
Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects

Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects

1997

Women State Legislators and Political Culture

Diana Burghard West

College of William & Mary - Arts & Sciences

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd>



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#), and the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

West, Diana Burghard, "Women State Legislators and Political Culture" (1997). *Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects*. William & Mary. Paper 1539626126.

<https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.21220/s2-jdce-by19>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.

WOMEN STATE LEGISLATORS AND POLITICAL CULTURE

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Government

The College of William and Mary in Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

by

Diana Burghard West

1997

APPROVAL SHEET

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts




Author

Approved, February 1997



David Dessler



Lawrence Evans



Ronald Rapoport

DEDICATION

To my husband, Mike West, who enabled me to finish. Thank you for your unfailing support and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
INTRODUCTION	2
RESEARCH EXPECTATIONS AND PREVIOUS FINDINGS	3
CULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS	5
POLITICAL CULTURES	6
HISTORICAL TRADITION	9
PROFESSIONAL STATUS	14
CONCLUSION	17
STRUCTURAL FACTORS	20
ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS	22
CONCLUSION	25
APPENDICES	28
BIBLIOGRAPHY	38
VITA	40

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express her appreciation to Professor David Dessler for his advice and thoughtful criticism throughout the thesis process. His organization and kindness were appreciated by the entire graduate class. The writer would also like to thank Professor Larry Evans for his input and insistence on high standards, and Professor Ronald Rapoport for his good humor and patience.

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Political Cultures	8
2.	Historical Traditions	13
3.	Professional Status	17
4.	Cultural Factors	19
5.	Structural Factors	22
6.	Multivariate Analysis	24

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to compare the data on political culture and structure from the 1970s and 1990s to determine which statewide characteristics currently have the most effect on the number of women holding state legislative office. The results of this study suggest that the rising number of women in the workforce has a positive effect on the number of women legislators, while the presence of a traditionalistic culture has a negative one.

The research structure is taken from a study by David Hill, "Political Culture and Female Political Representation," published in 1981. His study measured the correlation between variables of political culture and structure and the percentages of women state legislators in each state. Hill found that political culture was a much stronger correlate of female representation than political structure.

Data from the 1990s produced similar results. The correlation scores were recalculated using Pearson's r and a multivariate analysis was added. Political culture variables are still more highly correlated with greater numbers of women legislators than are structural variables, and the negative effect of a traditionalistic culture is now the strongest deterrent to female representation. However, the other variables which indicate high levels of female representation have changed. Most significantly, the professional status of women in each state has become a much stronger indicator than it was twenty years ago. Specifically, the correlation value of female employment scores has risen significantly, and the importance of its effect was confirmed by the multivariate analysis.

WOMEN STATE LEGISLATORS AND POLITICAL CULTURE

INTRODUCTION

Wherever women run for office, they can be elected. The number of women state legislators varies dramatically from state to state, however, ranging from 3.6 percent in Alabama to 38.1 percent in Washington.¹ This variation has raised the question of whether statewide characteristics account for these disparities, and if so, which ones are most closely related to female representation. Previous researchers have generally concluded that statewide characteristics account for little of the wide discrepancies in female representation among the states. However, demographic changes and an increase in the number of women legislators over the last twenty years invite a reevaluation of that conclusion.

This paper compares data on statewide characteristics from the 1970s with data from the 1990s. The research structure comes from one of the most succinct and systematic of the earlier studies, "Political Culture and Female Political Representation," written by David Hill and published in 1981. In short, Hill determined that political culture was a limited but viable indicator of female representation, while political structure was not. The object of this paper is to determine whether this is still true and whether the

¹"Women in State Legislatures, 1997," fact sheet. Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP), Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University.

same variables have become more or less important to female representation in the 1990s.

Previous findings are largely upheld, demonstrating that cultural characteristics are still better indicators than structural ones, although the values of the variables had changed in most cases. These findings add strength to more recent research which claims that individual circumstances such as party, incumbency, and financial resources are more likely determinants of electoral success than statewide characteristics.

RESEARCH EXPECTATIONS AND PREVIOUS FINDINGS

The research expectations of this paper were based on the following hypotheses:

H1: Cultural characteristics are stronger indicators of female representation than political structure.

H2: States with a historical tradition of supporting women's involvement in politics are likely to have more women legislators.

H3: Variables related to the higher education and professional accomplishments of women are stronger predictors of female representation in the 1990s than they were in the 1970s.

H4: Political structure variables are not viable indicators of female representation.

When David Hill published his study in 1981, contemporary research demonstrated

that "women tend to hold legislative seats in states and communities where legislatures are least professional and legislative service least desirable."² To determine why this was so, most studies at the time focused on whether state political structures affected women's election to office or kept them out of the more desirable seats. Hill posited that a more comprehensive explanation could be found by examining the political culture in each state as well.

Hill found that states whose political culture included a tradition of supporting women were more likely to elect women legislators. A great deal has changed over the last twenty years, however. For example, the number of women in state legislative office across the country has gone up 12.5 percent,³ and that change alone could alter the results of the study.

