

2015

Gendered Pathways to Office for Members of the 112th U.S. House of Representatives

Samantha Sarich

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Political Science](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Sarich, Samantha, "Gendered Pathways to Office for Members of the 112th U.S. House of Representatives" (2015). *Masters Theses*. 1804.
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/1804>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

The Graduate School
EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
Thesis Maintenance and Reproduction Certificate

FOR: Graduate Candidates Completing Theses in Partial Fulfillment of the Degree
Graduate Faculty Advisors Directing the Theses

RE: Preservation, Reproduction, and Distribution of Thesis Research

---

Preserving, reproducing, and distributing thesis research is an important part of Booth Library's responsibility to provide access to scholarship. In order to further this goal, Booth Library makes all graduate theses completed as part of a degree program at Eastern Illinois University available for personal study, research, and other not-for-profit educational purposes. Under 17 U.S.C. § 108, the library may reproduce and distribute a copy without infringing on copyright; however, professional courtesy dictates that permission be requested from the author before doing so.

Your signatures affirm the following:

- The graduate candidate is the author of this thesis.
- The graduate candidate retains the copyright and intellectual property rights associated with the original research, creative activity, and intellectual or artistic content of the thesis.
- The graduate candidate certifies her/his compliance with federal copyright law (Title 17 of the U. S. Code) and her/his right to authorize reproduction and distribution of all copyrighted materials included in this thesis.
- The graduate candidate in consultation with the faculty advisor grants Booth Library the non-exclusive, perpetual right to make copies of the thesis freely and publicly available without restriction, by means of any current or successive technology, including by not limited to photocopying, microfilm, digitization, or internet.
- The graduate candidate acknowledges that by depositing her/his thesis with Booth Library, her/his work is available for viewing by the public and may be borrowed through the library's circulation and interlibrary loan departments, or accessed electronically.
- The graduate candidate waives the confidentiality provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U. S. C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99) with respect to the contents of the thesis and with respect to information concerning authorship of the thesis, including name and status as a student at Eastern Illinois University.

I have conferred with my graduate faculty advisor. My signature below indicates that I have read and agree with the above statements, and hereby give my permission to allow Booth Library to reproduce and distribute my thesis. My adviser's signature indicates concurrence to reproduce and distribute the thesis.


_____
Graduate Candidate Signature


_____
Faculty Adviser Signature

Samantha Sarich
_____
Printed Name

Melinda Mueller
_____
Printed Name

Political Science
_____
Graduate Degree Program

5-5-15
_____
Date

Please submit in duplicate.

Gendered Pathways to Office

---

for Members of the 112th U.S. House of Representatives

(TITLE)

BY

Samantha Sarich

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Arts in Political Science

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

2015

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE



5-5-15
DATE

THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

DATE



5/6/15
DATE

5-5-15
DATE

THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

DATE

THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

DATE

Abstract

Research both asserts that there is a particular path through careers in either business or law that many political candidates take to Congress and that female candidates do not always follow this standard path. Female candidates have been found to emerge from a wider array of experiences outside of business and law. Differences in pathways male and female candidates take to public office have been widely studied, yet little attention has been focused on whether or not female candidates having experience serving on the board of a non-profit organizations can be a part of a viable alternate pathway to public office. Variables including the educations, occupations, and organizational membership, including whether or not representatives sat on the board for any non-profit organizations, are examined for the male and female members of the 112th U.S. House of Representatives in order to determine if there are differences for the men and women in their experiences before serving in Congress.

Acknowledgments

I wish thank the Political Science Department at Eastern Illinois University and to especially recognize my thesis advisor, Dr. Melinda Mueller. Dr. Mueller's patience, encouragement, and expertise throughout the entire process of this project were invaluable and I am incredibly appreciative of all of the work she put in providing me feedback and helping me to complete this project. I would also like to thank Dr. Ryan Burge and Dr. Andrew McNitt for their input as committee members. Their suggestions were incredibly insightful and helpful along the way. Dr. Mueller, Dr. Burge, and Dr. McNitt have all been instrumental in my development throughout my time in graduate school.

Above all I would like to acknowledge and thank my parents, Joan and Tom Sarich. They have been unwavering pillars of support and reassurance throughout my time in graduate school as well as my entire (long-lasting) academic career. Without their encouragement, humor, and never-ending support I certainly would not have been able to complete this project. Their generosity and hard-work have afforded me an endless amount of educational and impactful experiences and I hope to make them proud with this work.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1. Introduction	1
Chapter 2. Literature Review	8
Progressive Political Ambition	8
The Initial Decision to Run.....	9
Gender Differences in Participation and Ambition	10
Changes in Female Candidate Emergence.....	13
Importance of Background Characteristics.....	14
Recruitment of Female Candidates	16
Leadership within Non-profit Organizations as an Important Skill.....	18
Chapter 3. Methodology	22
Research Hypotheses	22
Data.....	23
Methodology	24
Chapter 4. Analysis	28
Chapter 5. Discussion and Conclusion	45
Appendix: Coding Charts	51
Works Cited	53

List of Table

Table 1: Number of Organizations Listed by Gender	29
Table 2: Gender and Number of Organizations Variables Cross-tabulation Table.....	30
Table 3: Gender and Board Membership Variables Cross-tabulation Table.....	31
Table 4: Gender and Occupation Variables Cross-tabulation Table	34
Table 5: Gender and Having Occupations Fall into More than 1 Category Variables Cross-tabulation Table.....	36
Table 6: Gender and “Male” and ”Female” Jobs Variables Cross-tabulation Table.....	38
Table 7: Gender and Education Variables Cross-Tabulation Table	40
Table 8: Gender and Age Variable Cross-tabulation Table	41
Table 9: Gender and Party Variables Cross-tabulation Table	42
Table 10: Logistic Regression of Serving on a Non-profit Board.....	43

Chapter 1. Introduction

In 2013 Sheryl Sandberg ignited discussions about women's roles in the workplace with her book, *Lean In*. Sandberg gave advice to women about leadership in the workplace and addressed the discrepancies in the number of men and women who hold leadership positions in both the government and business sectors (Sandberg, 2013). *Lean In* sparked some controversy, but most importantly the book brought attention to the issue of gender inequality across the United States. The impact of gender inequality in the workplace and beyond has long been addressed in academic research and the media have taken notice as well. For instance, actress Emma Watson gained media attention in October 2014 for her work as a UN Goodwill Ambassador advocating for gender equality and encouraging women around the world to increase their political participation (UN News Centre, 2014). Globally the discussion of gender inequality takes on several forms, but in the United States discussions regarding gender inequality often revolve around pay inequality and disparities in the numbers of male and female leaders in the workplace.

Inequality in the workplace between men and women, especially regarding disparities in wages and education are often attributed to gendered stereotypes. Such stereotypes are often attributed to limiting women in terms of entering into the same types of jobs as men, and in terms of advancing in their careers as quickly, or as far, as men do (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Burrell, 1996). According to a 2014 United Nations Human Development Report, the United States is ranked 47th in the world in terms of gender inequality, despite the fact that large strides for gender equality have been made in recent decades (United Nations Human Development Report, 2014). Gender inequality is commonly discussed in the media through the lens of disparities in

the workplace and in salaries, but the issue of gender disparity is certainly prevalent in other areas outside of the workplace as well.

Research on gender inequality in politics has called attention to the disparity between men and women in terms of running for and holding public offices. A study of thousands of congressional elections across the country found that the rate at which women are elected to the U.S. House of Representatives varies vastly from state to state despite the fact that the rate of women serving in the U.S. House has more than tripled over the last quarter-century (CAWP Fact Sheet: Women in the U.S. House of Representatives, 2012). States such as Wyoming and California have elected women at higher rates than others such as Louisiana and Delaware, but the fact still remains that women hold public office at a lower rate than men overall. It has been well established that there is a gender gap in political ambition as well as in the pathways candidates take to public office that stem from the patterns of gender inequality and gender stereotypes that are present in the United States (Fox and Lawless, 2010; Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Frederick, 2013; Thomas and Wilcox, 2014; Dittmar, 2015). As a result, research has sought to determine what factors cause this discrepancy. One answer is that women have different background experiences that alter their paths to public office. It has been posited that men and women experience different pathways to public office, not only because of the differences in the resources they have access to, but also because of the occupations they hold as well as the organizations they are affiliated with (Schlozman, Burns, and Verba, 1994; Fox and Lawless, 2010; Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Frederick, 2013). Differences between men and women in terms of political ambition and recruitment to run for public office have been addressed by scholars, but questions

about the differences between male and female candidate's previous experiences, and the impact their experiences can have on their political careers, continue to be raised.

