does seem to be a tendency on the part of the women to moralize, however.

Having discovered this moral tone in some of the responses regarding the informal rules, one is tempted to look for the same thing in discussions about how it is possible for a member to lose the respect of his colleagues. A slight trace of it did emerge in the form of deploring those who use public office for dishonest purposes. Two long-term Democrats from the Midwest spoke of this. One is a widow who succeeded her husband; the other is a Married Woman Politician with a great deal of prestige. The widow first --

"I can tell you many people who do not have the respect of their colleagues. It isn't necessarily because of some dishonesty but maybe dishonesty of purpose....There are some working and trying to undermine, trying to do things that are not in the best interests of this country."

And her colleague --
If they don't follow the rules, but still they are intelligent and they know what they are talking about and they don't try to mislead you, they too will gain wide respect. Perhaps it could almost be said that a rule is 'Don't misinform the House.' And certainly one of the rules I learned quite quickly is 'Don't talk on a subject if you are not quite expert on it.' There's bound to be someone sitting on the floor who is.

Another woman, a Republican from a rural district in the West, spoke along the same lines, but prefaced her remarks with a note of tolerance, almost of reluctance to entertain the idea that people do do things which cause them to lose the respect of their colleagues.

There have been some case of alcoholism, which is a very sad thing....The members, by the way, are very patient and not quick to judge their fellow members. They wait until it is proven. They don't jump and join the pack. You'll find very few members commenting on a colleague.

This reluctance to lose respect was also the response of a Democratic Married Woman Politician, far removed on almost every basis from the woman just quoted. She is from the very center of one of the most crowded and ethnically diverse sections of the Eastern part of the country. She is a relative newcomer, achieving election in the mid-1960s. Her answer was quite direct.

It's hard for members to say they lose respect for each other. There's a kind of unwritten understanding -- we're all in this thing together and the protection of each other is understood....I think it takes something very gigantic for members to lose respect for one another.

The very intangible effect of one person's influence over another emerged in answer to this question as it had regarding what the informal rules of the game were. Again, two Republican women, both from Eastern
states, both Married Women Politicians, gave surprisingly similar answers. The similarity was striking because one had been in the House twenty years and was ready to retire when she granted the interview. The other was at the beginning of her third term and was becoming increasingly active in the affairs of her party. In casual conversation, the older one had mentioned her great respect for the talents of the younger woman and alluded to the fact that occasionally they saw each other socially. This placed the similarity of their answers in a context and provided an additional point of reference for the analysis of subsequent responses. The older woman was quite clear on the subject of how one loses respect.

Getting up on the floor and speaking for home consumption and never following through on what they say...just making headlines.

The younger woman struck a comparable note.

One of the worst things is to try to impress your colleagues. There are Congressmen here who will go back and make the grandstand speeches to the electorate. But if they do it in the cloakroom, they will simply be laughed out of the room. A demagogue is very quickly discerned, and he is tolerated because it is part of the political process for some people, but it is not tolerated if it is turned on your colleagues.

To lose respect is one thing. To communicate its loss to a "fallen" colleague is quite another. The consensus among the women was that loss of respect is communicated by withdrawal of support, accompanied by a very tangible social distance. Excerpts from some of the responses show how this is handled. A Democratic Married Woman Politician from an Eastern state said,
It would be obvious. People don’t send out invitations. They don’t go to him on the floor. You feel it. A politician for the most part is totally uninhibited, and when they become inhibited in terms of not approaching certain people, in not inviting them to certain things, then they know.

Another Democrat, a veteran Married Woman Politician from the Midwest, elected in the ’50s said,

There are several ways to let them know. One is the person never gets the committee assignment of his choice. Another way is that no one pays attention to him when he speaks, which is deadening. That killed Joe McCarthy. Another thing would be not to pay any attention to him in committee....These are pretty deadly here.

From the Republican side the chorus was joined by another Married Woman Politician, also elected in the 1950s --

There is no deliberate way...it's just people leave them alone. They don’t go to them anymore...or work with them. I really think they’re killed with embarrassment because everyone is sympathetic. They just obviously work around that person in committee and soon it becomes obvious. It isn’t a matter that people are not friendly....

One Democratic Married Woman Politician, elected in the ’50s from the West, described by many of her colleagues as a most astute politician, spoke of the nature of the offense calling forth the appropriate sanction.

There are extreme cases, of course, and then some people who simply have a personality clash. In the extreme cases the House can always strip a member of his seniority and censure him. Mostly it's more subtle, not supporting him on a bill, or of course making cracks to the press....

In speaking of modes of operation Members of Congress prefer a reference to "compromise" rather than "bargaining." A Republican
Married Woman Politician from the West, elected in the '50s, was quick to make the distinction.

It is certainly true. But what does bargaining mean? This has an ominous sound. It sounds like 'I'll do something for you even though I don't really believe in it if you'll do something for me.' No, it's really an exchange of interest....It's really exchanging, calling their interest to something....

The process, however, by whatever name is alive and well. The fact that it extends far beyond the halls, offices, and committee rooms of the House itself was a fact alluded to by two Democrats especially. One is from the East; the other from the West. Both represent urban constituencies which, because of their geographic placement, are far removed from one another. Both are highly visible for quite good reasons which must be eliminated here in the interests of anonymity. The reason for mentioning visibility is that the kind of pressure to compromise which they allude to requires being known. One was elected in the 1950s; the other in the '60s. First, the older woman --

I sometimes think all the attention is turned by political scientists and the press to the seniority system to divert attention from things that need reform far more. To me the election of the chairman of a committee would bring about the most corrupt government this country has ever seen. We know the amount spent on campaign contributions; we know the contributions made by various people or by special interest groups....If there is to be a real change in government, there are two things I think have to be considered by the American people. One is campaign contributions and the power of special interests, and the second...the statement is made over and over again that the real work is done in committees. I think we're coming to a point now where the real work is not being done in committees and it cannot be done on the floor of the House. The reason I say this is that on my own committee
time after time they cannot even get two people who will attend where witnesses testify, on which supposedly the valid judgments later on will be based....

The younger woman enlarged upon who plays the compromise game.

Compromise is the most important art that is practiced here in the political arena. In the art of compromise it means that one gives and one takes....The extent of this giving and taking depends upon what is to be given and what is to be taken. It depends on the issue, on the questions that are involved, and who is doing the giving and the taking. One of the things I feel is not often talked about is that there is a great deal of pressure by lobbies here. Everyone has a lobby but the people....

When asked what is possible when compromise fails, those who would entertain the prospect as viable spoke of literally stumping for votes as a last resort, or working to modify legislation through amendments. One Democrat spoke of an alternative in terms which would have spoken to the heart of Max Weber's concept of power. She said,

There's another way and that is whipping you into line and that's used by the leadership. There are ways of letting you know that the leadership wants this bill and it would be wise for you to go along. You understand what they are trying to tell you. There are ways.

A person possessed of real power has the luxury of reaching a point where a stance of "Do this...or else" can, in effect, move mountains of resistance.

Consistent with expectations, the women associated their expertise with their committee assignments. Moreover, they seemed willing to leave it at that without going into the specifics of what aspect of education and labor or agriculture they were particularly knowledgeable about. One spoke of drawing her present interest from her past
experience, even though the committee of concern was not one of which
she was a member.

Congresswomen, no less than their male counterparts, look upon
the first committee assignments as matters of considerable importance.
This is so for the same reasons it is so for men as outlined in some
detail in the previous chapter. The women, too, were asked what
committees they aspired to when they came, how they made their prefer¬
ences known, how closely their actual assignments approximated their
desires, and whether or not they had changed committees over the years.
In cases of change, some attempt was made, through follow-up questions,
to discern motives for change. The reader is asked to recall the
framework for ranking committees in terms of prestige utilized in
Chapter VII as relevant to this discussion also. The same question
asked there is relevant here. Do the initial aspirations of female
respondents reflect desire based on the objective prestige of the
committee or are other considerations primary? In addition, it was
important to know what percentage received assignment to which committees.
Table 8.1 indicates the standing committees the women aspired to and
the committees women were actually assigned to.

18% indicate they made no choice initially. Two were Place Holders
and this kind of response from them was not surprising. The third was
a Married Woman Politician from the South, elected in the mid-'50s. Per¬
haps her response says something significant about the South since it
is not typical of other women elected in their own right in her decade
from other parts of the country.
TABLE 8.1
FIRST COMMITTEE ASPIRATIONS AND COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS
OF CONGRESSWOMEN IN STUDY SAMPLE (%) *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standing Committee</th>
<th>Aspired to</th>
<th>Assigned to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking and Currency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Labor</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Operations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Administration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate and Foreign Commerce</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judiciary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Marine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Astronautics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans' Affairs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways and Means</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>N=16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=16

* These percentages do not equal 100% because, as was done in the case of the men, the percentages are presented in round numbers for easier comparison.

Each member of the state delegation is assigned a committee according to seniority. Because I was the most junior member of the delegation, I took what was left over after all the rest had been served.

To repeat, this kind of response is not typical of other Married Women Politicians elected in the 1950s. An explanation which might account for it, as has been suggested, is that she was from the South,
where traditionally a more paternalistic political mode has been normative. Also this woman did not seek a long life in the House. She was not a candidate for re-election after serving eight years. She left the House at the age of fifty.

With few exceptions, the women who did state preferences went on to explain why without being asked. Not one of their answers reflected seeking a particular committee because of its importance or prestige in and of itself. What did surface was that a committee assignment was sought for one of several other reasons. Either it was essential because of the nature of the constituency represented, or it was perceived by the member as a means of acquiring sought-after knowledge. Or it was related to past occupational and professional experience.

The first reason was articulated by a Republican Married Woman Politician from the West, elected in the 1950s --

I wanted the Agriculture Committee. That had been quite an issue in my campaign. My opponent had pointed out that no one had ever served on the Agriculture Committee from our district, which was true, and that he would certainly get on it, so my people said they thought I should if I were elected. I agreed that was a fair request, and said I would do my best.

A choice made on the basis of knowledge to be gained was the result for one as the consequence of receiving advice from an unusual source. This Married Woman Politician, a Democrat from an urban area in the Midwest, elected in the 1950s, explained her preference.

I asked specifically for Government Operations. I was not aware that this was not even a major committee. A newspaperman had told me I would learn more faster on that committee than on any
other, but then I asked Mr. Dingle, the second ranking member, to see to it that I had a second committee. So he put me on Banking and Currency. And I must say I was wisely advised on Government Operations.

