

BRINGING MORE WOMEN INTO PUBLIC OFFICE

WOMEN
APPOINTED
TO THE
CARTER
ADMINISTRATION

A Comparison with Men

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY
RUTGERS

CENTER FOR THE AMERICAN WOMAN AND POLITICS

*Women
Appointed
to the
Carter
Administration:
A Comparison with Men*

*Women
Appointed
to the
Carter
Administration*

A COMPARISON WITH MEN

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

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

CONTENTS

Introduction		vii
Chapter 1	Background and Family Characteristics of Carter Appointees	3
	Family Environment	
	Education	
	Schools Attended	
	Field of Study	
	Age	
	Race	
	Marital Status	
	Spouse's Attitude	
	Children	
Chapter 2	Political Credentials and Prior Experience of Carter Appointees	15
	Party Affiliation	
	Partisan Activity	
	Carter Campaign Activity	
	Previous Public Service	
	Prior Job	
	Role Models and Mentors	
Chapter 3	The Recruitment of Carter Appointees	29
	Reason for Accepting Appointment	
	Effect on Appointees' Salaries	
	Relationship with Carter Prior to Appointment	
	Residence at Time of Appointment	
	Person Most Influential in Bringing About Appointment	
	Organizational Assistance	
	Appointees' Efforts	
	Most Important Factor Leading to Appointment	
	Relative Importance of Factors	
Chapter 4	A Woman's Perspective?	47
	Perceived Sex Differences in Political Opportunities	
	Views on Selected Issues	
	Views on Women's Issues	
	Sex Differences Among Democrats and Liberals	
	Support of Other Women	
	Membership in Women's Organizations	
Chapter 5	The Future: Beyond the Administration	63
	Employment After Leaving the Administration	
	Desire to Serve in Another Administration	
	Desire to Hold Other Positions	
	Aspirations for Future Positions	

Chapter 6	Conclusion	71
	Sex Differences	
	Differences Between Department Appointees and White House Staff Appointees	
	Implications for Women Who Want a Presidential Appointment	
	Future Research	
	Notes	81
	Selected Readings	87

INTRODUCTION

"You can bet I'm going to pay special attention to women--because if I don't, who will?"--Barbara Mikulski in her 1976 campaign for Congress. And in December 1976, barely one month after Jimmy Carter had been elected president, Mikulski was chastising him for using the "old boys network" to fill positions in his cabinet.¹ The 1976 campaign season and post-election period found women organizing to ensure that Carter would reach beyond traditional "networks" when making appointments to his administration. Women with official positions on the transition staff, as well as women organized outside the formal process, worked together to identify women, to advocate for their appointments, and to hold President Carter to his campaign promises.

As a candidate, Carter had vowed to seek out women for appointments in his administration. In June 1976, less than one month before the Democratic National Convention, he established the Committee of 51.3 Percent to advise him on issues, support his campaign, and assist him in seeking out "qualified" women to serve in his administration. When he announced the formation of the committee, Carter promised:

I will appoint qualified women early in my administration and in substantial numbers. They will not be in a few token positions at the top of my administration, but in jobs of importance throughout the government.²

The Committee of 51.3 Percent quickly established a plan to identify women for possible appointment. Talent Bank '77, an effort headed by Joan Tobin and Mitzi Wertheim, gathered the responses of three to four thousand women to a questionnaire that had been developed in cooperation with Carter's formally organized personnel operation--the Talent Inventory Program (TIP)--being conducted out of Carter's campaign headquarters in Atlanta under the leadership of Jack Watson.³ After Carter was elected, TIP moved its files from Atlanta to Washington, D.C., and resumes contained in Talent Bank '77 were delivered to the TIP office. Wertheim and Tobin continued their work within TIP as two of the eighteen core staff members for the operation.⁴ According to a number of published reports at the time, Barbara Blum, top woman on the Carter transition team, sought out women and minorities to fulfill President Carter's mandate to build a "base" of women and minority assistant secretaries and deputy secretaries from which cabinet members could be selected in future administrations.

Meanwhile, more than fifty women's organizations joined together to press for women's appointments. The women's groups organized the Coalition for Women's Appointments, which collected resumes and lobbied for

the appointment of women. Unlike Talent Bank '77, which dissolved after the election when its resumes were submitted to the official transition operation (TIP), the Coalition for Women's Appointments, under the leadership of the National Women's Political Caucus, continued to function throughout the Carter administration. The Coalition, by screening and compiling the names of hundreds of women qualified for appointments, responded directly to the claim by Carter and some of his top aides that they were having difficulty finding qualified women to serve in the new administration.

The Coalition's strategy was to meet not only with White House personnel, but also with cabinet secretaries. During the campaign, Carter had repeatedly pledged his commitment to a strong and independent cabinet, and in December 1976 he delegated the power of appointment for subcabinet posts to his cabinet officers. Thus, having Coalition members meet with cabinet officers as well as with White House staff was strategically important, since many appointments were made by department secretaries and subsequently approved through the White House.

Political observers, scholars and feminist activists agree that the lobbying effort by the Coalition combined with a presidential commitment to appoint substantial numbers of women created a climate of expectations about women's appointments far more optimistic than in the past. For the first time in history, women had organized a major effort to gain appointments. G. Calvin Mackenzie, in his analysis of the presidential appointments process, credits this lobbying effort with achieving an increased number of female appointees:

The growth that occurred in the number of female appointments was the result not of any substantial alteration in the operation of the appointment process, but rather of a change in the relative political strength of the actors who compose its environment.⁵

Responsiveness from the White House to women's efforts also has been cited as being important. Patricia Price Bailey, a Republican Carter-appointed member of the Federal Trade Commission, sees this connection:

The fact that it [the Coalition] existed made it an important development in women's political history. The fact that it was successful in its mission can be attributed, in part, to a receptive White House which allowed the Coalition to have direct access to the people directly responsible for making appointments.⁶

THE NUMBERS OF WOMEN APPOINTED

By January 1977 President Carter had nominated two women to serve in his cabinet. These two women, Juanita Kreps and Patricia Roberts Harris, became the fourth and fifth women ever to serve as U.S. cabinet secretaries. Later in his administration, Carter appointed a third woman to

his cabinet--Shirley Hufstедler, secretary of the newly established department of education.

Estimates of the total number of women appointed during the Carter years vary. At the end of 1977, one year into his administration, Jimmy Carter had appointed women to about 14% of his top policy positions.⁷ By the end of 1979, 22% of the 2,110 appointments made by Jimmy Carter had gone to women. These included 3 of the 5 women who had ever served as under secretaries and 63% of all women ever to serve as assistant secretaries.⁸ His record of appointing women to the federal bench also broke new ground. Of the 670 judges on the federal bench as of January 1982, 46 were women--42 of them had been appointed by President Carter.⁹

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The record numbers of women appointed to significant positions by President Carter provided an impetus for a study conducted by the Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP). For the first time in history, women had been appointed in large enough numbers to survey and to compare with other appointees. Throughout President Carter's years in office, political activists, scholars and journalists frequently asked questions about these women--especially, who they were and where they came from.

Women serving as appointees also were interested in learning more about themselves as a group. In 1977 the Center for the American Woman and Politics had made a first stab at gathering some information in its second national survey of women in public office.¹⁰ As part of its research, CAWP sent a questionnaire to women who had been appointed by President Carter. That questionnaire, designed primarily for elected officials, elicited a letter from the then Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs at HEW, Eileen Shanahan, urging CAWP to study women in appointed office as a separate group. She wrote, "Information about women who hold appointive office is a neglected area in the entire women's movement." Three years later, in proposing the study whose findings are described in this report, CAWP discovered that not only was there a paucity of information about women in appointive office, but also that very little was known and written about the appointive process itself.¹¹ Because there had been very little study of the appointive process, the paths to positions of influence and power in a presidential administration remained almost a mystery.

In spring of 1981 under a grant from the Charles H. Revson Foundation, CAWP conducted a study of women and men who had been appointed by President Jimmy Carter. Appointees were surveyed to learn about their personal and political backgrounds and the routes which they took into appointive office. The study was designed to gain a better understanding

of the appointments process itself and of similarities and differences between female and male appointees.

IDENTIFYING THE APPOINTEES

Women and men who served in cabinet and subcabinet positions at some time during President Carter's tenure in office (1977-1980) were the subject of CAWP's survey. In addition, women serving on the president's or vice-president's staffs were surveyed.¹² The cabinet and subcabinet positions in our study included cabinet secretary, deputy secretary, under secretary, deputy under secretary, assistant secretary, deputy assistant secretary, administrator, deputy administrator, agency director, and regulatory commissioner. The White House staff members surveyed included assistants, special assistants, and deputy assistants to the president and vice-president.

Women serving in these positions were identified through three sources: Women Today, a biweekly publication that monitored and published lists of female presidential appointees; a November 1979 list of 400 "top" women in the federal government compiled by Sarah Weddington, assistant to the president; and an August 1980 list of 600 "top" women compiled by Weddington. (While these lists were the most accurate available, it may be possible that some women who held such positions during Carter's four years in office were missing from our final lists.)

Men serving in comparable positions were identified through two sources: a list obtained from the White House in December 1980 of all men appointed by President Carter to the positions included in our study with the exception of deputy assistant secretary; and The United States Government Manual 1980-81. The United States Government Manual was used to compile our list of deputy assistant secretaries and to ensure that we had identified the universe of men who had served in the positions included in this study.

THE SAMPLES

Three samples were included in our study and are analyzed in this report. The first is not technically a sample, but rather consists of the entire population of women serving in cabinet and subcabinet positions. The second is a sample of men serving in positions with the same titles as those held by the women surveyed. Women serving in cabinet and subcabinet positions also are compared with the third sample (again not technically a sample) which consists of the entire population of women serving in positions on the White House staff.

Women Serving in Cabinet and Subcabinet Positions

A total of 112 women were identified as serving in the ten cabinet and subcabinet posts included in our study.¹³ Of these, 22 women were

career civil servants, not political appointees, and 1 woman could not be located despite repeated letters and phone calls. Thus the total number of women appropriate for our study was 89.

Men Serving in Cabinet and Subcabinet Positions

The women serving in these positions were not randomly distributed among the ten categories of offices. Therefore, in order to draw a sample of male appointees comparable to the universe of female appointees, we stratified the total population of male officials into the ten categories. Using systematic sampling, we selected the same number of men as there were women serving in each category.

One hundred and eleven men were selected as our sample. Of these, 19 were career civil servants, not political appointees; 1 was deceased; and 1 was too ill to participate. Thus the total sample of men in our study was 90.

Women on the White House Staff

Twenty women were identified as holding positions in the White House within the categories we selected. Of these, 1 was not a political appointee. Thus, for the positions included in our study the total universe of women serving in the White House was 19.

THE SURVEY

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

Our letter to participants described the study as the "first comprehensive study of men and women holding high-level appointments at the federal level."¹⁴ The letter outlined two goals for our research: first, to identify routes of entry into appointive federal office; second, to develop a profile highlighting similarities and differences between women and men in the routes they took to office. The letters were sent on stationery from CAWP's parent organization, the Eagleton Institute of Politics, in order to minimize any potential biases which might have resulted from using stationery indicating a women's organization was conducting the study. Each respondent was asked to select a day and time for her/his interview and to return the schedule in a postage-paid envelope.

The telephone survey was conducted during the two-week period between April 27, 1981 and May 7, 1981 by the Eagleton Poll, a unit of the Eagleton Institute of Politics.¹⁴ The interviews averaged twenty-five minutes in length.¹⁵

RESPONSE RATE

Response rates were similar for all three of the groups we studied. Of the universe of 89 women who had served in cabinet or subcabinet positions, 70 completed our survey for a response rate of 79%. Similarly, 66 of the 90 men in the sample participated, yielding a response rate of 74%. Of the universe of 19 women who had served as presidential or vice-presidential staff, 15 completed our survey, yielding a response rate of 79%.

THE APPOINTMENTS OF PARTICIPANTS

When and by whom were our participants appointed to their positions? Forty-five and six-tenths percent of the women compared with 42.4% of the men had held more than one position during Carter's four years in office. Since almost half of the women and men responding to our survey had held more than one position in the Carter administration, we asked participants to respond based on the position they had held last in the administration.

Women responding to our survey were slightly more likely than men to report having been appointed in 1980. Slightly over one-third of the women (34.3%), compared with about one-fifth of the men (21.5%), reported that they had been appointed to their last (or only) position in 1980. Among those reporting appointment in 1980, 69.6% of the women and 64.3% of the men had held a previous position within the Carter administration.

Approximately equal proportions reported receiving their appointments from the president and from cabinet officers. Forty-four and eight-tenths percent of the women, compared with 46.8% of the men, named the president as the person who had appointed them. Similarly, 43.3% of the women and 41.9% of the men indicated a cabinet secretary had appointed them. The remaining participants reported being appointed by an under secretary, assistant secretary or assistant to the president.

STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

This report is composed of six chapters. Chapter 1 examines the personal background and family characteristics of Carter appointees--their ages, races, marital status, and parents' occupations and involvement in politics.

Chapter 2 continues the exploration of appointees' backgrounds by focusing on political credentials and experiences, including partisan activity, involvement in the Carter campaign, previous employment, and the influence of role models and mentors.

Chapter 3 analyzes factors we anticipated would influence appointments. These include appointees' stated reasons for accepting appointments, salaries, personal relationships with Jimmy Carter, and geographic location at the time of appointment.

Chapter 4 examines the differences and similarities between women's and men's positions on current issues, and examines perceptions of sex differences in political opportunities and job performance.

Chapter 5 presents data on the employment status of appointees one year after President Carter left office. It also examines appointees' political ambitions: whether they would consider serving in another presidential administration, and whether they aspire to elective or appointive public offices in the future.

Chapter 6 concludes our study. It summarizes the most significant findings from our research. It discusses the implications of our research for women who desire presidential appointments and those who wish to help women obtain appointments. Last, it suggests some avenues for future research.

Notes for all chapters appear at the end of the report, and are followed by a list of selected readings.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We appreciate the contributions made by a number of people during various stages of this project. In the early stages, Bert Carp, then serving as special assistant for domestic affairs and policy in the White House, helped us to develop some broad categories of questioning. Cliff Zukin and Janice Ballou of the Eagleton Poll helped us translate our ideas into questions appropriate for a survey. Student assistants Sherry Dempsey and Sue Mast helped in locating addresses and phone numbers for appointees we surveyed. Figures in this report were checked by Mary Lynne Shickich.

Many people took time from their busy schedules to review our draft questionnaires. Our final questionnaire incorporated many of the changes suggested by Philip Burch, Arvonne Fraser, Marilyn Johnson, Rita Mae Kelly, Alan Rosenthal, Ida Schmertz, Betty Wilson and Betsey Wright.

All projects at CAWP involve a team effort and this project was no exception. Ruth B. Mandel, CAWP's director, provides general guidance, creative suggestions and leadership on all CAWP projects. Debbie Walsh conducted some of the late-hour interviews. Katherine E. Kleeman worked on editing the report. Martha Casisa, Claire Schoenfeld, and Lynn Bouanaka typed, xeroxed, retyped and rexeroxed many drafts of letters, the questionnaires, and this final report.

Finally, we are most grateful to the women and men from the Carter administration who participated in our study. CAWP was able to conduct this pathbreaking study only because they were willing to take time from their very busy lives to answer our questions.

Kathy Stanwick
Project Director

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

We begin this study by describing the personal and family background characteristics of male and female appointees, and the ways in which these backgrounds are similar or different.

FAMILY ENVIRONMENT DURING CHILDHOOD

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

Father's Occupation

A majority of women appointees had fathers with professional or managerial/administrative occupations (Table 1.1). Moreover, the fathers of female appointees more frequently were professionals or managers and administrators than were the fathers of male appointees.

Women on the White House staff were similar to other female appointees in having fathers who tended to be professionals or managers/administrators.¹ However, the fathers of these White House staff women were slightly more likely to be managers or administrators, and a little less likely to be professionals, than the fathers of other Carter appointees.

A smaller proportion of female appointees than male appointees had fathers who were salesmen or craftsmen. Similarly, a much smaller proportion of the women's fathers fell into categories other than those specifically listed in Table 1.1. The larger proportion of men's fathers included in the "other" category in this table is due largely to the number of men whose fathers were blue collar or service workers. While none of the women's fathers had blue collar or service jobs, 9.1% of the men's fathers were laborers/operatives and 4.5% of the men's fathers were service or private household workers. If father's occupation is used as an indicator of social class, more women than men appear to have come from families of middle to high social status.

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

Father's Occupation	Carter Appointees		White House Staff Women ^a
	Women %	Men %	
Professional ^b	36.8	28.8	26.7
Physician	7.4	4.5	6.7
Teacher/professor	7.4	3.0	6.7
Lawyer/judge	11.8	6.1	0.0
Manager/administrator ^c	32.4	19.7	33.3
Sales worker	8.9	13.6	6.7
Craftsperson	7.4	13.6	6.7
Farmer	4.4	4.5	0.0
Government employee/ civil servant	5.9	0.0	6.7
Elected public official	0.0	1.5	0.0
Self-employed	2.9	1.5	6.7
Other	1.5	15.2	13.4
Father not living; not raised by father	0.0	1.5	0.0
	100.0 ^d	100.0	100.0
Total ^e	(68)	(66)	(15)

^aThroughout this report, whenever we refer to "White House staff" women, we are referring to those 15 women who served on the staffs of President Carter or Vice-President Mondale.

^bIncluded in the "professional" category in addition to the three positions listed were health care workers, social workers, writers and journalists, consultants, etc.

^cIncluded in the "manager/administrator" category were members of the Federal Senior Executive Service, public administrators, business executives, military officers, etc. Respondents who indicated that they owned or managed a business also were placed in this category.

^dIn this and all subsequent tables, percentages may not add precisely to 100 due to rounding.

^eIn this and all subsequent tables, the number in parentheses refers to the number of respondents on which the table is based.

Mother's Occupation

Unlike father's occupation, mother's occupation rarely is used as a measure of social class. Nevertheless, mother's occupation is of interest for other reasons. An appointment to a presidential administration reflects an unusual level of professional accomplishment. One might expect that women who achieve such positions would come disproportionately from

TABLE 1.2: THE MAJORITY OF BOTH WOMEN AND MEN HAD MOTHERS WHO WERE FULL-TIME HOMEMAKERS

Mother's Occupation	Carter Appointees		White House Staff Women
	Women %	Men %	
Professional ^a	17.6	13.6	20.0
Teacher	11.8	6.1	6.7
Manager/administrator ^b	7.4	3.0	13.3
Sales worker	0.0	4.5	0.0
Clerical/secretarial	5.9	4.5	0.0
Self-employed	1.5	0.0	0.0
Homemaker	61.8	69.7	66.7
Other	4.4	3.0	0.0
Mother not living; not raised by mother	1.5	1.5	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(68)	(66)	(15)

^aIncluded in the "professional" category in addition to teachers were physicians, lawyers, health care workers, social workers, writers and journalists, consultants, etc.

^bIncluded in the "manager/administrator" category were members of the Federal Senior Executive Service, public administrators, business executives, military officers, etc. Respondents who indicated that they owned or managed a business also were placed in this category.

families where the mother set an example for her daughter by being successful in an occupation outside the home.