Many argue that women not only enter different occupations than men but that they also take different paths to Congress than men, so research seeks to focus on the experiences of female candidates to trace these differences (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Frederick, 2013; Fox and Lawless, 2005; Fox and Lawless, 2004; Burrell, 1996). However there is a gap in the research about the connection between gender differences, or gendered stereotypes, and the effects they have on the career choices of both men and women who eventually run for public office. One main assertion of this research is that female candidates for Congress emerge from different, and a wider array of, professions and organizations when compared to their male counterparts (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Fox and Lawless, 2005; Burrell, 1996). People who have careers in law have been found to be the most successful in politics (Darcy, Welch, and Clark, 1987) in the past, but more recent research suggests that female candidates do not always emerge from backgrounds of law (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013). Female candidates are less likely to come from business or management positions and are more likely to have backgrounds as teachers, nurses, or social workers (Thomas and Wilcox, 2014). Thomas and Wilcox (2014) also suggest that while men serve on city councils or as mayor before they run for Congress women are more likely to have been a member of a school board. This and other research suggests that women have a greater tendency to have experience with these fields and with nonprofit organizations (Themduo, 2009). More specifically, there exists very little research about the role that nonprofit organizations play as stepping stones to elected office for both men and women.

Some research does focus on gendered differences in candidate emergence but most of those studies focus on the influence of recruitment in the process (Frederick, 2013; Fox and Lawless, 2005). While men who enter politics tend to come primarily from backgrounds of business and law, women tend to come from a wider variety of areas and occupations including education and community activism, in addition to business and law (Fox and Lawless, 2005; Burrell, 1996). In terms of undergraduate college degrees men and women have been found to differ in what they choose. Computer science and engineering are comprised mostly of men while health, education, and social work majors are dominated by women. Art, communication, and languages majors have more women than men and majors dealing with math, science, and business see a more equal split between men and women (Who Studies What? Men, Women, and College Majors, 2014). While political science research deals with explanations of why male and female public office holders experience different pathways to office to some degree, other areas of research also offer perspectives which help to explain the potential differences for men and women's levels of participation in the political process. One of these areas highlights the relationship between gender and nonprofit board membership and employment in the nonprofit sector.

Surprisingly, studies of the nonprofit sector do not address gender as much as may be expected but they are nonetheless pertinent to the study and understanding of gender inequality in political ambition and political candidate emergence. It is a commonly held assertion that there are differences between men and women that lead them to have different characteristics and traits. Research has supported some of these generalizations and found women to be more altruistic than men (Themudo, 2009; Eckel and Grossman,

1997) as well as more public spirited as a result of their greater interest in justice and equality in comparison to men (Andreoni and Vesterlund, 2001). Also, other research about the nonprofit sector has found women to demonstrate higher levels of charitable giving and women also tend to volunteer more often than men do (Einolf, 2011; Themudo, 2009). Themudo (2009) asserts that globally, women believe service to others to be important in life at higher rates than men do. From a psychological perspective it has been postulated that women tend to demonstrate more nurturing and caring characteristics than men (Eagly and Crowley, 1986). While there is a certain extent of conjecture about the qualities that women display as opposed to men, and how this may affect their behavior, research about the nonprofit sector and psychological research both assert that women and men can take different pathways in their lives for these various reasons (Themudo, 2009; Eagly and Crowley, 1986). This research demonstrates that theories about men and women taking different paths to public office may develop, in part, from differences between men and women in terms of personal characteristics and other attributes.

Themudo's research regarding the nonprofit sector explicitly highlights gender and hypothesizes two theories of why the sector has a higher prevalence of women in the United States (2009). He argues that countries with higher levels of women's empowerment tend to have larger non-profit sectors than the countries with low levels of empowerment for women. Inversely, women's participation in the non-profit sector can also be attributed to low levels of empowerment for women caused by limited opportunities for women in the government and business sectors. This second theory is more in line with much of the political science research which generally argues that

women are often left out of the business sector and careers in law and, as a result, look to careers in other areas such as community activism, education, health care, or the nonprofit sector (Themudo, 2009; Fox and Lawless, 2004; Burrell, 1996). In 2007, the National Center for Nonprofit Boards reported that women comprised forty-three percent of nonprofit organization's boards, compared to corporate boards where women only comprised six percent of board membership. These statistics could indicate that Themudo's theory that women find more success in the nonprofit sector than in the business sector holds true for women in the United States.

There is a lack of research on the paths men and women take to running for public office and if this affects their experiences. It is well documented that women serve in public offices at much lower rates than men but research has found that men and women are equal in their electability (Dittmar, 2015; Thomas and Wilcox, 2014; Darcy, Welch, and Clark, 1994). If men and women are considered to be on equal footing, in terms of electability, once they actually campaign for public office then the reasons for the gender discrepancies can be theorized to stem from the pathways men and women take to running for public office. There is clear evidence that there are trends in the choices men and women make that have repercussions for their levels of political ambition. Certainly men and women have been shown to take different education and career paths and work like Themudo's (2009) also suggests that women may look to the nonprofit sector for opportunities that the business sector does not provide them.

This thesis will examine the organizational membership of members of the 112th U.S. House of Representatives to determine if there are gendered differences in their experiences in regards to organizational membership and other experiences including

both their education and occupations, before running for Congress for the representatives. This study seeks to determine if men and women experience different paths to public office as a result of having differences in their occupations, educations, and experiences, including membership on a non-profit organization's board. Specifically, the backgrounds of the men and women of 112th House are analyzed to determine if women and men served on the boards of any non-profit organizations and if women are found to have served on non-profit boards at higher rates than their male counterparts. Chapter 2 reviews the literature of political ambition, candidate emergence, gender differences in political participation and ambition, and the significance and role of serving on a non-profit organization's board. Chapter 3 outlines the methodology and data used to conduct the research in this study while Chapter 4 discusses the results and Chapter 5 discusses the findings and implications of the research.

Chapter 2. Literature Review

Progressive Political Ambition

In the study of what drives citizens to run for public office and the paths candidates take to get elected to public office, political ambition is defined, and some focus is given to the background characteristics of potential candidates in the process. These characteristics are considered crucial to increasing the chances of candidates getting elected (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Fox and Lawless, 2010a; Fox and Lawless, 2010b; Burrell, 1996; Darcy, Welch, and Clark, 1994). Schlesinger (1966) argues that politicians act in ways that they consider appropriate to winning public office. Schlesinger discusses strategic choices politicians make and explains that the principal flow of public officials is from the state level to the national level. He also defines penultimate offices as the office held just before gaining a top office which is considered governorships or a seat in the Senate in his study. Black and Rohde's research both serve as an important basis to the study of political ambition. Black's retrospective analysis of political ambition focuses on what shapes ambition in candidates by identifying risks and investments that candidates contended with when they decided to run for a higher office than what they currently hold (1970). He asserts that politicians are influenced by the political system itself because favorable conditions encourage potential candidates to run. Politicians are also influenced by their own rational choices which shape their decisions about whether to run for a higher public office or not.

Rohde's (1979) work is based on the work of Schlesinger (1966) and is complementary to Black's because he also suggests that politicians act rationally in terms of the choices that involve political ambition. However, Rohde's work differs from Black's because his is a prospective analysis involving members of the House of

Representatives determining whether or not they should run for a governorship or Senate seat in the future. Rohde also identifies representatives who are risk-takers, those whom he deems to be more likely to embrace risk and run for higher office. While Black and Rohde's research are cornerstones of political ambition studies they are limited to being able to identify trends of progressive ambition, which involves candidates who are moving up to higher offices than they currently occupy, because their data consists of members of Congress who have already passed the stage of being elected to their first public office.

The Initial Decision to Run

While progressive ambition has garnered much attention in political ambition research there is some research done on the preliminary decision to run for office as well (Fox and Lawless, 2010b; Fox and Lawless, 2005; Fox, Lawless, and Feeley, 2001). The study of progressive ambition focuses on candidates who have long since made their initial decision to run for a public office and are instead more focused on moving up to a higher public office than they currently hold. As a result literature that is focused on progressive ambition cannot fully explain factors involved in nascent ambition, which is the initial inclination to consider running for public office. This is a crucial caveat because nascent ambition is often tied to the study of political participation (Fox and Lawless, 2010a; Fox and Lawless, 2010b). What influences nascent ambition and initial candidate emergence is crucial to also understanding political participation as a whole because citizens who decide to run for a public office are considered to be demonstrating the highest level of political participation (Fox and Lawless, 2010b; Fox and Lawless, 2005). Fox and Lawless (2005) further assert that interest in seeking public office can be

motivated by individual-level considerations as well as personal experiences and demographic characteristics, but these factors have garnered less attention in the literature of political ambition and candidate emergence because they are not encompassed in the existing theories of political ambition and the political opportunity structure.

Gender Differences in Participation and Ambition

Research suggests that men and women are motivated to run for public office by different factors. Male candidates are considered to be motivated by political ambition, the desire to hold public office, or self-motivation while women tend to be motivated more often by community or specific policy issues that they have an interest or a stake in (Fox and Lawless, 2010b; Fox, Lawless, and Feeley, 2001; Burrell, 1996). Abrahams (1996) argues that women are more motivated to engage in political activity in order to benefit their community rather than to benefit personally in some way. Some evidence of women being motivated by community factors is demonstrated through interviews by Rombough and Keithly (2010). They conducted a qualitative study involving female Latina and Hispanic leaders in Rio Grande Valley, Texas who all reported that they entered politics to “make a difference—give back to the community” (181). Frederick (2013) concluded that many of the female candidates she interviewed in her qualitative study self-identified as community activists, or expressed a commitment to justice in some capacity as well.