Building on past experience for four of the women, all Married Women Politicians, was a preference for Education and Labor. Three of these women, two Democrats and one Republican, had worked in this area in their respective state legislatures. One of these was a professional educator before entering politics. The fourth, a Democrat from the West, elected in the '50s, had held no political office before election to the House but had been professionally associated with educational interests in her state prior to election.

A young, Republican Married Woman Politician gave her own professional qualifications as a reason for her choice but cited an interesting reason for not getting it.

When I first came, I asked to be on Judiciary. As a lawyer I thought this would be very valuable. But I learned they have not had a woman on this committee and that there was some feeling about having a woman on Judiciary, so I was given my choice of some very uninteresting committees from my point of view....

The responses of the Widows Turned Politicians were interesting in that the three elected in the 1950s, regardless of party affiliation, aspired to their husbands' committees. The one Republican, elected in the '60s, did not choose her husband's committee but rather a committee which was not necessarily related to constituent interests or her areas of expertise. She chose out of a different need disposition.

Interior and Insular Affairs was my first choice simply because I felt at that point I would be dealing with some tangible problems. It doesn't
have too much to do directly with my own district.

Analyzing male responses to this question revealed that a few men, with some interesting similarities in background, aspired to Public Works. Only one woman initially chose this committee. This was a Married Woman Politician from the West, elected in the '60s, who had been in her state legislature for many years and who had also been a Democratic National Committeewoman. Her comment echoes what seems fairly typical among life-long politicians and that is, "If you take what you're given, it turns out to be rewarding in the long run."

I wanted Public Works and I didn't get it because Stewart Udall and Chairman Aspinall came and persuaded me there was a vacancy on Interior and would I take Interior? That isn't what I wanted at all, but I have been in office long enough to realize that it isn't always what you want that you get, but you make the most of the opportunities you have.

Most of the women interviewed did not get the committee they asked for the first time around. Some chose to remain where they were throughout their years in the House. Others chose to change and the specifics of these changes will be considered shortly.

It is a matter of public record that two women of the Democratic Party, elected in the last decade, chose to make a formal protest regarding their first assignments. One was successful in effecting a change. Both these women, representing large urban constituencies, have been controversial from the start. In discussing the challenges made by these women, male respondents, particularly, mentioned the nature of the political structure in the urban areas from which they came plus their own atypical personal backgrounds as reasons for their choosing to challenge.
The rest of the women went the conventional route of making their preferences known. It was interesting, however, to hear two women put the process of making their preferences known in the context of a political campaign. Both are relative newcomers, having been elected in the late '60s. Both are comparatively young. Both had been active politically before their election. One is a Democrat from the West; the other a Republican from the East. First, the Democrat --

I conducted the most vigorous campaign of my life. I never really had to work that hard before. I had to go and lobby with the thirty members of our committee-on-committees to get what I wanted.

The Republican spoke of expertise she picked up the second time around.

At the start I felt my qualifications were enough to win my choice...but then I found out that everyone else had campaigned actively with the selection committee, and since the selection committee is made up of representatives from the major states and there are only a few Republicans from my state, I was at a very great initial disadvantage, which I didn't realize at the beginning. Next time I talked to every single member from Ohio. I wrote letters to the whole committee. I talked to the chairman....

Elsewhere, the suggestion has been made that the decision to change committees must be weighed in the light of what advantages accrue to change in relation to the seniority which may be lost. A decision to request a change may be in the interests of "vertical mobility" or the furtherance of career aspirations. One woman stands out in this regard. She is a Democrat, a Married Woman Politician from the Midwest elected in the '50s. Again and again her responses
are indicative of a very elusive quality which this writer had hoped to find more of. The fact that it is there at all is worth many of the pains of carrying out this research. This is a woman who does seem to have managed politically to use the fact that she is a woman. She began her career on a very minor committee which she initially requested. In addition she asked a ranking member from her state delegation to choose a second committee for her. From that point the narrative continues. Names and committees are omitted in the interests of anonymity.

When I changed I wanted ________ and the women in the House went to the Speaker and asked him to put me on it, so I was. Then I asked Chairman ________ who he would like from my state on ________, and he said, 'Well, would you like to be on it?' I said, 'I couldn't be.' He said, 'Why not?' I said, 'Why, I'm a woman.' And he said, 'That doesn't make any difference to me. I'll go ask the Speaker and the Majority Leader.' And he came back and said, 'Yes, you can be on it.'

This response is quite remarkable for a number of reasons. When this woman was ready to change committees, her bid for the move she wanted was actually made for her by the women of the House. An extraordinary fact, since all the evidence we have indicates that only on very rare occasions have the women of the House acted in concert on behalf of an issue or a person. The most astonishing part of her statement, however, has to do with the move she made to the committee on which she now serves. Even though in the final analysis we may have to conclude that women admit to no "woman's way" of achieving position and prestige, there, in fact, it is. First of all, in approaching the chairman of the committee, why would she believe she would have any-
thing to do with providing him with the person he wanted from her state? In fairness to the respondent, there is absolutely no evidence that the question was a calculated one, but it is difficult to believe that the chairman's response came right off the top of his head. Surely it's at least fair to suggest that the stage had been set. The response, "I couldn't be; I'm a woman," put the chairman in a unique position from which he could not easily back away. To have accepted that reason would have been to admit that certain people could be excluded from committees on bases which had absolutely nothing to do with their objective qualifications. This no chairman could ever publicly do. The rest of it is made to look quite easy. The Speaker and the Majority Leader acquiesced. The appointment was made.

A few women moved horizontally to committees having approximately the same rank. These became desirable either because of their association with major constituency interests or simply because these were the committees these women aspired to their first term.

Here and there, as responses have warranted, mention has been made of two Republican women, both from the East, one elected in the '50s; the other elected in the '60s. Their pasts would be considered different in many respects and yet at several points in the interview their responses were strikingly similar. This is one of those. Both spoke of moving from one of the committees they were originally on. When asked if she had changed, the older woman said,

Yes, I changed....I thought Banking and Currency had a broader sphere of influence. It seemed to me it was a much broader base than many of the others.
The younger woman included her remarks in a rather lengthy discussion of her comprehensive experience with the committee structure.

I sought another committee assignment my second term, and I realized after my first term that Banking and Currency was really one of the primary committees of the House. It proposed more legislation than any other committee and consequently I sought membership on that.

How much the older influenced the younger in these matters remains subject to speculation. It has been mentioned here where it occurs because it is the only hint of such influence which the answers from any of the respondents yield.

Each woman interviewed was well aware of the fact that a member must find time in the busiest of days to deal directly with constituent matters. All means of reaching the people and being reached by them must be explored. How one uses each tool of communication, however, is largely a matter of personal style. Above all, there is no substitute for being seen, and three Republican women, especially, acknowledged this. One spoke of the problems associated with this need, however, arising out of the nature of her particular district.

My people feel I'm closest to them when they see me. They would like to see me more often than I can oblige....I have found they like you around and if you are not there, they assume you do not care. That would be among those voters who do not understand the legislative process as well. Now among my voters naming a section of her district composed of the more affluent and the better educated, if they see men at home, they wonder why I'm not in Washington.

Geography necessitates effective use of the mail for most of those whose districts lie some distance from Washington. Two approaches to handling mail seem common. One is the personal response to every
letter. One Democratic Married Woman Politician arrived at the need for this for an interesting reason. Her answer also reveals something about a particular kind of political style.

I guess you just take the letters that are on the desk and you go through them. In a district like mine you handle a tremendous amount of mail and I'm one of the members who does answer her own mail. I have tried with people working for me. And everybody says, 'They don't sound like you, __________.' I think it's important to keep in mind I'm on a first name basis with all 427,000 of my constituents.

Another way of effecting maximum use of the mail is through the talents and skill of a competent staff. Few rely totally on staff work. Those who do at all make some important distinctions. Again, individual style is evident in each of these. A prominent Democratic legislator from the West, a Married Woman Politician with more than eighteen years' experience, has organized an effective operation to utilize a combination of staff and personal expertise.

We probably get one hundred letters a day. I don't read simple requests -- send me an agricultural handbook or whatever. If they are personal requests, they are always placed on my desk before they are answered. If they are referring to legislative matters on which my staff knows I have taken a position, they go ahead and answer the letter; and the incoming letter is stapled on and when it comes into my desk for a signature, then I read the incoming letter and decide if the answer is what I want it to be.

A Republican woman from a Western state, also a veteran Married Woman Politician, had a slightly different concept of staff work, placing it in a kind of team context.

I use the phone a lot. I write a lot of letters. I feel very fortunate in having such a wonderful
staff. Together we feel very strongly about truly responsive mail. I write all policy letters, and then if we have several hundred letters on the same subject we do have to go to those prepared letters. I read every bit of mail that comes into this office. It comes to my desk first. Then it's parcelled out to my experts. I sign every letter that goes out.

One Republican from the West, who stayed to serve for a few years in the '50s had an unusual advantage in that she owned some very significant means of communication.

I think I reached my constituents best through good newspaper coverage. This was easy since I was the owner and publisher of the largest newspaper in ______. I also owned the most popular radio and television stations. We always had a special correspondent and offices for our newspaper in Washington, so I had thorough, complete, and favorable coverage.

Once the need to keep in touch is established, the question of allocating time to meet the need is relevant. None of the women spoke in terms of percentages. A few spoke of what they do in this regard, allowing the writer to draw her own conclusions. Typical of these responses is the following from a very active Democratic legislator, a Married Woman Politician from a populous district in an Eastern state.

I have a district office open six days a week staffed by four full-time people. And I am in that office one day every week-end. I have trained people to know that if they cannot see me, I have paid for people who can help them with their problems....I have absolutely no private life. My husband is a very mature, understanding gentleman; we've been married about twenty-two years....

Another Democrat, from the Midwest, also a Married Woman Politician, with over eighteen years' experience, acknowledged the need to spend time, but during the work week put legislative commitments first.
Usually I am gone to a committee by 10:00 so I have very little time that I can spend with constituents here. They either have to call or be in this office before 10:00.

In Chapter VII some of the institutionalized means available to Members of Congress for keeping their publics aware of their existence and their activities were graphically presented. What was mentioned in that context was that no one uses all the means all the time. What happens is that, often through trial and error, a member chooses those media which best effect "presence" for him or for her.