Perhaps more importantly, however, the professional status of women has changed dramatically. Although women working outside the home were not unusual in the 1970s, today they are commonplace. Likewise, the number of women with college and law

²David Hill, "Political Culture and Female Political Representation," The Journal of Politics 43 (1981): 159.

³In 1977, 8.7 percent of state legislators were women. In 1997, it is 21.2 percent. See Appendix 1.

degrees has risen, and so the pool of likely legislators has increased. Therefore, the professional status of women may prove to be a more important indicator of women's representation than it was in the past.

To measure the impact of these variables on female representation, the correlation between the dependent variable--the percentage of women legislators in each state--and the independent cultural and structural variables was calculated using Pearson's r . A score of 0 indicates no correlation between the variables, while a score of 1 indicates perfect correlation. A score of .5 is considered a reliable indicator of correlation. Pearson's r was used in order to replicate Hill's study. In order to provide a more thorough interpretation of the data, however, a multivariate analysis was added at the end of this paper.

CULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS

State cultures have been defined and analyzed many times over the years to determine whether cultural characteristics lead to the election of more women candidates. Hill's study used nine measurements of state cultural factors, grouped into three categories: state political cultures; a tradition of female representation; and the

professional status of women in each state. Together, these measures indicate the state's openness to women's political participation. Presumably, the more open the state, the more likely women are to serve in elected office. Hill found political culture to be among the strongest correlates of female representation, and we expect the current results to be similar.

POLITICAL CULTURES

To measure state political cultures, Hill utilized Daniel Elazar's description of states as "traditionalistic", "individualistic", or "moralistic".⁴ As individualistic states neither promote nor lessen the likelihood of women winning office, Hill used only the traditionalistic and moralistic measurements. A scale score devised by Charles Johnson was used to quantify the states' cultures.⁵

Hill found a mild correlation between female representation and the traditionalistic

⁴David Elazar, American Federalism: A View from the States (New York: Crowell, 1966).

⁵Charles Johnson, "Political Culture in American States: Elazar's Formulation Examined," American Journal of Political Science 20 (August 1976), 491-509.

and moralistic scores. As expected, traditionalistic states had fewer women representatives ($r = -.37$), while moralistic states seemed to encourage female representation, if not very strongly ($r = .28$). Using the same scale score with 1997 data⁶ showed a much stronger negative correlation in traditionalistic states ($r = -.56$) but the same correlation in moralistic ones ($r = .28$). This suggests an uneven level of growth in female representation among the states, with traditionalistic states lagging behind their individualistic and moralistic counterparts.

To determine if this was so, the percentage of women legislators in 1977⁷ was compared with that in 1997, divided into the three political cultures. As expected, the individualistic and moralistic states had increased their female representation the most, at 14.12 and 13.74 percent respectively, while the percentage of women representatives in traditionalistic states had increased more slowly, at 9.93 percent. [See Appendices 1 and 2] This difference in growth explains some of the increase in the negative correlation with traditionalistic cultures, although other factors may also have contributed to the

⁶Author's calculations derived from data in "Women in State Legislatures, 1997" CAWP fact sheet.

⁷U. S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1979 (Washington DC, 1979), 513.

difference.⁸

Although it is useful to compare current findings with Hill's, caution must be used with Elazar's characterizations. First of all, they are dated, and do not account for demographic shifts which have occurred over the last twenty-five years. Arizona and New Mexico, where the greatest increases in traditionalistic states occurred, might no longer be considered traditionalistic, for example. Secondly, some characteristics which Elazar labeled "traditionalistic" might actually be regional, as many of these states are in the South. Nevertheless, Elazar's labels are still accepted as the "industry standard", and still shed some light on cultural differences among states and regions.

TABLE 1

POLITICAL CULTURES	1970s			1990s		
	Mean	Std. Dev.	(r)	Mean	Std. Dev.	(r)
Traditionalistic culture scale scores	.21	.29	-.37	.20	.29	-.56
Moralistic culture scale scores	.21	.17	.28	.20	.17	.28

⁸These figures make an imperfect comparison, however, as Hill's numbers were from 1973, not 1977.

HISTORICAL TRADITION

The second subcategory of cultural factors was historical indicators. Presumably, states with longer histories of women's political involvement would have higher numbers of women representatives. To measure the strength of states' tradition of women's involvement in politics, three variables were used: the number of women in each state legislature in 1937, the year in which full or partial suffrage was granted, and the year in which women were first allowed to serve on state court juries.

Hill found that the strongest predictor ($r = .67$) of female representation in the 1970s was the number of women in office in the 1930s. In the 1990s, the correlation was weaker ($r = .41$), reflecting the overall growth in women's representation across the United States. Indeed, a score comparable to Hill's would suggest that little progress had been made over the last twenty years.

The next historic indicator used was the year that suffrage was granted in each state. The vote was first extended to women in the western territory of Wyoming in 1869. By the end of the century, women had the vote in Colorado, Utah, and Idaho as well.⁹

⁹Janet Clark, R. Darcy, and Susan Welch, Women, Elections, and Representation (New York: Longman, 1987), 52.