However, as Table 1.2 suggests, this is not the case. The mothers of most Carter appointees, whether male or female, were homemakers at the time their children were growing up. While female appointees were somewhat more likely than male appointees to have employed mothers, the differences are small. Moreover, only about one of every four women appointees had a mother who held a professional or a managerial/administrative position.

White House staff women were much like other appointees in having mothers who were predominantly homemakers (Table 1.2). However, one of every three White House staff women had a mother who was a professional or manager/administrator.

Parents' Officeholding Experience

One might expect many federal appointees to have come from politically active families. Table 1.3 presents one measure of political activism-- the proportion of respondents whose fathers or mothers had held either

6 / Women Appointed to the Carter Administration

TABLE 1.3: SIMILAR PROPORTIONS OF THE PARENTS OF WOMEN AND MEN HAD HELD APPOINTIVE OR ELECTIVE GOVERNMENTAL OFFICE

	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Father held public office	14.7	15.4	26.7
Mother held public office	6.0	4.6	6.7
Total	(68)	(66)	(15)

TABLE 1.4: WOMEN WERE SLIGHTLY LESS LIKELY THAN MEN TO HAVE LAW DEGREES AND DOCTORATES

Highest Educational Degree Completed	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
High school diploma	2.9	1.5	13.3
B.A. or equivalent	22.1	15.2	40.0
M.A. or equivalent	25.0	21.2	13.3
J.D. or law degree	27.9	34.8	33.3
Ph.D. or other doctorate	22.1	27.3	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(68)	(66)	(15)

elective or appointive governmental offices.

While there were no significant sex differences between male and female appointees (Table 1.3), Carter appointees were drawn disproportionately from families where one or both parents had been officeholders. In the U.S. population as a whole, far less than 1% of citizens have served in political office. Yet, among Carter appointees, 17.9% of the women and 17.2% of the men indicated that at least one parent had held an elective or appointive office.

White House staff women were even more likely than other Carter appointees to have parents who once held public office. This was particularly true for the fathers of these women who were almost twice as likely as the fathers of other female Carter appointees to have served in appointive or elective offices. One of every three White House staff women had at least one parent who was an officeholder.

LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Just as Carter appointees were drawn disproportionately from high social status and politically active families, they also were drawn predominantly from the ranks of the well educated. Almost all had college degrees and a large majority had completed postgraduate degrees (Table 1.4).

Men were more likely than women to have earned law degrees or Ph.D.s. While almost one-half of the female appointees had completed law school or a doctorate, almost two-thirds of their male counterparts had done so. Women were slightly more likely than the men to have stopped their education upon completion of a B.A. or M.A. Thus, while female appointees were

very well educated, male appointees were even more so.

Women on the White House staff were less highly educated than other Carter appointees (Table 1.4). While a third had earned law degrees, none of the 15 White House staff women had a Ph.D. Moreover, more than one-half had not completed a degree beyond a B.A. The difference in educational levels between White House staff women and other Carter appointees probably reflects a difference in the process of recruitment for the two types of positions. Expertise in a substantive policy area, which may have been achieved in part by obtaining an M.A. or Ph.D., undoubtedly was a more important consideration in the selection of appointees for agency positions than in the selection of White House staff women. In contrast, as will be discussed later in this report, White House staff women had stronger records of involvement than other appointees in party activities and in the Carter campaign.

TYPES OF SCHOOL ATTENDED

Not only were Carter appointees highly educated, but also many of them received degrees from among the most prestigious colleges and universities in the country. While a majority of women and men with college degrees completed their undergraduate work at private institutions, women were substantially more likely to have earned B.A.s from private schools (Table 1.5).

Almost twice as many men as women held undergraduate degrees from Ivy League universities. This is not surprising given that women were not admitted to these schools until recent years. The female equivalent of the Ivy League schools traditionally has been those women's colleges

TABLE 1.5: MORE WOMEN THAN MEN RECEIVED UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES FROM PRIVATE COLLEGES

Type of College or University Granting Undergraduate Degree	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women	Men	Women
	%	%	%
Private	71.2	54.7	76.9
Ivy League	7.6	14.1	7.7
Seven Sisters	12.1	0.0	15.4
Other women's college	10.6	0.0	0.0
Public	28.8	45.3	23.1
U.S. Military Academy	0.0	3.1	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(66)	(64)	(13)

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

Type of College or University Granting Graduate Degree	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women	Men	Women
	%	%	%
Private	76.5	72.7	57.1
Ivy League	25.5	30.9	42.9
Seven Sisters	2.0	0.0	0.0
Other women's college	0.0	0.0	0.0
Public	21.6	23.6	42.9
Foreign	2.0	3.6	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(51)	(55)	(7)

constituting the Seven Sisters, and a significant number of female appointees did attend these schools. In fact, if attending either an Ivy League school or a Seven Sisters school is considered as an indicator of an East Coast "elite" education, then somewhat more women than men had the benefit of such an education.

The important role of women's colleges as incubators of future female leaders also is apparent from the data in Table 1.5. Almost one-fourth (22.7%) of female Carter appointees were educated at single sex schools.

The types of graduate and law schools attended by women and men were remarkably similar (Table 1.6). Almost three-fourths of both women and men completed their advanced degrees at private institutions, and men were only slightly more likely to have attended Ivy League schools.

Like their female counterparts among other appointees, White House staff women were far more likely to have attended private than public institutions (Tables 1.5 and 1.6).

FIELD OF ADVANCED STUDY

Among those Carter appointees with advanced degrees, the reported fields of study for females and males were very similar (Table 1.7). Law was by far the most common area of study for both sexes. While law was as frequent a choice for women as for men among those who received advanced

TABLE 1.7: WOMEN AND MEN WITH ADVANCED DEGREES HAD SIMILAR FIELDS OF STUDY

Field of Study	Carter Appointees		White House Staff Women
	Women %	Men %	
Law	38.0	41.8	57.1
Political science/ public administration/ international relations/ public policy	16.0	14.5	0.0
Economics	16.0	9.1	0.0
Business/finance/ accounting	8.0	9.1	0.0
Mathematics/sciences/ engineering	6.0	14.5	14.3
History	8.0	3.6	0.0
Social work/counseling	4.0	0.0	0.0
Humanities	0.0	3.6	0.0
Education	4.0	0.0	28.6
Other	0.0	3.6	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(50)	(55)	(7)

TABLE 1.8: ON THE AVERAGE, WOMEN WERE YOUNGER THAN MEN

Age	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women	Men	Women
Under 30	0.0	1.5	0.0
30-39	41.8	30.3	53.3
40-49	32.8	39.4	26.7
50-59	22.4	19.7	13.3
60 or older	3.0	9.1	6.7
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(67)	(66)	(15)
Mean age	42.8	46.3	42.7

TABLE 1.9: THE MAJORITY OF WOMEN AND MEN WERE CAUCASIAN

Race	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women	Men	Women
Caucasian	86.6	86.4	92.9
Black	11.9	12.1 ^a	7.1
Hispanic	0.0	1.5	0.0
Asian	1.5	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(67)	(66)	(14)

^aIncluded in this category is one man who was both black and Native American.

degrees, women among all Carter appointees were slightly less likely to hold law degrees than their male counterparts. This was due to the fact that more men than women undertook postgraduate study.

No significant sex stereotyping in the field of study is apparent in Table 1.7. While men outnumbered women in the fields of mathematics and science, more women than men had completed graduate work in economics. While a few women but no men majored in social work and education, the reverse pattern was true for another course of study where women traditionally have been concentrated. Two of the men but none of the women had completed graduate work in the humanities.

AGE

Research on women holding elective positions in government generally has found them to be older on the average than their male counterparts.² In light of this finding, the data in Table 1.8 are significant because they show that female Carter appointees actually tended to be somewhat younger than men in comparable positions. Only one Carter appointee (a male) was under thirty years of age at the time of our survey. However, two-fifths of all women surveyed--as compared to less than one-third of the men--were in their thirties. Moreover, while only two of the women (3.0%) were sixty or older, almost one-tenth of the men were. The mean age of all male respondents was 46.3 years. For female appointees, the mean age was 42.8 years.

Like female Carter appointees, White House staff women disproportionately were concentrated in the younger age brackets. More than half of White House staff women were between the ages of thirty and thirty-nine.

Moreover, women among Carter appointees were much less likely to be married than their male counterparts. Almost all of the men were married. Women were five times more likely than men to be single and twice as likely to be divorced or separated. White House staff women were even more likely to be single or separated/divorced than other female appointees.

SPOUSE'S ATTITUDE

Those respondents who were married at the time of the survey were asked to characterize their spouses' attitudes toward their work in politics and government (Table 1.11). Large majorities of both women and men claimed that their spouses were "very supportive," and no one characterized his or her spouse's attitude as "somewhat resistant." Nevertheless, there was some notable variation between female and male appointees. Men were twice as likely as women to claim that their spouses were only "somewhat" rather than "very" supportive. In addition, while none of the women had spouses whom they perceived as "indifferent," a small minority of the men did.

CHILDREN

Since women among Carter appointees were more likely than men never to have married, it follows that women were less likely than men to have children. However, even if those appointees who had never married are excluded, women far less frequently than men had offspring (Table 1.12). Moreover, when they had children, they had fewer of them.

Only slightly more than one-fourth of the women who were or had been married had a child under twelve years of age (Table 1.13). Despite the

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

Number of Children	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
None	30.2	6.3	20.0
1	24.5	12.7	20.0
2	24.5	38.1	50.0
3 or more	20.8	42.9	10.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(53)	(63)	(10)

TABLE 1.13: AMONG APPOINTEES WHO HAD BEEN MARRIED, FEWER WOMEN THAN MEN HAD YOUNG CHILDREN

Age of Youngest Child	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Under 6 years old	9.4	9.5	20.0
6-11 years old	18.9	23.8	10.0
12-17 years old	18.9	28.6	10.0
18 years old or older	22.6	31.7	40.0
No children	30.2	6.3	20.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(53)	(63)	(10)

The mean age of White House staff women was 42.7.

It should be emphasized that the data in Table 1.8 reflect age in early 1981 at the time of our interviews with appointees. Most of these individuals actually received appointments to the Carter administration two to four years earlier. Thus, at the time of their appointments, respondents were actually slightly younger than our data show.

RACE

Not surprisingly, the vast majority of appointees were Caucasians (Table 1.9). Only a handful of appointees came from minority groups, although blacks were represented in the Carter administration in approximately the same proportion as in the American population as a whole. According to 1980 U.S. Census figures, blacks constitute 11.7% of the American population, and the proportions of blacks in Table 1.9 are very close to this figure.

There were no significant differences in the proportions of female and male appointees drawn from various racial groupings. However, black representation among White House women was proportionately less than among other female appointees; only one of the fourteen White House staff women who supplied information about their race was black.

MARITAL STATUS

Research on women serving in elective political offices has found the vast majority to be married, and among those who were not married, many were widowed.³ In contrast, only a slight majority of female Carter appointees were married and only two were widowed (Table 1.10).

TABLE 1.10: FEWER WOMEN THAN MEN WERE MARRIED

Marital Status	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women	Men	Women
	%	%	%
Married	55.9	86.4	26.7
Single, never married	22.1	4.5	33.3
Divorced/separated	19.1	9.0	33.4
Widowed	2.9	0.0	6.7
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(68)	(66)	(15)

TABLE 1.11: WOMEN MORE OFTEN THAN MEN HAD SPOUSES SUPPORTIVE OF THEIR WORK IN POLITICS AND GOVERNMENT^a

Spouse's Attitude Toward Appointee's Work	Carter Appointees	
	Women	Men
	%	%
Very supportive	89.5	71.9
Somewhat supportive	10.5	21.1
Indifferent	0.0	7.0
Somewhat resistant	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0
Total	(38)	(57)

^aFigures are not presented for White House staff women, since only four had spouses. However, all reported that their spouses were very supportive.

older average age of the men, slightly larger proportions of the male appointees who ever had been married had children under twelve. However, a large majority of men, like women, had no young children.

Like other female Carter appointees, White House staff women who had been married were likely to have no children or only one or two (Table 1.13).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Perhaps the most important finding regarding the backgrounds of Carter appointees is the overall similarity between females and males. Women and men most frequently had fathers who were professionals or managers/administrators and mothers who were homemakers. Slightly more than one of six appointees of both sexes had a least one parent who had held an elective or appointive office in government. Both women and men were extremely well educated, and those who had done postgraduate work went to very similar schools. Law was by far the most common field of study for both sexes. Both male and female appointees were predominantly Caucasian and concentrated between the ages of thirty and fifty. A majority of both sexes were married, and those who were married tended to have spouses who were supportive of their work in politics and government. Overall, then, the number and the extent of similarities between male and female appointees are striking.

Yet, the few differences between the sexes that do emerge are quite interesting. Perhaps the most predictable sex difference was the finding that men were somewhat more likely than women to have law degrees. Undoubtedly, this reflects the fact that very few women in those generations having completed their education prior to the mid-1970s attended law schools. Given the sex-segregated nature of legal education up until recent years, perhaps what is most surprising is that so many (27.9%) of the women held law degrees.

In at least two respects, women among Carter appointees exhibited characteristics traditionally associated with governing elites to a greater extent than did the men. More women came from families with a relatively high social status, as measured by father's occupation. Also, a larger proportion of female appointees had undergraduate degrees from private, rather than public, institutions.

Female Carter appointees were clearly a distinctive breed of political women. Relative to women holding various elective offices in the late 1970s, Carter appointees were younger, better educated, and more likely to be trained in fields such as law and economics that traditionally have been male dominated.⁴ Because these women were at the forefront of women moving into nontraditional roles during the 1970s, it is not surprising that their family situations differed in important ways

from those of their male counterparts. Women were less likely to be married and more likely to be single, separated, or divorced. They also were less likely to have children. When female appointees were married, their husbands were almost uniformly perceived by the women as "very" supportive of their political and governmental activities. Male appointees were less uniform in their assessments of their wives' support.

The data on family situations suggest that more female than male Carter appointees have delayed marriage and child rearing or have chosen not to marry and raise children. Those who have married and remained married perhaps have been able to do so, in part, because they perceive their husbands to be fully supportive of their governmental work and political activity. While most male appointees also viewed their spouses as very supportive, the greater variation among the men suggests that lack of spousal support was perhaps not as likely to prevent or to disrupt their marriages or their public careers.

Soon after his election, Jimmy Carter found himself in conflict with Democratic women and women's groups over the issue of appointments. Carter and his top aides insisted that they had difficulty finding "qualified" women willing to serve in the new administration. This claim was made despite the fact that the Coalition for Women's Appointments, an ad hoc coalition representing more than fifty women's organizations formed under the leadership of the National Women's Political Caucus, had screened and compiled the names of hundreds of women whom they considered "qualified." Protests by Carter and his aides about the difficulty of finding qualified women for top positions prompted Juanita Kreps, upon Carter's announcement that he had chosen her as Secretary of Commerce, to quip, "I think it would be hard to defend the proposition that there are not a great many qualified women."¹

This second chapter of our report continues our exploration of appointees' backgrounds by focusing largely on the political credentials and experience that appointees brought with them to their positions in the Carter administration. Experience in a variety of spheres--partisan activity, involvement in the Carter campaign, government service, and previous employment--are examined. We also assess the influence of role models and mentors in helping appointees develop the credentials necessary to receive major appointments. Implicit throughout is the underlying question of whether Carter was, in fact, able to find "qualified" women for his administration. In the conclusion to this chapter, we return to this question and address it directly.

POLITICAL PARTY AFFILIATION

One of the factors that might help qualify an individual for appointment to a presidential administration is party affiliation. One would anticipate that a president and those who recruit for a new administration would show a strong preference for individuals who share the chief executive's partisan identification. It is not surprising, then, that a large majority of both female and male Carter appointees identified themselves as members of the Democratic party (Table 2.1). Nevertheless, women appointees were slightly more likely to be Democrats than were the men.²

White House staff women were even more likely than other female appointees to share the president's party affiliation. All of these women were Democrats. The fact that none of the White House staff women were Republicans or Independents is not surprising since a major job responsibility for anyone working on the White House staff is to advocate the

TABLE 2.1: MORE WOMEN THAN MEN WERE DEMOCRATS

Party Affiliation	Carter Appointees		White House Staff Women
	Women	Men	
Democrat	83.6	72.6	100.0
Republican	6.0	11.3	0.0
Independent	10.4	16.1	0.0
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(67)	(62)	(15)

TABLE 2.2: AMONG DEMOCRATIC APPOINTEES, A MAJORITY OF WOMEN AND MEN HAD BEEN ACTIVE IN THEIR PARTY

Party Activity	Carter Appointees		White House Staff Women
	Women	Men	
Active in party	50.0	53.3	100.0
Not active in party but used to be	16.1	8.9	0.0
Never active in party	33.9	37.8	0.0
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(56)	(45)	(15)

president's program in a very partisan manner.

PARTISAN ACTIVITY

One might expect Carter appointees not only to be Democrats, but also to be active and to show leadership within the party. In fact, it is commonly assumed that presidential appointments are used to reward those who have given years of loyal service to the party.

As Table 2.2 shows, about half of female and male appointees were currently active in the party. If one also includes women and men who reported party involvement in the past, almost two-thirds of the Democrats had been active at some time. Not surprisingly, in contrast to Democratic appointees, Republican appointees were not strong partisan activists. Only one of the four female Republicans and two of the seven males reported involvement in their party.

All of the White House staff women claimed that they were currently active in the Democratic party, as compared with half of the other female Democratic appointees. This higher level of reported partisan activity among White House staff women is not unexpected. Their jobs in the Carter administration demanded that they act as liaisons between the president or vice-president and various political constituencies and leaders, including partisan ones, on an almost daily basis.

As two more specific measures of partisan involvement and leadership, appointees who had been active in the Democratic party were asked about their service as party officials and as national party convention delegates (Table 2.3).

Democratic men and women among appointees were similar in their party officeholding experiences with just about half of the self-designated "active" Democrats having held elective or appointive party positions.

However, this similarity does not hold when participation as national convention delegates is examined. Among "active" Democrats, females were almost three times more likely than males to have been delegates to national conventions in the years prior to 1980.

Perhaps to a greater extent for females than for males, serving as a delegate to a national party convention made the prospective appointee visible to Carter and his close associates. Most conventional channels for identifying prospective appointees for the new administration undoubtedly yielded the names of far more men than women since women traditionally have not been well integrated into predominantly male networks. However, recent Democratic conventions have witnessed a surge in the number of female delegates, and these delegates may constitute a pool of women who are fairly visible to those influential in the appointments process.

While, as noted earlier, all of the White House staff claimed to be active Democrats, they were considerably less likely than other female appointees to have held elective or appointive party positions and to have served as national convention delegates (Table 2.3). This finding suggests that the White House staff women's claims of high levels of party involvement may stem largely from their responsibilities on the White House staff and/or from their experience in campaigning for Carter, the topic to be examined next in this report.