In addition to the usual means of maintaining contact, the newsletter seems to be an important communications tool. Most of the women use it. Those who do not are convinced they get sufficient mileage out of other means. One spoke of the newspapers she owned. Another said, "No, I have not sent one out. Thank God, the media have been so good to me...." But in the same breath she spoke of her intention to use them in the future.

The frequency with which newsletters went out was related almost entirely to a cost factor. Those who sent them only three or four times a year expressed regret that they could not send them more frequently.

For the majority who did use newsletters, follow-up questions referred to content. What did they write about? Generally, the women wrote about issues facing Congress of particular concern to their constituents, often adding their own positions on these. One spoke of acquainting her district with services available to them through the Federal Government. In addition, there was the usual reference, through photographs especially, to the member's participation in significant events,
usually in the company of some celebrity of either national or state im-
portance.

A related question asked to whom the letters were sent. Some used
the "Postal Patron " approach, but quite a few were more selective,
sending only to those who requested them, or to newspapers for publication,
or to registered voters, as cases in point.

Only five said they had used questionnaires. One Married Woman Pol-
itician, a Democrat from the West, gave a reason why she did not.

I have avoided it. I think they do have a purpose
and I really would like to do it, except that I
think questionnaires have been so badly abused.
So many times they contain just loaded questions
and are designed to get certain answers. I think
a lot of people just throw them away.

Another Westerner, also a Married Woman Politician, also a Democrat,
saw another reason why they were suspect, but felt she had gotten around
this and did use one.

Yes, I've had college people and everybody help me
with questionnaires, and last year I did my own
with very simple questions and we had the highest
response we've ever had. To hell with the pro-
fessors.

Every Member of Congress tries to use the structured event to best
advantage in enhancing his image and advancing his message. Therefore,
each invitation to speak at a civic event, to attend a fund-raising din-
er, to keynote a rally, or to motivate a class of graduates must be
weighed in relation to image-building and communication. Certainly other
factors may enter in, but these may not be overlooked. The women were
asked two questions relating to this need. First, they were asked if
they were in the habit of making public appearances at home, including
radio and television appearances. Then they were asked if a conflict should arise among invitations, did they have any special criteria for resolving it.

The answer to the first question, generally, was affirmative. The specific use of radio and television, however, was selective on a personal basis. Some women used television only to the extent that a particular station’s range was contiguous with the boundaries of the district, and then only in response to invitations to be guests on a talk show or to participate in a televised discussion of issues. A few mentioned how valuable a vehicle television was, especially during campaigns.

One woman, with a very active past in radio, a Republican from the West elected in the ’50s, spoke of a very carefully planned weekly broadcast.

One of my assistants and I sit down...he is a former radio newsmen and he does the writing. I tell him we’re getting a lot of questions in our mail on this or that major bill or something is coming up in the news that I know people are going to be concerned about, so on that basis we pick what might be in their minds. Then if there’s nothing really hot, I’ll say I know the district is very interested in this bill and we ought to explain where it is in committee and what it contains. We build a five-minute radio broadcast every week. Different radio stations carry the program at different times. There are twenty-nine stations in my district.

What needs to be emphasized is that, in the use of various platforms for being seen and heard, the women responded out of a personal assessment of their effectiveness in each of these media. No clear patterns of response emerge.

The last question asked was one designed to elicit free response con-
cerning the pressures of the job. The women were asked whether the longer they were in Congress, the more they were required to spend time on non-legislative projects vs. legislative. It was placed intentionally at the end in the hope that by that time the interview had reached a point where rapport would be established, and reflections would be forthcoming that could not be unearthed by specific-type probes. In cases where the members were not pressed for time, this did turn out to be the case.

Of all who answered, only one answered negatively, saying she thought during her first term she actually did the least amount of thinking on substantive matters. Two Republican women, both Married Women Politicians, one from the West elected in the '50s, the other from the East elected in the 1960s, spoke at length in answer to this question, putting into focus many of the separate ideas which individual women had put forth. First, the Westerner --

I'm so jealous of my working time. There's been a change. I moved in from the suburbs. So driving to work I have a half-hour less to think and reflect .......I feel a constant sense of frustration since I have my interest called to so many things....Your days are long here -- ten hours or more and, of necessity, tense. You do learn to live with that. I've learned to lie down on my couch fifteen minutes in the middle of the day. They say the mark of a freshman Congressman is that he has no pillow on his couch.

A few more complicated threads were woven through the younger woman's response. What was interesting, particularly, was that the responsibilities of one of her other roles were turned into decided assets in coping with this one.

I find you have to make time to think. I have found
the key to this for me is selecting the very best possible staff....The better your staff the more time you have to really deal with the legislation and to really think about it and reflect. Even then, I think the only time I have left is time on planes going back and forth to the district. Having my children at home requires me to be home to check on their homework. And I make it a point to have homework too. Many of the men have their families out of Washington, so that they will go to parties every night because we are invited to something every single night. But by virtue of my responsibilities at home, I am at home more often, and I think this gives me more time to do my homework.
Conclusions: Chapters VII and VIII

This chapter and the one which went before have probed individual perceptions of the Congressional role on the part of the men and women interviewed. For the most part an analysis of these responses has been made without comment. These chapters would not be complete, however, if some attention were not given to what similarities and differences there are between the responses of the two groups.

Studies of institutionalized roles frequently yield a common fact which is fundamental. This is that, in an institutionalized setting, shared definitions of what is required for effective role performance tend to evolve over time, and each generation of participants is socialized to what these are. Consequently, there is a vast reserve of ideas about how to be and what to do in order to be effective. The participants draw at will upon this reserve, and any differences which are observable among them must be credited to basic differences among people who come to the role from various points in the stages of their lives with their own individual pasts and their own unique, one-of-a-kind personalities.

What does emerge from these interviews is that there is a broad, comprehensive understanding of what it means to be a Member of Congress, and that, in its totality, this is normative. Within this total framework, what one chooses to be and what one chooses to emphasize are deeply personal. Congress is an institution steeped in tradition and historically bent upon giving its participants maximum freedom in developing their individual styles of response within subtle, but clearly understood boundaries of what is appropriate.
We set out hypothesizing that within this comprehensive perception of the Congressional role, there would be, in fact, masculine and feminine ideologies. And indeed there are. Before identifying these specifically, it is necessary to sketch in broad strokes the comprehensive role perception which emerges from the responses of these Members of Congress.

Aware constantly that continuance in the role is dependent upon positive evaluation by the voters, the Member of Congress sees himself through their eyes as either an ombudsman for his constituents or a framer of just laws for the governance of a nation. Because signals from the constituent public are strong in both directions, many cannot decide between the two, but internalize both sets of expectations in the comprehensive role concept, assigning priorities on a situational basis.

Besides his constituents, however, the member has another "public", the company of his peers in the House itself. With them he engages in the delicate art of reciprocity in order to effect the passage of viable laws in the Chamber while saving "face" at home and in the larger political world swirling around him in the process. The way into the confidence of his peers is through knowledgeability and trustworthiness. There is a facade of righteousness in Congress. Its maintenance is so important to the participants that the occasional one who cries "foul!" or who "plays "foul!" is likely to be cast in the uncomfortable role of pariah. Ostracism and gossip are the primary social controls insuring conformity. Depending upon one's point of view, playing "foul" consists either of inadequacy in job performance or some degree of personal, moral and ethical depravity.
Achieving expertise in subject-matter or facility with process is of the greatest importance for every member and the vehicle for such accomplishment is the committee assignment. At the beginning of each Congress the ritual is enacted. Requests are made. Assignments verify the sophistication or lack of it with which the member assessed his proper place. Requests are made on the basis of political advantage to be gained, possibility of attainment, past professional or occupational experience, career aspirations, and/or constituent interests. Assignments are made on the basis of seniority, party considerations, geographic distribution and personal affinities. Changing committees in the course of one's career necessitates giving an affirmative answer to whether changing is important enough to exchange some seniority on one committee for a junior position on another.

A fundamental life-source is presence, either real or psychological, in the awareness of one's constituents. Channels of communication are varied -- letters, phone calls, visits, radio and television appearances, etc. No one uses them all. All use some. Choices depend upon assessments of effectiveness in sustaining presence. They consist of selecting means and assigning priorities.

Within this framework some perceived differences do appear. However, what does emerge is probably more characteristic of men and women in society at large at the present time rather than a unique characteristic of the House of Representatives.

The first point of difference to be noted is in the realm of career orientations. In society at large what differences there are between men and women in this regard seem to stem from the fact that what defines a
man more than anything else is his work role. On the other hand, a woman generally places work in a more comprehensive framework of all the roles she is called upon to play. Therefore, the willingness of the men interviewed here to speak in greater detail of aspirations beyond and after House membership is not surprising. Women members internalize a concept of themselves as legislator, and for the time that they are that their aspirations do not seem to range far beyond.

In addition, our society traditionally has made it necessary for women to justify their occupational role by reconciling it with the requirements of other roles considered more essential to their feminine identity, namely their roles as wives and mothers. Therefore, it is not at all surprising to hear Married Women Politicians allude to these in references to how they see themselves as Members of Congress. Illustrative of this point is the woman who mentioned that she had no private life whatsoever, but that this was possible because of her husband's understanding and maturity. No male respondent made any allusion to family. In addition, there was the woman who saw the need she had to spend time with her children as a distinct asset in making it possible for her to do the "homework" so essential to the task of being an informed legislator. No male respondent alluded to such "assets."

On another level, from the responses presented here, one cannot say definitively that women are more moral than men, but from the responses it can be said that the women here did stress moral and ethical considerations more consistently than the men did in describing those "rules of the game" essential for respect and esteem.

Nor can it be said that women are more geared to women's concerns.
Each saw her expertise arising out of her particular placement in the system, by way of committee assignment especially. Most social systems strive to place participants at points in the system precisely where their participation may reach maximum efficiency in relation to the interests of the whole. Both men and women cope with Social Security, consumer affairs, education. The only point that can be made is that women in the House are noticeably absent from the analytical concerns of the Committee on Rules, or the vast area of foreign affairs, or participation in the Judiciary. What has to be said in connection with this point, however, is that the absence of women may well be a function of what society has prepared women for in terms of expertise, and this is not necessarily a consequence of a prejudicial stance on the part of the male majority. What also has to be said is that there have been women active in the field of foreign affairs. But only one woman here has aspired to membership on the Judiciary. What one directs one's attention to, in the final analysis, does seem to be a consequence of a very delicate kind of reciprocity between what one aspires to and agreement among the others that the aspirations are realistic in terms of the maximum efficiency of the system. This is particularly true of goal-oriented institutions.