Other differences between male and female candidates, in terms of both political ambition and political participation, have been studied but there are some commonalities as well. Women have been found to be somewhat less likely to contribute money to

political campaigns although few other differences have been found between men and women's levels of political participation, as well as in their likelihoods of getting elected once they actually enter a race (Dittmar, 2015; Fox and Lawless, 2010b). Male and female candidates also have similar campaign resources, strategies, and tactics (Dittmar, 2015). While research has found women to vote in elections at higher levels than men they have also been found to be somewhat more reluctant to influence others by advocating for political candidates (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013). One of the starkest differences to be found between men and women is that women are historically less likely to demonstrate ambition to run for any level of public office (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Fox and Lawless, 2010a; Burrell, 1996; Darcy, Welch, and Clark, 1994). In a 2001 study by Fox and Lawless, running for office "crossed their mind" for 64 percent of the men and only 47 percent of the women, and these results were relatively unchanged in a 2008 update of the data. In addition, in each of the four categories of careers tested in the study, including lawyers, business executives, educators, and political activists, the differences between male and female candidates were statistically significant (Fox and Lawless, 2010b).

Research has sought to determine what factors influence the large gender disparities found in political ambition. As a result, studies of political ambition that highlight factors such as personal experience and other background characteristics often focus on the differences between male and female candidates to determine why differences occur. It is important to note that this is done not because differences have been found between men and women based solely on the aspect of gender itself. Rather, differences in political activity have been attributed to the discrepancies found between

men and women in terms of the factors and resources that facilitate their levels of participation, such as socioeconomic status and socialization (Fox and Lawless, 2010b; Schlozman, Burns, and Verba, 1994). In fact Schlozman, Burns, and Verba, (1994) posit that “gender differences in political orientation seem to be specific to politics—rather than the manifestation of general personal attributes” (p. 1070).

Rombough and Keithly, (2010) hypothesize that structural barriers are often what can hold women in back in politics and can help to explain why women are underrepresented in holding public offices. Other research focuses on gender disparities in political ambition as well as participation. Some examine factors including attitudes (Fulton et. al., 2006), as well as political and personal costs (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Darcy, Welch, and Clark, 1994) and recruitment (Fox and Lawless, 2005) in connection with gender to determine what affects the choices of women who run for public office as opposed to men who run for office. Both personal experiences, such as leadership skills, willingness to take risks, and family responsibilities shape the decisions of women to enter politics (Rombough and Keithly, 2010; Palmer and Simon, 2003; Costantini, 1990) as well as the political and professional experiences of women that contribute to their choices have been studied (Frederick, 2013; Fox and Lawless, 2010b; Fox, Lawless, and Feeley, 2001; Dolan and Ford, 1997; Burrell, 1996). The literature suggests that women are often found to have different paths to running for Congress than their male counterparts due to various differences in the background experiences and resources that influence their political ambition and participation (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Fox and Lawless, 2010b; Fox, Lawless, and Feeley, 2001; Burrell, 1996; Darcy, Welch, and Clark, 1994; Schlozman, Burns, and Verba, 1994).

Changes in Female Candidate Emergence

Research suggests that women's paths to public office have evolved over time from women coming to public offices through the death of their husbands, to women who have volunteered with civic groups and then transition into politics using their private sector qualifications as their entry passes (Burrell, 1996). The Women's Movement of the 1970s prompted, and encouraged studies to focus specifically on how women come to decide to, and then run for public office. Historically, a common way for women to obtain public office was through the widow connection, meaning they inherited a public office through the death of their husband. (Palmer and Simon, 2003; Burrell, 1996). It has also been asserted that recently more and more women now work their way from lower level public offices to higher ones, just as men have commonly done (Burrell, 1996). However, this has not always been the case for female candidates. Factors such as age, family obligations, and inequality of resources (such as income, education, and employment experiences) have all been identified as reasons why women's paths to political offices are different than those of men (Fulton et. al., 2006; Fox and Lawless, 2005; Palmer and Simon, 2003; Burrell, 1996; Schlozman, Burns, and Verba, 1994; Costantini, 1990).

Disparities in occupational experiences of men and women are also emphasized as an important contribution to why male and female candidates enter politics in different ways. In the 1970s and 1980s women were less likely than men to have advanced degrees and high incomes and they were also business executives and attorneys at lower rates than men (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Burrell, 1996). In the past women were discouraged, and in some cases altogether prevented, from entering the educational and

occupational fields, such as law and business, that are so often attributed to leading to a career in politics most commonly (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Burrell, 1996; Darcy, Welch, and Clark, 1994). It has often been argued that public officials tend to be well educated and have high incomes, as well as careers in either business or law. As a result women were less often considered to have the necessary credentials, resources, experiences, and backgrounds that most often lead to a successful candidacy (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Burrell, 1996; Darcy, Welch, and Clark, 1994). Darcy, Welch, and Clark (1994) assert that women are often not socialized to pursue typical male careers in business, law, science, and medicine which are the common areas public official derive from. Professions within law, business, education, and community activism tend to yield the highest amounts of potential candidates overall, but the fields of education and community activism have been found to yield more female candidates than male candidates, although there are certainly female candidates who come from backgrounds in business and law as well (Thomas and Wilcox, 2014; Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Fox and Lawless, 2004; Burrell, 1996).

Importance of Background Characteristics

Background characteristics of candidates have been theorized to be significant to their campaigns for public office because these traits are deemed to be related to potential success in the political sphere. Having held a previous public office, or currently holding public office, is asserted by Darcy, Welch, and Clark (1994) to be the best way for female candidates to be taken seriously and to establish credibility to run for national office. In addition, establishing credentials, as well as promoting those credentials, are critical elements to garnering support. This has been argued as something that is of special

importance for women candidates because females in public office have had to combat stereotypes about lacking leadership ability and competency based upon their gender (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Burrell, 1996; Darcy, Welch, and Clark, 1994). The often referenced “glass ceiling” is the theory that women are kept in lower-level positions because of advancement barriers. Gendered stereotyping is arguably attributed to playing a role in the gender wage gap in the public sector because when characteristics of leaders in the public sector are viewed as being masculine, as they often are, this impacts women’s abilities to move into those higher-level roles, according to Stivers (1993).

However, women may be able to benefit in some ways by not following the same paths to office as men. Burrell (1996) argued that voters seek, and respond more positively, to candidates who differ from the common archetype of political candidates with a background in business or law. Not being seen as “one of the boys” or closely tied to special interest groups in some way can be an asset in some cases, and especially for female candidates in particular. Research has found that female candidates do indeed come from fields outside of the most common areas candidates often emerge from (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Fox and Lawless, 2010b; Fox and Lawless, 2004; Burrell, 1996). Data collected on female as well as male nominees between 1968 and 1990 found that the female nominees held a variety of occupations outside of business and law including homemaking, civic activism, nursing, ministry, teaching, and social work. Elementary and secondary educations, as well as administration in non-private sectors were the most frequent occupations for the women. In fact, in this particular dataset, law and business were the predominant categories for men, but less than half of the female nominees were a part of those two categories (Burrell, 1996). Thomas and

Wilcox (2014) also point out that women are more likely than men to be teachers, nurses, and social workers.

Recruitment of Female Candidates

Women have been found to be recruited to run for every level of public office less often than men so research has focused specifically on how women are recruited or encouraged to run for office both on the state and federal levels (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Frederick, 2013; Fox and Lawless, 2010a; Rombough and Keithly, 2010; Fulton et. al., 2006; Burrell, 1996). The role of recruitment by parties and committees is an important element in the understanding of political ambition in general because Krebs (1998) asserted that congressional elections are less divisive when political parties endorse candidates and when congressional campaign committees recruit candidates to run for office. Fox and Lawless (2010a) focused their research on the discrepancies of political recruitment between men and women. They found that while women were less likely to be recruited than men, women's organizations that specifically sought out female candidates improved recruitment rates amongst women. Some organizations have specifically focused on recruiting women to run for public office at all levels. The National Women's Political Caucus and other similar groups have identified the specific goal of increasing the amount of women who hold public office by training female candidates and providing them with the necessary financial and other resources to run a campaign (Burrell 1996). Organizations like EMILY's List, More Women in Congress, the National Organization for Women PAC, and the National Women's Political Caucus amongst others are well known for successfully recruiting female

candidates as well as giving money predominantly to female candidates (CAWP Fact Sheet: Women's PACs and Donor Networks, 2014).

One specific example of women's experiences with political ambition and recruitment is Angela Frederick's work (2013). Frederick utilized qualitative methods to analyze how female candidates emerged in Texas. She conducted interviews with women running for the Texas state legislature and found that women running for a seat were often approached and encouraged by their political party to run. In this particular case all of the women interviewed were Democrats recruited by their party. Frederick's work is unique because she used the responses of the women as qualitative data to demonstrate how women candidates perceive themselves and their own experiences with being recruited to run for a public office.