Suffrage was extended to women not in recognition of their rights, however, but largely as a way of raising the number of citizens in the territory so that statehood could be conferred. Women were also expected to have a beneficial civilizing effect upon the frontier, casting votes in favor of stability and permanence. In fact, nine of the twelve states which granted women suffrage before the Nineteenth Amendment was passed in 1920 were in the West.

The West also led the way in women's legislative service. The first three women to serve in a state legislature were elected in Colorado in 1894.¹⁰ In 1896, Utah and Idaho followed suit, electing three women to their legislatures as well.¹¹ Therefore, it seems likely that women's service in state legislatures would follow a pattern similar to that of suffrage--those states which admitted women to the franchise the earliest and had the longest traditions of women in state elected office would have the highest numbers of women state legislators today. Indeed, states with the highest percentages of women state legislators today are in the regions with long histories of supporting women's rights--New England and the Pacific and Mountain states. [See Appendix 3]

Hill found no real correlation, however, between the granting of suffrage and the

¹⁰Clark, Darcy, and Welch, 52.

¹¹Clark, Darcy, and Welch, 52.

number of women legislators serving in 1973 ($r = .17$). The connection with jury service was even weaker ($r = .10$). The current correlations were stronger, indicating the possibility of a link between representation today and historic measures of openness.

Hill measured the effect of historic tradition by using an "innovation score" suggested by Jack Walker¹² to calculate each state's openness to change regarding the adoption of suffrage and the year that women were first allowed to serve on state court juries. The innovation score was calculated by assigning the first state to adopt the policy a score of .00, and the last state a score of 1.00. All the states in between received a score based on the number of years that elapsed until that state's adoption of the program. The innovation score for each state is 1.00 minus the state's score on the issue. In the case of suffrage, for example, fifty-one years elapsed between 1869, when Wyoming was the first state to allow its women to vote¹³, and 1920, when the Nineteenth Amendment was passed. California granted suffrage to women in 1911, forty-two years after Wyoming, and thus has an innovation score of .18, which is 42 divided by 51 (.82), and subtracted from 1.00. In

¹²Jack Walker, "The Diffusion of Innovations Among the American States," *American Political Science Review*, 63 (September 1969), 880-899.

¹³As a territory, Wyoming first granted full suffrage to women in 1869. Wyoming was admitted as a state in 1890. Similarly, Utah first granted women suffrage in 1870, but was not admitted until 1896.

the case of jury service, it took seventy years before all fifty states allowed women to serve on state court juries, beginning with Utah in 1898, and ending with Mississippi in 1968. In both categories, the higher the score, the more open the state to women's participation in politics.

As mentioned above, Hill found no significant correlation between these historical indicators and levels of women's representation in the 1970s, although innovation in women's suffrage was slightly stronger ($r = .17$) than innovation in women's jury service ($r = .10$). In the 1990s, the scores had become essentially the same. The suffrage correlation was still mild, however ($r = .26$), and the correlation with jury service was only slightly stronger ($r = .27$).

As with the change in political culture scores, the shift above may be attributable to the overall growth in the percentage of women legislators across the United States. The jump in the jury innovation scores probably reflects, once again, the slower growth in the mostly traditionalistic states in the South.

When the states are divided into the nine regions defined by the U.S. Census of the Population, the New England, Pacific, Mountain states are the three regions with the most women legislators in both 1977 and 1997. All regions gained female representation over

the twenty year span, of course, but the Mountain and Pacific areas increased their percentages the most, supporting the higher correlation between the more innovative Northwestern states and their higher levels of female representation. Conversely, the South Atlantic, Middle Atlantic, and East South Central regions gained the least. [See Appendix 3]

TABLE 2

HISTORICAL TRADITION	1970s			1990s		
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>(r)</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>(r)</u>
Tradition of female representation ^a	2.90	4.46	.67	31.70	19.85	.41
Innovation in women's jury service	.46	.24	.10	.47	.24	.27
Innovation in women's suffrage	.25	.25	.17	.12	.26	.26

^a Number of female legislators in 1937.

PROFESSIONAL STATUS

The historical and political cultures of the states provide some indication of a state's likelihood of having a high number of women legislators. More relevant today, however, is the state's tradition of women's professional success. This data is more recent, and reflects the professional gains of women over the last two decades. It was expected that states with a greater number of professional women would have a higher number of women in legislative office, as the former would indicate acceptance of and support for women's representation in the professions, including professional politics.

The professional status of women in each state was determined using four separate measures: the ratio of women who had completed four years of college to all people who had done so;¹⁴ the ratio of women lawyers to all lawyers;¹⁵ women workers as a percentage of all workers; and women workers as a percentage of all women.¹⁶ The first two indicators measure the level of career preparation for political life, as politicians are usually

¹⁴Author's calculations based on data from the U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of the Population: 1990, Washington, DC, 1990), 202-207.

¹⁵Author's calculations based on data from Clara N. Carson and Barbara A. Curran, The Lawyer Statistical Report: The U.S. Legal Profession in 1988. (Chicago: American Bar Foundation, 1988).