In the two chapters which follow attention is turned, first, to how men perceive the role expectations applied to women in some very important relational areas, and second, how women perceive themselves perceived in these same areas of social relations.
CHAPTER IX

WOMEN IN THE CONGRESSIONAL ROLE: A MASULINE IDEOLOGY

The questions relating to Congresswomen were incorporated into the questions asked of male members where they seemed to fit best. This was always in relation to the responses they were making about role perceptions they had regarding themselves.

The first time that some response regarding women was called for in the questioning was after the men had been asked what each believed was the most important thing he was in Congress to do. Then they were asked if they thought a woman should conceive of her role differently.

The initial response from ten of the men was that they should not, but by no means can this be written off as a rejection of any idea of male-female differences in approaching the Congressional role. All except two of those who responded in this manner qualified their initial statements immediately. It is interesting that the differences in opinion were more along party lines than along regional or length of service lines. Democrats were more likely than Republicans to qualify with greater diversity. Also, while all of the Republicans initially gave a negative response to this question, a few Democrats had well-defined thoughts regarding a belief that women did, in fact, have a unique expectational component associated with their incumbency that men did not have.

The only serious reservations associated with a negative response from Republicans came from two men, veterans of almost twenty years' service, both from the same Midwest state, one from a suburban constituency.
ency in a large city, the other from a down-state setting. The up-state urban Republican centered his remarks on some of the advantages women have, especially in the area of campaigning, and some extenuating circumstances, rarely applicable to men, which might operate to excuse women for ineffectual performance.

I have talked to a lot of women here and I would think that to some degree they want to be treated as just another member....I think most of us would agree it's easier to campaign as a woman. Many of us men acknowledge that the most difficult opponent would be a woman, because if you get kicked in the shins by a man, you can return the kick, but you really can't -- a woman has a tremendous advantage in that. I think the rough-and-tumble of politics becomes a one-way street. A woman can practice it but is rarely subject to it....Most of the women here are real classical ladies....Another thing is, I think a woman without much talent could get by because you could always absolve her because she's a woman. On the other hand, a man without talent or energy -- you wonder how he got here....That gives a slight advantage to the woman who perhaps doesn't show the talent that might be associated with the position.

The second Republican, much respected in the House, a ranking member of a major committee, spoke of changes over time. He had known a woman member from his state, the widow of a Congressman, who stayed approximately eight years to carve out her own career. With her in mind he made these remarks.

Possibly she had a woman's role. I don't mean to derogate the importance -- I am saying I think now the woman who comes here looks at her job as a Congressman. These women don't look at things through a woman's eye, and this is a good thing.... There's one fundamental thing I do think and that is that woman are very much more careful in their approach to a problem and I think this is largely because they have a feeling that someone back home is going to think that, because they're a woman, they didn't approach this thing
right. There are still a lot of people who believe that.

Among Democrats the majority believed there should be no difference at all. Two who answered this way qualified by saying that perhaps in the past women had been a bit more militant regarding women's issues, but this was gradually changing. Two, both elected in the '50s said more, perhaps, between the lines than on the surface about their generation's expectations of women. The first, an old man, ready for retirement, a committee chairman, said,

Women have advanced in government and their lives have been made a little easier, not by their votes but by the votes of men, and I wouldn't want to say a woman can come here and change things. Some things shouldn't be changed. In most states of the union we now have laws protecting women....Some of the things the extreme advocates want to put over would destroy these gains for women. That's why some of the older heads over here, the women who have made a great contribution, are not advocates of that women's lib.

The younger, also from the West, very involved in Congressional reform, put his observations a little differently.

My own experience with women as members is that they are just as capable as men....I've served with many women -- from the standpoint of emotional stability, ability, etc., I've found them absolutely equal to men.

Each employs comparative criteria, the former more blatantly chauvinistic (but in a fatherly fashion) than the latter; the latter implying an expectation of inadequacy which he had not had confirmed.

As noted earlier, only the Democrats, crossing regional and length of service lines, spoke positively about aspects of role expectations which would be particularly relevant to women. Two spoke of the necessity
of her being concerned with women's rights. One of these added a note of caution.

Of course I think it's well for her to speak for some interests of that constituency but I don't think it should be singled out as that.

Two other Democrats, one from the South, the other from the North, both elected in the '60s, young, attractive, and articulate, saw a positive place for women. Perhaps, as a consequence of their cultural heritage, they expressed it differently. The Southerner spoke in this vein.

I would like to think she feels the obligation to bring something distinctly feminine to the job... A man can't think like a woman and I don't think a woman can really think like a man, but over 50% of our population are women and I think certainly we need more of their voice.

The Northern member, a liberal and a civil rights activist, approached the subject from the larger perspective of civil rights.

I think it's quite clear that job discrimination against women is quite rampant in our economy. We fight it right here in our own offices.... So I think women have a special role to play along that line.... It's good to have people who are victims of these kinds of things participating in legislative councils. Having said all that, I reject Gloria Steinem, who overstates the case, I think, when she says women in this country are in the same position that all black people are in. Women still go to the Waldorf Astoria and always have; women still have silk sheets and always have.

Each of these young man was allowing for a very specific feminine approach to the meaning of membership.

Immediately after being asked to respond to whether or not women did and should conceive of their role differently from men, the respon-
dents were asked to address themselves to whether or not they thought a woman's constituents had expectations of her which they would not have of a man. Here there was much more of a tendency to shy away from the question, pleading that they would have no idea -- that this was a question that only a woman could answer.

Of those who would answer, the position of those who rejected the idea was probably best articulated by a relative newcomer, a third-term Republican from the East, who centered his attention on the durability of constituent interests regardless of who represented them.

Only three, two Democrats and a Republican, believed constituents would have special expectations of women. The Republican, an avowed Conservative from the Midwest, put the difference on a liberal-conservative basis but implied an association with being true to what is supposed to be a uniquely feminine attribute in our society, namely a humanitarian orientation.

I would gather that it is more difficult for a woman to be a conservative politically because the bleeding hearts of the day bring a peculiar form of pressure to bear on a woman. They appeal to her emotions. Perhaps it's more difficult to be here and be a woman. On the other hand, women who are here and who stake out a position on issues have people's respect. They won't try to intimidate a woman, pressure her as much as a man. It works both ways. Really, it's a very complex sort of thing.

The other two, Democrats, elected in the 1960s, one from the South, the other from the West, also spoke of some unique characteristics constituents expected women to bring to the role, implying much of what the Republican above had said, but couching it in softer terms. The Southerner said,
I think the women especially expect them to be a little more militant in their furtherance of programs of particular interest to women. I think for the most part they are more sociologically inclined -- even the members of the other party.

The man from the West expressed it this way.

I rather think they probably expect her to be more compassionate, more understanding of the woman's role in our society. The women expect her to be that, and the men kind of think she'll be that too.

Next, the men were asked to express their own expectations, but in generalized terms, responding to whether they thought women's male colleagues in the House had expectations of them they did not have of other men. The responses were varied and seemed more personal in tone with little similarity along party, regional, or length of service lines. To appreciate the flavor, a cross-section of responses must be considered.

The "expectation" most commonly referred to was respect, interesting because at face value it has little to do with legislative expertise. A Southerner, elected in the '60s as a Democrat, launching a political career after many years as a successful businessman, spoke of it almost as an afterthought.

I couldn't say I had noticed any tendency on the part of males to expect anything different. There is certainly always and I hope it always remains, a respect for a woman -- well, I think they're a little more careful in their language and in their attitudes, and I hope that old-time respect for womanhood doesn't go by the board.

Another Democrat from the West, a younger man also elected in the '60s enlarged upon the same idea a bit more facetiously:

I've seen them extend privileges, yes. But they are privileges of courtesy -- nothing unusual. I have in mind Patsy Mink. She's a pretty gal and
the guys obviously are going to -- when she goes
to lobby somebody, she just has a better chance,
all other things being equal, of being successful.

Still another Democrat from the West, an older man elected in the
'50s, also spoke of respect, but in a slightly different vein.

Any capable woman can make it. Mrs. Hansen, for
instance, has the respect of the members. She
renders her reports accurately; she holds hearings
when she's supposed to. Therefore, she's more
successful in passing legislation. More than that
she's respected by the Senate in conference.

The rendering of respect seems to be the common expectation, but
what is interesting is that it is an expectation that men have of them-
selves in relating to women. It is not an expectation that they have of
the woman. A question seems to be whether women members would be ob-
jects of respect for their male colleagues as women even when and if
their legislative expertise fell short of the mark. If this is so, it
may well be fair to say that women, because of their sex, are spared
some of the negative sanctions which would be visited upon men who proved
to be ineffective legislators.

Finally, as a last attempt to identify specific sources of facili-
tating or discriminatory behavior directed at women, the men were asked
if they sensed any tendency on the part of the leadership of their party
to favor a man over a woman in making, for example, attractive committee
assignments. By far the consensus among Republicans and Democrats was
that this was not the case. For the most part, they cited reasons inher-
ent in the organization of the House by way of explanation. The most
common was a reference to the seniority system as it was coupled with
the necessity of geographic input on the various committees. A Demo-
crat from the South, himself a member of the Democratic committee-on-committees, summarized this explanation well.

No, I haven't observed that the leadership tends to reward women particularly for their conscientiousness, but they haven't hindered them in any way either. Once again, under this crazy system we have, seniority is so important that it's very difficult to push anyone ahead. The committee assignments, of course, are important, and you could say that to give someone a good committee assignment would be a way of pushing them ahead, but committee assignments are so often made on a geographic basis as well as a seniority basis.

A Republican veteran, elected in the '50s from the Midwest, gave essentially the same answer to the question.

Committee assignments in part have a geographic input. A woman or no one can control this. Coming in at a time when there might be a key person from your state holding the committee of your choice, whether you're a man or a woman, you're excluded. So the question of geography or the seniority of persons from your area works for you or against you regardless if you're young or old, male or female.