Confidence in their ability to hold public office has also been found to be a key component for female candidates deciding to run (Fox and Lawless, 2010a). If a potential candidate does not deem themselves qualified to run for public office then seeking an office is unlikely for them (Fox and Lawless, 2005). In their 2005 study, which lends itself to their later works as well, Fox and Lawless used the Citizen Political Ambition Study, a mail survey that was sent to a group of both men and women who were considered to be well situated in terms of running for public office, something they called the eligibility pool. The survey of the potential candidates asserted that women who were more confident in their abilities were more likely to consider running even though, in general, fewer women than men viewed themselves as qualified to run for any office at all. Being recruited or approached by family members, political organizations, or other groups has been shown to help increase the confidence of potential female candidates

who did not themselves consider running before being approached (Frederick, 2013; Fox and Lawless, 2010a; Rombough and Keithley, 2010).

Leadership within Non-profit Organizations as an Important Skill

Burns, Schlozman, and Verba (2001) assert that “women often aspire to public office after experience in voluntary organizations” (63) and for both men and women a significant form of political participation includes involvement in organizations that take a stance on a public issue of some kind, with the most common type of organization for both men and women to be affiliated with being charitable and social service organizations (Burns, Schlozman, and Verba, 2001). Thomas and Wilcox (2014) also argue that women are more likely to have experience working with interest groups or volunteering in some way. It has been argued that women hold certain characteristics that draw them to being involved in some way with nonprofit organizations. A common argument is that women are nurturing and caring (Eagly and Crowley, 1986) which can drive them to seek helping others through the nonprofit sector. Themudo (2009) Eckel and Grossman (1997) argue that women are more public spirited than men, Einolf (2011) found women to believe service to be crucial, and Andreoni and Vesterlund (2001) add that women tend to be more interested in justice and equality when compared to men. These characteristics can be used as an explanation for why some choose to run for public office. Fox and Lawless (2010b) found women to be driven to run for public office because of a particular community issue they take an interest in and Rombough and Keithly (2010) discussed women who were motivated to run because they reported that they wanted to make a difference in their community.

Burns, Schlozman, and Verba (2001) also contend that in the past, especially before women acquired the right to vote, organizations played a critical role in women gaining important leadership and practical skills such as giving speeches and conducting meetings. Organizations made up entirely of women also helped to prepare women to function in other areas of public life, including politics. They also found that civic skills, which are the communication and organizational abilities that citizens can gain to better utilize their time and money in their political lives, are important resources for politics. As previously discussed, Themudo's (2009) work asserts that women may look to the non-profit sector for opportunities and experiences not afforded to them in the private sector. In regards to organizations, trends have been found in regards to what types female candidates have been most often affiliated or engaged with. Civic and society groups were most common before 1992, while after 1992 women tended to be associated more often with business and professional organizations (Dolan and Ford, 1997).

Holding a leadership position of some kind within a non-profit organization has also been asserted to be a positive attribute for candidates. In a 2010 study Fox and Lawless found that serving on the board of a nonprofit organization or foundation increased the likelihood for both women and men of being recruited to run for a political office by ten percent. Frederick (2013) also asserted that the women she interviewed who identified as community activist expressed higher amounts of confidence in themselves as candidates when explaining how they decided to run for public office. The level of women's service on the boards of non-profit organizations is significantly higher than their service on the private sector and corporate boards. Women made up just over forty

percent of non-profit boards in 2007 and less than ten percent of corporate boards in comparison (The National Center for Nonprofit Boards, 2007).

Frederick (2013) also found a connection to the importance of non-profit management and the recruitment process of women in general. Throughout her research Frederick spoke to several women who had backgrounds in nonprofit management or work with nonprofit organizations in some capacity. None of the women in the study cited their previous work experience in this field alone as a direct motivation for their decision to run for the state legislature, but many reported that they were subsequently approached by PACs, political parties, or other groups that they were connected to, or who were aware of them because of their work with nonprofit organizations. Burrell (1996) asserts that while none of the women in her study of female nominees from 1968 to 1990 went directly from civic volunteerism straight to a successful run for the House; community involvement was found to lead to a career in local or state politics which could then serve as a foundation for winning a congressional seat for women. Work or participation in the non-profit sector in some way can be argued as a being an important step in the right directions towards getting on a path to running for public office.

Research has touched on how experience with a nonprofit organization can be a sort of stepping stone to running and winning a public office. Women have been found to be more willing to run for office once encouraged to run and to be recruited less often than men. Nothing definitively argues a direct connection between the two but evidence from Frederick (2013), Fox and Lawless (2010), and Burrell (1996) suggests that involvement on a nonprofit organization's board can be a way for women to get noticed and be encouraged to run for office. At the same time Carroll and Sanbonmatsu (2013)

and Burns, Schlozman, and Verba (2001) demonstrate that developing leadership skills is crucial for candidates. Themudo (2009) argues that women find opportunities in the nonprofit sector more so than in the private sector. For this reason it can be argued that women can find opportunities to develop leadership skills and get noticed through nonprofit board membership.

More research is necessary to determine if non-profit board membership was a way for representatives to develop their skills and possibly helped them gain attention as a potential candidate. This can be argued to be especially important to understand for the female members of the U.S. House of Representatives who may not all come from what is considered the standard path to public office. This research seeks to add to this body of literature that argues that women can find alternate pathways to public office through a wider array of occupations and through membership on a non-profit organization's board. Extant research does not focus on this specific aspect although some studies (Fox and Lawless 2010; Burrell 1996) have used membership on a non-profit organization's board as one variable in its study.

Chapter 3. Methodology

Research Hypotheses

As discussed, previous work analyzing gender differences in political ambition and candidate emergence have shown that men and women can take different paths to public office for several reasons. Gender stereotypes and different access to resources may play a role in stopping women from partaking in the traditional fields of business and law, which are hypothesized to produce the most public officeholders (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Fox and Lawless, 2004; Burns, Schlozman, and Verba, 2001; Burrell, 1996). Research also argues that the nonprofit sector and nonprofit board membership provides women an opportunity to gain skills and experience outside of the traditional fields and which then situate them to run for public office (Frederick, 2013; Themudo, 2009; Rombough and Keithly, 2010). In combination with studies which contend that women demonstrate higher levels of care characteristics than men tend to (Eagly and Crowley, 1986; Themudo, 2009) it makes sense to hypothesize that women can find more than one way to make themselves a viable candidate to run for public office. There are undoubtedly women who establish themselves through their backgrounds in business and law but research has shown that women can emerge as a candidate through other means. Some studies have put some emphasis on the role of the nonprofit sector and board membership, but it has not been the primary focus of those studies (Frederick, 2013; Rombough and Keithly, (2010); Fox and Lawless, 2005; Burrell, 1996). Those studies also tend to examine women serving at the local and state level. Since women at those levels have shown evidence that they have worked with nonprofit organizations and that their work there has helped get them to public office in

some way then it also makes sense that this will hold true for female representatives at the national level. All of this research leads to two hypotheses:

- (1) Female members of the House of Representatives will have served on non-profit organization boards at a higher rate than their male counterparts.
- (2) Female House members will have a wider range of educational and occupational experience as well as organizational affiliation than their male counterparts.

Data

In order to identify potential differences in male and female political candidates' backgrounds data are collected from the *Congressional Directory 2011-2012*. The *Congressional Directory* offers a wide array of information about each member of Congress including what, if any, nonprofit organizations members of the House of Representatives sat on the boards of before their time in the House. All 72 of the female members of the 112th House along with a random sampling of 72 men, for a total of 144 members will serve as the sample. More information beyond organizational membership information was collected to gain a better understanding of the backgrounds of the representatives. In addition to the nonprofit organizations each member lists in their *Directory* entry the other data include the state they represent, their party identification, gender, age, educational background, the year they were first elected to the House of Representatives, and any previous occupations and work experience. Their work experience includes any previous public offices they held at lower levels of government.

Supplemental information for the representatives was gathered from the Biographical Directory of the United States Congress website and from their personal websites to fill gaps in the information from the *Congressional Directory*. Some

representatives listed the years they served on organizational boards, but for the ones who did not these other sources as well as information from nonprofit organization's websites were used to determine whether they served on boards before or after they began their time in Congress. Nonprofit organizations are not the only types of organizations recorded for this study. Any organizations the representatives list are collected to determine how many organizations, of any kind, representatives tend to be a part of and to track if there are any changing trends in the types of organizations men and women affiliate with, as Dolan and Ford (1997) found. However, only nonprofit organizational boards that the members served on *before* their election to the House are relevant for this analysis because this demonstrates the experience of men and women before they were a representative. In order to distinguish between nonprofit and other organizational membership their previous organizational affiliations in professional and other types of organizations are recorded separately for each member. Also, the Center for American Women and Politics Fact Sheet on Women in the U.S. House of Representatives 2012 was utilized primarily to gather information about the women in the dataset and the occupations they have held. Many of the female representatives of the 112th Congress list several occupations across several different categories. There are certainly also male representatives in the dataset who listed occupations that fell into more than one category as well. The CAWP Fact Sheet did not list any organizations for the female representatives but it was used as a guide for coding the Occupations variable which is explained further below.