CARTER CAMPAIGN ACTIVITY

A common assumption is that working in a successful presidential campaign leads to a government appointment. Hamilton Jordan and Jody Powell are visible examples of individuals from the Carter administration who seemed to follow this route into appointive positions. To test if this assumption was valid for a large number of appointees, respondents were asked if they

TABLE 2.3: AMONG DEMOCRATIC APPOINTEES WHO HAD BEEN ACTIVE IN THE PARTY, MORE WOMEN THAN MEN HAD SERVED AS DELEGATES TO THE NATIONAL CONVENTION

	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Had held elective or appointive party position	37.8	46.4	33.3
Had served as delegate to national party convention	27.0	10.7	13.3
Total	(37)	(28)	(15)

TABLE 2.4: MORE WOMEN THAN MEN WORKED IN CARTER'S 1976 GENERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN

	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Worked in Carter's 1976 primary campaign	10.3	10.6	13.3
Worked in Carter's 1976 general election campaign	31.3 ^a	22.7	60.0
Total	(68)	(66)	(15)

^aIn this particular case, the total is 67.

TABLE 2.5: VERY FEW OF THE WOMEN AND MEN WHO WORKED IN CARTER'S 1976 CAMPAIGN WERE IN SALARIED POSITIONS

Campaign Positions	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Salaried	5.0	6.7	66.7
Voluntary	90.0	86.7	33.3
Both salaried and voluntary	5.0	6.7	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(20)	(15)	(9)

had worked for the election of Jimmy Carter in 1976.

Table 2.4 shows no difference between women and men in their involvement in Carter's primary campaign. Only about one-tenth of both female and male appointees worked for Carter in the primaries. A somewhat larger percentage campaigned for Carter in the general election, and here women were more active than the men. As seen in Table 2.5, almost 90% of both female and male appointees who worked in the Carter campaign served as volunteers.

The larger proportion of women than men who worked for Carter in the general election suggests that campaign involvement, like service as a delegate to a party convention, may help women become visible to those who are influential in the appointments process.

A small percentage of women on the White House staff, similar to that of the other female appointees, had worked in the primary campaign. A difference did occur between these two groups of women in general election campaign activity with women on the White House staff twice as likely as other women appointees to have campaigned in 1976. The White House staff women were much less likely than other appointees to have worked as volunteers in the campaign. Six of the fifteen White House staff women held salaried positions in the campaign compared with only two of the sixty-eight female appointees. The fact that such a large proportion of the White House staff women worked in salaried positions suggests both that their involvement in the campaign was of a serious nature and that, at least in some cases, working in the Carter campaign may have been a critical factor leading to the appointment of women to the White House staff. This finding is evidence that working in a salaried position in a presidential campaign can lead to an appointment in the administration--although

the appointment is more likely to be to a White House staff position than to an agency or department position.

PREVIOUS PUBLIC SERVICE

Previous research on those who received political appointments in the administrations of Presidents Franklin Roosevelt through Lyndon Johnson found that most federal appointees were likely to have served in government at some time prior to their appointments.³ To determine whether this experience is still common among male political appointees, and to discover if it is as common among females, we asked Carter appointees about prior appointive, administrative, and elective positions they had held at the federal, state, county, and local levels. The results are presented in Table 2.6.

Federal Government Experience

About one-fifth of all Carter appointees, and a slightly greater proportion of women than men, had held appointive positions in presidential administrations prior to Carter's. Slightly more than half of the appointees had held federal civil service positions before 1976 (Table 2.6), and women were just as likely as the men to have held these positions.

The White House staff women were far less likely than other female appointees to have had previous federal governmental experience. Almost 10% fewer of the White House staff women had held appointments in presidential administrations prior to Carter's. Moreover, only one-fifth of the women on the White House staff had held positions in the federal civil

TABLE 2.6: WOMEN HAD MORE PRIOR GOVERNMENT EXPERIENCE THAN MEN

<u>Type of Experience</u>	<u>Carter Appointees</u>		<u>White House Staff</u>
	<u>Women</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
Had held appointive position in a previous presidential administration	22.1	18.2	13.3
Had held federal civil service position	54.4	53.0	20.0
Had served in a cabinet, sub-cabinet, or administrative position in state government	27.9	22.7	20.0
Had held appointive or administrative position in county or local government	26.5	19.7	26.7
Had held elective office at any level of government	10.3	6.1	20.0
Total	(68)	(66)	(15)

service prior to 1976 compared with more than half the other female appointees.

State Government Experience

Women appointees were slightly more likely than men to have held an appointive or administrative position in state government prior to their appointment to the Carter administration (Table 2.6). In one respect, however, women did lag slightly behind the men in experience at the state level. While few of the appointees, whether male or female, had been appointed by governors to state cabinet posts, more of the men (9.1%) than the women (2.9%) had served in these positions. This probably reflects the fact that recruitment for top political appointments at the state level, as at the federal level, traditionally has taken place through networks that are predominantly male.

A slightly smaller proportion of White House staff women than of other female appointees had held appointive or administrative positions in state government. However, 6.7% of women on the White House staff had been appointed to state cabinet positions, a larger proportion than among other female Carter appointees.

County and Local Government Experience

As was true for federal and state governmental service, experience in county or local government was more common for female than for male appointees (Table 2.6). About one-fifth of the men but more than one-fourth of the women had held appointive or administrative positions at the county or local level.

Women on the White House staff were just as likely as other female appointees to have served in an administrative or appointive position in local or county government.

Elective Office

In addition to asking about prior experience in appointive and administrative government posts, we asked appointees if they ever had held an elective public office at any level. As Table 2.6 shows, very few Carter appointees of either sex had served in elective positions. Nevertheless, slightly more women than men had held elective offices.

Of those appointees who had held elective office, all but two of the seven women and all of the four men had held at least one administrative or appointive position at some level of government. Because few Carter appointees had held elective office who had not had some administrative/appointive experience, elective officeholding does not seem to have been an important factor considered by those who made appointments to the Carter administration.⁴

Women on the White House staff were proportionately more active in electoral politics than other women appointees. One-fifth of the White House staff women had served in elective government positions compared

with one-tenth of other female appointees.

Summary of Previous Public Service

In summary, women among Carter appointees were somewhat more likely than their male counterparts to have previous officeholding experience at all levels of government. An overall summary measure of the proportion of appointees with prior experience in government helps to highlight two points. First, Carter appointees were not strangers to government service, and second, proportionately more women than men had government experience. While 71.2% of the men we surveyed had served in appointive, administrative (including civil service), or elective positions prior to their appointments to the Carter administration, 83.8% of the women had served in a governmental position of some type.

JOB PRIOR TO APPOINTMENT

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

In our study, we originally wanted to chart appointees' entire occupational histories. However, because we had so many possible areas of inquiry, we decided to focus specifically on the appointee's most recent job. We assumed that this position would, in most cases, be the one that would have had the greatest impact in making her or him appear qualified for an appointment.

As Table 2.7 demonstrates, most female and male appointees held high-level, professional positions immediately prior to their appointments. Moreover, the types of jobs held by female and male appointees were, for the most part, very much alike. Similar proportions of the women and men were employed as attorneys, college professors or administrators, state or local government executives, private sector executives, consultants, journalists or writers, and Carter-Mondale campaign or transition staff members. Clearly, the largest source of both female and male appointees was the public sector, with 42.7% of the women and 53.0% of the men last employed in government jobs.

However, despite the overall similarities in occupational backgrounds between female and male appointees, some significant differences emerge. About one-fifth of the female appointees and slightly more than one-fourth of the male appointees reported they had been employed by the federal government in high-level positions. However, only 7.4% of the women worked in the same departments to which they received appointments as compared with 24.2% of the men. These data indicate much higher levels of inter-departmental mobility for the women.

TABLE 2.7: WOMEN AND MEN HELD SIMILAR JOBS IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO THEIR APPOINTMENTS

Job Prior to Carter Appointment	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Government Positions			
Federal employee	20.6	27.2	6.7
Same department or agency as appointment	7.4	24.2	0.0
Different department or agency from appointment	13.2	3.0	6.7
Congressional staff member	7.4	15.2	20.0
State/county/city executive	8.8	9.1	13.4
Federal/state legislator	4.4	0.0	6.7
Carter-Mondale campaign/transition staff	1.5	1.5	20.0
Nongovernment Positions			
Executive in public affairs organization/nonprofit organization/foundation	20.6	6.1	6.7
Attorney	11.8	12.1	6.7
Administrator or college professor	10.3	10.6	0.0
Executive in private sector	4.4	6.1	6.7
Consultant	4.4	3.0	6.7
Journalist/writer	2.9	1.5	6.7
Other	2.9	7.5	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(68)	(66)	(15)

Almost twice as many men as women had held congressional staff positions. Although roughly equal proportions of men and women were serving on congressional committee staffs at the time of their appointment, 6.1% of the men but none of the women reported they were on the staffs of individual members of Congress. Apparently, those responsible for recruiting for the new administration either did not look to women serving on members' staffs or were not successful in recruiting them.

One-fifth of the female Carter appointees came from executive positions in public affairs organizations, nonprofit organizations, and foundations. Only slightly more than one-twentieth of the men came from these types of institutions. It appears that public affairs organizations, nonprofit organizations, and foundations, perhaps because they have been less resistant than many other institutions to providing employment opportunities for women, have served an important role in helping many women to develop the management skills and visibility necessary to obtain high-level administrative positions in the federal government.

As we indicated earlier, identical proportions of the female and male appointees were employed in college teaching or administrative positions. However, none of the female educators but more than half of the male educators were college administrators. This finding is probably a reflection of the fact that the highest levels of college administration still remain heavily male-dominated.

White House staff women showed a somewhat different pattern from other female appointees in the jobs they held prior to their appointment to the Carter administration. They were less likely than other women appointees to have been high-level federal employees and more likely to have been congressional staff members. Women on the White House staff also were much less likely to have been employed as executives in public affairs organizations, nonprofit organizations, and foundations. In fact, almost three times as many of the women appointed to department and agency positions served in these positions. While one-tenth of the other women appointees were employed as college teachers, none of the women on the White House staff was. Nevertheless, the greatest difference in employment appeared among those women who reported having worked as staff members for the Carter-Mondale campaign or transition team. One-fifth of the White House staff women but only 1.5% of the female appointees served as staff for Carter-Mondale, again suggesting a strong link between campaign activity and appointment positions on the White House staff.

ROLE MODELS AND MENTORS AS CRITICAL INFLUENCES

Thus far in this chapter of the report we have been concerned with assessing the political credentials and prior experience of Carter appointees. However, we suspected that in many cases appointees would feel that their motivation for public service and experience could be attributed, in part, to the inspiration, encouragement, and assistance of others. While previous research on political appointees has not explored the influence of role models and mentors, we thought it might be useful to examine the question of whether there were certain individuals who had played a critical role in developing appointees' interest in public service and in helping them gain the prerequisite levels of experience and achievement.

Role Models

To ascertain whether appointees had role models, we asked them, "Has there been one political leader whom you particularly admired and whose example inspired you to become active politically?" Slightly less than half of the female appointees and slightly more than half of the male appointees answered affirmatively (Table 2.8). Women on the White House staff were much more likely to have had a role model with almost three-fourths of this group responding affirmatively.

TABLE 2.8: WOMEN LESS OFTEN THAN MEN HAD ROLE MODELS

	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Had a role model	44.8	53.0	73.3
Total	(67)	(66)	(15)

TABLE 2.9: OF APPOINTEES WITH ROLE MODELS, SOME WOMEN BUT NO MEN HAD FEMALE ROLE MODELS

Role Model's Sex	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Male	66.7	100.0	54.5
Female	33.3	0.0	45.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(30)	(35)	(11)

While none of the men reported that their role models were women (Table 2.9), one-third of the female appointees did. Considering the male dominance of the political sphere, it is perhaps surprising that as many as a third of all female appointees with role models had been inspired by women. An even larger proportion of the White House staff women with role models, almost one-half, reported that their role models were women.

We also asked appointees to indicate the positions their role models held at the time they served as role models. As Table 2.10 shows, the largest proportion of Carter appointees reported that their role models had

TABLE 2.10: FEWER WOMEN THAN MEN HAD ROLE MODELS WHO WERE ELECTED OFFICIALS

Role Model's Position When He/She Served as a Role Model	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Elected federal official ^a	46.6	54.3	45.5
Elected state or local official ^b	3.3	8.6	9.1
Federal department or agency official	23.3	25.7	9.1
Presidential staff member	0.0	0.0	18.2
First lady ^c	6.7	0.0	9.1
Other	19.9	11.5	9.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(30)	(35)	(11)

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

^bIncludes governor, state representative, and mayor.

^cAll references listed here were to Eleanor Roosevelt.

been elected federal officials, and this was true for a slightly greater percentage of men than women. Men also were more likely than women to report that their role models had been elected state or local officials. These sex differences are not surprising, since one-third of the women looked to their own sex for role models, and traditionally, fewer than 10% of all elected officials have been women.⁵

The second most frequently mentioned position held by role models was federal department or agency official, and here there was no significant sex difference. One individual listed by several women as the person who inspired them to become politically active was Eleanor Roosevelt. Hers was the only name mentioned several times among those who specified female role models.

White House staff women were similar to other female appointees in that almost half of those who had role models reported that their role models were federal officials. Also, like several of the other female appointees, one member of the White House staff said Eleanor Roosevelt was her role model. However, differences did emerge in the proportions who reported other types of officials as role models, and these differences seem very much related to the roles the appointees eventually assumed in the Carter administration. Fewer than one-tenth of the White House staff women but almost one-fourth of other female appointees named a federal department or agency official as their role model. In contrast, one-fifth of the White House staff women mentioned presidential staff members whereas none of the other female appointees did.

Mentors

To determine whether appointees had mentors, we asked them, "Was there one political leader or activist who helped your political career along in some significant way?" Similar proportions of female and male Carter appointees, about two-fifths, said yes (Table 2.11). Among women on the White House staff, the proportion was much higher, with two-thirds indicating that they had mentors.

Although the majority of appointees with mentors reported that their mentors were male, about one-eighth of the female appointees (and one of the men) had female mentors (Table 2.12). Again, with the traditional lack of women in positions of influence in politics, the fact that even a few of the female appointees had been aided by women is remarkable.

Proportionately more of the White House staff women reported that their mentors were female. Of the ten White House staff women reporting mentors, three had female mentors.

Table 2.13 indicates the highest positions the appointees' mentors had held. As was true for appointees' role models, mentors of male appointees more frequently were elected officials at various levels of government than were the mentors of female appointees. Almost one-half of

TABLE 2.11: WOMEN AND MEN WERE EQUALLY LIKELY TO HAVE HAD MENTORS

	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Had a mentor	45.6	40.9	66.7
Total	(68)	(66)	(15)

TABLE 2.12: OF APPOINTEES WITH MENTORS, WOMEN MORE OFTEN THAN MEN HAD FEMALE MENTORS

Mentor's Sex	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Male	87.1	96.3	70.0
Female	12.9	3.7	30.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(31)	(27)	(10)

the men had mentors who were federal elected officials, compared with slightly more than one-third of the women. While relatively few appointees had mentors who were state or local elected officeholders, this was true for proportionately more men than women.

Female appointees were about equally as likely as their male counterparts to have mentors who had served as federal department and agency officials. However, the women were more likely than men to have mentors whose

TABLE 2.13: FEWER WOMEN THAN MEN HAD MENTORS WHO WERE ELECTED OFFICIALS

Highest Position Mentor Has Held	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Elected federal official ^a	35.5	48.1	60.0
Federal department or agency official	35.5	37.0	0.0
Elected state or local official ^b	6.5	11.1	0.0
Presidential staff member	3.2	3.7	10.0
Judge/attorney	6.5	0.0	0.0
Official in political party or organization	0.0	0.0	20.0
First lady	0.0	0.0	10.0
Other	12.9	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(31)	(27)	(10)

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

^bIncludes governor, state representative, and mayor.

highest positions in politics were not among the major positions listed in Table 2.13. About one-eighth of the females, but none of the males, had been aided primarily by individuals (e.g. a consumer advocate, a union official) who did not hold any of the positions in Table 2.13. This finding, in combination with the finding that women were far less likely than men to have mentors who were elected officials, indicates that the mentors of women came from more diverse sources than did the mentors of men.

White House staff women were much more likely than other female Carter appointees to name an elective federal office as their mentor's highest position. None of the women on the White House staff reported that her mentor had been a federal departmental official, even though one-third of the other female appointees did. Finally, unlike other women appointees, two White House Staff women had mentors who had served as officials in a political party or political organization, and one White House staff member named Eleanor Roosevelt as her mentor.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Our data clearly demonstrate that female Carter appointees were as qualified or, in some respects, perhaps more qualified than their male counterparts. As many women as men reported strong partisan involvement. Women were as likely as men to have held elective or appointive party positions, and they were more likely than the men to have served as delegates to a national Democratic convention. Proportionately as many women as men had worked for Carter in the primaries, and more of the women than the men had campaigned for Carter in the general election. Female appointees more often than their male counterparts had held appointive or administrative positions at federal, state, and local levels. Similarly, slightly more of the women than the men had held an elective public office. Finally, the occupational profiles of men and women, as measured by the last job they had held prior to their appointment to the Carter administration, were quite similar. Clearly, contrary to the protests of Carter and his top aides, it was possible to find "qualified" women to serve in the administration.

The fact that women had somewhat more experience than the men as party convention delegates and as Carter campaign workers suggests that the ways individuals were identified as potential appointees may have differed somewhat for females and males. A substantially larger proportion of the women (38.2%) than of the men (25.8%) had worked in the Carter campaign, been a delegate to a Democratic national convention, or both. Since women were not as likely as men to come to the attention of those recruiting for the new administration through traditional sources and networks,⁶ we believe that serving as a delegate and working in the Carter campaign were alternative ways for women to make themselves known and visible to those

who, after the election of Jimmy Carter, became influential in the appointments process. Because men were so much more likely than women to surface as potential appointees through conventional recruitment networks, service as a convention delegate or campaign worker probably was less important in helping men to establish themselves as visible candidates for appointments to the administration.

The data presented in this chapter of our report also suggest that the credentials and experiences relevant to gaining an appointment to the White House staff differed from those relevant to gaining an appointment to a federal department or agency. White House staff women, unlike other female appointees, were all Democrats, and without exception, claimed to be currently active in the Democratic party. However, their partisan activity was less likely to take the form of serving in an official party position or serving as a convention delegate. Unlike other female appointees, most of the White House staff women had worked in the Carter campaign. Moreover, unlike other Carter appointees, most women who worked in the campaign held salaried positions. While fewer of the women on the White House staff served in appointive or administrative positions in government, more of them had held elective public offices. Finally, the last jobs held by White House staff women prior to their appointment to the Carter administration were far more likely to have been jobs on congressional staffs or with the Carter-Mondale campaign or transition staffs. It appears, then, that the experience of White House staff women was far more heavily concentrated around Democratic electoral politics in general and the Carter campaign in particular than was the experience of those women who received appointments to the agencies and departments.

While political credentials and prior experience are important in helping to establish an individual as qualified for a political appointment, many other factors undoubtedly affect the offering and acceptance of appointments. In Chapter 3 we continue our examination of the recruitment of Carter appointees by looking beyond background and qualifications to the more immediate factors that may have influenced appointments to the federal administration.

We begin this chapter with an investigation of appointees' stated reasons for accepting Carter appointments. Next, we examine certain other factors that we thought might have affected the selection of appointees and their acceptance of appointments--salary prior to appointment, personal relationship with Carter, and geographic location at the time of appointment.