Evidence of sex discrimination cited by observers of the Congressional process and frequently by women themselves is that women seldom, if ever, serve as floor leaders for their committees in steering proposed legislation through the last stages of floor debate, amendments, and final passage. In addition, prestigious sub-committee chairmanships, it is said, seldom go to women. If this is so, attempts to account for it would require identifying specific roles within the House leadership component. Because of the nature of the alleged discrimination, committee chairmen would emerge as suspect in this regard rather than the more comprehensive roles of Speaker, whip, majority and minority leader, etc. Among Democratic members, especially, an occasional hint was dropped that
some committee chairmen might, in fact, have reservations about women on their committees. What was interesting was how frequently these were couched in "I have never seen it, but I have heard it said..." terms. Those most inclined to mention it at all were Southern members.

The next questions moved away from asking about particular categories of persons and referred rather to how the "rules of the game" applied to women members. This was one of the few questions where unanimity prevailed in the answers except for a lone dissident voice. It belonged to a Republican from the West, elected in the '50s. The fact that someone believed the rules were different was not surprising, but the reasons why would have Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott writhing in their graves.

I'm inclined to think the members might be a little more tolerant of women because most of the women who come here are not particularly professionally qualified. There are a few that are, but most of them are not. Therefore, I think the members would be a little more tolerant. They'd figure the men ought to know better. Generally, even those who do come from some political experience do not have the same educational background the man have. Most of the men have been lawyers, which ought to be a training ground. I don't know that any of the women are lawyers. Most of them, at least, are not. Now I'm not a lawyer either, so I'm not particularly impressed with lawyers, but I think that most of the men had professional jobs before they came here. Many of them have been active in community affairs.

In view of the social characteristics of women members over the past twenty years (Refer to Chapter VI), and especially in the last decade, it seems fair to wonder what prompted the content and the tone of this response. This gentleman may simply have been voicing a personal bias, or he may be a legitimate spokesman for some older House members.
who do feel this way about their female colleagues. In the absences of other responses like this, the question remains academic. What also may have prompted a reply of this nature is that the man is using his own decade of entry as a reference point. The woman elected in her own right was certainly there but perhaps not as "professionally" qualified if the qualifications of male members are to be accepted as normative. It is idle rambling to try to discern motivation, but whatever prompted it, the response remains interesting for the attitudes it seems to convey, even if they can be attributed to only one man.

Finally, in an attempt to unearth some further differences between men and women as men perceived them, a slightly different approach was used. Starting with the obvious observation that women were in the minority in the House, the male respondents were asked if they felt this fact prompted men to believe they had to do more to facilitate their being accepted by their colleagues than they would feel they should do for men. In general, for both parties, all regions, and both decades of entry, the answer was negative. Some did qualify their answers, and for those who did, some personal differences emerged.

None believed women received any extra consideration on legislative matters. Two Democrats, one from the South elected in the '60s, the other from the West elected in the '50s, spoke of there being no need for this. First, the man from the South --

I don't think they've been helped particularly, but by the same token I don't see there are any road blocks that have been placed in their way. I think it's been a well in which the cream rises to the top no matter who it is. I've never sensed any animosity. I would say there are some women here who are not popular, but they wouldn't be popular, probably
even less popular, if they were men. Why? Because they're too pushy and too militant ...

The man from the West put it a bit differently.

I don't think they'd help or hinder her because she's a woman. There's a great tendency on the part of the members to judge her on her abilities.

Two Republicans, both from the Midwest elected in the '50s spoke of courtesies extended to women. The first referred to a woman from his state who came when her husband died in the midst of campaigning. He spoke of a "brotherly concern."

In her case her husband was nominated in the primaries and then passed away. She was picked by the caucus to fill the seat, and then she was elected. I remember when she came, I felt I had a big brotherly obligation. All of my state's delegation went out of their way -- Can we help you? Can we give you tips on staff? On issues?

The other, also alluding to a woman from his state whom he knew, spoke of courtesies which were refused in the '50s.

I think the women really resent being helped too much. The woman down here wants to be treated pretty much like a man. I remember when we were drawing for committees. Mrs. ______ and I and three other Republican Congressmen came that same year from our state. We thought of offering her the first choice of committees. We proposed this to her. She said, not at all; she'd draw.

A refreshing young Democrat, elected in the '60s from a Midwest state, spoke for the male perspective very engagingly.

As for myself, I just find you girls very attractive and I just enjoy holding doors. Take Martha -- Martha'd be a match for any man in political debate. She's a brilliant person. I have affection for her. We're very good friends. And I love "ladies first" and all that sort of thing. I don't think that vitiates the argument for equal worth...
Women emerge, at least, as objects of courtesy and, as such, have a right to special considerations as women. In legislative matters, however, their male counterparts claim equal treatment is normative. How one manages to abstract from woman as woman when dealing with woman as legislator is challenging to ponder. Is it possible to make clear-cut distinctions? Is overlapping inevitable? Does the need for rendering gentlemanly courtesies shelter a woman from some legislative infighting, just as some of the respondents claimed it sheltered women from much of the rough-and-tumble of campaigning, rendering her a formidable opponent at that stage of the game? Do the rendering of courtesies integrate women more completely into the system or, as far as the core legislative role is concerned, do they serve to isolate her by establishing social distance between a woman and her male colleagues?

The last two questions asked were designed specifically to be used at the conclusion of the interview. The men were asked, first, if they knew any of the women well. The answers were very disappointing. Very few felt they really knew their female counterparts. Most attributed this to the fact that they had never served on the same committees and therefore had never had an occasion to work together.

The responses to the last question were somewhat different. The respondents were asked if, as we had talked, anything else had occurred to them which might be helpful in understanding women in Congressional roles. All but four of the men responded at some length. The answers ranged from assessing the effectiveness, by name, of present incumbents to explaining why more women aren't actively involved in office-seeking.

On the first point, what follows is an attempt to extrapolate those
qualities which the men praised in their female colleagues as well as those which they criticized. The same names came up again and again as women respected by the House. Respect seemed associated with leadership, an astute sense of what is politically possible, and an expertise in the subject matter which is her responsibility. In addition, these women were praised because they were reasonable and recognized the dependent nature of achieving legislative success. The major criticism was directed to women who set themselves apart, either by pushing too fast and too hard, or by allowing their emotions to run away with their reason. One very comprehensive evaluation of incumbents was made by a veteran Republican from the Midwest. It is not reproduced here because it alludes to individuals by name with some hard-nosed observations. In general, women emerge from this run-down as either "hard-working, effective legislators" or the "sweet, motherly, grandmotherly" type. In between there are those caught in the throes of "politics." For this man, this last was a distasteful position for a woman to be in.

On this last question, a few of the men took the occasion to explain why so few women were there. The response of a Democrat from the East summarized the view of several when he said,

I don't think a woman has ever been at a disadvantage in seeking elective posts. Most women just don't bother. Quite understandably. Running for public office is an all-consuming thing. It destroys family life. Very few women with children can ever run for public office. It's impossible because, even if you were to succeed, you might just as well forget your family. And therefore, most women who do run will have no children, no family responsibilities. You are now narrowing the field considerably to begin with, so that means there are just fewer women interested or available.
Also, it was noted that more women probably were not in Congress because so few, proportionate to their number in the population, aspired to be there. Interestingly enough, the same reason was given explaining why women had so seldom broken through to top leadership positions in the House. The men who spoke of this believed that few aspired to them.

At the outset, the intention was that these responses would be left without comment until the women's responses were analyzed. They appear next, followed by a discussion of similarities and differences.
Charles Horton Cooley's theory of the "looking-glass self" is frequently summarized in text books surveying the field of sociology. Students sometimes will interpret the second step in that theory as "what we think other people think about what we're doing," and the third, "how we feel about the way we think they think." In a way, this is what this chapter is about. Questions relating to expectations the women believed other people in their social circle had of them were scattered throughout the interview. The objective was not only to get straight responses to direct questions, but to discern whether or not these selected role "others" actually helped or hindered the subject in her own role performance.

Each of the respondents was asked what she thought was the most important thing a member's job involved. Their answers to this have been reported in Chapter VIII. As an immediate follow-up, each was asked if she thought a woman in Congress might see her task somewhat differently from the way a man defines his. Six of the sixteen believed she would. Four of these are Married Women Politicians; two are widows who became politicians; three are Republicans, and three Democrats; two are no longer in Congress. The reason for reciting this litany of labels is that they seem to show that distinguishing characteristics have very little to do with how the women responded to this question.

Two Democrats spoke of a woman's natural inclinations arising out of
her place in the society and the need government has for greater attention to these concerns. What made these two answers interesting was that the older woman, a widow of a politician, who has been in Congress for twenty years, is in active opposition to many of the goals contemporary feminism has. She said,

The work I have done on my committee for my special interests I think are the things that are natural to women. From the very day I started, I got working on consumer problems....I thought, who knows better than a woman -- how you buy, what you buy, what it contains, what you should know about an item -- than someone who does most of the buying.

The younger woman, elected in the '60s, a Married Woman Politician, labeled by some as militantly associated with the mainstream of contemporary feminism, shared some very fundamental ideas with her older colleague.

Our nation's priorities are so upside down that it's shocking; but you have to understand that for the most part the gentlemen concern themselves with things such as banking, insurance, transportation....But the humanistic values, the questions that have to do with the preservation and conservation of human life, seem to have a low priority....This is where I feel women must come in. Women are particularly tuned and sensitive to the problems of health, education, and social welfare in a way that no man can ever be because of their close proximity to children, to life in the community, to what is actually happening within the family unit.

Two Republican women, both elected in the '60s, one from the East, the other from the Midwest, affirmed the difference from completely different points of view. Like their Democratic colleagues just quoted, they saw women in a unique position. One said this,

Yes, I think so, I certainly don't serve in Congress as a woman as such...but frankly, I feel it's an ad-
vantage to be a woman in the House. I think that even though we don't ask for special favors, we are given them by our male colleagues. I think they do go out of their way to see that we have an opportunity to be heard -- just through a courteous gentlemanly effort.

One other woman, a Democrat much admired by all the male respondents in this sample, also believed being a woman made a difference.

I think one of the things that happens is that a woman works harder at the job. She feels compelled to. She just spends more hours on it.

Half the women from both sides of the aisle, especially the ones with the most years' service, regardless of party or region, did believe that being a woman made a difference in constituents' expectations. On the Republican side the reasons given were very much the same. One woman who succeeded her husband in the '60s said,

I think women, particularly, expect something of us. The remark has been made over and over, 'I feel because you are a woman, you will understand.' Particularly in cases involving children, men in the service -- they feel a woman has a little more heart, perhaps.

Another Republican from the East, also elected in the '60s, said much the same thing.