Methodology

This data discussed above were collected and coded in order to run a logistic regression analysis and cross-tabulation tables. The Board Member variable, whether or

not a member served on a nonprofit board before their time in Congress, serves as the dependent variable for the logistic regression. The other variables, Age, Education, Gender, Occupations, and Party ID are also used in the regression analysis. For the Education variable all of the degrees each representative listed were recorded, but only the highest degree each representative listed was used for the regression analysis. Each of the seven categories (lower level government, business, law, education, non-profit/community activism/social work, medicine/nursing, and other) for the Occupation variable were re-coded into dummy variables for the logistic regression so each individual category for the variable could be tested. See the Appendix for a full explanation of how these variables and all of the others were coded for the regression analysis and cross-tabulation tables.

Two other variables that were also used in the logistic regression which require further explanation as well. The majority of the representatives in the dataset listed more than one occupation across several different areas so it was necessary to identify several categories that they could fit in to. All of the Occupation categories each representative fell into were recorded. For the logistic regression Occupations category each representative's most common or longest held job was used. For example, if a representative listed their occupations as state representative, councilwoman, educator, and businesswoman they were coded into 3 categories including lower level government (1), business (2), and education (4) and for the regression analysis they were coded as 1 (lower level government). The CAWP Fact Sheet was used as a guide to assist with the occupation coding for the entire dataset. Another variable which identifies representatives who did and did not list occupations in more than one category was developed from this

information as well to be used in another cross-tabulation table in order to determine how many representatives fell into multiple Occupation categories. See the Appendix for a breakdown of the coding used for both of these variables that involve occupations.

Another variable was developed based upon the literature discussed previously. Thomas and Wilcox (2014), Carroll and Sanbonmatsu (2013), Fox and Lawless (2004), Burrell (1996), and Darcy, Welch, and Clark (1994) discuss how male and female candidates have a tendency to emerge from different occupations, with male politicians emerging from business, law, and lower level government, and female candidates coming from a wider range of backgrounds including education and community activism. In order to test this theory for the members of the 112th House each member was coded into one of two categories, occupations male candidates tend to come from, considered “male” occupations or occupations female candidates tend to come from, considered “female” occupations. Business, law, and lower political offices were a part of the “male” occupations category and education, nursing, and non-profit/community activism/social work categories were a part of the “female” occupations category. While Darcy, Welch, and Clark (1994) argue that careers in medicine are typically dominated by men the medicine category in this study is considered under the “female” category because the majority of representatives who fall into it held jobs as nurses. Nursing is considered to be a career more women are in than men according to Thomas and Wilcox (2014) and Burrell (1996). Each representative was coded into one category or the other based upon what the majority of their occupations listed fell into. The same resources used to code representative for the Occupations variable were also used for this variable. For example, if a representative listed serving at a lower level of government, being a lawyer, and also

listed being a teacher that person would be coded into the “male” category because two of their three occupations fall into that “male” category. This was done to test if there are any trends in the types of occupations all representatives used in the dataset held before their time in Congress. For a full explanation of how this variable was coded see the Appendix. Cross-tabulation tables were run on this variable and several other variables as well. These include identifying the average number of organizations, nonprofit organizations and all others, men and women in the dataset list, how many of the representatives list occupations in more than one category, and how many served on nonprofit organization boards before they were a member of Congress.

Chapter 4. Analysis

When comparing the male and female representatives of the 112th House it is clear that while there are many similarities between the two groups there are also some important differences. The most common occupation among both the men and women in the dataset with sixty of the one hundred forty four representatives is holding a position of some kind in lower level government, such as serving on a city council, being a mayor, or serving in a state legislature. The second most common occupations are in law with thirty-seven representatives and business was third with twenty-four representatives. The most commonly held degree for the entire data set was a J.D. with fifty-three of the one hundred forty four representatives followed by a Bachelor's degree with thirty-eight representatives and then a Master's degree with thirty three representatives. The average age of the female representatives in the dataset is 61.5 while the male average is only slight lower at 58.36. Sixty-three of the representatives are Republicans, and the remaining eighty one representatives are Democrats. Forty-nine of the Democrats are women and twenty-three of Republicans are women. Several cross-tabulation tables were run to identify the distribution of the men and women in the dataset for the variables including age and party affiliation as well as the variable including education, occupations held, "Male" versus "Female" occupations, and holding occupations that fall into more than one category. These tests reveal that there are some small differences between men and women in terms of the amount of organizations they were involved with before being a member of Congress and larger differences in the occupations they held before they were a member of Congress and the degrees they hold.

Table 1 below shows that the men and women in the dataset reported being involved in about the same amount of organizations on average based on in their

Congressional Directory or *Congressional Biography* entries. The female representatives have a slightly higher mean in the number of organizations they list than the male representatives, and while the difference between the two is small at only 0.03 it is statistically significant.

<u>Table 1: Number of Organizations Listed by Gender</u>		
	Male Representatives	Female Representatives
Mean	2.11	2.14
Standard Deviation	3.35	2.89
N	72	72
T Test=6.69		
Sig=.000		
N of Valid Cases=144		

When comparing how many organizations the representatives listed it can also be seen that the men and women fall into similar categories. See Table 2 for a breakdown of how many organizations male and female representatives listed. Similar amounts of men (thirty-seven) and women (thirty-eight) did not list any organizations at all while ten women and nineteen men listed one to three organizations and twelve women and seventeen men listed between four and six organizations. Just over fifty percent of both male and female representatives did not list being a part of any organizations. Listing

between one and three and four and six organizations were the next most common categories with about twenty percent of men and women falling into those categories respectively. Four women, including Marcy Kaptur (D OH-09) and Cynthia Lummis (R-WY), listed ten or more organizations while only two men, Alcee Hastings (D-FL 20) and Richard Neal (D-MA 2) fell into that category.

<u>Table 2: Gender and Number of Organizations Variables Cross-tabulation Table</u>		
	Male Representatives	Female Representatives
0 organizations	25.7%	26.4%
1-3 organizations	13.2%	6.9%
4-6 organizations	8.3%	11.8%
7-9 organizations	1.4%	2.1%
10+ organizations	1.4%	2.8%
N	72	72
Pearson Chi Square=4.53		
Sig=.338		
N of Valid Cases=144		

For all one hundred forty-four representatives in the dataset, one hundred seventeen representatives did not serve on the board of any non-profit organizations before running for Congress while twenty-seven representatives did serve on at least one

non-profit organization's board before their time in Congress as shown in Table 3 below. Out of those twenty-seven representatives who did serve on a non-profit board twenty of them are female and seven are male. Just under fourteen percent of the women included in this study served on at least one non-profit organization's board before running for Congress compared to just under five percent of the men in the sample. Overall, under twenty percent of the representatives in the dataset listed being on the board of non-profit organizations before they served in the House.

<u>Table 3: Gender and Board Membership Variables Cross-tabulation Table</u>		
	Male Representatives	Female Representatives
No, Board Membership	45.1%	36.1%
Yes, Board Membership	4.9%	13.9%
N	72	72
Pearson Chi Square=7.70		
Sig=.006		
N of Valid Cases=144		

A higher percentage of the representatives who served on at least one non-profit organization's board are women and there are trends in the type of organizations the women of the 112th Congress were members of before they ran for Congress. Many of the women including Betty McCollum (D-MN 04), Carolyn Maloney (D-NY 12), Virginia Foxx (R-NC 05), and Marsha Blackburn (R-TN 07) were members of well-

known organizations such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Rotary Club, the American Legion, the Girl Scouts, the Elks, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the American Lung Association, The National Organization for Women, and the American Red Cross. These large, national-level organizations are not the only type of organizations the women listed. Being a member of a school board, or multiple school boards, as well as being a member of a hospital or university's advisory board or board of directors was also common amongst the women. Judy Chu (D-CA 27), Susan Davis (D-CA 53), Frederica Wilson (D-FL 24), and others all sat on school boards while women like Debbie Wasserman-Schultz (D-FL 23) and Rene Ellmers (R-NC 02) served on the board for a hospital or medical center. Many of the women list being a part of local or state-level organizations like Cynthia Lummis (R-WY) who lists organizations including the Wyoming Business Alliance and the Leadership Wyoming Board. Other women like Karen Bass (D-CA 37) and Allyson Schwartz (D-PA 13) work with local non-profit organizations. Others show a specific interest or theme through their organizational membership such as Carolyn McCarthy (D-NY 04). All of the organizations McCarthy listed deal with gun violence in some capacity, including Americans against Gun Violence, Guns for Goods, New York 'Stop the Violence' Campaign Board of Directors, and New Yorkers against Gun Violence.