We then turn to the efforts made by other people, organizations, and the appointees themselves in attempting to secure positions in the Carter administration. Finally, we look at appointees' perceptions of the most important factor that led to their appointments, as well as their perceptions of the relative importance of a large variety of factors we thought might have influenced appointments.

REASONS FOR ACCEPTING CARTER ADMINISTRATION APPOINTMENTS

Public officials almost always report that they seek or accept government positions because of a desire to serve the public. In order to gain insight into additional reasons why appointees had chosen to work for the Carter administration, we asked, "Aside from a desire to serve the public, what were the one or two most important reasons you accepted an appointment to the Carter administration?"

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

Our data support, although weakly, this notion that men might more often be motivated by self-serving considerations and women by public-serving ones. As Table 3.1 illustrates, both female and male appointees seemed to agree that reasons related to their careers and to policy were the most important. However, men were slightly more likely than women

TABLE 3.1: WOMEN MORE OFTEN THAN MEN ACCEPTED APPOINTMENTS FOR POLICY-RELATED REASONS

Most Important Reason(s) for Accepting Carter Appointments ^a	Carter Appointees		White House Staff Women
	Women %	Men %	%
Advancement of career	46.3	51.6	20.0
Specific interest			
Policy area/issue	41.8	32.8	26.7
Management	17.9	10.9	13.3
Federal government	14.9	4.7	13.3
Personal/professional commitment			
To President Carter or his policies	10.4	12.5	40.0
To Vice-President Mondale or his policies	0.0	0.0	20.0
To federal official (other than Carter or Mondale)	4.5	9.4	0.0
Other			
Opportunity for public service	9.0	10.9	6.7
Reason related to personal life	6.0	6.2	6.7
Reason related to women	4.5	1.6	13.3
Opportunity for broadening experience	4.5	3.1	0.0
Reason related to party affiliation	4.5	1.6	6.7
Opportunity for employment in the White House	0.0	0.0	20.0
Other	0.0	7.8	0.0
Total	(67)	(64)	(15)

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

to mention career-related reasons; women more often than men reported policy-related reasons.

While none of the reasons for accepting appointments were mentioned by nearly as many appointees as were the two above, three others were reported by at least 10% of the women. Approximately one of every seven women stated that an interest in the federal government led her to accept an appointment. Three times as many women as men listed this reason. Like the greater proportion of women reporting policy-related concerns, this sex difference may be a reflection of women's greater propensity to be motivated by public-serving considerations.

More than one-sixth of the female appointees also gave reasons related

to managerial concerns. Again, fewer men than women mentioned this as a reason for accepting appointments. Given the small number of women who have had opportunities to be managers in the private or public sphere, it is not surprising that women were more likely than men to have accepted appointments in order to gain managerial experience. However, it is somewhat surprising that women also were more likely than men to report that they accepted appointments in order to put their expertise in management to good use.

Finally, approximately one of every ten women reported accepting an appointment primarily because of her commitment to President Carter or his policies. There was a notable sex difference in the proportions of appointees mentioning reasons related to Carter.

The reasons White House staff women gave for accepting appointments differed considerably from the reasons given by other female appointees. In stark contrast to department and agency appointees, two-fifths of the women on the White House staff mentioned a commitment to Carter or his policies. Another two-fifths reported that they accepted an appointment because of the opportunity to work in the White House or with Vice-President Mondale. Fewer of the White House staff women than of other appointees gave career-related or policy-related reasons. The fact that women on the White House staff were more likely to cite reasons related to Carter or Mondale is consistent with our finding earlier that White House staff women were much more likely to have been involved in the presidential campaign. Apparently, these women felt a much stronger personal commitment to Jimmy Carter and Walter Mondale than did agency and departmental appointees.

EFFECTS OF ACCEPTING APPOINTMENTS ON APPOINTEES' SALARIES

Although the largest proportion of both female and male appointees reported that their decisions to accept positions in the Carter administration had been career-related, it is not surprising that appointees did not cite the lure of high salaries as a reason for joining the administration. In fact, the common perception is that it is difficult to attract first-rate individuals to fill high-level positions precisely because they would have to accept cuts in salary.

Previous sections of our report showed that both female and male Carter appointees were highly educated and had held similar jobs (with the one exception discussed below) immediately prior to their appointments to the administration. On this basis, one might expect that the salary levels of women and men were fairly similar prior to their acceptance of appointments and that they would be about equally likely to report increases or decreases in salary upon joining the administration.

TABLE 3.2: MORE WOMEN THAN MEN RECEIVED A HIGHER SALARY IN THE CARTER ADMINISTRATION THAN IN THEIR PREVIOUS JOBS

Salary in Carter Administration Relative to Salary in Previous Job	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Higher salary	51.5	28.8	66.7
About the same salary	35.3	43.9	33.3
Lower salary	13.2	27.3	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(68)	(66)	(15)

Table 3.2 compares the salaries Carter appointees were offered to serve in the administration with their salaries immediately prior to their appointments. Striking differences between female and male appointees are apparent. Interestingly, while very few appointees took salary cuts to join the administration, twice as many men as women did. In contrast, more than one-half the women compared with slightly more than one-fourth the men experienced a salary increase upon accepting a federal appointment.

It appears that women appointees were in lower paying positions prior to their appointments than their male counterparts, in spite of the overall similarities in their backgrounds. We suspected that this might be attributable, in large part, to the slightly greater concentration of women in public affairs organizations, nonprofit organizations, and foundations, or to the slightly older age (and thus the greater experience and tenure) of the men relative to the women.

To determine whether the former explanation accounted for the greater propensity of women to experience salary increases upon joining the administration, we compared the salary status of those individuals who came from jobs in public affairs or nonprofit organizations or from foundations with the salary status of those who came from other types of jobs (Table 3.3). While those employed in public affairs organizations, nonprofit organizations, or foundations did tend disproportionately to experience increases in salary, the fact that more women than men came from these organizations does not account entirely for the disparities in women's and men's salaries. As Table 3.3 indicates, among those appointees who came from other types of positions, women still were far more likely to experience an increase in salary, and somewhat less likely to take a salary cut, upon joining the administration.

TABLE 3.3: EXCLUDING APPOINTEES WHO HAD HELD POSITIONS IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS/NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS OR FOUNDATIONS, WOMEN WERE STILL MORE LIKELY THAN MEN TO RECEIVE A SALARY INCREASE UPON JOINING THE ADMINISTRATION

Position Held Prior to Initial Carter Appointment	Salary in Carter Administration Relative to Salary in Previous Job	Carter Appointees	
		Women %	Men %
Executive in public affairs organization/ nonprofit organization/ foundation	Higher salary	71.4	50.0
	Lower salary	14.3	25.0
	Total	(14)	(4)
All other positions	Higher salary	46.3	27.4
	Lower salary	13.0	27.4
	Total	(54)	(62)

We also looked at salary status within age groups. As Table 3.4 demonstrates, the same proportion of women and men under age forty received salary increases when they accepted appointments. However, after age forty a much greater proportion of female than male appointees experienced raises in their salaries while a noticeably smaller proportion of female than male appointees experienced cuts in salary.

These findings of parity in salary at younger ages but inequities at older ages suggest two possible explanations. First, it is possible that these findings reflect the fact that discrimination in salary and in opportunities for advancement was far more pronounced when the older women were building their careers than it was for younger generations. A second possibility is that women and men start out at roughly equal salary levels during early stages in their careers, but as their careers progress, men's salaries advance more than women's.

Two-thirds of the White House staff women compared with one-half of other female appointees received salary increases when they accepted appointments to the Carter administration (Table 3.2). As reported in earlier sections, women on the White House staff had lower levels of educational attainment than other women appointees and served in somewhat different types of positions prior to their appointments. Because of these educational and employment differences, the differences between White House staff and other female appointees apparent in Table 3.2 are not surprising.

TABLE 3.4: AMONG APPOINTEES UNDER AGE 40, WOMEN WERE NO MORE LIKELY THAN MEN TO RECEIVE A HIGHER SALARY IN THE CARTER ADMINISTRATION THAN IN THEIR PREVIOUS JOBS

Age	Salary in Carter Administration Relative to Salary in Previous Job	Carter Appointees	
		Women %	Men %
Under 40	Higher salary	57.1	57.1
	Lower salary	7.1	0.0
	Total	(28)	(21)
40-49	Higher salary	50.0	11.5
	Lower salary	18.2	34.6
	Total	(22)	(26)
50-59	Higher salary	40.0	23.1
	Lower salary	20.0	38.5
	Total	(15)	(13)
60 or older	Higher salary	50.0	16.7
	Lower salary	0.0	66.7
	Total	(2)	(6)

RELATIONSHIP WITH CARTER PRIOR TO INITIAL APPOINTMENT

Like the perception that accepting a presidential appointment often necessitates a salary cut, another perception shared by many observers of the appointments process is that those who are friends of the chief executive are favored in receiving appointments. The appointments of John Mitchell by President Nixon, Bert Lance by President Carter, and William French Smith by President Reagan are some of the most visible examples reinforcing this perception.

Table 3.5, however, suggests that most people who received appointments in the Carter administration were neither friends nor acquaintances of Jimmy Carter. Nevertheless, prior to their first appointments, more women than men knew Carter at least slightly. While no appointees reported that Carter was a close personal friend, small proportions, including more women than men, reported that they knew him fairly well. Three-tenths of the female appointees knew the president slightly compared with only one-sixth of the male appointees. The fact that more women than men had served as party delegates and as Carter campaign workers probably helps to account for the higher proportions of women who knew the president.²

Although the majority of White House staff women had never met Jimmy Carter, larger proportions of these women than of other female appointees knew him fairly well. One-fifth of the White House staff women, compared with less than one-tenth of the other women, reported that Carter was a close personal friend or that they knew him fairly well. While it is impossible to determine which was cause and which was effect, the greater tendency of White House staff women to know Carter well or fairly well seems related to the fact that greater proportions of White House staff women had worked in the Carter campaign, especially in salaried positions.³

PLACE OF RESIDENCE AT TIME OF INITIAL APPOINTMENT

Another commonly held belief about the appointments process is that appointments go disproportionately to those from the president's home state. Carter's appointments of Griffin Bell and Hamilton Jordan, as attorney general and chief of staff respectively, are only two of the most obvious examples that have given credence to this belief.

To determine whether there was a "Georgia connection," we asked appointees where they had been residing when they received their initial appointments to the Carter administration. Table 3.6 presents the results of this inquiry.

Because of Jimmy Carter's reputation as "anti-Washington establishment," it is somewhat surprising that more than half of both women and men had been living in the District of Columbia area when they were appointed. Apparently, the Carter administration did not have to search far geographically in order to locate qualified potential appointees.

TABLE 3.5: BEFORE THEY WERE APPOINTED,
WOMEN MORE OFTEN THAN MEN KNEW
JIMMY CARTER

Relationship with Carter Prior to First Appointment	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Close personal friend	0.0	0.0	6.7
Knew fairly well	7.4	4.6	13.3
Knew slightly	29.4	16.9	20.0
Never met	63.2	78.5	60.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(68)	(65)	(15)

TABLE 3.6: A MAJORITY OF BOTH WOMEN AND MEN WERE
LIVING IN THE WASHINGTON, D.C. AREA
WHEN THEY WERE APPOINTED

State of Residence at Time of First Appointment	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Washington, D.C. Area	54.4	53.0	60.0
District of Columbia	44.1	28.8	53.3
Maryland	2.9	12.1	6.7
Virginia	7.4	12.1	0.0
Georgia	5.9	1.5	6.7
New York	11.8	9.1	26.7
Other states	27.9	31.9	6.7
Not living in U.S.A.	0.0	4.5	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(68)	(66)	(15)

Also surprising are the small proportions of women and men who had been living in Georgia, the president's home state. The lack of larger numbers of Georgians probably results from the fact that Carter delegated major responsibility for selecting subcabinet officials to the department secretaries.⁴ In spite of the small number of appointees from Georgia, a larger proportion of women than men were living in Georgia at the time of their appointments.

Also notable is the fact that a larger proportion of appointees, both female and male, came from New York than from any other state outside the D.C. area. For example, while none of the women and only 1.5% of the men came from Walter Mondale's home state of Minnesota, slightly more than one of every ten women and slightly less than one of every ten men came from New York.⁵ This concentration of appointees in New York state is additional evidence that despite Carter's "outsider" image, his recruitment of appointees had an East Coast establishment tinge.

The location of White House staff women prior to their appointments was similar to the location of other female appointees. As Table 3.6 demonstrates, women on the White House staff were only slightly more likely than other women appointees to have been living in the Washington, D.C. area, and similar proportions had been living in Georgia. However, two differences are apparent. First, one-fourth of the women on the White House staff came from New York, compared with one-tenth of other female appointees. Second, White House staff women were more concentrated geographically, with less than one-tenth coming from states other than those in the D.C. area, New York, and Georgia.

PERSON MOST INFLUENTIAL IN BRINGING ABOUT RESPONDENTS' APPOINTMENTS

Although almost half of both women and men claimed they were appointed by Jimmy Carter, only one person named Carter as the person most influential in obtaining her appointment (Table 3.7).⁶ Almost three-fourths of female and male appointees reported that administrative personnel within the departments and agencies were most important in bringing about their appointments. This finding is very likely a result of Carter's delegation of subcabinet appointments to department officials.

Although similar proportions of women and men named federal administrators as most influential, within this general category differences emerge. Larger proportions of women, slightly less than one-third, reported cabinet secretaries as most important compared with less than one-fourth of the men. On the other hand, smaller proportions of female appointees than male appointees named an under secretary or an assistant secretary as the person most influential in their appointment. Possibly Carter's commitment to appointing women to his administration was more

TABLE 3.7: WOMEN WERE MORE LIKELY THAN MEN TO CITE DEPARTMENT SECRETARIES AS MOST INFLUENTIAL IN BRINGING ABOUT THEIR APPOINTMENTS

Title of Person Most Influential in Bringing About Respondent's Appointment	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
President	1.7	0.0	6.7
Vice-President	0.0	0.0	20.0
Federal department and agency officials	71.8	73.1	13.4
Secretary	31.7	22.2	0.0
Under secretary	8.4	15.9	0.0
Assistant secretary	15.0	23.8	0.0
Regulatory commissioner	5.0	0.0	0.0
Presidential/vice-presidential staff member	6.7	12.7	53.4
U.S. senator/representative	3.4	11.2	0.0
Other	11.8	3.2	6.7
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(60)	(63)	(15)

clearly understood and acted upon by the department secretaries than by subcabinet officials.

While presidential and vice-presidential staff members and members of Congress far less frequently were named as influential than were departmental and agency personnel, they seem to have been critical more often for men than for women. Smaller proportions of women than men believed that the person most influential in their appointment was a member of the presidential or vice-presidential staff or a member of Congress.

As one would expect, White House staff women differed from other female appointees in whom they identified as most influential in their appointments (Table 3.7). White House staff women were far less likely than other women appointees to name department or agency administrators and regulatory commissioners. They were far more likely to name the president, vice-president, and White House staff members.

We asked appointees about the gender, as well as the title, of the people they considered most important in helping them to be selected for appointments. Women appointed to agency and departmental positions and to the White House staff were much more likely than male appointees to point to another woman as the person most responsible (Table 3.8). Of the thirteen female department and agency appointees who named other women as most important in their appointments, three named one female department secretary, two named another female secretary, six named different

TABLE 3.8: MORE WOMEN THAN MEN NAMED A WOMAN AS THE PERSON MOST INFLUENTIAL IN BRINGING ABOUT THEIR APPOINTMENTS

Sex of Person Who Had the Most Influence in Bringing About Respondent's Appointment	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Female	21.7	7.8	20.0
Male	78.3	92.2	80.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(60)	(64)	(15)

TABLE 3.9: MORE WOMEN THAN MEN REPORTED THAT AN ORGANIZATION ASSISTED THEM IN OBTAINING APPOINTMENTS

	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Received direct or indirect assistance from an organization	34.3	27.3	20.0
Total	(67)	(66)	(15)

women in subcabinet positions, one named a female regulatory commissioner, and one named a woman on Carter's staff. The three White House staff women who cited other women as most influential in their appointments named two different women on Carter's staff. Thus, it appears that a number of different women within the administration were actively involved in trying to get other women appointed to high-level positions.

ORGANIZATIONAL ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING APPOINTMENTS

In addition to discovering which individuals appointees perceived as most influential in bringing about their appointments, we wanted to determine whether particular organizations were viewed as having played critical roles. As Table 3.9 demonstrates, more than one-third of the women and slightly more than one-fourth of the men reported that an organization, other than a political party, had assisted them directly or indirectly in obtaining appointments to the administration.

Table 3.10 shows the types of organizations that appointees reported had helped them. There are some interesting sex differences, the most obvious having to do with the support of women's organizations. Almost half of the women but none of the men who had received organizational assistance reported that women's organizations had helped them. Among the specific organizations mentioned by women, the National Women's Political Caucus (NWPC) and its state affiliates were named most often--by 13.0% of all female appointees who mentioned any organization. An equal proportion also named the Coalition for Women's Appointments, an ad hoc coalition representing more than fifty women's organizations which was spearheaded by the NWPC.

Female appointees also were more likely than male appointees to report

TABLE 3.10: AMONG WOMEN WHO REPORTED ASSISTANCE FROM ORGANIZATIONS, A MAJORITY INDICATED THAT WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS HAD HELPED THEM OBTAIN APPOINTMENTS

Type of Organizations That Assisted in Obtaining Appointment ^a	Carter Appointees	
	Women %	Men %
Women's ^b	47.8	0.0
Women's Political Caucus	13.0	0.0
Coalition for Women's Appointments	13.0	0.0
League of Women Voters	8.7	0.0
Labor	13.0	5.9
Civil rights	13.0	0.0
Public interest/consumer	8.7	5.9
Government ^c	4.3	29.4
Transportation/housing	4.3	11.8
Law/criminal justice	4.3	11.8
Science/engineering	4.3	5.9
Commerce/business ^d	4.3	5.9
Social welfare	4.3	5.9
Education	4.3	0.0
Environment/historic preservation	4.3	0.0
Defense	0.0	11.8
Agriculture	0.0	5.9
Veterans	0.0	5.9
Total	(23)	(17)

^aTotal percentages do not add to 100 because respondents could name one or two organizations.

^bWomen's organizations are defined as those groups that fulfill one or both of two criteria. First the group's membership consists entirely or primarily of women. Second, the goals of the organization are concerned entirely or primarily with changing the status of women in society.

^cIncludes both organizations of public officials and government departments.

^dIncludes both commerce/business organizations and companies/corporations.

labor and civil rights organizations as having offered critical assistance. Men were more likely than women to name government-related entities such as associations of public officials or specific departments or agencies of government. While we found it somewhat puzzling that the names of departments and agencies were given in answer to this question, several of the men responded in this manner. Men also were more likely than women to report assistance from defense-related organizations.