I find that constituents, especially those in trouble, seem to have more faith....They will not give up so easily when they approach a Congresswoman....There is a kind of confidence in the sensitivity and approachability of a woman that I find really an asset.

A Democratic Widow Turned Politician from the Midwest, with twenty years in the House behind her, spoke too of different expectations.

I think we're in a show case. I have said to them we have to work twice as hard. We have to be twice as good. Everything we do is exaggerated.
Everything I do well is puffed up -- fine -- but if I do anything bad, it's also puffed up.

One Republican Married Woman Politician from the West spoke of expectations in terms of personal standards of conduct as an application of the double standard. The conduct of women must be impeccable. Men can occasionally make a mistake.

In order to find out what they thought men thought of them, the women were asked if they believed their male colleagues had any particular expectations of them because they were women. Only three of the sixteen did not. The others gave a variety of different explanations as to what these were.

One woman, a Democrat, known as a legislator to be reckoned with, spoke with great sympathy for a man's problem in this regard.

I think it's very difficult for men who have worked in a man's world exclusively, and outside of their home relations in their relations with women in the business world, have always had women in subservient positions. Still, even my colleagues, and I think this is general across the nation, will say, 'I'll get my girl to do that.' So I recognize the fact that it probably is difficult for some of the men who have always had that superior position with women in industry to recognize women members on an equal basis.

Another Democrat elected in the '60s, was not so sympathetic but understood what was happening.

The fascinating thing about it is that it's not overt. It's subtle. You know it's there. Remarks will be made like, 'Well, she's a woman... I don't think it's important to give her that much consideration.' Or 'You know these women... they talk a lot.' It's hard to put your finger on it, but you know it's there.

Some spoke of the tendency of men to overreact where women are con-
cerned. A Married Woman Politician from the Midwest said,

I think there is some tendency for the men to assume that you’re not going to have any intelligence at all, but then, if you show any, they are so overwhelmed that they give you too much credit.

Another Democrat, this one from the West, spoke of some strengths women had because of their rather low-key aspirational goals, which men had to reckon with.

Women have no fear of being themselves, because after all we’re not running for President. There aren’t eight of us prancing around in the Senate wanting to be President. I think the thing we concentrate on is our job.

Only one woman put male expectations on a social plane in a world larger than the House itself. She is a Republican in her third term when she was interviewed, a woman with a family.

I feel being a woman perhaps in a social sense creates a little more difficulty because, at least my type of person, would not be going out drinking after the meetings and so forth. You don’t go out on the golf course with the men where so many of the problems are really ironed out, and you have to do it in a more structured climate more often.

With the next question attention shifted to whether or not a woman seemed to be favored or discriminated against by the House leadership, especially in the matter of committee assignments and appointments to important positions. The general feeling was that women had been treated very fairly by the leadership. To prove her point, one Republican woman, praising both the Democratic and Republican leadership with her remarks, called attention to the fact that women served on practically every committee in the House, some in very influential positions.
If anything, many felt they had actually been helped considerably by the leaders. A woman who carefully cited specific examples was a Republican widow who served a few years in the '50s. She said,

They helped me a great deal -- making sure the parliamentarian referred my bills to friendly committees when there was a choice, tipping me off on what the opposition might do, telling me what strategy to use, even speaking for my bills. I don't know that it was because I'm a woman. My husband had been an exceedingly popular Member of Congress. I was a leading Washington hostess for years and had many, many personal friends on both sides of the aisle.

This answer is particularly remarkable for its recollection of an era long gone by most contemporary standards.

One who felt differently attributed her staying power to the people. This woman, also a Republican, hails from the East and was elected in the '60s. It is in marked contrast to the response just considered.

I feel my opportunity here exists because of the confidence of the people. In the party you have positions given out by the 'establishment,' and they are very leery of women. They're used to congratulating women for all of the clerical work and all the volunteer work, but when it comes to making decisions, they don't quite trust women, and the only women they will trust are the ones who think exactly as they do.

A Democratic widow of twenty years' experience whose responses frequently had a "down-home" flavor felt also that equality did not prevail entirely. At the time she was interviewed, she was next in line for a chairmanship.

I'll say we're not one of the gang. We've never been taken in as confidantes... If we find things where we think they ought to consult us, we try to go as a group. We did this on numerous things, things like asking that the areas around the Capitol be better policed. Nobody was concerned about that.
In a final group of questions, the women were asked whether or not they thought the rules of the game which they had previously laid out in some detail were different for women than for men. The unanimous feeling was that they were not. A Democratic Married Woman Politician from the West, dating back to the '50s, considered by the society at large as an expert in her field, gave her negative response with a wry smile.

No, you've heard the expectation applied to Negroes... 'They're fine as long as they're in their place.' I think the same applies to women. Her place in the minds of those who feel that way is a subservient one. I've used the phrase many times that woman must be the innovator, but she must never be caught with the blueprints in her hands....

A question asked toward the end of the interview concerned whether or not the women felt they had been helped particularly or hindered in the process of role internalization. Most felt they had received no different treatment at all, to speak of. One, however, who had waged a very flamboyant campaign for election, challenging her party organization and the Democratic establishment in her district, is a Married Woman Politician elected in the '50s. She spoke of an interesting reception she had from the other women in the House.

The gentlemen were far more helpful, far more friendly, far more outgoing than the women. It took quite some time before the women began to relate to me....I'm not blaming them at all....Maybe it was because I didn't reach out at all....I do think one of the things that might have made some of the men and women reluctant was the reputation that had preceded me....

Finally, in what proved in most cases to be a very relaxed atmosphere toward the end of the interview, these women were asked if there
might be anything else they would care to share in the interests of pro-
viding further insights into the Congressional role as women experience
it.

One woman, far removed from the House when she answered because she
had succeeded her husband in the '50s and had stayed a relatively short
time, stressed what had frequently come up in some of her other responses.
"Women should not seek to serve as woman."

Another Republican widow who had also served in the '50s for a few
years, used this opportunity to give her explanation for why so few women
are in Congress.

I often hear the criticism that there are far too
few women in Congress....To me it is quite natural
to have few women in Congress because when a person's
at his prime, that's when he should be in Congress,
and that is the very time a 'normal' woman is too
busy rearing her family to have any time to be in
politics. I don't care what examples you cite,
a woman cannot serve in Congress without neglecting
a young and growing family.

A Democrat, quoted frequently in these pages as one of the most re-
spected members of the House, shared the secret of what it takes to make
it regardless of who you are.

One of the difficulties for women is that women
who have come have not stayed that long. Many
women have chosen not to run again. Very few
women have been defeated. The secret is to re-
main long enough to get in positions where you
control things, and the way to power is open to
any woman as it is to any man. All you have to
do is to keep getting elected and to outlive
everybody who precedes you. The first require-
ment for one of these jobs is just sheer physical
stamina....
Conclusions to Chapters IX and X

What seems obvious from the foregoing discussions is that men and women do feel there are differences in expectations applied to women. What remains is to see how similar the two points of view regarding these expectations are.

In the discussion of theory (Chapter IV), the rights and duties inherent in the relations between Members of Congress and the House leadership, peer, and constituent segments of the social circle were drawn from the literature and placed in perspective (Figure 4.3, p. 92).

Figure 10.1 takes the role of the Congresswoman and again identifies the rights and duties inherent in the relations between the woman and the House leadership, peer, and constituent segments of her social circle. But this time the expectations are drawn from the responses of the Members of Congress studied in connection with this research.

A point which needs to be emphasized is that this graphic portrayal represents total input. No attempt was made to rule out responses on the basis of the fact that any one was just made by one person. All were given equal weight, regardless of the numbers of respondents presenting a particular expectation.

With regard to the leadership there is great consistency between the rights granted a member as these were generalized in Figure 4.1 and the rights believed to be a woman's as the members of the sample defined them. The men believe the leadership must exercise tolerance in her regard; they must help her and they must care for her. The "tolerance" expectation may well bespeak an underlying suspicion that a great many women still come and will come inadequately prepared. For their
FIGURE 10.1

DUTIES AND RIGHTS INHERENT IN THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE CONGRESSWOMAN AND THE HOUSE LEADERSHIP, PEER, AND CONSTITUENT SEGMENTS OF HER SOCIAL CIRCLE AS DEFINED BY MEN AND WOMEN IN STUDY SAMPLE

Male Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights</th>
<th>Duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>Spared to be a lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>To be worthy of respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Not to be cast in a men subservient role</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Congresswoman

Female Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights</th>
<th>Duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special favors</td>
<td>Work freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not to be</td>
<td>think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriented to human concerns</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion</td>
<td>To be worthy of trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Decency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights</th>
<th>Duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To stake out a position</td>
<td>Militant on women's rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be careful</td>
<td>To be a political &quot;liberal&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be attentive to approach</td>
<td>To be a lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be oriented to human concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leadership  Peers  Constituents  Leadership  Peers  Constituents
part the women also expect help and care. In addition, some expect to
be advised. To be tolerated was not in the women's litany of rights.
It is interesting to note that the men assign no duties to women in
their relations with the leadership. The women express one, again to-
tally in line with the generalized expectation -- to keep one's place.

Moving to the "peer" segment of the circle is an interesting con-
trast in many respects. There are some similarities between the "pack-
aged" expectations in Figure 4.3 and the responses in Figure 10.1. The
generalized duties of acquiring knowledge and becoming a subject-matter
expert are certainly implied in the male expectations of carefulness
and thoroughness and even in their "concern with women's issues." On
the female side the same can be said of "hard work."

It is most interesting to note, however, that the men transfer the
right to respect in Figure 4.3 to the duty to be worthy of respect in
Figure 10.1. This is an extremely significant shift because it puts
the burden of behaving in a way worthy of respect (and the implication
is this is a "ladylike" way) squarely on the shoulders of women. In the
process it emerges as a very subtle form of social control. A glance at
the women's side of the responses in Figure 10.1 regarding peers betrays
some points of basic confusion. As far as rights are concerned, some
women believe their femininity gives them the right to special favors,
while others believe the role frees them from something which is char-
acteristic of women in many other fields of endeavor where femininity
casts women in a role subservient to men. In addition, while some women
see "not to be cast in a subservient role" as a right, others consider
"thinking as the men do" a duty. Regardless of how one feels about either
of these, the potential for role conflict in the peer segment of the role as far as women respondents are concerned is far too obvious to be ignored.