¹⁶Author's calculations based on data from the U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of the Population: 1990, (Washington, DC, 1990), 215-221.

drawn from the college educated and the legal community. The second two indicators compose what Hill called a "female employment score" to measure the level of women's participation in the work force in each state. Presumably, states with more women in the work force would be more tolerant of women working in the legislature.

In 1981, Hill found no correlation between female representation and the number of women with college or law degrees in each state ($r = .06$ and $r = -.02$, respectively). In 1997, the correlation to the number of women with BA's had dropped slightly, resulting in a very mild negative association ($r = -.07$). The connection between women's representation and the number of women in the legal community had risen significantly, however ($r = .39$), suggesting that states with more women litigators are likely to have more women legislators as well. This finding underscores the fact that political candidates are most likely to be drawn from the legal profession.

Professionalism as a whole has become more important. In the 1970s, the correlation between professionalism and representation was very weak. The female employment score for 1970 was only slightly more promising than the education correlates ($r = .15$). Data from 1990's were much stronger, however ($r = .43$), making the employment score the second strongest indicator. This is not surprising, given the demographic changes over the past two decades mentioned above.

A final measure of the work force factor was a comparison of median salaries for male and female college graduates. Surprisingly, Hill found that states which discriminated the most against women in this category had the highest numbers of women legislators ($r = .26$). Hill posited that this finding might be due to differences in job tenure, rather than outright discrimination. Although that is a possibility, perhaps a better explanation is that states with high median salaries for women offer educated women more options. In states with high median salaries, women may be less likely to consider a career in politics, which can be unstable and unremunerative. Where good jobs are available, women are happy to fill them, and legislative service becomes a less viable option.

The data used by Hill in the 1970s is no longer published in the 1990s, so per capita income in each state was substituted.¹⁷ In the 1990s, this provides a good correlation with female representation ($r = .40$). It seems possible that more prosperous states are somewhat more likely to have women legislators. However, this variable must be interpreted with great care, as it is not broken down by sex and does not reflect levels of educational attainment.

¹⁷Data are from the U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1996, (Washington, DC: Department of Commerce, 1996), 452.

TABLE 3

PROFESSIONAL STATUS	1970s			1990s		
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>(r)</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>(r)</u>
Female employment scores, 1970 and 1990	1540	182	.15	1717	228	.43
Per capita income, 1995	--	--	--	218.73	30.15	.40
Female employment in legal profession, 1970 and 1988	.04	.01	-.02	.14	.03	.39
Female achievement in higher education 1970 and 1990	.42	.02	.06	.48	.02	-.07
Sex discrimination in income, 1970	.45	.05	.26	--	--	--

CONCLUSION

Overall, then, the cultural factors which had the strongest correlation to women's representation in the 1970s were the tradition of representation as indicated by the number of women legislators in 1937 and the traditionalistic and moralistic political culture scale scores. In the 1990s, the strongest correlate was the negative correlation with traditionalistic cultures ($r = -.56$), followed by the female employment score ($r = .43$), the

tradition of representation ($r = .41$) and employment in the legal profession ($r = .39$).

The second and fourth correlates support the author's hypothesis that the professional status of women has become a much more important indicator of women's representation in state legislatures. As more women work outside the home and gain professional acceptance, electing them to office becomes more commonplace.

The third correlate, along with the innovation scores, support the author's hypothesis that states with a historical tradition of supporting women's involvement in politics are likely to have more women legislators. Cultural variables are only one part of this study, however. The other two hypotheses are related to the structural variables. In the 1970s, Hill found that political structure was not related to female representation, and the same results were expected in the 1990s.

TABLE 4

CULTURAL FACTORS	1970s			1990s		
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>(r)</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>(r)</u>
Traditionalistic culture scale scores	.21	.29	-.37	.20	.29	-.57
Female employment scores, 1970 and 1990	1540	182	.15	1717	28	.42
Per capita income, 1995	--	--	--	218.73	30.15	.40
Tradition of female representation ^a	2.90	4.46	.67	2.90	4.46	.39
Female employment in legal profession, 1970 and 1988	.04	.01	-.02	.14	.03	.38
Innovation in women's jury service	.46	.24	.10	.47	.24	.29
Moralistic culture scale scores	.21	.17	.28	.20	.17	.28
Innovation in women's suffrage	.25	.25	.67	.88	.26	.27
Sex discrimination in income, 1970	.45	.05	.26	--	--	--
Female achievement in higher education 1970 and 1990	.42	.02	.06	.48	.02	-.07

^a Number of female legislators in 1937.

STRUCTURAL FACTORS

At the beginning of this paper it was noted that women tended to serve in the least desirable seats, leading to the question of what factors made this so. The structural factors of legislative service, i.e., compensation, mean constituency size, frequency of the legislative sessions, and the length of the sessions, might affect the number of women in office along with cultural factors.