Table 3.11 presents the types of organizations that assisted appointees in obtaining appointments categorized according to different criteria. Women's organizations have been excluded from this table, and all other organizations have been grouped according to whether they were

TABLE 3.11: WOMEN FAR LESS OFTEN THAN MEN REPORTED ASSISTANCE CLEARLY RELATED TO THEIR LAST JOBS

Organization That Assisted in Obtaining Appointment Was ^a	Carter Appointees	
	Women %	Men %
Clearly related to respondent's last job	39.1	70.6
May have had connections to respondent's last job	21.7	29.4
Not related to respondent's last job	8.7	0.0
Total	(23)	(17)

^a Percentages do not add to 100 because respondents could name one or two organizations and because women's organizations are excluded from this table.

TABLE 3.12: WOMEN AND MEN WERE SIMILAR IN THE EFFORTS THEY MADE TO OBTAIN THEIR APPOINTMENTS

Level of Involvement of Respondent in Pursuing an Appointment	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Made no effort and had to be convinced to accept an appointment	19.4	16.9	7.1
Made no effort but was receptive to the idea of serving	37.3	44.6	64.3
Made some effort but did not actively pursue an appointment	22.4	18.5	28.6
Actively sought an appointment	20.9	20.0	0.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(67)	(65)	(14)

clearly related to the individual's last job, may have been related to the individual's last job, or almost certainly were not related to the individual's last job. Almost twice as many men as women mentioned a non-women's organization that was clearly related to their jobs, and a slightly smaller proportion of men than women mentioned an organization that may have been connected to their previous employment.

These findings suggest that employment networks were far more important in helping to obtain appointments for men than for women. However, women's relative lack of assistance from organizations connected in some way to their previous employment was compensated for, in part, by the critical support women received from women's organizations.

APPOINTEES' EFFORTS ON THEIR OWN BEHALF

We also asked appointees about the efforts they made on their own behalf in order to gain appointment to the Carter administration. As Table 3.12 demonstrates, women and men were fairly similar in the amount of effort they exerted. While almost one-fifth of male and female appointees needed to be persuaded to accept positions, another one-fifth of both sexes actively sought appointments. Women were almost as likely as men to claim that they made some effort on their own behalf but did not actively pursue an appointment. Women were slightly less likely than men to have stated that they made no effort on their own behalf but were fairly receptive to the idea of serving.

The White House staff women differed from other female appointees in the effort they made to obtain appointments (Table 3.12). Overall, women on the White House staff were considerably less active in their pursuit of appointments, as Table 3.12 shows.

MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR LEADING TO APPOINTMENT

In addition to asking appointees about the individuals and organizations that helped them to obtain their positions, we asked each respondent to indicate the single most important factor that led to his or her appointment. Interestingly, almost one-fourth of the female appointees but no male appointees reported gender-related factors (Table 3.13). Two-thirds of the women within this category cited specifically the fact that they were women with professional qualifications as most important.

Half of the female appointees and three-fifths of the male appointees stated, without mentioning gender, that their professional qualifications and reputations were most important. If those appointees who cited the fact that they were women with professional qualifications are combined with this category, then a somewhat greater proportion of women than men focused on their qualifications and reputations as the most critical factor leading to their appointments. Professional or personal contacts were reported as most important by only one-tenth of the women but one-fifth of

TABLE 3.13: A SIZABLE MINORITY OF WOMEN APPOINTEES REPORTED FACTORS RELATED TO THEIR SEX AS MOST IMPORTANT IN OBTAINING THEIR APPOINTMENTS

Most Important Factor Leading to Appointment	Carter Appointees		White House Staff Women
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Sex-related factor	23.9	0.0	6.7
Being a woman with profes- sional qualifications	17.9	0.0	0.0
Professional qualifications/ reputation	50.8	63.6	46.7
Professional or personal contacts	10.4	19.7	33.3
Campaign or transition work for Carter-Mondale	3.0	4.5	6.7
Former officeholding experience	3.0	3.0	6.7
Being the right person at the right place at the right time	4.5	4.5	0.0
Other	4.5	4.5	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(67)	(66)	(15)

the men. The greater proportion of men than women citing "contacts" suggests that the women, in spite of their greater experience as delegates to Democratic conventions and as members of the Carter campaign staff, were less well integrated into networks of people with substantial political clout.

Very small proportions of women and men reported the most important factor that led to their appointments was past job performance in the same department as the appointment, campaign or transition team work for Carter-Mondale, former officeholding experience, or "luck"--being the right person at the right place at the right time.

Although similar proportions of White House staff women and other female appointees reported the most important factor leading to their appointments was their professional qualifications and reputations (Table 3.13), differences between the two groups are apparent. While almost one-fourth of the female appointees reported factors related to their gender, only one of the fifteen White House staff women claimed her sex was the most important factor in her appointment. However, one-third of the women on the White House staff stated that professional and personal contacts were most important, compared with only one-tenth of the female appointees. Apparently, knowing the right person was more often critical for White House staff women than for other female appointees.

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF VARIOUS FACTORS IN INFLUENCING APPOINTMENT

In addition to asking appointees about the single factor that they considered most important in helping them to obtain their appointments, we asked appointees to assess the importance of a large array of factors we thought might be critical. These included those examined in this or earlier sections of this report, as well as a few additional possible influences on the appointments process. Appointees were asked to indicate whether they thought each factor was very important, somewhat important, slightly important, or not at all important in influencing their appointments to the Carter administration. Table 3.14 presents the proportions of respondents who reported that each factor was "very important."

The largest proportions, by far, of both female and male appointees rated as very important professional credentials, technical expertise, occupational and professional contacts, work in last job, and managerial abilities. With the exception of managerial abilities, which were rated as very important by only about two-fifths of the women, each of these factors was rated as very important by a majority of both women and men.

Nonetheless, on two of these factors that so many appointees saw as very important, there were sizable differences between the sexes. Women were less likely than men to view occupational and professional contacts as very important. Apparently, while professional networks were crucial

TABLE 3.14: WOMEN WERE LESS LIKELY THAN MEN TO RATE THEIR OCCUPATIONAL/ PROFESSIONAL CONTACTS AND THEIR MANAGERIAL ABILITIES AS VERY IMPORTANT IN OBTAINING THEIR APPOINTMENTS

Rated Very Important in Obtaining Appointments:	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Professional credentials	77.9	80.3	73.3
Technical expertise	69.1	74.2	60.0
Occupational or professional contacts	67.6	81.8	60.0
Work in last job	61.8	60.6	33.3
Managerial abilities	39.7	56.1	26.7
Contacts with Carter's close associates	30.9	22.7	33.3
Former officeholding experience	22.1	24.2	20.0
Activity of organizations on appointee's behalf	19.1	9.1	6.7
Political party activities	10.3	4.5	26.7
Ford/Carter transition work	7.4	6.1	13.3
College contacts	5.9	9.1	0.0
Activity of state and national party leaders on appointee's behalf	5.8	3.0	26.7
Carter campaign work	4.4	3.0	20.0
Total	(68)	(66)	(15)

for women, they were even more critical in the eyes of men, perhaps because the men were better integrated into these networks. Also, women were considerably less likely than men to rate managerial abilities as important to their appointments. This may well be due to the fact that women traditionally have had fewer opportunities than men to function as managers and to develop their managerial abilities.

Other differences between women and men also are apparent in Table 3.14. A somewhat larger proportion of female appointees than male appointees rated as very important their contacts with Carter's close associates. This sex difference probably was due, in large part, to the fact that women were more likely than men to have been campaign workers and delegates to Democratic conventions; these activities probably afforded the women more opportunity to get to know those individuals close to Carter.⁷

Women also were substantially more likely than men to rate activity of organizations on their behalf as very important in influencing their appointments. Seven of the thirteen female appointees who claimed organizational activity was very influential also reported that women's organizations assisted them in their appointments. Thus, it appears that at least a few of the women viewed the activities of women's organizations

on their behalf as critical in obtaining their appointments.

Although similar for the most part in their reports of very important factors, White House staff women differed from the female appointees in expected ways. A much greater proportion of women on the White House staff compared with other women appointees rated as very important their own partisan activity, the activity of state and national party leaders on their behalf, Carter campaign work, and Ford/Carter transition work. White House staff women were much less likely than other female appointees to report work in their last job and managerial abilities as very important in influencing their appointments.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Evidence from this chapter of the report suggests that the process of recruitment to high level positions in the Carter administration differed somewhat for females and males. The factors which affected women's selection as appointees and their acceptance of positions within the administration were not always identical to those for men.

While the two types of reasons for accepting appointments most frequently mentioned by appointees of both sexes were policy-related and career-related, men more often cited career-related factors while women more often gave policy-related reasons. Women were more likely than men to increase their salary upon joining the administration and were less likely to take a cut in salary. These sex differences in the effects of accepting appointments upon salaries were not due simply to the fact that women were more likely than men to have come from nonprofit organizations, public affairs organizations, or foundations. Nor were these differences due simply to the younger average age of the women. There were no sex differences for appointees under age forty, but for those appointees more than forty years old, women were more likely than men to experience a raise in salary upon joining the administration and less likely to take a salary cut.

While most appointees did not know the president prior to their appointment, women were more likely to have known Carter than were men. This finding is related to the fact that more women than men were campaign workers and Democratic national convention delegates.

Women and men viewed different people as most important in influencing their appointments to the Carter administration. Women were more likely to name cabinet secretaries while men were more likely to name under secretaries and assistant secretaries as the person most influential in their appointments. Men also were more likely than women to report that a member of the vice-presidential or presidential staff or a member of Congress was the most influential person. This pattern of findings suggests that the department secretaries were more responsible than other actors in the

process for recruiting women to the administration.

Our data also suggest that some women within the administration were particularly active in helping other women to gain appointments. Female appointees were much more likely than their male counterparts to name another woman as the individual most influential in their appointments. This pattern of women supporting other women was not due simply to the effort of a few individuals; rather, several different women were cited as most influential by female appointees.

The pattern of women supporting other women also was evident in organizational support. Almost one-half of those women, compared with none of the men, who reported critical assistance from organizations cited women's organizations. Two women's organizations in particular--the National Women's Political Caucus and the Coalition for Women's Appointments--were mentioned with notable frequency.

There were other differences between the sexes in organizational support. Women were more likely than men to receive assistance from labor and civil rights groups and less likely to name government-related (often agencies or departments) and defense-related organizations. Women were much less likely than men to name an organization that appeared to be related to their previous job, suggesting that employment networks were less important for women than for men.

Finally, there were sex differences in appointees' ratings of various factors that led to their appointments. When asked about the single most important factor, almost one-fourth of the women but none of the men gave a gender-related response. Women were more likely than men to mention their professional qualifications and reputations and less likely to cite "contacts" as most important.

When asked to assess the importance of a variety of factors that may have influenced their appointments, additional sex differences were apparent. Again, men were more likely than women to attach importance to "contacts"--this time, occupational and professional contacts in particular. This finding provides further evidence that employment networks were not as important for women as for men. Women also were less likely to rate managerial abilities as very important to their appointments, perhaps because they had had fewer opportunities to develop these abilities. However, women were more likely than men to rate as very important their contact with close Carter associates and the activity of organizations, particularly women's organizations, on their behalf. Thus, while women did not perceive employment networks or managerial abilities as having been as important to their selection as the men did, their contacts with Carter associates, perhaps gained through their work in the campaign or as delegates, and the activity of organizations, particularly women's organizations, on their behalf served as alternative mechanisms for obtaining appointments.

The recruitment of White House staff women appears to have differed from that of other female appointees in ways that were predictable, given the differences in the nature of the positions they filled. White House staff women were more likely than other female appointees to have accepted appointments because of a commitment to Jimmy Carter or a desire to work in the White House or with Walter Mondale. White House staff women more often knew Jimmy Carter personally than did other appointees, and they more frequently named the president, vice-president, or other White House staff members as influential in their appointments. Finally, White House staff women were more likely than other female appointees to mention professional and personal contacts as the most important factor leading to their appointment, and they more frequently rated their own partisan involvement, the activity of party leaders on their behalf, and their work on the Carter campaign and/or transition as very important in helping them to obtain appointments.

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

Did female Carter appointees hold political views that differed from those of their male counterparts? This chapter of our report will examine perceptions of sex differences in political opportunities and job performance, issue orientations, and reports of activities undertaken in support of other women. We will attempt to determine whether a distinctive woman's perspective was evident among women who received appointments to the Carter administration.

PERCEPTIONS OF SEX DIFFERENCES IN POLITICAL OPPORTUNITIES AND JOB PERFORMANCE

We asked Carter appointees four questions designed to measure their perceptions of women's access to positions of public leadership and their capabilities when occupying such positions. Two of these items focused on political opportunities for women, while the other two dealt with women's job-related performance. The items and appointees' responses are presented in Table 4.1.

Both women and men among Carter appointees saw political opportunities for women as severely constricted. Women were somewhat more likely than men to disagree with the statement that "women have just as much opportunity as men to become political leaders." While more than three-fourths of the men disagreed, nine of every ten women took exception to this statement.² Women and men differed most in the intensity of their disagreement. Only about one-third of the men disagreed strongly in contrast to almost two-thirds of the women.

Female and male appointees were more similar in their concurrence that it is more difficult to identify women who are qualified for high-level appointive positions than to identify qualified men. Approximately three-fourths of both women and men acknowledged that locating women is more difficult while only about one-fourth claimed that finding women is of less or equal difficulty.

Women and men differed more in their perceptions of each sex's relative capabilities for officeholding than in their perceptions of women's access to political positions. As Table 4.1 shows, women more often than

TABLE 4.1: WOMEN AND MEN DIFFERED IN THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF WOMEN'S POLITICAL OPPORTUNITIES AND CAPABILITIES

Perceptions of Political Opportunity ^a	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Women and men have equal opportunity to become political leaders			
Agree strongly	1.5	9.4	6.7
Agree mildly	9.0	14.1	13.3
Disagree mildly	26.9	42.2	33.3
Disagree strongly	62.7	34.4	46.7
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(67)	(64)	(15)
Identifying women for appointive positions is more difficult, less difficult, or the same as identifying men			
More difficult	71.2	75.0	53.3
Same	27.3	23.4	46.7
Less difficult	1.5	1.6	0.0
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(66)	(64)	(15)
Perceptions of Job-Related Performance ^a			
Men make better managers than women			
Agree strongly	0.0	4.8	0.0
Agree mildly	1.5	12.9	0.0
Disagree	13.4	32.3	6.7
Disagree strongly	85.1	50.0	93.3
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(67)	(62)	(15)
Women officeholders devote more, less, or the same amount of time to the job than men			
More	43.9	16.9	53.3
Same	56.1	83.1	46.7
Less	0.0	0.0	0.0
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(66)	(59)	(15)

^aFor precise wording of questions see NOTES, Chapter 4, Note 11 at end of report.

men rejected the statement that "men make better managers than women." Although most men disagreed, women were nearly unanimous in their disagreement with only a single exception. As with the question on opportunity to become political leaders, female appointees held their views with considerably

greater intensity than males. More than four-fifths of the women compared with only one-half of the men disagreed strongly.

There was an even larger sex difference on the question of whether "women in office generally devote more, less, or about the same amount of time to the job than men do." A majority of both sexes claimed that the time devoted was equal, and no one responded that women devote less time to the job than do men. However, more than two-fifths of the women compared with less than one-fifth of the men expressed the belief that women spend more time.³

White House staff women were not vastly different from other female Carter appointees in their perceptions of women's opportunities in the public sector or the capabilities of women who hold political positions. White House staff women were a little less likely than other female appointees to disagree that women have just as much opportunity as men to become political leaders. Similarly, they were somewhat less likely than other appointees to claim that it is more difficult to find qualified women for appointive positions than it is to identify qualified men. All White House staff women disagreed that men make better managers than women, and a slightly larger proportion of White House staff women than of other female appointees claimed that women generally devote more time to the job than do men (Table 4.1).

VIEWS ON SELECTED SALIENT ISSUES

We asked Carter appointees for their views on several issues that were the focus of considerable public attention and debate during the second half of the 1970s. Since we were able to include only a small number of issue-related items, we decided to focus on issues that were both politically significant during the late 70s and among the most likely to show sex differences. Table 4.2 presents the wording of the policy-related items included in our study and shows the distribution of responses to the various items.

Public opinion polls traditionally have found women to be more pacifistic and less supportive of the use of military force than men.⁴ While we did not ask directly about the use of military force, we did ask appointees whether they agreed or disagreed that the military strength of the United States should be superior to that of the Soviet Union. There was no sex difference in proportions giving liberal responses, with less than one-fourth of both females and males disagreeing with this statement. However, men were substantially more likely to agree that the United States should be superior to the Soviet Union in military strength. Women were more likely than men to opt for the "neutral" response, indicating a somewhat more reserved posture toward a U.S. military build-up.

While a majority of female and male Carter appointees gave the hard-line,

TABLE 4.2: ON THREE OF FOUR CONTEMPORARY ISSUES, WOMEN WERE MORE LIBERAL THAN MEN

Issue Item ^a	Carter Appointees		White House Staff Women
	Women %	Men %	
Military strength of U.S. should be superior to U.S.S.R.			
Agree ^b	53.1	72.4	28.6
Neutral	22.7	5.2	14.3
Disagree ^c	24.2	22.4	57.2
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(66)	(58)	(14)
Convicted murders should receive the death penalty			
Agree ^b	14.9	16.7	0.0
Neutral	10.4	10.0	0.0
Disagree ^c	74.6	73.3	100.0
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(67)	(60)	(14)
No more nuclear power plants should be built			
Agree ^b	25.0	3.2	46.7
Neutral	17.2	6.5	20.0
Disagree ^c	57.8	90.3	33.3
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(64)	(62)	(15)
Private sector can solve our economic problems			
Agree ^b	18.5	27.7	0.0
Neutral	4.6	9.2	0.0
Disagree ^c	77.0	63.0	100.0
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(65)	(65)	(14)

^aFor precise wording of issue items see NOTES, Chapter 4, Note 12 at end of report.

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

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

conservative response regarding U.S. military strength, an even larger majority of appointees stood clearly on the liberal side of the capital punishment issue. Although public opinion surveys have found women in the general population more opposed than men to imposing the death penalty,⁵ there were no significant differences in opinions between female and male Carter appointees. Both women and men among appointees were far more

liberal on this issue than the general population, with male appointees particularly far out of line with their male counterparts in the public.⁶

Nuclear power is a third issue on which public opinion polls have shown sex differences in the general population with women more likely to favor cutting back the operations of nuclear power plants, more opposed to building new plants, and more predisposed to shut down existing plants.⁷ Like their counterparts in the population, women appointees were more opposed to the construction of new nuclear power plants than were male appointees. Sex differences among appointees were much larger on this issue than on U.S. military strength or capital punishment. However, a small majority of women and a very large majority of men disagreed that "no additional nuclear power plants should be built."

The final general issue item included in our study focused on appointees' faith in the private sector's ability to devise solutions to our economic problems. While most appointees did not believe that the private sector alone could cure our economic woes, there were slight sex differences on this question. Women were somewhat less likely than men to express faith in the capabilities of private enterprise.

White House staff women were more liberal than other female Carter appointees on all four of the issue items. Unlike other appointees, a majority of White House staff women disagreed that the military strength of the United States should be superior to that of the Soviet Union. All of the women on the White House staff expressed opposition to capital punishment. Almost twice as large a proportion of White House staff women as other female appointees agreed that no new nuclear power plants should be constructed. Finally, White House staff women were unanimous in their rejection of the statement that the private sector, acting alone, can find solutions to our economic problems.