The "constituent" segment of the circle in Figure 10.1 also contains some expectations consistent with those expressed in Figure 4.3. "Compassion" and "Understanding" are mentioned by both the men and the women in the sample. These can well be incorporated under any one of the expectations concerning duties in Figure 4.1. It is interesting that while a generalized right granted members by constituents is "security" no one in the sample group alludes to it. In the male responses what the women referred to as an obligation to be involved in human concerns was called the duty to be a political "liberal."

The men believed constituents expected women to be militant on women's rights, but women did not. The other duties identified by the sample are also in line with generalized expectations.

The need now, it seems, is to return to the hypotheses presented at the beginning of this research in an attempt to impose some order on the findings presented here.
CHAPTER XI
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This research was designed to be an exploration of the perceptions American Congresswomen of the past two decades have had of the Member of Congress role. In order to structure a perspective from which to derive meaning, a male group was chosen whose responses were regarded as normative. Extensive biographical data were collected and some order was imposed upon these to provide a background of life experiences against which to probe the significance of the personal responses.

Starting with Florian Znaniecki's theory that an adequate analysis of social role requires a consideration of four components: person, social circle, duties, and rights, some tentative hypotheses were formed to serve primarily as insight-yielding probes. It is now time to determine if and to what extent these hypotheses are confirmed.

Within the person component of the analysis, the following hypotheses were suggested:

Hypothesis 1: In terms of routes of access to the Congressional role, the experience of Married Women Politicians will approximate the male norm.

In addition to what Bullock and Heys (1972) have already established in this regard, the first point of comparison which seems relevant has to do with the first public office achieved by those who eventually become Members of Congress. For the men in the study sample 50% held elective
office before coming to Congress. To the extent, then, that holding elective office prior to entry is normative, 50% of the Married Women Politicians approximate the norm by the fact that they also were elective officials at the state or local level prior to entry into the House.

When circumstances of entry are brought into focus, the norm for the men in the sample seems to be that they are their party's candidate to challenge an incumbent (twelve are) or they are independent challengers (three are). Seven women were their party's candidate to challenge an incumbent; three were independent challengers. These ten were Married Women Politicians.

What can be said then is, that on the basis of public offices held prior to entry and the circumstances of entrance, Married Women Politicians do approximate the male norm.

What is implied is that the routes of access for any other objective role-type will be atypical. Therefore, a second hypothesis emerged from the "person" component.

Hypothesis 2: In terms of routes of access to the Congressional role, the Widow Turned Politician and the Place Holder are atypical.

Since only six of the twenty-four women studied were from the South, and four of these six were Place Holders, it seems safe to assume that the Place Holder role is a Southern phenomenon. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact there are only five Place Holders in the entire study sample.

In terms of educational attainment, no Widow or Place Holder is a lawyer, which is a further deviation from the male norm of the law de-
gree as a frequent prerequisite.

One's principal occupation is often looked upon as the springboard from which the bid is made for acceptance into the political arena. Among the forty-four Members of Congress studied, three listed no principal occupation. These three are from the Widow Turned Politician and Place Holder categories. What is of even greater significance is the fact that, when occupational class is presented by stage of career, eight of the forty-four subjects were not employed at the time of their election to the House. All these were women from the Widow Turned Politician and Place Holder categories.

As far as routes of access are concerned, twelve of the twenty-four women studied (50%) succeeded their dead husbands, a fact which in itself makes this group atypical.

No Widow Turned Politician or Place Holder held elective office prior to entry.

Place Holders and Widows Turned Politician tend to stay fewer years than the men and their Married Women Politician colleagues. For one thing, staying a short time is of the very nature of the Place Holder role. Furthermore, widows, as a group, tend to be somewhat older than their colleagues when they enter because of the circumstances associated with their coming. Therefore, in most cases, advancing age makes a long career impossible.

To what extent do political party affiliation, geographic region, and/or decade of entry affect basic background characteristics and routes of access?

Hypothesis 3: Background characteristics and routes of access for
the three objective role-types are mediated by political party affiliation, geographic region, and/or decade of entry.

From the data gathered this will have to be rejected as a generally applicable statement of fact. This is not say they do not intervene at all at selected points. For one thing, twice as many women who were Democrats entered the House during the two decades studied. In addition, only six of the twenty-four women who are still alive are from the South.

When ethnic identity was described, four women deviated from the Anglo-Saxon and Western European norm. All four were Democrats and elected in the 1960s. All four were from the North.

On other counts the disparity in numbers between Democrats and Republicans and the general regional spread in both groups make any further comparative analysis with regard to party, region, and decade of entry insignificant.

The interview data yielded some interesting findings indeed. Role component 2 within the Znaniecki scheme posits the social circle of the role incumbent essential to the analysis of social roles. In the theoretical discussion relative to this component much was made of the fact that a woman in the Member of Congress role comes as a woman and a politician, and the woman aspect is an important consideration in the internalization of a political role. For this reason role perceptions for both men and women were considered important as an attempt to determine if sexual identity played any significant part in a person's arriving at what the role required. It was believed that any differences perceived here could well interfere with a woman's successful integra-
tion into the role. This assumption was grounded, as were others, in the contention that male perceptions were normative. In relation to this point, three additional hypotheses were formed.

**Hypothesis 4**: In terms of basic role perception, what differences there are between men and women will stem from personal choice among institutionalized options and will not be based on sex identity.

What emerged at the conclusion of Chapter VIII is the belief that the Member of Congress role has become institutionalized over time. This means that there are, in fact, certain basic role requirements buttressed by an elaborate structure of formal and informal controls. Within that comprehensive definition, individuals choose to emphasize those aspects of the role which they internalize most in the complex process of personally becoming a Member of Congress. The role is defined through combining these perceptions into a comprehensive whole. Differences of emphasis are personal, not the specific consequence of sexual identity.

From another perspective, the respondents were asked to single out woman in the Congressional role.

**Hypothesis 5**: Men and women will posit different role expectations for women in the House of Representatives.

**Hypothesis 6**: What men and women choose to emphasize in positing differences in role expectations for women in the House of Representatives may well be attributed to the sexual identity of the group responding.

Support for both these positions emerged from a comparison of male and female responses to queries regarding their perceptions of expectations inherent in the role with generalized expectations derived
The most significant discrepancies appeared in comparisons between the respondents and the generalized expectations when relations with the peer segment of the circle were in focus. Paramount among these was the male transfer from respect as a right in the relationship to a duty which women have in the sense that women are expected to engage in that behavior which makes it possible for them to be objects of respect for their male colleagues. In addition, a potential for role conflict was manifest in the female responses where some confusion existed concerning the female right to be free from a subservience to males to a duty which some saw the woman having to conform her thinking to her male colleagues.

The final two components in the adequate analysis of any social role stemming from the Znaniecki articulation of role theory concern the duties and rights of incumbency, comprehensively labeled "expectations." Three segments of the social circle were selected for analysis and the consequences of that analysis have been presented. From the description of the social circle of the Member of Congress in general, and the Congresswoman in particular, two additional hypotheses were formulated.

**Hypothesis 7:** More than any other category of member, the Married Woman Politician elected between 1950 and 1970 comes uniquely equipped with the resources necessary for integrating the expectations of the three segments of the member's circle chosen for analysis: the House leadership, her peers, and her constituents.

It was this writer's contention that, because of the social role
out of which she becomes a Member of Congress, the Married Woman Politician is uniquely qualified to effect the necessary integration and reconciliation among role expectations which are potentially in conflict.

A woman who marries in this society must internalize some of the social implications of this choice. In marrying, a woman assumes her husband's name and his status. She assumes the obligation of justifying whatever she does in relationship to that choice. If she is a mother, her obligation is compounded. Much of the literature on the role of women in contemporary America speaks to this fact. One approach to sex equality (which has quickly become a "classic" in the literature of contemporary feminism) is Alice Rossi's approach to the three models of attempts to effect sexual equality (1969). As preface to her presentation, Rossi speaks of early childhood socialization to sex role identity.

Age and sex are the earliest social categories an individual learns. The differentiation between mother and father, or parent and child, is learned at a tender, formative stage of life; and consequently we carry into adulthood a set of age and sex role expectations that are extremely resistant to change. Not only do girls learn to accept authority from the older generation and from men, but they learn this lesson in intense, intimate relationships. By the time they reach adulthood, women are well socialized to seek and to find gratification in an intimate dependence on men, and in responsible authority over children. They may be dominant and affirmative mothers with their own children, or as teachers in classrooms, but pliant and submissive as wives.

The point is that the woman who marries copes with the traditional expectations of women in their relations with men at the most intimate level of her existence. She may accept these expectations or she may
reject them, but she cannot ignore them. She must cope. So a married woman in our society is in a unique position to develop the resources for sorting out those situations in which subordination is called for from those in which she must respond as an equal or even as a dominant figure. Traditional expectations of men have not allowed the same range of appropriate responses. Therefore, it seems fair to suggest that the Married Woman Politician, who has played out her life through the various levels of appropriate response before assuming the Member of Congress role is in what one might call a privileged position in terms of having the expertise required for reconciling potentially conflicting expectations within the role itself.

One last hypothesis was suggested.

Hypothesis 8: Among Married Women Politicians elected between 1950 and 1970, integration of the expectations of the three segments of the member's social circle selected for analysis will derive from a woman's willingness to utilize some or all of the resources with which she comes uniquely equipped.

This writer had no illusions about the possibility of this being confirmed. Its confirmation depends upon unearthing a very elusive quality of response from a woman in an interview-type setting which, in essence, separates her from the day-by-day living out of the role. To be able to say that it seems to have emerged in one case is its own reward. It suggests that the ability to use one's sexual identity politically exists in the House much as the ability to use one's race, one's ethnic identity, one's religious affiliation, politically, does.

In the interview sessions the respondents were assured anonymity.
If, in the subsequent brief discussion, the identity of the woman involved is too thinly veiled, it is not intentional. Finding her was simply too significant to a major thrust of this research to ignore. She is a Democrat, a veteran of almost twenty years in the House. She holds a prestigious seat on one of the major committees of the House. Every man interviewed brought up her name in conversation as highly respected and probably the most capable woman in the legislative branch of government. Because of her prestige, finding this evidence of using sexual identity to reap legitimate political rewards has to be significant.

How does a woman use her sexual identity politically at the national level? Evidence of it in this woman came early in the interview. She was asked what made her decide to aspire to public elective office. Her answer was simple and to the point.