Presumably there is more competition for seats in states that pay more and demand less. Indeed, Hill found that fewer women serve where the pay is higher ($r = -.34$). Women were also less likely to serve where constituency size was larger ($r = -.29$). Hill also found fewer women in legislatures which met annually ($r = -.22$) and had longer legislative sessions ($r = -.02$). In the 1990s, little has changed, although the negative correlations are weaker.

Structural variables, in fact, now show almost no correlation with the number of women in each state legislature, indicating that women are no longer likely to serve in the less desirable seats. All the r scores hover around zero. Having annual legislative sessions is no longer a negative correlation ($r = .04$), and the rate of compensation and mean

constituency size are essentially zero ($r = .03$ and $r = -.02$, respectively).¹⁸ The length of the legislative sessions shows a very slight correlation ($r = .09$),¹⁹ which indicates that women are now somewhat more likely to serve in legislatures with longer sessions. This would fit into the overall picture of greater professionalism among women of the 1990s, but it is impossible to draw a definitive conclusion from such a small score, and great caution ought to be used in its interpretation.

Overall, however, it is safe to say that the lack of correlation between structural variables and female representation suggests that these structural factors are no longer a barrier to women's election. This confirms the author's hypotheses that cultural variables are stronger indicators than structural ones, and that structural variables are not viable indicators of female representation.

¹⁸These three data sets are derived from The Book of the States, 1996-97. (Lexington, Kentucky: The Council of State Governments).

¹⁹Data are derived from "1995 Legislative Regular Session Calendar" and "1996 Legislative Session Calendar" provided by the National Conference of State Legislators, Denver Colorado.

TABLE 5

STRUCTURAL FACTORS	1970s			1990s		
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>(r)</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>(r)</u>
Length of legislative session, 1971-1972, 1995-1996 ^a	269.08	184.26	-.02	178.4	115.06	.09
Legislative compensation, 1995-1996, biennium ^b	157.96	114.33	-.34	382.41	332.67	.03
Annual legislative session ^c	.69	.47	-.22	.86	.35	.04
Mean constituency size, 1973, 1996 ^d	26.42	27.98	-.29	33.62	38.36	-.02

^a Expressed in number of days.

^b Expressed in hundreds of dollars.

^c Dummy variable (annual = 1; biennial = 0).

^d Expressed in thousands.

ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS

Although Pearson's r provides a basis for interpreting the relationship between the level of female representation and the independent variables, it does not provide enough information to evaluate which variables have the greatest effect on the number of women legislators. Because explanatory variables may be correlated, the relative importance of

each variable may be biased. To correct for this, a multivariate analysis, or linear regression, was run on the data. This regression provides a neutral beta weight, which eliminates variations in the values that are the result of differences in the units of measurement. The researcher can then compare the differing effects of the variables.

According to the analysis, the variable with by far the greatest effect on female representation is the negative effect of a traditionalistic culture ($b = -.6050$), followed by the female employment score ($b = .3591$), confirming the impact of more women in the workplace. These two variables are also the only ones with a standard error higher than 1.96 (-3.149 and 2.299 , respectively), which means that they are the only factors found to be statistically significant in this study.

The remaining variables have standard error scores which are too low for them to be considered statistically reliable. However, it is interesting that the variables with the smallest beta-weights were mostly the structural variables, although the effect of the tradition of female representation was also surprisingly small ($b = .0414$).

Overall, the results of the analysis contradict some of the earlier results but confirm others. For example, Hill found the tradition of female representation to be the strongest correlate in the 1970s, but it is one of the weakest factors today when compared to the

effects of other variables. On the other hand, the negative impact of a traditionalistic culture appears to be confirmed.

The most important result of the analysis is the confirmation that the higher number of women in the workplace has a measurable impact on the number of women elected to legislative office. The most surprising--though statistically insignificant--results are the negative effects of the moralistic culture and per capita income, which had positive correlation scores. These results underscore the benefits of using a multivariate analysis to measure the relative effects of the variables, and support the conclusion that cultural variables have a greater effect than structural ones.

TABLE 6

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS	
	<u>Beta</u>
Traditionalistic culture scale scores	-.605045*
Female employment score	.359145*
Moralistic culture scale scores	-.318446
Innovation in women's suffrage	.223523
Female employment in legal profession	.208958
Length of legislative sessions	-.147935

TABLE 6, cont.

	<u>Beta</u>
Female achievement in higher education	-.139252
Per capita income	-.068292
Legislative compensation	-.044638
Tradition of female representation	.041371
Innovation in women's jury service	.039254
Annual legislative session	.001045

*significant at .95 level

CONCLUSION

To varying degrees, all four original hypotheses were confirmed by the correlation scores obtained with the 1990s data. However, the multivariate analysis suggest a slightly different picture. Cultural variables are still stronger factors than structural ones, with traditionalistic cultures having the strongest effect of all. The impact of historic tradition, however, is considerably weaker. The educational and professional variables have mixed

results, with higher education showing no significant effect, but with the employment score demonstrating a high level of importance. Lastly, political structures play only a negligible role, if any, on the number of women legislators.