VIEWS ON WOMEN'S ISSUES

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

One issue that has become closely associated with the feminist movement is child care. As Table 4.3 shows, almost one-half of the women compared with less than one-third of the men agreed that the government should provide child care services to all parents who desire them, with fees charged according to ability to pay. Far more men than women opposed this idea. Given that this question was asked of appointees in early 1981 when the tide was definitely running against an expanding role for the

TABLE 4.3: MEN WERE SUPPORTIVE OF FEMINIST POSITIONS ON WOMEN'S ISSUES
BUT WOMEN WERE EVEN MORE SUPPORTIVE

Issue Item ^a	Carter Appointees	
	Women %	Men %
Government should provide child care		
Agree strongly	15.2	12.1
Agree	33.3	17.2
Neutral	15.2	10.3
Disagree	28.8	44.8
Disagree strongly	7.6	15.5
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(66)	(58)
Constitution should ban abortion		
Agree strongly	0.0	3.1
Agree	0.0	3.1
Neutral	0.0	1.5
Disagree	4.4	6.2
Disagree strongly	95.6	86.2
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(68)	(65)
Federal ERA should be ratified		
Agree strongly	69.1	39.1
Agree	20.6	37.5
Neutral	5.9	10.9
Disagree	1.5	7.8
Disagree strongly	2.9	4.7
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(68)	(64)
Women's movement has gone too far in fight for equality		
Agree strongly	0.0	0.0
Agree	2.9	3.2
Neutral	0.0	14.3
Disagree	29.4	44.4
Disagree strongly	67.6	38.1
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(68)	(63)

^aFor precise wording of issue items see NOTES, Chapter 4, Note 13 at end of report.

federal government, the fact that a sizable minority of the men and a near majority of the women favored this proposal is striking.

As with child care, there were sex differences, although small ones, on the abortion issue. All the women and nine of every ten men expressed

opposition to a constitutional amendment to prohibit abortion under all or almost all circumstances.⁸ Thus, while most male Carter appointees shared the views of the feminist movement on this issue, female Carter appointees were unanimous in their support of the feminist position.

Carter appointees also were overwhelmingly supportive of the Equal Rights Amendment, with women again showing higher levels of feminist support than the men. Three-fourths of the men and nine of every ten women agreed that the ERA should be ratified. Sex differences were particularly apparent in intensity of support for ERA. A total of 69.1% of the women compared with 39.1% of the men strongly agreed with the statement that the Equal Rights Amendment should be ratified. This difference in intensity suggests that the ERA was an issue of greater concern for women than for men.

As a final overall measure of support for feminist goals, we asked appointees to agree or disagree with the statement: "The women's movement has gone too far in pushing for equality between the sexes." The pattern here was very similar to that found for ERA. Men overwhelmingly disagreed but women were nearly unanimous in their rejection of this statement. Because the reactions of appointees to this statement were so one-sided, it was again the differences in proportions who expressed strong sentiments that were most revealing. Approximately two-thirds of the women (67.6%) compared with only about one-third of the men (38.1%) expressed strong disagreement with the idea that the women's movement has gone too far in pushing for equality. Thus, while most men as well as most women voiced general support for the feminist movement, the women were more intense in their support.

SEX DIFFERENCES AMONG DEMOCRATS AND LIBERALS

In the two sections above, we have shown that female and male Carter appointees differed somewhat in their views on U.S. military strength, nuclear power, the capabilities of the private sector, child care, abortion, ERA, and the feminist movement. However, there are factors other than gender which may have affected the attitudes and issue positions of Carter appointees. As we noted in Chapter 2 of this report, a larger proportion of women appointees (83.6%) than male appointees (72.6%) were Democrats. Similarly, as Table 4.4 shows, a somewhat larger proportion of women than men identified themselves as liberals in political ideology. More than two-thirds of the women compared with only half the men claimed that they thought of themselves as liberal or very liberal on most contemporary issues. Were the sex differences on issues found earlier in this section due simply to the fact that women appointed to the Carter administration more often than the men were Democrats and liberals? Or were

TABLE 4.4: WOMEN MORE OFTEN THAN MEN IDENTIFIED THEMSELVES AS LIBERAL OR VERY LIBERAL IN POLITICAL IDEOLOGY^a

Political Ideology	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Very liberal	13.8	7.9	15.4
Liberal	55.4	44.4	76.9
Middle-of-the-road	24.6	39.7	7.7
Conservative	6.2	7.9	0.0
Very conservative	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(65)	(63)	(13)

^aThe question used to measure political ideology was worded as follows: On most contemporary issues, do you generally think of yourself as very conservative, conservative, middle-of-the-road, liberal, or very liberal?

there genuine sex differences in views that showed up even among Democrats and among liberals?

Table 4.5 presents the three general issues and Table 4.6 presents the women's issues on which sex differences were found earlier in this chapter. Both of these tables show the proportions of men and women among four groups--Democrats, Republicans/Independents, liberals, and moderates/conservatives--who gave various responses to the issue items. Since the largest proportions of Carter appointees were Democrats and liberals, it is these groups on which we focus our attention.

Table 4.5 demonstrates that female Democrats were more liberal in their responses to all three general issue questions than were male Democrats. Women among Democrats were more likely than men to opt for the neutral response on the question regarding U.S. military strength while men were more likely than women to agree that U.S. military strength should be superior to that of the Soviet Union. Similarly, female Democrats were more likely than male Democrats to agree that no new nuclear power plants should be built and to disagree that the private sector can solve our economic problems. While there were only a small number of Republicans and Independents among appointees, women among these appointees were not notably more liberal than their male counterparts. In fact, on the question regarding the private sector, their responses were distinctly less liberal.

Just as Democratic women were more liberal than Democratic men in their responses to the questions in Table 4.5, women who identified themselves as liberals gave more liberal responses than their male counterparts.

Female liberals were less likely than male liberals to agree that the U.S. should be militarily superior to the Soviet Union, more likely to agree that no additional nuclear power plants should be built, and more likely to disagree that the private sector alone can find ways to solve our economic problems. Among self-identified moderates and conservatives, women's views on these issues fairly closely paralleled those of their male counterparts.

Clearly, then, on these general issues, sex differences existed among both Democrats and liberals. The greater liberalism of female appointees was not due simply to the fact that women appointees were more likely than their male counterparts to be Democrats and self-identified liberals.

TABLE 4.5: WOMEN DEMOCRATS AND LIBERALS EXPRESSED MORE LIBERAL VIEWS ON SEVERAL ISSUES THAN DID THEIR MALE COUNTERPARTS

Issue Item ^a	Democrats		Republicans/ Independents		Liberals		Moderates/ Conservatives	
	Women %	Men %	Women %	Men %	Women %	Men %	Women %	Men %
Military strength of U.S. should be superior to U.S.S.R. ^b								
Agree ^b	50.9	71.8	70.0	73.3	45.5	75.0	68.4	66.7
Neutral	23.6	5.1	10.0	6.7	25.0	0.0	21.1	11.1
Disagree ^c	25.4	23.1	20.0	20.0	29.5	25.0	10.5	22.2
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(55)	(39)	(10)	(15)	(44)	(28)	(19)	(27)
No more nuclear power plants should be built								
Agree ^b	28.8	4.8	9.1	0.0	34.2	6.5	5.0	0.0
Neutral	19.2	9.5	0.0	0.0	22.0	9.7	10.0	3.4
Disagree ^c	51.9	85.7	90.9	100.0	43.9	83.9	85.0	96.6
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(52)	(42)	(11)	(16)	(41)	(31)	(20)	(29)
Private sector can solve our economic problems								
Agree ^b	13.2	17.8	45.4	37.5	6.8	12.1	44.5	44.8
Neutral	0.0	8.9	18.2	12.5	2.3	9.1	11.1	10.3
Disagree ^c	86.8	73.3	36.4	50.0	90.9	78.8	44.5	44.8
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	(53)	(45)	(11)	(16)	(44)	(33)	(18)	(29)

^aFor precise wording of issue items, see NOTES, Chapter 4, Note 12 at end of report.

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

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

TABLE 4.6: WOMEN DEMOCRATS AND LIBERALS EXPRESSED MORE FEMINIST VIEWS ON SEVERAL ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT THAN DID THEIR MALE COUNTERPARTS

Issue Item ^a	Democrats		Republicans/ Independents		Liberals		Moderates/ Conservatives	
	Women %	Men %	Women %	Men %	Women %	Men %	Women %	Men %
Government should provide child care								
Total agree ^b	55.5	37.5	18.2	6.7	56.9	41.9	30.0	12.5
Agree strongly	18.5	17.5	0.0	0.0	20.5	16.1	0.0	4.2
Total	(54)	(40)	(11)	(15)	(44)	(31)	(20)	(24)
Constitution should ban abortion								
Total disagree ^c	100.0	95.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.0	100.0	86.2
Disagree strongly	98.2	86.7	81.8	100.0	97.8	87.9	90.0	82.8
Total	(56)	(45)	(11)	(16)	(45)	(33)	(20)	(29)
Federal ERA should be ratified								
Total agree ^b	91.1	90.9	81.8	56.3	95.6	90.9	80.0	60.7
Agree strongly	73.2	50.0	45.5	18.6	75.6	57.6	55.0	21.4
Total	(56)	(44)	(11)	(16)	(45)	(33)	(20)	(28)
Women's movement has gone too far in fight for equality								
Total disagree ^c	96.4	93.0	100.0	62.5	100.0	90.9	90.0	70.4
Disagree strongly	75.0	46.5	27.3	25.0	75.6	57.6	50.0	18.5
Total	(56)	(43)	(11)	(16)	(45)	(33)	(20)	(27)

^aFor precise wording of issue items see NOTES, Chapter 4, Note 13 at end of report.

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

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

Table 4.6 demonstrates that Democratic and liberal women also appeared more "feminist" in their views on several issues associated with the feminist movement. Women among Democrats and liberals were considerably more likely than their male counterparts to agree that the government should provide child care services. While Democratic and liberal women were not much more likely than men to espouse the feminist position on the other three issues in Table 4.6, there were noticeable sex differences in the intensity of their views. Larger proportions of female than male Democrats and liberals strongly disagreed with the idea of a constitutional amendment to prohibit abortion, strongly agreed that the ERA should be ratified,

and strongly disagreed that the women's movement has gone too far in pushing for equality.

Among Republicans and Independents, women were more likely than men to give feminist responses, except on the abortion item, where 100% of both sexes gave feminist responses. Similarly, women among moderates and conservatives were more supportive of feminist positions on all issues than were their male counterparts (Table 4.6).

Thus, it does appear that there were sex differences on these issues commonly associated with the feminist movement that transcended party or ideology. It is not simply because more of the women appointees were Democrats and liberals that women, as a group, appeared more supportive of feminist positions than did male appointees.

SUPPORT AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF OTHER WOMEN

One of the ways in which women can work to change the political world

TABLE 4.7: A MAJORITY OF WOMEN REPORTED THAT THEY TRIED TO INVOLVE MORE WOMEN IN POLITICS

Frequency With Which Appointees Undertook the Following Activities	Carter Appointees Women %	White House Staff Women %
Actively recruit women when hiring staff		
Frequently	91.3	93.3
Sometimes	7.2	6.7
Almost never	1.4	0.0
	100.0	100.0
Total	(69)	(15)
Encourage individual women to become active in politics		
Frequently	61.4	80.0
Sometimes	28.6	13.3
Almost never	10.0	6.7
	100.0	100.0
Total	(70)	(15)
Speak to various groups of women, urging them to become active in politics		
Frequently	37.7	60.0
Sometimes	34.8	6.7
Almost never	27.5	33.3
	100.0	100.0
Total	(69)	(15)

is by supporting the positions and concerns of the feminist movement. As we have seen, most female Carter appointees were, in fact, supportive of feminist positions on women's issues. A second means through which women can work to bring about political change is by encouraging other women to become involved in politics. In order to ascertain the extent to which female Carter appointees engaged in activities that would help to involve other women in politics, we asked women appointees a series of three questions on this subject; their responses are presented in Table 4.7.

First, women were asked about the frequency with which they tried to recruit women when hiring staff. Almost all female appointees claimed they made an effort to hire women as staff members, and nine of every ten said they did so frequently. A slightly smaller, but still very large, majority of women claimed that they encouraged individual women to become active in politics, and almost two-thirds reported that they did this frequently. The activity that elicited the smallest proportions reporting the behavior was speaking to groups of women in order to encourage them to become active in politics. Nevertheless, more than one-third of female Carter appointees claimed that they frequently spoke to women's groups for this reason, and another one-third stated that they did so sometimes.

White House staff women were not significantly more or less likely than other female appointees to engage in these activities in support of other women. However, they reported that they did these things with greater frequency. Significantly larger proportions of White House staff women than other appointees reported that they frequently encouraged individual women and groups of women to become active in politics.

If one accepts these reports as valid indicators of behavior, it appears that the women among Carter appointees were quite active in trying to increase the involvement of other women in the political sphere.

MEMBERSHIPS IN FEMINIST AND OTHER WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS

The organizational memberships of female Carter appointees also suggest high levels of interaction with other women and support for feminist goals.

Table 4.8 indicates that female Carter appointees, like other women among political elites,⁹ were "joiners." Three-fourths belonged to a labor union or professional association, almost two-thirds were members of a college or alumni group, and more than one-third belonged to a parent-teacher organization and to a church or religious group. White House staff women were almost as likely as other female Carter appointees to belong to each of these types of organizations.

Large proportions of female appointees also belonged to "women's groups"--those groups whose membership was entirely or primarily women. More than half belonged to a women's professional or business organization,

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

Belonged to the Following Organization or Type of Organization	Carter Appointees Women %	White House Staff Women %
Nonwomen's Organizations		
Labor union or professional association	77.1	66.7
College or alumni group ^a	64.3	46.7
Parent-teachers' organization (e.g. PTA)	40.0	33.3
Church group	35.7	33.3
Women's Organizations		
General types		
Women's professional or business organization	52.9	60.0
Organization of women public officials	40.0	46.7
Women's service organization (e.g. Soroptomist or the Junior League)	21.4	6.7
Specific organizations		
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs (BPW)	14.3	20.0
League of Women Voters (LWV)	18.6	26.7
American Association of University Women (AAUW)	17.1	13.3
Junior League	2.9	0.0
Feminist Organizations		
Feminist group	52.9	80.0
Women's Political Caucus (WPC)	44.3	73.3
National Organization for Women (NOW)	32.9	60.0
Total	(70)	(15)

^aIn some cases, these groups were single-sex groups since many women appointees attended women's colleges.

and about one of every seven belonged specifically to the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs (BPW). Two-fifths of all female appointees had been members of an organization of women public officials. Approximately one-fifth belonged to a women's service organization, and almost that many belonged specifically to the League of Women Voters (LWV) and the Association of University Women (AAUW). While we also asked about membership in the Junior League, very few Carter appointees belonged to this group.

Consistent with the high levels of support for feminist issue positions and the reports of behavior to encourage other women to become active

in politics, female Carter appointees reported high levels of membership in feminist organizations--those organizations whose sole or primary purpose is to improve the status of women in politics or society. More than one-half belonged to one or more feminist organizations, and sizable proportions belonged to each of two of the largest feminist organizations in the country. More than two-fifths were members of the National Women's Political Caucus and/or one of its state or local affiliates, and about one-third of all women appointees were members of the National Organization for Women (NOW).

White House staff women, like other female Carter appointees, were "joiners" who showed high levels of organizational membership. However, they were slightly less likely than other Carter appointees to belong to the four types of non-women's organizations in Table 4.8 and somewhat more likely to belong to women's organizations and feminist groups (with the exception of women's service organizations and the Junior League).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Female and male Carter appointees did, in fact, view the political world somewhat differently. Nevertheless, the differences are best characterized as differences of degree rather than as fundamental conflicts between the sexes.

While most men perceived political opportunities for women to become political leaders as more limited than those for men, the women seemed more intense in their sentiments. Most men perceived that women would not make worse managers than men and that they devote as much time to the job. However, far more of the women felt strongly about the managerial capabilities of women relative to men and expressed the view that women, in fact, devote more time to the job than men do.

Sex differences also were apparent on several contemporary political issues, with women showing somewhat more liberal tendencies. Women were less likely than men to assume a hawkish posture on the issue of U.S. military strength relative to that of the Soviets. They also were more opposed to building new nuclear power plants and expressed less faith in the ability of the private sector to develop solutions to our economic problems. These sex differences were not simply a result of the fact that more women than men were Democrats and self-identified liberals. Both among Democratic appointees and among liberal appointees, women expressed more liberal positions than men. Given the greater liberalism of women on these three issues, it is somewhat surprising that there were no sex differences in the responses to the question about capital punishment. Perhaps the lack of sex differences is due, in part, to the fact that the men were so liberal on this issue; more male appointees expressed liberal opinions on the death penalty than on any other item.

It is important to reiterate that we asked about those issues where we thought sex differences were most probable. As a result, the findings of this section cannot be read as indicating that on all, or even most, issues women appointees were more liberal than the men. However, the findings do suggest that there were some issues on which women appointees did have a distinctive perspective--a perspective that was slightly more liberal in nature than that of their male counterparts.

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

In summarizing her reactions to the Carter administration's record in appointing women, Jane McMichael, former executive director of the National Women's Political Caucus, was quoted as saying, "The numbers aren't there, but for the first time an administration is appointing real feminists, rather than just any woman to fill out the quotas."¹⁰ The data collected in our study would seem to support McMichael's claim. Not only were female appointees overwhelmingly supportive of feminist issue concerns, but they also reported high levels of membership in feminist organizations and high levels of activity to encourage individual women or groups of women to become involved in politics. More than half belonged to a feminist group, and large majorities reported that they tried to hire women as staff members, encouraged individual women they knew to become politically active, and spoke to groups of women in order to urge them to become more involved in politics.

Those who accept appointments to a presidential administration realize that their tenure in office will be short-lived. Not only do they serve at the pleasure of the president (and in some cases the Senate), but also they know that the administration may come to an end after four years and will certainly come to an end after eight. What happens to women (and men) serving in high-level appointive positions upon leaving the administration? Do they move on to comparable positions in the public or private sector? Or do they have difficulty finding suitable employment? Would they serve in a future presidential administration? And do they aspire to other elective or appointive positions at various levels of government? These questions are central to our examination in this chapter of the post-administration employment patterns and political ambitions of Carter appointees.

EMPLOYMENT AFTER LEAVING THE ADMINISTRATION

Our interviews with Carter appointees were conducted in April and May 1981. Table 5.1 shows the employment patterns of appointees at that time--only a few months after the administration had ended. Although many appointees left the administration well before December 1980, many others remained in their jobs at least for a short time after the administration ended. Table 5.1 indicates that men far more often than women stayed in their positions during the first few months of the Reagan administration. Almost one-third of the men compared with fewer than one-fifth of the women remained in the same position in April/May, 1981, that they had held at the end of the Carter administration.

Not only were women less likely than their male counterparts to retain their appointive positions as of late spring 1981, but also they were less likely to be employed in any job (Table 5.1). About one of every ten women, compared with one of every twenty men, was unemployed at the time of our interviews.