I had been to a woman lawyers' meeting. A woman who was a suffragette had picketed the White House and had been jailed for it. Well, she called me and asked me to run for state representative. And I said, 'Oh, No!' When I told my husband she had asked me to run for state representative, he said, 'Well, did you tell her you would?' I said I hadn't and he said, 'You go right in there and tell her you will.'

A sensitivity to a woman's concern prompted the call. A husband's insistence called forth a response.

There is sometimes a reluctance on the part of achievement-oriented professional women to acknowledge the part men have played in their ascendency. It's almost as if to acknowledge this is to fall into the trap of positing male supremacy. In order to comment on this in relation to this woman, the liberty is taken to introduce relevant material from
another source at this point in the discussion. About a year ago this prestigious Member of Congress appeared on a popular afternoon talk show. To begin with, the television personality doing the interviewing alluded to a conversation which had taken place off camera where the member had talked about her husband preceding her in law school and his encouraging her to join him. They both decided to attend their own state's university because it would accept women. She then went on to speak of the fact that, as a lawyer, she had no intention of entering politics until her husband pushed her. Her comment to the television audience was, "He pulled me into law school and pushed me into politics."

In the interview she granted in connection with this study, she talked about how she has made her way to the position she now holds. Her amazing movement through the ranks has been detailed elsewhere in these pages. Suffice it to recall here that the first major change came as a result of a request made on her behalf by the women of the House, by all counts, an unusual circumstance. In terms simpler than the subject warranted she then told of approaching the chairman of the committee on which she now serves to ask him what member from her state he would like on his committee. To his "What about you?" she responded, "I couldn't; I'm a woman." Amid protestations that the fact mattered not at all to him, he assured her he would consult the Speaker and the majority leader on the subject. He did, and she was given a place on the committee.

Although most women acknowledge the need for women in Congress to attend to the so-called "women's concerns," few would give the most basic of these as a major field of expertise. The response this woman gave to
the question asking if there was any subject on which the respondent con-
sidered herself an expert was,

I have probably done more for women's rights
than any Congressman who has ever sat here.

The existence of this quality in this woman is only allowed to
surface here. What is needed now in terms of future research on the
role of women in the Congress of the United States? It is this writer's
personal opinion that we need to call a moratorium on further reordering
of biographical data until some of the more pertinent issues have been
attended to. The biographical data bank has been established. Now we
need to look at the woman in Congress as a role player, identifying for
analysis other segments of the social role such as her family, pressure
groups, the press, and the other media of communication. In addition,
comparable studies of women in state legislatures must be undertaken
to determine similarities and differences in role perceptions. And
finally, it will be necessary to move into the realm of cross-cultural
studies to unearth fundamental societal difference. The task is endless.
This research is intended as a small contribution.
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APPENDIX I

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS WHO ARE THE SUBJECTS OF THIS STUDY

The Honorable:

*Earle Cabell
*Frank Clark
William Cotter
Vincent Delany
*Edward Derwinski
Robert Drinan
*Richard Fulton
*Andrew Jacob, Jr.
Richard Henderson
*Harold T. "Bizz" Johnson
*William S Mailliard
*Robert McClory
*Lloyd Meeds
*George P. Miller
*Bertram Podell
*Henry S. Reuss
*Paul Rogers
*B. F. Sisk
*William Springer
*Lawrence Williams

The Honorable:

*Bella Abzug
+Irene Baker
+Iris Blitch
*Shirley Chisholm
+Marguerite Stitt Church
*Florence Dwyer
+Elizabeth Farrington
Kathryn Granahan
Ella Grasso
*Edith Green
*Martha Griffiths
*Julia Butler Hansen
*Margaret Heckler
Louise Day Hicks
Elizabeth Kee
Coya Knutson
*Catherine May
*Patay Mink
Catherine Norell
*Charlotte Reid
+Corinne Riley
Edna Simpson
*Leonor Sullivan
Lera Thomas

* These Members of Congress granted personal interviews
+ These Members of Congress responded to a mailed questionnaire, some by taping their responses, others by writing them
APPENDIX II

FORM USED FOR COLLECTION OF BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Objective role-type:

Name: State: Party:

Date of birth: Age: Sex: Ethnic Origin:

Religion: Father's Occupation:

Relatives in Politics:

Residence: Marital status:

Age at marriage:

Comments on spouse:

Comments on children:

Education:

None:

Pr

Secondary:

Undergraduate:

Coll./Univ. Years attended Degree

Graduate

Coll/Univ. Years attended Degree

Honors:
**Professional Training:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Legal</td>
<td>Attended Law School at Graduation, years of attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admitted to the Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practiced Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occupational Experience:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Political Offices:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Other Business Interests:

Other Political Interests:

Date of first election/appointment to the House

Occupation at T.O.E.

Age:

Last political office at T.O.E.

Comments on circumstances of entrance:

Length of service:

Committee appointments:
APPENDIX III

THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE *+

1. How did you first become interested in politics?

2. Do you think you will continue to seek office in the House?

3. Do you see yourself in any other positions in government?

4. When you consider your job, what do you really think is the most important thing you do here in the House?

5. When you think about a woman coming to Congress, do you think she sees the job differently from the way a man sees it?

6. Do you think constituents have different expectations of a woman in this office than they would have for a man?

7. Do you find that the woman members of the House have different expectations of a woman than they do of a male member?

8. Do the male members of the House have different expectations of a woman than they have of their male colleagues?

9. Is there any tendency on the part of the leadership which you have observed that would indicate they might have different expectations of a woman than they have of men?

10. Has it been your experience that constituents, your colleagues, and the leadership do things particularly to help a woman perform her role that they would not do for a man?

11. Has it been your experience that constituents, your colleagues, and the leadership do things particularly to hinder a woman in the performance of her role that they would not do for a man?

12. In the literature we read a great deal about certain "rules of the game" which someone coming for the first time should learn very quickly. What are some of these?

13. In sizing up the "rules of the game" are they any different for women?

14. We hear it's possible for some Members of Congress to lose the respect of their colleagues. What are some of the things a person could do to lose respect?

15. How does a person know he has lost respect? What can happen to him?
THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

16. In the literature we read that the House is highly decentralized, so the way to resolve conflicts consistently is through some kind of bargaining process. Is this true and how does it work?

17. If bargaining fails, what other alternatives are there?

18. Is there any particular subject that you feel you have picked up a great deal of expertise in?

19. When you came to the House, what committees did you want to be on?

20. How did you go about making your preferences known?

21. Have you changed committees? What changes have you made?

22. How do you think your office best handles constituent requests?

23. About how much time do you personally spend with constituents and constituent matters?

24. Do you send out a newsletter?

25. What kinds of things do you usually write about in your newsletter?

26. Do you ever use questionnaires? For what purpose?

27. When you go back to the district, are you in the habit of making radio and television appearances?

28. If two requests for your time conflict, do you have any criteria for assigning priorities?

29. The longer you're here do you find you spend more time on projects that are non-legislative in character than on your legislative concerns?

30. Is there anything else which occurs to you which might be helpful to me in assessing different perceptions of the role as these apply to men and women?

*Adjustments were made where the sex of the respondent required them

+The general format of some background questions is based on questions used in Wahlke, Eulau, et al., The Legislative System
APPENDIX IV

SAMPLE LETTERS REQUESTING INTERVIEWS AND MAILED RESPONSES*

I. Interview Request

The Honorable

The House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

Dear 

I am a doctoral candidate in sociology at Loyola University in Chicago. For quite some time I have been interested in the political behavior of women in our society, and I am especially concerned about the dearth of research on the careers of American women who have achieved positions of political decision-making, specifically in the Congress of the United States. Therefore, with the consent of the director of my research, Dr. Ross P. Scherer of Loyola and after consulting with Dr. Duncan MacRae Jr. of the University of Chicago, I have decided to do my doctoral research on selected aspects of the role of the Congresswoman, concentrating on the women who have served in the House from 1950 to the present.

Since part of my research design necessitates interviews with incumbent Congresswomen, I am writing to ask you if I may have the opportunity of speaking with you in Washington sometime between _________ and _________ of this year.

If you will grant me an interview, I would appreciate your returning the enclosed card upon receipt of this letter. When I arrive in Washington, I will call your office to confirm the appointment. I am asking your permission to record our visit together. The reason for this is that several of the questions I will be asking you are open-ended; I do not take shorthand, and I am very concerned that my data reflect quite accurately the responses you may make to the questions I will ask. Should you consent to my taping our interview, I assure you your replies will be held in strictest confidence and upon completion of my research the tapes will be destroyed.

In advance I want to thank you for your cooperation and I look forward to meeting you in the near future.

Sincerely yours,
II. Request for Mailed Questionnaire Response (male version)

Dear [Name],

I am a doctoral candidate in Sociology at Loyola University, Chicago. For quite some time I have been interested in the political behavior of women in our society, and I am especially concerned about the dearth of research into the careers of American women who have achieved positions of political decision-making, specifically in the Congress of the United States. Therefore, with the consent of my own advisers, Dr. Ross P. Scherer and Dr. Helena Znaniecki Lopata of Loyola, and after consulting with Professor Duncan MacRae Jr. of the University of Chicago, I am doing my doctoral research on selected aspects of the role of women in Congress, concentrating on the women who have served in the House of Representatives between 1947 and the present.

Since all concerned with this research agree that data gathered from women only without a masculine viewpoint as a control would be less than complete, my sample includes men like yourself, chosen at random from men who share with the women of my sample certain characteristics. Primary among these are the same year of entry into the Congress, same political party and the same region of the country. The enclosed questionnaire is designed to help me gain some insight into how you conceived of your role during the years you served in the House. I am also interested in the observations you made of the performance of the women who served with you during those years.

I realize I am asking a great deal of you. A questionnaire of this sort is no substitute for a personal visit. I know this very well since I have had the opportunity of interviewing twenty-six Members of Congress in the last two years, fifteen of whom have been incumbent male members. I wish I could meet you personally, but at this time the questionnaire is the only way I have of reaching you which is financially feasible for me.

Please consider my questions and answer them in the way that is best for you. I am enclosing a stamped, self-addressed envelope if you decide to return the written form. If it is easier for you to record your responses on tape, I have access to both a cassette recorder and a standard tape recorder. In either case your responses will be held in strictest confidence as anonymity will prevail in the report. Thank you for your cooperation. If you will return your responses to me by July 15, I shall be very grateful.

Sincerely,

Eleanor V. Fails
Eleanor V. Fails, Assistant Prof. of Sociology
Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa.
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