This paper examines only a few of the many cultural and structural variables that affect female representation. Analysis of other variables could extend this analysis and possibly produce different results. For example, analyzing the turnover rate in each state legislature could prove valuable, as higher turnover means more open seats. Another possibility would be to analyze the openness of each legislature to initiatives, referendums, and recalls. Those states which allow their citizens to initiate these procedures are presumably more open to citizen participation and thus more open to women's participation. Yet another avenue of inquiry could center on the professionalism of each state legislature, including some of the variables used in this study, but also the availability of staff. However, the most beneficial studies would be centered on a small sample of states and examine the circumstances of individual cases.

Examining the conditions which seem to promote or discourage female representation is important to representative democracies. Many people recognize the disparity between the percentage of women in legislative office and the percentage of women in the population. As a result, attempts have been made to change the system and

lower the barriers which stand between women and political office. However, the results of this study confirm those of earlier research--the barriers to female representation are not structural ones which can be legislated away. Instead, they are cultural ones which seem to be overcome in non-traditionalistic states where women are an important part of the workforce and the professional role of women has become an accepted part of society. In order to have more women in legislative offices, states need to have more women in professional ones.

The study of women in elected office will continue until the percentage of women legislators approaches the percentage of women in society. Apparently, that will happen only as women reach professional parity, which may take a long time indeed. Although many of the correlation scores in this study are quite low and should be interpreted cautiously, overall the results of the correlations and the multivariate analysis do support the current prevailing argument that women can be elected anywhere, and the variables which have the greatest effect are related to the candidate rather than her surroundings.

APPENDIX 1

FEMALE REPRESENTATION IN 1977 AND 1997

<u>STATE</u>	<u>% 1977</u>	<u>% 1997</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
Alabama	2.14	3.57	1.43
Alaska	6.66	13.33	6.67
Arizona	17.77	36.66	18.89
Arkansas	2.22	17.03	14.81
California	5.00	22.50	17.50
Colorado	14.00	35.00	21.00
Connecticut	19.78	28.34	8.56
Delaware	12.90	24.19	11.29
Florida	11.25	23.12	11.87
Georgia	4.66	16.52	11.86
Hawaii	11.84	17.10	5.26
Idaho	9.52	23.80	14.28
Illinois	8.89	25.98	17.09
Indiana	6.00	18.66	12.66
Iowa	11.33	20.66	9.33
Kansas	6.66	29.69	23.03
Kentucky	5.79	9.42	3.63
Louisiana	1.38	11.11	9.73
Maine	14.67	25.80	11.13
Maryland	11.17	28.72	17.55
Massachusetts	7.14	23.00	15.86
Michigan	5.40	22.97	17.57
Minnesota	5.97	30.34	24.37
Mississippi	1.14	11.49	10.35
Missouri	8.12	21.82	13.70

<u>STATE</u>	<u>% 1977</u>	<u>% 1997</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
Montana	9.33	23.33	14.00
Nebraska	4.08	26.53	22.45
Nevada	11.66	33.33	21.67
New Hampshire	26.88	31.13	4.25
New Jersey	10.83	15.00	4.17
New Mexico	4.46	26.78	22.32
New York	4.26	18.48	14.22
North Carolina	13.52	17.05	3.53
North Dakota	12.66	16.32	3.66
Ohio	6.06	21.96	15.90
Oklahoma	4.69	10.06	5.37
Oregon	13.33	25.55	12.22
Pennsylvania	4.34	12.25	7.91
Rhode Island	7.33	26.00	18.67
South Carolina	5.88	12.94	7.06
South Dakota	7.61	17.14	9.53
Tennessee	2.27	13.63	11.36
Texas	6.07	18.23	12.16
Utah	5.76	15.38	9.62
Vermont	15.00	29.44	14.44
Virginia	6.42	15.00	8.58
Washington	15.54	38.09	22.45
West Virginia	8.95	14.92	5.97
Wisconsin	9.09	23.48	14.39
Wyoming	<u>7.60</u>	<u>17.77</u>	<u>10.17</u>
	435.02	1060.61	625.49

1977 mean = 8.7%

1997 mean = 21.2%

% change = 12.5%

Sources: Author's calculations based on data from U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1979 (Washington, DC, 1979), 513, and "Women in State Legislatures, 1997" fact sheet, Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP), Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

APPENDIX 2

CHANGES IN MORALISTIC, INDIVIDUALISTIC AND TRADITIONALISTIC STATES

MORALISTIC

<u>STATE</u>	<u>% 1977</u>	<u>% 1997</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
California	5.00	22.50	17.50
Colorado	14.00	35.00	21.00
Idaho	9.52	23.80	14.28
Kansas	6.66	29.69	23.03
Maine	14.67	25.80	11.13
Michigan	5.40	22.97	17.57
Minnesota	5.97	30.34	24.37
Montana	9.33	23.33	14.00
New Hampshire	26.88	31.13	4.25
North Dakota	12.66	16.32	3.66
Oregon	13.33	25.55	12.22
South Dakota	7.61	17.14	9.53
Utah	5.76	15.38	9.62
Vermont	15.00	29.44	14.44
Washington	15.54	38.09	22.45
Wisconsin	<u>9.09</u>	<u>23.48</u>	<u>14.39</u>
	176.42	409.96	233.44

1977 mean = 10.38%

1997 mean = 24.12%

% change = 13.74%

INDIVIDUALISTIC

<u>STATE</u>	<u>% 1977</u>	<u>% 1997</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
Connecticut	19.78	28.34	8.56
Delaware	12.90	24.19	11.29
Illinois	8.89	25.98	17.09
Indiana	6.00	18.66	12.66

cont.