As one would expect given the highly political nature of their jobs, none of the White House staff women remained in her White House position at the time of our interviews. Moreover, women on the White House staff were more likely than other female appointees to be unemployed. One-fifth of the White House staff women were without jobs in late spring 1981.

We wanted to examine whether the greater difficulty women had in finding jobs after the administration ended (apparent in Table 5.1) was a short-term or long-term phenomenon. Consequently, we recontacted Carter appointees in the spring of 1982 and asked them to describe their employment

TABLE 5.1: WOMEN WERE SLIGHTLY LESS LIKELY THAN MEN TO BE EMPLOYED IN SPRING 1981

	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Employed at time of our initial interviews in spring 1981	88.2	95.5	80.0
Still employed in last position held in Carter administration as of spring 1981	17.6	31.8	0.0
Total	(68)	(66)	(15)

as of January 1982. There were no significant differences between women and men in the proportions employed; very few women (3.3%) and none of the men reported that they were unemployed (Table 5.2). Nevertheless, a few sex differences in nature of employment are apparent. Men were far more likely than women to be employed by the federal government. Comparing Table 5.2 with Table 2.7 in Chapter 2 of this report, it is apparent that a higher proportion of men had jobs with the federal government one year after the administration ended than had had jobs with the federal government prior to joining the Carter administration. The reverse pattern is true for the women. A slightly smaller proportion of women held jobs in the federal government in January 1982 than had held such jobs before accepting an appointment to the Carter administration. While women were less likely than men to be employed by the federal government, they were more likely in early 1982 to have jobs with state and local governments.

As of the beginning of 1982, men also were more likely than women to report that they were attorneys. While the proportion of women practicing law was similar before and after the administration, the proportion of men reporting employment as lawyers increased noticeably following the administration (see Table 2.7, Chapter 2, and Table 5.2 of this chapter). As noted in Chapter 1, more men than women had law degrees and thus were able to take up the practice of law, in the absence of more attractive offers, after leaving the administration.

Women were almost twice as likely as men to have jobs in the field of education, either as administrators or as college teachers. While approximately one-tenth of women and one-tenth of men came to the administration from jobs in education (Table 2.7, Chapter 2), one-fifth of the women compared with only one-tenth of the men took jobs in the field of education after leaving the administration.

The only other notable sex difference is in the consultant category (Table 5.2). Women were slightly more likely than men to classify themselves as consultants. Both women and men were far more likely to be consultants after leaving the administration than immediately before joining the administration (see Table 2.7, Chapter 2).

The major difference in the employment patterns of White House women is that they were far more likely than other appointees to be employed as consultants. About half listed consulting as their primary occupation as of January 1982.

It appears, then, that female appointees may have had more difficulty than male appointees in finding employment immediately after the administration ended. However, one year after Carter left office, most appointees, both female and male, reported that they were employed. From the descriptions given us by appointees, we were not able to discern major differences between women and men in the quality and status of the jobs they were able to find after leaving the administration. Although we found few differences in the employment status of female and male appointees, we are reluctant, based on the data we collected, to draw strong conclusions

TABLE 5.2: ALMOST ALL WOMEN AND MEN REPORTED THAT THEY WERE EMPLOYED BY JANUARY 1982

Position as of January 1982	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Government Positions			
Federal government employee	14.9	32.2	0.0
State/local government employee	6.6	1.7	0.0
Candidate for public office	1.6	0.0	0.0
Nongovernment Positions			
Executive in public affairs organization/nonprofit organization/foundation	1.6	0.0	7.7
Attorney	13.1	20.3	23.1
Educational administrator or college professor	21.3	11.9	7.7
Executive in private sector	9.8	10.2	7.7
Consultant	21.3	17.0	46.2
Journalist/writer	3.3	1.7	0.0
Physician	0.0	1.7	0.0
Lecturer	1.6	0.0	7.7
Retired	0.0	3.4	0.0
Unemployed	3.3	0.0	0.0
Other	1.6	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(61)	(59)	(13)

about the comparability of the employment of women and men following the administration for two reasons. First, we do not know if women moved to jobs with salaries equal to those of the men. Second, because we had to rely on self-reports of employment, our findings are subject to whatever omissions and biases may have entered into those self-reports.

DESIRE TO SERVE IN ANOTHER PRESIDENTIAL ADMINISTRATION

In our interviews with appointees in spring 1981, we asked about the likelihood that they would accept an appointment in some future presidential administration (Table 5.3). Approximately one-quarter of both women and men claimed that they were unsure about whether they would do so. While many appointees, both female and male, expressed uncertainty over their intentions, women were more likely than men to say that it was "very likely" that they would accept an appointment in the future, if offered. Women just as frequently as men said that it was "somewhat likely" that they would accept an appointment. Men more often claimed that it was "not at all likely" that they would accept an appointment.

Two-thirds of the women on the White House staff--a greater proportion than among other Carter appointees--responded that they would be "somewhat likely" to accept appointments to a future presidential administration (Table 5.3). These women far less frequently than other female appointees reported that they would be "very likely" to accept another appointment, perhaps because their service in office is more clearly linked to loyalty to a specific individual.

TABLE 5.3: WOMEN MORE OFTEN THAN MEN SAID THEY WOULD BE VERY LIKELY TO ACCEPT AN APPOINTMENT TO A FUTURE PRESIDENTIAL ADMINISTRATION

Probability That Appointee Would Accept Appointment in Future Presidential Administration	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Very likely	36.8	28.8	6.7
Somewhat likely	35.3	34.8	66.7
Not at all likely	4.4	10.6	13.3
Unsure	23.5	25.8	13.3
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	(68)	(66)	(15)

TABLE 5.4: WOMEN WERE MORE LIKELY THAN MEN TO ASPIRE TO APPOINTIVE POSITIONS AND EQUALLY LIKELY TO ASPIRE TO ELECTIVE OFFICES

	Carter Appointees		White House Staff
	Women %	Men %	Women %
Aspire to another appointive position at any level of government	83.8	74.2	60.0
Aspire to an elective office at any level of government	41.2	40.9	40.0
Total	(68)	(66)	(15)

DESIRE TO HOLD OTHER APPOINTIVE OR ELECTIVE POSITIONS

We also asked appointees whether there were any other appointive positions or any elective offices at any level of government that they would like to hold. Table 5.4 presents appointees' responses to these questions.

Not surprisingly, appointees of both sexes were about twice as likely to want to serve in appointive positions as in elective offices. Nevertheless, two-fifths of both women and men expressed an interest in elective officeholding, suggesting that in the minds of many Carter appointees elective and appointive officeholding were not viewed as mutually exclusive domains. The proportions expressing a desire to hold elective office were considerably larger than the proportions (10.3% of the women and 6.1% of the men) who had actually held elective office prior to joining the Carter administration.

While there were no significant differences between women and men in their desire to serve in elective positions, women were somewhat more likely than men to express an interest in holding appointive positions at some level of government in the future. Three-fourths of the men and more than four-fifths of the women said they would like to hold an appointive position at some time in the future.

Women on the White House staff were about equally as likely as other female appointees to want to hold elective office but less likely to want to hold another appointive position.

ASPIRATIONS FOR FUTURE POSITIONS

Table 5.5 presents respondents' reports of the highest office they would like to hold at some point in the future for those appointees who expressed some interest in serving in another appointive or elective position. This measure provides some indication of where appointees would like to be at the pinnacle of their public careers. The largest proportions of both women and men claimed that a federal cabinet position represented their highest aspiration; women who wanted to continue their public careers were a little more likely than men to aspire ultimately to a cabinet post. The second most popular choice of both women and men was a federal subcabinet position; in this case, men were far more likely than women to see such a position as the pinnacle of their public careers. The only other option chosen by more than one-tenth of those who expressed an interest in future officeholding was that of U.S. senator. Approximately the same proportion of women and men ultimately aspired to a seat in the U.S. Senate.

Table 5.6 presents responses to the question, "Which office would you like to hold next?" asked of those appointees who expressed an interest in serving in some elective or appointive position in the future. The most

TABLE 5.5: AMONG APPOINTEES WHO WANT TO SERVE IN AN APPOINTIVE OR ELECTIVE POSITION IN THE FUTURE, WOMEN WERE SLIGHTLY MORE LIKELY THAN MEN TO NAME A FEDERAL CABINET POST AS THE HIGHEST POSITION THEY WANT TO HOLD

Highest Position Aspired To	Carter Appointees	
	Women	Men
Federal		
President	5.9	2.3
U.S. senator	13.7	14.0
U.S. representative	3.9	0.0
Federal cabinet secretary	35.3	30.2
Federal subcabinet post	17.6	30.2
Federal regulatory commissioner	2.0	2.3
Ambassador	3.9	4.7
Other federal position	2.0	4.7
State		
Governor	5.9	4.7
Director of department of state government	3.9	0.0
State legislator	0.0	2.3
Judge	3.9	2.3
Other	2.0	2.3
	100.0	100.0
Total ^a	(51)	(43)

^aTotals are based only on those appointees who expressed an interest in holding another appointive or elective position in the future. White House staff women are not included in this table because so few aspired to another office.

frequent response was a federal subcabinet position, given by more than one-third of both women and men. The second most frequently mentioned governmental position was that of federal cabinet official, named by almost one-sixth of the women and slightly more than one-sixth of the men. There were not major sex differences in proportions naming each of these types of positions, although men were slightly more likely to express an interest in holding a cabinet-level position next while women were just slightly more likely to opt for a subcabinet-level position. (This was the reverse of findings of sex differences in responses to the question about the highest position that appointees desired.) No other type of office was named by more than one-tenth of appointees except for U.S. senator among men. While men were more likely than women to say that the next position they wanted to hold was that of U.S. senator, women were a little more likely than men to report that the next office of interest to them was that of U.S. representative or governor of a state.

TABLE 5.6: AMONG APPOINTEES WHO WANT TO SERVE IN AN APPOINTIVE OR ELECTIVE POSITION IN THE FUTURE, WOMEN MORE OFTEN THAN MEN NAMED A FEDERAL SUBCABINET POSITION AS THE NEXT POSITION THEY WANT TO HOLD

Next Position Aspired To	Carter Appointees	
	Women %	Men %
Federal		
U.S. senator	5.7	14.0
U.S. representative	5.7	2.3
Federal cabinet secretary	15.1	18.6
Federal subcabinet post	37.7	34.9
Federal regulatory commissioner	1.9	4.6
Ambassador	7.5	9.3
Other federal position	5.7	9.3
State		
Governor	5.7	2.3
Director of department of state government	5.7	0.0
State legislator	1.9	0.0
Judge	0.0	2.3
Other	7.5	2.3
	100.0	100.0
Total ^a	(53)	(43)

^aTotals are based only on those appointees who expressed an interest in holding another appointive or elective position in the future. White House staff women are not included in this table because so few aspired to another office.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Most appointees were able to find suitable employment after leaving the Carter administration, although it appears that female appointees may have had slightly more difficulty in the short-term than their male counterparts. One year after Carter left office, the employment rate of women and men appeared similar. The major differences that we could detect were in the nature of employment. Women were far less likely than men to have jobs with the federal government and somewhat less likely to have jobs as attorneys. Women were almost twice as likely as the men to have jobs in the field of education, as administrators or as college professors, and they were a little more likely to be consultants.

It is clear that most appointees did not intend for their public careers to end with their appointment to the Carter administration. Rather, majorities claimed that it is somewhat or very likely that they would accept an appointment to a future presidential administration if one

were offered, and very large majorities expressed an interest in holding an appointive position at some level of government. Even though only a handful had served in elective office prior to joining the administration of Jimmy Carter, about two-fifths claimed that they would like to serve in an elective position.

Previous research has been divided over the question of whether women in elites are less ambitious than their male counterparts. On the one hand, a number of studies, focusing mostly on party elites, have concluded that female elites have lower levels of ambition for public officeholding than male elites.¹ On the other hand, data from CAWP's 1977 study of women holding public office indicated that female officeholders are at least as ambitious politically as their male counterparts.² The data on women and men serving in the Carter administration would seem to support the latter position in this controversy. Female appointees more often than their male colleagues claimed that they would be "very likely" to accept an appointment to a future presidential administration. Women also were more likely to express a desire to hold appointive posts at other levels of government and were just as likely to claim that they would like to serve in an elective office. There were not major differences between those women and men who expressed some interest in serving in another appointive or elective position when asked about the highest position and the next position that they would like to hold. Although there were small differences, these did not point consistently in the direction of higher ambition for either women or men. Thus, the conclusion we drew for public officeholders in 1977 seems appropriate for appointees to the Carter administration as well: the women are at least as ambitious for future public officeholding as their male counterparts.

The final chapter of our report has three components. First, we highlight the most significant findings from the previous sections. Second, we discuss the implications of our findings for women who desire appointments to presidential administrations and those who wish to help women obtain appointments. Third, we suggest some avenues that future research might explore.

REVIEW OF MAJOR FINDINGS OF SEX DIFFERENCES

The most noteworthy findings of similarities and differences between women and men serving in high-level agency and departmental positions in the Carter administration are briefly summarized below.

Overall the backgrounds of women and men (e.g. parents' occupations and public officeholding experience, education, age, race, marital status, number and ages of children) were quite similar.

The major differences were:

Women were somewhat less likely than men to have law degrees.

Women were more likely than men to have received their undergraduate degrees from private, rather than public, colleges and universities. A sizable minority attended women's colleges.

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

Women appointees were younger than their male counterparts.

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

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

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

Women appointees were as qualified for high-level positions in a presidential administration as were the men. Nevertheless, there were a few interesting differences in the experiences and credentials of female and male appointees. These differences were:

Despite overall similarities in the occupational profiles of women and men, the women were more likely to come to the administration from jobs in public affairs organizations, nonprofit organizations, and foundations.

Women were more likely than men to have been delegates to a Democratic national convention.

Women were more likely than men to have worked in the 1976 Carter general election campaign (although there were no differences in the proportions of women and men who had worked in the primary campaigns).

Women appointees more often than their male counterparts had held prior appointive or administrative positions at federal, state, and local levels.

Women far more often than men had political role models and mentors who were women.

There were important differences between women and men in the circumstances surrounding their selection as appointees and their acceptance of positions in the administration. Among the most interesting of these were the following:

Women more often cited policy-related reasons for accepting appointments while men more often gave career-related reasons.

Female appointees of age forty or older more often than their male counterparts increased their salaries upon joining the administration and less often took cuts in salary.

Women more often than men knew Jimmy Carter prior to their appointments.

Women were more likely than men to name a cabinet secretary as the person most influential in their appointments. Women less often than men reported an under secretary, an assistant secretary, a member of the White House staff, or a member of Congress as the most influential person.

Several women claimed that other women within the administration were the most influential in helping them obtain appointments.

Almost half of the women (but none of the men) who reported receiving assistance from organizations cited women's organizations.

Almost one quarter of the women (but none of the men) mentioned their sex as the single most important factor leading to their appointments. Women were more likely than men to mention their professional qualifications and less likely to cite "contacts" as most important.

Women were more likely than men to rate their contact with close Carter associates and the activity of

organizations on their behalf as very important in their appointments. They less often than men rated professional contacts and managerial abilities as very important.

Women appointees viewed the political world somewhat differently than their male colleagues, although the differences were more often differences of degree than fundamental conflicts. A distinctive "women's perspective" seemed to exist in the following respects:

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

Women expressed more "liberal" views than men on several contemporary political issues, including U.S. military strength, nuclear power, and the ability of the private sector to solve our economic problems.

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

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

The postadministration employment patterns and future officeholding ambitions of female and male Carter appointees were similar in most respects. However, there were some key differences, including findings that:

Female appointees seemed to have more difficulty than their male counterparts in finding jobs in the first few months after the administration ended. More women than men were unemployed in spring 1981; more men than women retained positions with the federal government.

Although most women and men were employed by January 1982, women were less likely than men to have jobs with the federal government or as attorneys; women were more likely than men to be educational administrators, college professors, and consultants.

Women appointees more often than their male counterparts claimed that they would be "very likely" to accept an appointment to a future presidential administration.

Women also were more likely than men to express an interest in holding appointive positions at other levels of government.

REVIEW OF MAJOR FINDINGS OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DEPARTMENT/AGENCY APPOINTEES AND WHITE HOUSE STAFF APPOINTEES

In addition to revealing ways in which women appointees differed from their male colleagues, our research also uncovered some important differences in characteristics and recruitment between women appointed to department and agency positions and women appointed to the White House staff. Women on the White House staff differed from other female appointees in the following ways:

Women on the White House staff were more likely to have parents (especially fathers) who once held public office.

Women on the White House staff were less highly educated.

White House staff women were even more likely to be single, divorced, or separated than other female appointees.

All the White House staff women, without exception, were Democrats and all claimed that they were currently active in the Democratic party, compared with smaller proportions among other female appointees. However, they were far less likely than other female appointees to have held elective or appointive party positions and to have served as delegates to national party conventions.

White House staff women were far more likely to have worked in the Carter campaign in 1976 and far more likely to have held salaried positions in the campaign.

Similarly, the last job held prior to appointment more frequently was with the Carter-Mondale campaign or transition team in the case of White House staff women. White House staff women less frequently than other women appointees came to the administration from jobs in the federal government, with universities, or with public affairs organizations, nonprofit organizations, or foundations.

While White House staff women were less likely to have held prior appointive or administrative positions in state or federal government, they were more likely to have held an elective public office.

Women on the White House staff were more likely to have mentors who held elective federal offices and less likely to have mentors who were federal departmental officials.

White House staff women were far more likely than other appointees to mention a commitment to Carter or his policies, the opportunity to work in the White House, or the opportunity to work with Mondale as reasons for accepting their appointments.

Women on the White House staff were more likely to experience increases in salary upon joining the administration.

Larger proportions of White House staff women knew Carter prior to receiving appointments.

White House women more often named the president, vice-president, or other White House staff members as the person most influential in their appointments.

Women on the White House staff were considerably less likely to indicate they had made efforts on their own behalf in order to gain appointments.

White House staff women were less likely to claim that their sex was the most important factor in their appointments but more likely to report that "contacts" were most important.

Women on the White House staff more often rated as very important factors in gaining their appointments their own partisan activity, the activity of state and national party leaders on their behalf, Carter campaign work, and Ford/Carter transition work.

White House staff women were more "liberal" than other female appointees on the issues of U.S. military strength, capital punishment, nuclear power, and the abilities of the private sector to solve our economic problems.

White House staff women more often reported that they frequently recruited women when hiring staff, encouraged individual women to become active in politics, and spoke to groups of women encouraging them to become active in politics.

Women on the White House staff were somewhat more likely than other female appointees to belong to women's organizations and feminist groups.

Women on the White House staff were more likely than other women appointees to be unemployed in spring 1981.

Women on the White House staff were more likely than other women appointees to be working as consultants in January 1982.

White House staff women more often said they would be "somewhat likely" and less often said they would be "very likely" to accept an appointment to a future presidential administration. They were less likely than other women appointees to express an interest in serving in an appointive position at any other level of government.

IMPLICATIONS FOR WOMEN WHO WANT A PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENT

Clearly, the women (and men) who participated in our study were a very tiny and exceptional subsample of the American public. The vast majority of citizens, even among politically active individuals, will never receive presidential appointments. However, our research suggests that women who already possess a set of nearly essential socioeconomic characteristics can take certain steps to better position themselves for

presidential appointments. Nevertheless, even among those who possess the necessary socioeconomic characteristics and position themselves well, few actually will be chosen.