Other women are also a part of organizations that relate directly to their profession, the most common trend being those who are lawyers or attorneys being a part of the American Bar Association. Terri Sewell (D-AL 07), Zoe Lofgren (D-CA 19), Diana DeGette (D-CO 01), and Sheila Jackson Lee (D-TX 18) are all a part of either the American Bar Association, the Bar Association of their state, or both. Marcy

Kaptur (D-OH 09) was an urban planner before her time in Congress and she lists being a member of the American Planning Association, the American Institute of Certified Planners Fellow, and the University of Michigan Urban Planning Alumni Association. It is evident amongst the women of the 112th Congress that Democrats have a higher tendency to be a member of a non-profit or foundation's board; sixty-eight percent of women who are affiliated with non-profit organizations are Democrats, but women of both parties are involved in a variety of organizations. Common organizations amongst the men were also Bar Associations and organizations that relate to their professions. This trend of being affiliated with organizations that relate to the member's background or work experience in some way is evident for both the men and the women of the 112th Congress.

While the men and women are similar in being a part of organizations that relate to their professions in some way where they differ is in the actual occupations they held before being a member of Congress. Table 4 shows the distribution of the representatives in each occupation. In terms of occupations, serving at a lower level of government is the most common one representatives held before their time in Congress. Sixty-one representatives in the dataset held at least one position in lower level government. For the women in the dataset ten served at just a local level of government, twenty-eight served at just a state level of government, and twelve served at both the local and state levels before running for Congress. The lower level government, business, law, education, and medicine categories all had both men and women fall into them while the Non-profit/Community Activism/Social Work category only had three representatives in it and all three of those representatives are women.

<u>Table 4: Gender and Occupation Variables Cross-tabulation Table</u>		
	Male Representatives	Female Representatives
Lower Level Government	9.7%	34%
Business	13.2%	3.5%
Law	20.8%	4.9%
Education	4.2%	2.1%
Medicine/Nursing	0.7%	3.5%
Non-profit/Community Activism/Social Work	0%	2.1%
Other	1.4%	1.4%
N	72	72
Pearson Chi Square=50.57		
Sig=.000		
N of Valid Cases=144		

The lower level government, business, law, education, and medicine categories all had both men and women fall into them while the Non-profit/Community Activism/Social Work category only had three representatives in it and all three of those representatives are women. These three women are Karen Bass, Niki Tsongas, and Allyson Schwartz. Karen Bass (D-CA 37) founded and was also the director of a non-profit organization called Community Coalition, Niki Tsongas (D-MA 03) was a social worker, and Allyson

Schwartz (D-PA 13) was an executive director of a non-profit organization and she also worked as a commissioner of human services in Philadelphia. None of the men in the sample fell into the Non-profit/Community Activism/Social Work category for their primary occupation; however Luis Gutierrez (D-IL 04) did work for some time as a social worker. His primary occupation was as a teacher so for that reason he fell into the Education category.

Research holds that men are more likely than women to have served at a lower level of government, but that women are increasingly serving in lower levels of government (Burrell, 1996). Law and business both had more men than women in their categories but more women held an office at a lower level of government than men. However for this variable each representative was only coded into one occupation category, most often the category into which most of their occupations fell into, so it is likely that more than fourteen men served at lower levels of government in addition to the other occupations they listed. It also seems like a drastic discrepancy that only nine women fell into the law category while twenty-eight men did it is likely that some of those female representatives also fell into another category, such of lower level government, that they were actually coded into. For this reason a variable was coded for having occupations that fall into more than one of the occupation categories to test the theory that women have a tendency to come from a wider variety of occupations (Fox and Lawless, 2010; Burrell, 1996). Table 5 show how many representatives fell into more than one category for the Occupation variable. Twenty women and twenty-nine men only had occupations fall into category but fifty-two women and forty-three men had occupations that fell into more than one category.

<u>Table 5: Gender and Having Occupations Fall into More than 1 Category Variables</u> <u>Cross-tabulation Table</u>		
	Male Representatives	Female Representatives
No, only 1 category	20.1%	13.9%
Yes, more than 1 category	29.9%	36.1%
N	72	72
Pearson Chi Square=2.50 Sig=.80 N of Valid Cases=144		

The three women who fell into the Non-profit/Community Activism/Social Work category for the Occupation variable help to demonstrate the variety of experiences the women in the 112th House had before they ran for Congress and how many representatives have experience in more than one area. Karen Bass (D-CA 37) has experience as a non-profit organization's director but she also spent some time as a physician's assistant and later served in the California State Assembly as well. Niki Tsongas (D-MA 03) had a career in social work and was the dean of external affairs for a community college and then went on to work as a lawyer after receiving her J.D. twenty years after she received her B.A. (Nicola Tsongas Biographical Directory of the U.S. Congress 2014). Allyson Schwartz (D-PA 13) was the director of a non-profit

organization just like Karen Bass, but she was also the director of human services in Philadelphia and then later served in the Pennsylvania State Senate before running for Congress. These women, like many others in this study worked in a variety of fields before they became a member of Congress.

Based upon the research that argues that men and women tend to enter different occupations (Thomas and Wilcox, 2014; Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Fox and Lawless, 2004) the “male” versus “female” occupations variable was created in order to test whether men and women in this dataset fall into what are considered typically male and female careers. Using this research as a guide, occupations that fell into the in lower level government, business, and law categories were considered “male” occupations and occupations in the education, non-profit/community activism/social work, and other categories were considered “female” occupations. Table 6 below shows the cross-tabulation table for the “Male” versus “Female” occupations variable. While there are more men in the “male” occupations category and more women in the “female” occupations category neither category has an overwhelming amount of men or women in them or vice versa. What is apparent is that for men and women in the dataset they are both much more likely to have come from lower level politics, business, or law in general than from education or community activism. Forty-seven of the one hundred forty-four representatives held a majority of their occupations in the areas that are typically considered “female” occupations compared to the ninety-seven who spent more time in what are considered “male” dominated occupations in some capacity. The experiences of Karen Bass, Niki Tsongas, and Allyson Schwartz discussed above also demonstrate how women in this study have occupations and experiences that cut across both male and

female dominated professions. Bass and Schwartz were both directors of non-profit organizations and then later went on to serve in the state government while Tsongas began her career in social work and then became a lawyer later on in life. These three women are representative of many other women in this study who had experience in an array of occupations before they ran for Congress.

<u>Table 6: Gender and “Male” and “Female” Jobs Variables Cross-tabulation Table</u>		
	Male Representatives	Female Representatives
“Male” Jobs (Politics/Law/Business)	36.8%	13.2%
“Female” Jobs (Education/Community Activism/Other)	13.2%	19.4%
N	72	72
Pearson Chi Square=2.558		
Sig=.077		
N of Valid Cases=144		

Holding a J.D. is the most common degree in the Education variable across all of the representatives in the study with fifty-three representatives total having a J.D. as their highest degree. Of those fifty-three representatives who have a J.D. twenty-two of them are female, including Martha Roby (R-AL 02), Jackie Speier (D-CA 12), Colleen Hanabusa (D-HI 01), and Ann Marie Buerkle (R-NY 25) and thirty-one are male

including Tim Griffin (R-AL 02), Rob Andrews (D-NJ 01), Steve LaTourette (R-OH 14), and Nick Rahall (D-WV 03). Having a Bachelor's degree and having a Master's degree are the next biggest categories with thirty-eight and thirty-three representatives respectively. Some representatives like Sue Myrick (R-NC 09), Candice Miller (R-MI 10), Brian Bilbray (R-CA 50), and Gary Miller (R-CA 31) only had "attended" or "some college" listed as their education. These representatives were coded into the Other category. See Table 7 for a breakdown of how many representatives fell into each category for the Education variable.

Of the female members who list what their major or concentration was for their degree less than ten have a degree in education, but that list does include Zoe Lofgren (D-CA 19), Lois Capps (D-CA 23), and Janice Hahn (D-CA 36). Four women have a degree or certification in nursing or medicine including Carolyn McCarthy (D-NY 04), Rene Ellmers (R-NC 02), Lucille Roybal-Allard (D-CA 34), and Lois Capps (D-CA 23). Three women listed having an M.B.A. including Cathy McMorris Rodgers (R-WA 05), Loretta Sanchez (D-CA 47), and Laura Richardson (D-CA 37) as did two men in the sample, including Fortney "Pete" Stark (D-CA 13) and John Shimkus (R-IL 15). Allyson Schwartz (D-PA 13) is the only person, male or female to have a Master's in Social Work in the dataset. Not every representative listed their major of their degree so there are certainly more men and women who have degrees in these areas. For example, Betty McCollum (D-MN 04) is only listed as holding an A.A. and a B.S. but also has experience as a teacher which would imply that her degrees are in education in some capacity.

<u>Table 7: Gender and Education Variables Cross-Tabulation Table</u>		
	Male Representatives	Female Representatives
Bachelor's Degree	13.9%	12.5%
Master's Degree	9%	13.9%
J.D.	21.5%	15.3%
M.D./Ph.D.	2.8%	2.8%
Other	2.8%	5.6%
N	72	72
Pearson Chi Square=4.452 Sig=.348 N of Valid Cases=144		

Men and women in this study are different in their occupational experiences but in other areas they are again similar. See Tables 8 for a breakdown of the average ages of the representatives in the dataset by gender. In terms of the ages of the representatives the men and women in the dataset are very similar. About thirty-seven percent of the representatives fall into the sixty to sixty-nine years old age range with the fifty to fifty-nine years old age range and the seventy to seventy-nine year old age ranges having the next two highest percentages of representatives falling into their categories with about twenty-five percent of representatives and just under eighteen percent of representatives

in those categories respectively. In terms of party affiliation there is a fairly substantial difference between the men and women used in this study.