<u>STATE</u>	<u>% 1977</u>	<u>%1997</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
Maryland	11.17	28.72	17.55
Massachusetts	7.14	23.00	15.86
Missouri	8.12	21.82	13.70
Nebraska	4.08	26.53	22.45
Nevada	11.66	33.33	21.67
New Jersey	10.83	15.00	4.17
New York	4.26	18.48	14.22
Ohio	6.06	21.96	15.90
Pennsylvania	4.34	12.25	7.91
Rhode Island	7.33	26.00	18.67
Wyoming	<u>7.60</u>	<u>17.77</u>	<u>10.17</u>
	130.16	342.03	211.87

1977 mean = 8.68%

1997 mean = 22.80%

% change = 14.12%

TRADITIONALISTIC

<u>STATE</u>	<u>% 1977</u>	<u>%1997</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
Alabama	2.14	3.57	1.43
Arizona	17.77	36.66	18.89
Arkansas	2.22	17.03	14.81
Florida	11.25	23.12	11.87
Georgia	4.66	16.52	11.86
Kentucky	5.79	9.42	3.63
Louisiana	1.38	11.11	9.73
Mississippi	1.14	11.49	10.35
New Mexico	4.46	26.78	22.32
North Carolina	13.52	17.05	3.53
Oklahoma	4.69	10.06	5.37
South Carolina	5.88	12.94	7.06
Tennessee	2.27	13.63	11.36
Texas	6.07	18.23	12.16

cont.

<u>STATE</u>	<u>% 1977</u>	<u>%1997</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
Virginia	6.42	15.00	8.58
West Virginia	<u>8.95</u>	<u>14.92</u>	<u>5.97</u>
	98.61	257.53	158.92

1977 mean = 6.16%

1997 mean = 16.10%

% change = 9.93%

APPENDIX 3

CHANGES IN DIFFERENT REGIONS OF THE COUNTRY

NEW ENGLAND

<u>STATE</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
Maine	14.67	25.80	11.13
New Hampshire	26.88	31.13	4.25
Vermont	15.00	29.44	14.44
Massachusetts	7.14	23.00	15.86
Rhode Island	7.33	26.00	18.67
Connecticut	<u>19.78</u>	<u>28.34</u>	<u>8.56</u>
	90.80	72.91	163.71

1977 mean = 15.13%

1997 mean = 27.28%

% change = 12.15%

MIDDLE ATLANTIC

<u>STATE</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
New Jersey	10.83	15.00	4.17
New York	4.26	18.48	14.22
Pennsylvania	<u>4.34</u>	<u>12.25</u>	<u>7.91</u>
	19.43	45.73	26.30

1977 mean = 6.48%

1997 mean = 15.24%

% change = 8.76

SOUTH ATLANTIC

<u>STATE</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
Florida	11.25	23.12	11.87
Georgia	4.66	16.52	11.86
Delaware	12.90	24.19	11.29
Maryland	11.17	28.72	17.55
North Carolina	13.52	17.05	3.53
South Carolina	5.88	12.94	7.06
Virginia	6.42	15.00	8.58
West Virginia	<u>8.95</u>	<u>14.92</u>	<u>5.97</u>
	74.75	152.46	77.71

1977 mean = 9.34%

1997 mean = 19.06%

% change = 9.71%

EAST NORTH CENTRAL

<u>STATE</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
Illinois	8.89	25.98	17.09
Indiana	6.00	18.66	12.66
Michigan	5.40	22.97	17.57
Ohio	6.06	21.96	15.90
Wisconsin	<u>9.09</u>	<u>23.48</u>	<u>14.39</u>
	35.44	113.05	77.61

1977 mean = 7.09%

1997 mean = 22.61%

% change = 15.52%

EAST SOUTH CENTRAL

<u>STATE</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
Alabama	2.14	3.57	1.43
Kentucky	5.79	9.42	3.63
Mississippi	1.14	11.49	10.35
Tennessee	<u>2.27</u>	<u>13.63</u>	<u>11.36</u>
	11.34	38.11	26.77

1977 mean = 2.83%

1997 mean = 9.53%

% change = 6.69%

WEST NORTH CENTRAL

<u>STATE</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
Iowa	11.33	20.66	9.33
Kansas	6.66	29.69	23.03
Minnesota	5.97	30.34	24.37
Missouri	8.12	21.82	13.70
Nebraska	4.08	26.53	22.45
North Dakota	12.66	16.32	3.66
South Dakota	<u>7.61</u>	<u>17.14</u>	<u>9.53</u>
	56.43	162.5	106.07