What are the socioeconomic characteristics that are shared by the large majority of those who obtain appointments? First, whether female or male, appointees tend to come from families of relatively high social status. Those who received appointments to the Carter administration came disproportionately from families where the father was a professional or a manager/administrator, and this was more often true for female than for male appointees. Similarly, a majority of appointees had attended private colleges and universities, and this, too, was far more often true for women than for men. Those who received undergraduate degrees from Ivy League, Seven Sisters, or other women's colleges were particularly overrepresented among appointees. Appointees not only often attended "elite" institutions, but they also were very highly educated, indicating that individuals without an advanced degree are not likely to be selected as appointees.

These characteristics--high socioeconomic status and an education in private schools, resulting in an advanced degree--can be considered initial screening mechanisms. Few individuals, especially women, without these characteristics receive appointments. Perhaps this is due to greater self-confidence and willingness to put oneself forward found among well educated and higher social class individuals; perhaps it is because those who are well educated and upper or middle class are better connected into networks of people who may have influence in the appointments process. Whatever the reason, it is clear that the selection process operates with a strong socioeconomic and class bias.¹

Our research indicates that those women who possess the necessary educational credentials and social background can take certain steps that might enhance the likelihood that they will serve in a presidential administration. Our research demonstrated that almost all female appointees were either unmarried at the time of their appointments or married to men whom they perceived to be very supportive of their political activity and governmental work. Women who marry men who are somewhat resistant to their wives' participation in politics or government probably will not have the necessary support at home for taking on the responsibilities of a high-level appointment. Few of the women appointed to the Carter administration had young children, suggesting that the presence of young children may act as a deterrent to appointive officeholding. Findings from our study regarding family characteristics indicate that decisions about marriage and the timing of children, while not explicitly political acts, are likely to have important effects on women's decisions about seeking and accepting presidential appointments.

It also appears from our study that women less often than men are helped by professional and personal contacts in obtaining appointments, probably because women are less likely to be as well integrated into traditionally male networks. However, women in the Carter administration more often were helped by organizations, especially women's organizations, and by women who occupied influential positions in the administration. There was evidence in our study that women supported women both from inside and outside the administration and that, in the eyes of the female appointees themselves, the support of other women had an impact. Thus, it seems that an otherwise qualified woman might enhance her chances of receiving an appointment by enlisting the help of both women on the inside of the administration and women's organizations on the outside exerting pressure on the administration to ensure that women receive appointments. The assistance of other women can help to compensate for a woman's lack of access, relative to that of her male colleagues, to the "old boys network."

It also appears from our study that a woman who has her sights set on a presidential appointment would be well advised to acquire certain types of experience as a means of enhancing the probability that she will be appointed. Women were less likely than men to view managerial abilities as an important factor leading to their appointments, probably because as a group they have had fewer opportunities to acquire such abilities. However, more women than men came to the administration from jobs in public affairs organizations, nonprofit organizations, and foundations, suggesting that these organizations are an alternative arena to government and the private sector--and perhaps one avenue more open to women's participation--for developing managerial skills. Clearly, a woman who desires a high-level appointment in a presidential administration would be well advised to acquire managerial experience in some sphere, whether it be in business, government, or nonprofit/public affairs organizations.

Women in the Carter administration were more likely than men to have been delegates to a national party convention, to have worked in the 1976 Carter campaign, and to have served in other administrative, appointive, and elective positions at all levels of government. These experiences may have helped make women who became appointees visible to those within the administration responsible for selecting appointees. Since women are not as likely as men to come to the attention of those recruiting for the administration through traditional means, experiences such as working in the campaign, serving as a delegate, or holding a position in government may serve as alternative ways for women to make themselves known to people who may someday exercise control over appointments to a presidential administration.

While a woman may enhance her chances of receiving a presidential appointment if she has the characteristics and experiences outlined above, there is no clearcut formula that will guarantee an appointment. From the many who have the relevant experiences and characteristics, very few are chosen. And even among the women in our study, there was as much diversity as similarity.

FUTURE RESEARCH

As the first research project investigating sex differences in routes into appointive positions at the federal level, this study has answered many questions and provided a baseline for future research. However, several questions have arisen as a result of this study that we hope will be addressed in future research. To conclude our profile, we will outline four of the questions that we consider most in need of attention.

First, the conclusions we have drawn in this study are limited to the experience of one Democratic administration. One would expect to find many similarities across different administrations as well as many differences. Yet, in order to clarify the nature and extent of the similarities and differences, studies like ours need to be repeated in the future. The administration of Ronald Reagan would seem an excellent starting point for such replication since both the partisan and the ideological coloration of the administration are quite different from that of the Carter administration.

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

A related concern is the question of what happens to appointees after they leave an administration. Do women have a more difficult time than men finding jobs of comparable salary and status to those they held in the administration? While there is much interest in this question, we were

only able to follow appointees for one year after leaving office. Moreover, our measure of the types of positions held by appointees after leaving the administration was relatively crude because we had to rely on self-reports. Thus, it was not possible to determine the quality or status of jobs held by people in the same occupational category. A more in-depth study that followed the careers of former appointees over a longer time frame and that relied on more objective measures of employment could provide a far more definitive answer to questions relating to the post-administration career patterns of appointees.

Finally, future research should move beyond the question of how women obtain appointments to ask also whether female appointees have a differential impact on policy decisions within an administration. The data presented in Chapter 4 of this report suggest that women may have somewhat different views than their male colleagues, especially on issues of special concern to women. However, the question of whether these different views translate into different priorities and policy decisions among female and male appointees remains a subject for future research.

NOTES

Introduction

1. Ernest D. Furguson, "Women, Blacks in Bottom Cabinet Drawer," Los Angeles Times, December 27, 1976.
2. Quoted from a speech by Jimmy Carter on Women's Rights presented before the Committee of 51.3 Percent, June 13, 1976.
3. Bruce Adams and Kathryn Kavanagh-Baran, Promise and Performance: Carter Builds a New Administration (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books/D.C. Heath and Company, 1979), p. 20.
4. Adams and Kavanagh-Baran, p. 21.
5. G. Calvin Mackenzie, The Politics of Presidential Appointments (New York: The Free Press, 1981), p. 257.
6. Conversation with Patricia Price Bailey, January 21, 1983.
7. Adams and Kavanagh-Baran, p. 79. President Ford, by contrast, had appointed women to about 5% of top policy positions after one year in office.
8. Interdepartmental Task Force on Women, Honoring a Commitment to the People of America: The Record of Jimmy Carter on Women's Issues (Washington, D.C.: The White House Office on Women, 1980), p. 9.
9. National Women's Political Caucus, Women in the Federal Judiciary: A Status Report (Washington, D.C.: National Women's Political Caucus, January 15, 1982).
10. Center for the American Woman and Politics, Women in Public Office: A Biographical Directory and Statistical Analysis (Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, 1978).
11. Noteworthy studies on the appointments process include: Adams and Kavanagh-Baran; Mackenzie; and David T. Stanley, Dean E. Mann, Jameson W. Doig, Men Who Govern (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1967).
12. CAWP did not survey a sample of men serving on the White House staff. Because there is such a small number of positions, and those few positions have varying kinds of responsibilities, we considered it impossible to select a sample which would be truly comparable.
13. The 112 women represent the total universe of women (that is to say, all women) identified as having held those positions during President Carter's four years in office.
14. A few interviews, which could not be conducted during the two-week period, were conducted between May 7 and May 12, 1981. The Eagleton Poll has been conducting public opinion polls and program evaluation services for state, local and federal government, interest groups, the media and others since 1971.
15. Copies of the survey instruments (questionnaires) are available at the Center for the American Woman and Politics.

Chapter 1

BACKGROUND AND FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS OF CARTER APPOINTEES

1. Throughout this report, whenever we refer to "White House staff" women, we are referring to those fifteen women in our survey who served on the staffs of President Carter or Vice-President Mondale.
2. See, for example, Marilyn Johnson and Susan Carroll, Profile of Women Holding Office II (New Brunswick, NJ: Center for the American Woman and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, 1978), p.16A.
3. Johnson and Carroll, p. 13A.
4. Johnson and Carroll, pp. 7A-20A.

Chapter 2

POLITICAL CREDENTIALS AND PRIOR EXPERIENCE OF CARTER APPOINTEES

1. "Carter and Dr. Kreps Share 2 Verbal Jabs," The New York Times, December 2, 1976. For additional information regarding the clash between women and Carter over appointments, see Myra MacPherson, "Catch 22 for Women," The Washington Post, January 16, 1977; and Nancy Hicks, "Feminists Critical of Carter on Jobs," The New York Times, February 8, 1977.
2. It is important to note that some positions on regulatory commissions by statute must be filled by individuals who are not from the president's party. However, the numbers of Republicans and Independents among the male and female regulatory commissioners in our study were very similar--two men and three women. Thus, the finding that women appointees were more likely to be Democrats than were the men is not a byproduct of the mandated appointment of non-Democrats to certain commission slots.
3. Stanley, Mann, and Doig, p. 41.
4. We remind the reader that we have examined only those women and men who were appointed to high-level positions. The elective officeholding experience of individuals appointed to other positions may be more or less significant and is worthy of exploration in future studies.
5. Johnson and Carroll, p. 4A.
6. For descriptions of the recruitment of women to the administration, see "How the White House Recruits Women Managers," The Christian Science Monitor, March 11, 1977; Myra MacPherson, "Is Criteria a Subterfuge," Home News, January 19, 1977; and Ellen Boddie, "Carter on Women: Mixed Reviews," Women's Political Times, Vol. 2 (Winter, 1977).

Chapter 3

THE RECRUITMENT OF CARTER APPOINTEES

1. Edmond Costantini and Kenneth H. Craik. "Women as Politicians: The Social Background, Personality and Political Careers of Female Party Leaders," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 28 (1972), p. 236.
2. While 8, or 61.5%, of the 13 appointees who had been delegates knew

Carter fairly well or slightly, only 25.8% of the 120 appointees who had not been delegates knew Carter. Similarly, while 50.0% of the 38 appointees who had worked in the campaign knew Carter fairly well or slightly, only 21.1% of 95 appointees who had not worked in the campaign knew him.

3. Of the three women on the White House staff who knew Carter very well or fairly well, two had held salaried positions in the Carter campaign.

4. See Mackenzie, p. 67.

5. These New Yorkers were not concentrated in any one or two departments or agencies; rather, they were fairly widely dispersed. Thus, it does not appear to have been the case that one or two departmental secretaries were primarily responsible for the large number of appointees from New York. Philip H. Burch, Jr., *The New Deal to the Carter Administration*, Vol. 3, *Elites in American History* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1980), p. 362, found that since the Civil War, New York has supplied a disproportionate number of appointees. He attributes this to New York City's "economic influence."

6. See INTRODUCTION to this report, section on The Appointments of Participants.

7. The data provide some support for this explanation. While 13.9% of the 36 women and men who had been delegates rated their contact with Carter associates as very important, only 8.2% of 98 appointees who had not been delegates did so. Similarly, 34.3% of the 35 appointees who had worked in the campaign compared with 26.5% of the 98 appointees who had not worked in the campaign rated contact with Carter associates as very important.

Chapter 4

A WOMAN'S PERSPECTIVE?

1. See Emily Stoper and Roberta Johnson, "The Weaker Sex and the Better Half: The Idea of Women's Moral Superiority in the American Feminist Movement," *Polity*, Vol. 10 (Winter 1977), pp. 192-217 for an historical review and critique of many of these arguments.

2. Interestingly, higher proportions of both women and men among Carter appointees disagreed with this statement than did women holding any public office in our 1977 study of women public officeholders. Among women public officeholders in 1977, the highest levels of disagreement were among female state senators, where 60% disagreed that women have just as much opportunity as men to become political leaders. See Johnson and Carroll, p. 39A, Table 53. Perhaps elective public officeholders show lower levels of disagreement than appointees because of differences in their experiences. While appointees' opportunities are controlled primarily by elites, it is primarily voters who exercise control over opportunities for elective officeholders. Elites may be perceived as less willing than voters to extend opportunities to women.

3. Although the format of the questions differed somewhat, results from our 1977 study of public officeholders indicate that women officeholders were more likely than appointees to believe that women in public office work harder than their male counterparts. More than 70% of women officeholders in every category of office at local, county and state levels agreed with the statement "Women in office generally devote more time to the job than do men." See Johnson and Carroll, p. 42A, Table 56.

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

5. See, for example, Gallup Opinion Index, No. 158 (September 1978).

6. For example, a Gallup poll conducted March 3-6, 1978, found 70% of men and 55% of women favored the death penalty for persons convicted of murder compared with 16.7% of male and 14.9% of female Carter appointees. Gallup Opinion Index, No. 158 (September 1978).

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

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

9. For example, we found that women public officeholders in 1977 on the average reported from three to six current active memberships. See Johnson and Carroll, p. 11A.

10. Adams and Kavanagh-Baran, p. 79.

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

Do you agree or disagree that: Women have just as much opportunity as men to become political leaders?

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

Do you agree or disagree that: In general, men make better managers than women?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Equal Rights Amendment should be ratified.

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

Chapter 5

THE FUTURE: BEYOND THE ADMINISTRATION

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

2. See Johnson and Carroll, pp. 51A-53A.

Chapter 6

CONCLUSION

1. This is not to say that one cannot receive a presidential appointment if one comes from a blue collar background or has only a B.A. or has been educated in public schools. However, one's chances are certainly diminished.

SELECTED READINGS

- Aberbach, Joel D.; Chesney, James D.; Rackman, Bert. "Exploring Elite Political Attitudes: Some Methodological Lessons." Political Methodology 2 (1975): 1-27.
- Adams, Bruce and Kavanagh-Baran, Kathryn. Promise and Performance: Carter Builds a New Administration. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books/D.C. Heath and Company, 1979.
- Baxter, Sandra and Lansing, Marjorie. Women and Politics: The Invisible Majority. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1980.
- Boddie, Ellen. "Carter on Women: Mixed Reviews." Women's Political Times 2 (1977).
- Burch, Philip H., Jr. The New Deal to the Carter Administration: Elites in American History, vol. 3, New York: Holmes and Meier, 1980.
- "Carter and Dr. Kreps Share 2 Verbal Jabs." The New York Times, 21 December 1976, p. 1A.
- Center for the American Woman and Politics. Women in Public Office: A Biographical Directory and Statistical Analysis. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, 1978.
- Coffey, Matthew B. "A Death at the White House: The Short Life of the New Patronage." Public Administration Review 34 (1974): 440-444.
- Costantini, Edmond and Craik, Kenneth H. "Women as Politicians: The Social Background, Personality and Political Careers of Female Party Leaders." Journal of Social Issues 28 (1972): 217-236.
- Diamond, Irene. Sex Roles in the State House. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.
- Dye, Thomas R. Who's Running America? 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1979.
- Dye, Thomas R. and Pickering, John W. "Governmental and Corporate Elites: Convergence and Differentiation." Journal of Politics 36 (1974):900-917.
- Farah, Barbara G. "Climbing the Political Ladder: The Aspirations and Expectations of Partisan Elites." In New Research on Women and Sex Roles, edited by Dorothy G. McGuigan. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Center for the Continuing Education of Women, 1976.
- Fiedler, Maureen R.S.M. "The Participation of Women in American Politics." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, 1975.
- Ferguson, Ernest D. "Women, Blacks in Bottom Cabinet Drawer." Los Angeles Times, December 1976.
- Havemann, Joel. "Carter is Taking Pains in Picking His Plums." National Journal 47 (1976): 1650-1654.
- Heclo, Hugh. A Government of Strangers. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1977.

- Henry, Laurin L. "The Presidency, Executive Staffing, and the Federal Bureaucracy." In The Presidency, edited by Aaron Wildavsky. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969.
- Hicks, Nancy. "Feminists Critical of Carter on Jobs." The New York Times, 8 February 1977.
- "How the White House Recruits Women Managers." The Christian Science Monitor, 11 March 1977.
- Interdepartmental Task Force on Women. Honoring a Commitment to the People of America: The Record of Jimmy Carter on Women's Issues. Washington, D.C.: The White House Office on Women, 1980.
- Jennings, M. Kent and Thomas, Norman. "Men and Women in Party Elites: Social Roles and Political Resources." Midwest Journal of Political Science 7 (1968): 469-492.
- Johnson, Marilyn and Carroll, Susan. Profile of Women Holding Office II. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for the American Woman and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, 1978.
- Keesling, Karen and Cavanagh, Suzanne. Women Presidential Appointees Serving or Having Served in Full-Time Positions Requiring Senate Confirmation 1912-1977. Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 23 March 1978.
- Kirkpatrick, Jeane J. The New Presidential Elite. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976.
- Mackenzie, G. Calvin. The Politics of Presidential Appointments. New York: The Free Press, 1981.
- MacPherson, Myra. "Catch 22 for Women." The Washington Post, 16 January 1977, p. 1.
- MacPherson, Myra. "Is Criteria a Subterfuge." Home News, 19 January 1977.
- Mann, Dean E. The Assistant Secretaries. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1965.
- National Women's Political Caucus. Women in the Federal Judiciary: A Status Report. Washington, D.C.: National Women's Political Caucus, 1982.
- Patton, Arch. "Government's Revolving Door!" Business Week, 22 September 1973, pp. 12-13.
- Pomper, Gerald. Voters' Choice: Varieties of American Electoral Behavior. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.
- Stanley, David T.; Mann, Dean E.; Doig, Jameson W. Men Who Govern. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1967.
- Stoper, Emily and Johnson, Roberta. "The Weaker Sex and the Better Half: The Idea of Women's Moral Superiority in the American Feminist Movement." Polity 10 (1977): 192-217.
- Tolchin, Martin and Tolchin, Susan. To the Victor... New York: Random House, 1971.
- Warner, W. Floyd; Van Riper, Paul P.; Martin, Norman H.; Collins, Orvis F. The American Federal Executive. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.



Project Staff

Ruth B. Mandel, *Director, CAWP*

Kathy A. Stanwick, *Assistant Director, CAWP*

Project Director, "Bringing More Women Into Public Office"

Susan J. Carroll, *Senior Research Associate, CAWP*

Barbara Geiger-Parker, *Research Associate, CAWP*

Katherine E. Kleeman, *Research Associate, CAWP*

John Cohen, *Research Assistant, CAWP*

The Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP) is the only research, education, and public service center of its kind. Established in 1971 with a Ford Foundation grant to the Eagleton Institute of Politics, the Center designs and sponsors a variety of programs aimed at developing and disseminating knowledge about women's political participation. CAWP encourages women's full and effective involvement in all areas of public life.

As a unit of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, CAWP programs reflect Eagleton's long-standing interest in political institutions, political practitioners, and public policy in the United States. CAWP is supported by: Rutgers; grants and contributions from foundations, government, corporations, and individuals; consulting fees; and income from the sale of publications.

Inquiries about the Center for the American Woman and Politics should be directed to Ruth B. Mandel, Director.



CENTER FOR THE AMERICAN WOMAN AND POLITICS (CAWP)
Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers-The State University of New Jersey
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
201/932-9384