<u>Table 8: Gender and Age Variable Cross-tabulation Table</u>		
	Male Representatives	Female Representatives
30-39 years old	2.1%	0.7%
40-49 years old	7.6%	5.6%
50-59 years old	13.9%	11.8%
60-69 years old	18.8%	18.8%
70-79 years old	4.9%	12.5 %
80-89 years old	2.8%	0.7%
N	72	72
Pearson Chi Square=8.35 Sig=.138 N of Valid Cases=144		

Table 9 shows that a little less than fifty-seven percent of the representatives in the dataset are Democrats with eighty-one of the one hundred forty-four representatives. Forty-nine of the Democrats are female while only twenty-three of the sixty-three Republicans in the dataset are female. Overall, just under forty-four percent of the representatives are Republicans, but more men than women included in the dataset are Republicans.

Table 9: Gender and Party Variables Cross-tabulation Table		
	Male Representatives	Female Representatives
Republicans	27.8%	16%
Democrats	22.2%	34%
N	72	72
Pearson Chi Square=8.15		
Sig=.004		
N of Valid Cases=144		

Finally, a logistic regression was conducted to examine the relationship between serving on the board of a non-profit organization and various predictors. All 144 cases were included in the sample and the dependent variable of non-profit board membership was coded as 1 for representatives who did serve on a non-profit organization's board and 0 for those who did not serve on a board before their time in Congress. Table 10 below summarizes the analysis results. The independent variables used in the regression analysis are gender, education, occupations (with each category in the variable as a dummy variable), age, party, number of organizations listed, having an occupation in more than one category, and the "male" versus "female" jobs variable. Out of the independent variables tested only two are statistically significant at the .05 level. The gender variable is significant at .02 and the Number of Organizations listed variable is significant at .00. In the model gender is positively correlated with serving on a non-profit board which indicates that the women in the dataset tend to have served on a

Table 10: Logistic Regression of Serving on a Non-profit Board

	B	S.E.	Wald	Sig	Exp(B)
Female	1.61	.72	4.99	.02**	5.03
Education Level	-.35	.28	1.55	.21	.70
Low Level Gov't Occupation	.91	1.55	.35	.55	2.50
Business Occupation	1.73	1.71	1.02	.31	5.69
Law Occupation	.31	1.91	.02	.87	1.36
Education Occupation	1.86	1.81	1.06	.30	6.46
Non-profit/Community Activism/Social Work Occupation	1.73	1.94	.79	.62	2.36
Other Occupations	-18.29	2766.41	.79	.37	5.66
Age	-.44	.25	3.09	.079	.64
Party	.50	.60	.71	.39	1.66
Organizations Listed	1.05	.23	19.46	.00**	2.86
Occupation in more than 1 Category	-.98	.69	2.00	.15	.37
"Male"/"Female" Jobs	.21	.80	.07	.79	1.23
Constant	-2.27	1.80	1.59	.20	.10
Nagelkerke R Square=.29					
N=144					
**= Significant < .05					

non-profit board at higher levels than the men. The organizations listed variable is also positively correlated with the serving on a non-profit board variable which demonstrates that as the number of organizations a representative is a part of increases the more likely they are to have also served on the board of a non-profit organization. The logistic regression model's R^2 is .29 which does not indicate a particularly strong relationship overall and almost all of the variables are not statistically significant.

This logistic regression analysis alone does not yield enough significant results to argue that serving on a nonprofit organization board can impact any of the variables tested or that it can be argued as a definitive alternate path to public office alone. For this reason the t-test and cross-tabulation tables are important because they can help to explain more of what is going on with the variables. Based upon the t-test and cross-tabulation tables conducted here it can be argued that women in this dataset do come from a wider variety of backgrounds than their male counterparts. Three of the women have occupational backgrounds in community activism, social work, or non-profit management while none of the men do, except for the one man who had a secondary career as a social worker. More of the women than the men held a career that fell into more than one category which also suggests that women have a wider array of background experience than the men. Also, more women than men fell into the "female" jobs category than men, but more women fell into the "male" category than fell into the "female" category. While the male and female representatives were affiliated with very similar number of organizations before running for Congress women had the slightly higher rates than the men.

Chapter 5. Discussion and Conclusion

Dittmar (2015) asserts that women making political progress “matters not only for democratic fairness, but also for effective representation” (p. 4). Female candidates may enter into campaigns with comparable resources and the same ability to get elected as their male counterparts, but they are still drastically underrepresented in the U.S. House of Representatives. Burrell (2014) asserts that the reason for this is that fewer women run for office in the first place. Certainly great strides have been made yet references are often made to the so-called 1992 “year of the woman” when the disparities in the amount of women who run and get elected to public office are discussed. Once female candidates decide to run they face similar circumstances to male candidates, but the problem remains in getting women to run for office in the first place. Extant research points to structural barriers and gendered stereotypes that affect women when they choose to and actually run for office.

The results discussed here demonstrate that the educations, occupations, and organizational memberships of male and female members of the 112th House are different. While men and women list being associated with non-profit and other organizations at similar rates, the data supports the theory that men and women can take different pathways to public office and that women are shown to come from a wider variety of backgrounds than their male counterparts. These results may, in turn, have consequences for the understanding of how male and female candidates differ in their pathways to public office. There is evidence that serving on the board of a non-profit organization or working with non-profit organizations in some way is a part of the pathway to public office for some members of Congress, and the members who most likely have this type of experience tend to be women. While that is not to say that serving

on a non-profit board or working in community activism in some capacity is as prevalent as other paths such as those in business and law this research helps to argue that it is one of the many other paths women can take in addition to careers and experiences in lower level government, business, and law. Certainly this study demonstrates that female representatives come from both the traditionally considered areas of education and community activism, but that they also have plenty of experience in the areas of business, law, and lower level government just like the male representatives.

This study fits in with the literature in that it finds men and women to have differing paths to public office to some extent. While there is only a small amount of evidence in this study that experience with non-profit organizations is a viable and prevalent alternate path to public office for women, with that route being one of the many paths for women as Fox and Lawless (2010), Burrell (1996), and Frederick (2013) also found. These studies all find that women do not always take what is considered the traditional route to public office through a law degree and being a lawyer or serving at a lower level of government before running for Congress. Of course that route is still the most prevalent for both men and women in the 112th House, but this research found that women do also have educational and occupational backgrounds in education, health care, and community activism as well as business, law, and lower level government. This supports research in candidate emergence that argues that female candidates emerge from a wider variety of occupations than their male counterparts (Thomas and Wilcox, 2014; Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Fox and Lawless, 2004; Burrell, 1996; Darcy, Welch, and Clark, 1994). This study found the men and women of the 112th House do come from the careers that the literature argues that candidates come from most often but it also

substantiates research that women often come from education, health care, and community activism at higher rates than their male counterparts (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Fox and Lawless, 2004; Burrell, 1996).

This study fills a gap and extends the research done with regards to gender differences in politics and pathways to public office but it also specifically focuses on the non-profit board membership of members of Congress. For this reason data collection was somewhat difficult. The *Congressional Directory* was helpful and was a good basis for gathering information about each member of the House used in this study but it did not provide consistent information for each member. Some representative's entries listed their entire educational and occupational background and provided information about their organizational membership as well while several representatives were missing information from their entry. Biographical information was easy to obtain from other sources such as the Biographical Directory or from the representatives' websites and the CAWP Fact Sheet helped fill in gaps in the female representative's information, but these other sources were only marginally helpful for obtaining information about the organizational membership for the representatives. While some members had the dates for when they were on the board of organization in their *Congressional Directory* entry and others had the information listed in some way on their own website a few did not have this information. In the discussion of the Occupations cross-tabulation table in Chapter 4 it was mentioned that some women in the data served at the local level of government (such as positions in the city council) while others just served at the state level (in state legislators or as governors) and some women served at both the local and state levels. This distinction is important because of work like Schlesinger's (1966)

which argues that politicians progressively move up through lower levels of government and that penultimate offices, offices that politicians hold right before they win a place in Congress, are often at the state level. Making this distinction is important to further clarify the path representatives take before their time in Congress in future studies. Distinctions were not made in this study between passive and active levels of membership on non-profit boards. Certainly some members simply pay dues in order to sit on a board while others are actively engaged with the organization but there was no information about what type of role the representatives had in the non-profit organizations while they sat on the board. This distinction would be important to make in future studies as it makes a substantial difference in terms of developing civic skills and gaining experience whether representatives had an active or passive role on the non-profit organization boards they were members of before their time in Congress. While there are some other sources like Project Vote Smart (votesmart.org) that contains more specific information such as dates of service about representatives they are not as reliable as the Directories and the other sources used in this paper. All of the women in the 112th House were used but only a sampling of men were used because of the difficulty with data collection. While a sample serves as a basis for studying this topic certainly a larger dataset that includes all of the men and women in the House would have been ideal. Being able to use data for every member of the House would help to further strengthen the results found in this research.