1977 mean = 8.06%

1997 mean = 23.21%

% change = 15.15%

WEST SOUTH CENTRAL

<u>STATE</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
Arkansas	2.22	17.03	14.81
Louisiana	1.38	11.11	9.73
Oklahoma	4.69	10.06	5.37
Texas	<u>6.07</u>	<u>18.23</u>	<u>12.16</u>
	14.36	56.43	42.07

1977 mean = 3.59%

1997 mean = 14.11%

% change = 10.52%

MOUNTAIN

<u>STATE</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
Arizona	17.77	36.66	18.89
Colorado	14.00	35.00	21.00
Idaho	9.52	23.80	14.28
Montana	9.33	23.33	14.00
Nevada	11.66	33.33	21.67
New Mexico	4.46	26.78	22.32
Utah	5.76	15.38	9.62
Wyoming	<u>7.60</u>	<u>17.77</u>	<u>10.17</u>
	80.10	212.05	131.95

1977 mean = 10.01%

1997 mean = 26.50%

% change = 16.49%

PACIFIC

<u>STATE</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
Alaska	6.66	13.33	6.67
California	5.00	22.50	17.50
Hawaii	11.84	17.10	5.26
Oregon	13.33	25.55	12.22
Washington	<u>15.54</u>	<u>38.09</u>	<u>22.45</u>
	52.37	116.57	64.10

1977 mean = 10.47%

1997 mean = 23.31%

% change = 15.95%

TOTALS

<u>REGION</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
New England	15.13	27.28	12.15
Middle Atlantic	6.48	15.24	8.76
South Atlantic	9.34	19.06	9.71
East North Central	7.09	22.61	15.52
East South Central	2.83	9.53	6.69
West No. Central	8.06	23.21	15.15
West So. Central	3.59	14.11	10.52
Mountain	10.01	26.50	16.49
Pacific	10.47	23.31	15.95

<u>1977</u>		<u>1997</u>	
New England	15.13	New England	27.28
Pacific	10.47	Mountain	26.50
Mountain	10.01	Pacific	23.31
South Atlantic	9.34	West North Central	23.21
West North Central	8.06	East North Central	22.61
East North Central	7.09	South Atlantic	19.06
Middle Atlantic	6.48	Middle Atlantic	15.24
West South Central	3.59	West South Central	14.11
East South Central	2.83	East South Central	9.53

SOURCES CONSULTED

- Carson, Clara N. And Barbara A. Curran. The Lawyer Statistical Report: The U.S. Legal Profession in 1988. Chicago: American Bar Foundation, 1988.
- Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP), "Women in State Legislatures, 1997" fact sheet. Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- Clark, Janet, R. Darcy, and Susan Welch. Women, Elections, and Representation. New York: Longman, 1994.
- The Council of State Governments, The Book of the States. Chicago: The Council of State Governments, 1959.
- The Council of State Governments, The Book of the States. Lexington, Kentucky: The Council of State Governments, 1994-95.
- The Council of State Governments, The Book of the States. Lexington, Kentucky: The Council of State Governments, 1996-97.
- Hill, David. "Political Culture and Female Political Representation." The Journal of Politics 43 (1981): 159-168.
- Johnson, Charles. "Political Culture in American States: Elazar's Formulation Examined." American Journal of Political Science 20 (August 1976): 491-509.
- National Conference of State Legislatures. "1995 Legislative Regular Session Calendar," and "1996 Legislative regular Session Calendar." Denver, Colorado.
- Rule, Wilma. "Why More Women are State Legislators: A Research Note." The Western Political Quarterly 43 (June 1990): 437-448.
- Trager, James. The Women's Chronology. New York: Henry Holt, 1994.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1979. (100th edition.) Washington, D.C., 1970.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. Census of the Population: 1980. Washington, D.C., 1980.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. Census of the Population: 1990. Washington, D.C., 1990.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1996. (117th edition.) Washington, D.C., 1996.

Walker, Jack. "The Diffusion of Innovations Among the American States."
American Political Science Review 63 (September 1969): 880-899.

"Women in State Governments." State Government 10 (October 1937): 214-215.

VITA

Diana Burghard West

Born in Evanston, Illinois, on June 20, 1967. Graduated from The Principia Upper School in St. Louis, Missouri, in 1985. Received B.A. from Wellesley College in 1989. Majored in American Studies with concentrations in history and literature.

Worked in Washington, DC, from 1989 to 1990 at the Institute of International Education and from 1990 to 1993 at the Close Up Foundation. Served as an Education for Democracy volunteer in Czechoslovakia for six months in 1991. In August, 1993, the author entered the College of William and Mary as a graduate student in Government. Since completing the course work, the author has been working at Colonial Williamsburg and teaching evening sections of American National Politics at Thomas Nelson Community College. In April, 1995, the author married Mike West, doctoral candidate in Physics at the College.

The course requirements for this degree have been completed, but not the thesis: Women State Legislators and Political Culture.