Women at the Political Elite Level in the U.S.: A Multi-Factor Analysis of Limited Participation

Shabnam Dadparvar[1], Zou Yixuan[2], Liu Chencan[3]

[1]PHD student of International Relations, CCNU, dadparvar@ut.ac.ir
[2] MA in Ethics, Yunnan University of Finance and Economics, Catherine_zouyixuan@hotmail.com
[3] PHD students of Constitutionalism and the rule of law, CCNU, acan71@msn.com

Abstract: Although women's achievements are considered to prove their desirable conditions in western societies, especially in the United States, women's presence at political elite level is much lower than men in that country. Attention to the top elective offices in the United States reveals a deep gender disparity: In 112th congress (2011-2013), among 435 representatives, there are only 17 women in Senate and 75 in the House. Considering the success of the "quota system" in European, Latin American, partly African and Asian countries, the author believes that using of this method in the United States in the short term, help the women to be more confident in their abilities and also, people feel the positive effect of their presence and vote them more. On the other hand, since according to the accomplished researches, women have more inclination for peace, their more presence in the congress, can be influential in interior and foreign policies, and hence, in international relations. This article surveys and analyzes the reasons, seeking to understand why in the United States, with an established democracy, women's presence is lower than men at high political positions and descriptive-analytical method is used to examine factors leading to this lower presence. The factors are: political, economic, and social-cultural.

[Shabnam Dadparvar, Wang Yonghui. **Women at the Political Elite Level in the U.S.: A Multi-Factor Analysis of Limited Participation.** *J Am Sci* 2013;9(1):17-28]. (ISSN: 1545-1003). http://www.jofamericanscience.org. 4

Keywords: women, United States, political; economic and cultural factors, quota system

1. Introduction

Consistently over time, history and civilizations have been shaped by the elites (Sora 2003: 1). In the United States, elites considered as a major component of political system and checking their performances is an important way to be acquainted with American policy, governorship, society and culture. However, the presence of women in political elite level is relatively low. Ninety-two women currently serve in the 112th Congress: 75 in the House (51 Democrats and 24 Republicans) and 17 in the Senate (12 Democrats and 5 Republicans). Ninety-two women were initially sworn in to the 112th Congress, and two Democratic House Members have since resigned, and two others have been elected. This number (92) is lower than the record number of 95 women who were initially elected to the 111th Congress (Manning 2012: 1).

Table1: Women in the United States Congress: 1987-2012

Congress	Years	Total Number of Women in Congress	Number of Women in House	Number of Women in Senate
100th	1987-1989	25	23	2
101st	1989-1991	31	29	2
102nd	1991-1993	33	30	3
103rd	1993-1995	55	48	7
104th	1995-1997	59	50	9
105th	1997-1999	65	56	9
106th	1999-2001	67	58	9
107th	2001-2003	75	62	13
108th	2003-2005	77	63	14
109th	2005-2007	85	71	14
110th	2007-2009	91	75	16
111th	2009-2011	93	76	17
112th	2011-2013	93	76	17

Notes: The figures for each Congress reflect the total number of women serving at the conclusion of that Congress. For the 112th Congress, the figures are current as of the date of writing this article

Although women made up a vast majority of the American population since its formation, they were treated like a minority group. In the social hierarchy, they were given a specific "place" and their access to employment and in public activities were banned, and they were considered with poor, weak and "natural" subordinate personality (Chafe 1992: 327).

A series of various cultural, economic and political transitions during America's history influenced women to redefine their identities and accordingly some movements are formed in line with women rights (Jeydel 2004: 28-29). Woman suffrage as woman`s right to vote, was a major event in primary evolution of women rights protection movements which was formed following the plan of struggle against slavery in the nineteenth century and it was a preface of their political participation (Matthews 2000: 8). In July 1848 a group of 200 women and 40 men met in Seneca Falls, New York, to discuss women's rights. This was the first time in U.S. history that such an event had taken place. The pioneering activists, Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton called the meeting, giving prospective attendees a week's notice (Matthews 2000: 279). But a man would be asked to be the head of their meeting, because women leadership in a street meeting was