This study is still usable in order to make generalizations about the influence of gender on politics and the pathways to public office. Political science research has focused on the impact of gender in many ways and this research demonstrates that there

are gendered differences in how men and women run for Congress. The number of women who run for office is smaller than the amount of men who run and this is often attributed to differences in levels of political ambition (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Fox and Lawless, 2010a; Fox and Lawless, 2001; Burrell, 1996; Darcy, Welch, and Clark, 1994) and to differences in recruitment (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Frederick, 2013; Fox and Lawless, 2010a; Rombough and Keithly, 2010; Fulton et. al., 2006; Burrell, 1996). This study proves that more research can be done on the background experiences (education, occupations, organizational membership) of members of Congress as well as candidates running for public offices at any level.

A study that includes a dataset of every member of the House or that uses data from more than one year would help to expand research in this area. Also, this quantitative data can be combined with qualitative data along the lines of what Frederick (2013) did. Interviewing female representative or female candidates any level of government could help to further understanding of how membership on a non-profit organization's board can play into a woman deciding to run for public office. Also, through qualitative methods more information about the nature of the board membership could be ascertained. Interviewing representatives or those who work for them would provide more in-depth information about the nature of their board membership, but that type of information is outside the scope of this study. Frederick's (2013) study, as previously discussed, did not find any female candidates who directly cited their experience with non-profit organizations as a direct influence on their decision to run for public office, but she did find evidence that is helped the women she interviewed get noticed. Burrell (1996) also asserts that while none of the women in her study of female

nominees went directly from civic volunteerism straight to a successful run for the House, she did find that community involvement can lead to a career in local or state politics which could then serve as a foundation for winning a congressional seat for women.

More research based on interviews like what Frederick (2013) did and that follow the basis defined by Burrell (1996) that work with non-profits or in community activism can serve as a stepping stone to running for public office would help to expand information on this topic even further. Also, Fox and Lawless conducted surveys with female candidates in their 2005 study. They focused mostly on what drove the women they surveyed to run for public office but future studies could conduct surveys and inquire about the role of non-profit board membership as well. It would be useful to study this for members of Congress but also for elected officials at lower levels of government as well since so many members of Congress, both men and women, begin their political careers at the lower levels of government.

Appendix: Coding Charts

Gender Variable	
Female	1
Male	0

Party Identification Variable	
Democrat	1
Republican	0

Age Variable	
30-39 years old	1
40-49 years old	2
50-59 years old	3
60-69 years old	4
70-79 years old	5
80-89 years old	6

Highest Level of Education Variable	
Other/H.S. Diploma	0
Bachelor's Degree	1
Master's Degree	2
J.D.	3
M.D./Ph.D.	4

Non-profit Board Membership Variable	
Yes, did serve on a board	1
No, did not serve on a board	0

More than One Occupation Listed Variable	
Yes	1
No	0

Occupations Dummy Variables		Other
Lower Level Government	1	0
Business	1	0
Law	1	0
Education	1	0
Medical/Nurse	1	0
Nonprofit/Social Work/Community Organizing	1	0
Other	1	0

“Female” vs. “Male” Occupations Variable	
"Female Jobs" (Education/Nursing/Community Activism/Non-profit)	1
"Male Jobs" (Law/Business/Lower Level Politics)	0

Works Cited

- Abrahams, Naomi. (1996). Negotiating power, identity, family, and community: women's community participation. *Gender and Society*, 10(6), 768-796.
- Andreoni, J., & Vesterlund, L. (2001). Which is the fair sex? Gender differences in altruism. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116, 293-312.
- Black, Gordon S. (1970). A theory of political ambition: career choices and the role of structural incentives. *American Political Science Review* 64(3), 879-887.
- Burns, Nancy, Kay Lehman Scholzman, and Sidney Verba. (2001). *The private roots of public action: Gender, equality, and political participation*. Harvard University Press.
- Burrell, Barbara C. (1996). *A woman's place is in the house: Campaigning for Congress in the feminist era*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Congressional Directory, 2011-2012. 2012. US Government Printing Services: Washington D.C.
- Carroll, Susan J. and Kira Sanbonmatsu. (2013). *More women can run: Gender and pathways to the state legislature*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- CAWP Fact Sheet: Women in the U.S. House of Representatives 2012. (2012). Retrieved from:
http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/fast_facts/levels_of_office/documents/house12.pdf.
- CAWP Fact Sheet: Women's PACs and Donor Networks. (2014). Retrieved from:
http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/education_training/resources/documents/pacs.pdf.
- Constantini, Edmond. (1990). "Political women and political ambition: closing the gender gap." *American Journal of Political Science* 34(3), 741-770.

- Darcy, Robert, Welch, Susan and Clark, Janet. (1987). *Women, elections and representation*. New York: Longman.
- Darcy, Robert, Susan Welch, and Janet Clark. (1994). *Women, elections, and representation*, 2nd ed. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Dittmar, Kelly. 2015. *Navigating Gendered Terrain: Stereotypes and Strategy in Political Campaigns*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Dolan, Kathleen and Lynne E. Ford. 1997. Change and continuity among women state legislators: evidence from three decades. *Political Research Quarterly*, 50(1), 137-151.
- Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 100, 283-308.
- Eckel, C. C., & Grossman, P. J. (1998). Are women less selfish than men? Evidence from dictator experiments. *Economic Journal*, 108, 726-735.
- Einolf, Christopher J. (2011). Gender differences in the correlates of volunteering and charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(6), 1092-1112.
- Fox, Richard and Jennifer Lawless. (2004). Entering the arena? Gender and the decision to run for office. *American Journal of Political Science*, 48(2), 264-280.
- Fox, Richard and Jennifer Lawless. (2005). *It takes a candidate: Why women don't run for office*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fox, Richard and Jennifer Lawless. 2010. If only they'd ask: Gender, recruitment, and political ambition. *The Journal of Politics*, 72(2), 310-326.

- Fox, Richard and Jennifer Lawless. (2010). *It still takes a candidate: Why women don't run for office*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fox, Richard, Jennifer Lawless, and Courtney Feeley (2001). Gender and the decision to run office. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 26(3), 411-435.
- Frederick, Angela. (2013). "Bringing narrative in: Race-gender storytelling, political ambition, and women's paths to public office." *Journal of Women, Politics, and Policy* 34, 113-137.
- Fulton, Sarah A., Cherie D. Maestas, L. Sandy Misel, and Walter J. Stone. (2006). The sense of a woman: Gender, ambition, and the decision to run for Congress." *Political Research Quarterly*, 59(2), 235-248.
- "In Uruguay, UN women Goodwill Ambassador Emma Watson urges women's political participation." (2014, September 18). *UN News Centre*. Retrieved from: <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=48741#.VUkgqtJVigl>.
- Krebs, Timothy B. (1998). "The determinants of candidates' vote share and the advantages of incumbency in city council elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 42, 921-35.
- "Non-Profit Board Statistics." (2007). *Bohse Tips: Board of Director Series*. Retrieved from: http://bohse.com/images/file/Board_of_Director_Series/Non-Profit_Board_Statistics.pdf.
- Palmer, Barbara and Dennis Simon. (2003). "Political ambition and women in the U.S. House of Representatives, 1916-2000. *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(2), 127-138.

- Rohde, David. (1979). Risk-bearing and progressive ambition: The case of members of the United State House of Representatives. *American Journal of Political Science*, 23(1), 1-26.
- Rombough, Shirley and Diane C. Keithly. (2010). Women in politics: An analysis of personal characteristics leading to success in gaining local elective office. *Race, Gender, and Class*, 17(3/4), 173-188.
- Sandberg, Sheryl. (2013). *Lean in: Women, work, and the will to lead*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Schlesinger, Joseph. (1996). *Ambition and Politics: Political Careers in the United States*. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.
- Schlozman, Kay Lehman, Nancy Burns, and Sidney Verba. (1994). Gender and the pathways to participation: The role of resources. *The Journal of Politics*, 56(4), 963-990.
- Stivers, Camilla. (1993). *Gender images in public administration: Legitimacy and the administrative state*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Themduo, Nuno. (2009). "Gender and the nonprofit sector." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38(4): 663-683.
- Thomas, Sue and Clyde Wilcox (ed.) (2014). *Women and elective office past, present, and future*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tsongas, Nicola S. Biographical Information. (2015). *Biographical Directory of the United States Congress*. Retrieved from: <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=t000465>.

United Nations Development Programme. "Human development reports: Gender inequality index." (2014). Retrieved from: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/table-4-gender-inequality-index>.

"Who studies what? Men, women, and college majors". (2014, October 23). *NPR*. Retrieved from: <http://www.npr.org/blogs/money/2014/10/28/359419934/who-studies-what-men-women-and-college-majors>.