supposed flagrant and graceless and they were suffered from exposure to offensive labels. In final manifesto of these two days congress which was more composed of American middle class white women, it was emphasized on "women historical oppression by men" and women were desirous to have equal rights to men in economic, social, educational, political, financial and religious areas. The meeting was in fact a turning point in American history for starting women's movement (Woods 2000: 5). Over the years, women have continued their struggle to obtain equal rights to men and in 1900s some states had granted the suffrage (in some fields). In 1910, a wide scope of demonstrations had been formed which was followed by capturing, jail and high tortures for women, till they had been active for war campaign operation before they have had suffrage during the First World War and then, In January, 1918, President Wilson, announced that women's suffrage was urgently needed as a "war measure". Saying "We have made partners of the women in this war...Shall we admit them only to a partnership of suffering and sacrifice and toil and not to a partnership of privilege and right?" The House of Representatives passed the federal woman suffrage amendment 274 to 136 but it was opposed in the Senate and was defeated in September 1918. Another attempt in February 1919 also ended in failure. In May 1919 the House of Representatives again passed the amendment (304 to 89) and on 4th June 1919 the Senate finally gave in and passed it by 66 to 30. On August 26th, 1920 the Nineteenth Amendment was certified by the Secretary of State, when Tennessee, the thirty-sixth and final state needed, signed for ratification. (Navarro 2010: 188-189). In 1920, 19th Amendment was ratified by senate (Rau 2006: 44) and after that all women in U.S acquired equal right to men for the first time and enter into American political sphere. Removing legal obstacle in order to political participation leads to gender equality in these fields (Hakim 1950: 29-33). During the twentieth century, women`s efforts resulted and they succeeded in changing their positions from "second-class" citizens to the nearly full partners in the political and economic fields in U.S.. The legal barriers that impede their access to political and economic power had been removed and new support for the protection of their rights occurred (Flaudi 2006: 1-2). But despite of all achievements and success, women place is still open in so many jobs and posts and they are still lower than men in jurisdiction including economic and political fields. Since President Roosevelt presidency, from 1932 to 2010, just about 30 women have served as ministers in the cabinets. According to a research, women presence in the military elite level is not too high. Despite increasing their number in different military levels in U.S. during the past few decades, no one could reach to senior military officials till 1995. In fact at that time, of the 929 highest ranking people in the army, navy, air force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard (those who had achieved the rank of general officer), only 11 were women 1.2 percent (Zweigenhaft and Domhoff 1998: 69). Women presence in judiciary higher-level officials is not so significant. Despite of their high interest in civil and judicial procedures, their number was increased in law colleges and they are formed half of law faculties' students and in 2008, half of U.S legal experts was constitute by women, but their number in the Supreme Court is still limited (National Women's Law Center 2009: 1). From 1789 to 2009, 106 men and only 2 women were at the highest federal court officials. Of course it is notable that women had not been in the post till 1981 and after that the gender prohibition was broken and Sandra Day O'Connor as a first woman was selected for highest judicial post by President Reagan (Federal Judges 2008). Till 2008 just 25% of U.S judicial highest posts in general official courts were assigned to women which there were 25 African-American, 18 Hispanics, and 3 Asian among them. After O'Connor's retirement in 2006 to 2010, three other women were assigned to the highest posts of federal court: Ruth Ginsburg (the first Jewish judge woman) was selected by President Clinton in 1993, Sonia Soto mayor (Hispanic woman). In 2009, and Elena Kagan in August of 2010 were chosen by President Obama. Although women judges are more concerned about women and generally minorities` rights (Feenan 2009: 4), entering into judgeship is more difficult for them than men in U.S. (Klebanow and Jonas 2003: 35). Now there is a question, how it could be possible that women cannot be active along men at the level of political elites in a country like U.S., where women constitute half of its population (U.S. Census Bureau 2011).

1.1. Women low corporation at the political management level and individual capabilities

Leaders of women's rights organizations believe that the women`s political attitudes and behaviors are different from men. According to Patricia Ireland, former president of NOW, "certainly voters perceive women candidates as more honest…and as advocating issues that make our world a better place to live." According to Gallup survey in 2000, 57% of American people believe that women participation in policy leads to better administration (Baxter and Lansing 1980: 140).

Tom Smith's extensive research on the use of military force from 1930s, through the 1980s found

gender differences on 87 percent of the questions, with an average 9 percent gap (Smith 1984: 384-396). Women tendency is more toward peace and quiet. In 1952, for example, 45 percent of the women compared to only 37 percent of the men interviewed believed the United States should have stayed out of the Korean War. Similar differences of opinion surfaced during the Vietnam War. During the Persian Gulf War, women were on average 14.3 percent more likely than men to think the United States had made a mistake in sending troops to the area. At one point, only 37 percent of women but 61 percent of men supported that war. More generally, the Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP) found, when compare to men, women are:

- Less militaristic on issues of war and peace
- More often opposed to the use of force in nonmilitary situations
- More likely to favor measures to protect the environment and to check the growth of nuclear power
- More often supportive of programs to help the economically disadvantaged
- More likely to favor laws to regulate and control various social vices (e.g., drugs, gambling and pornography)
- More often supportive of efforts to achieve racial equality
- Less likely to be optimistic about the country's future (McGlen et al. 2002: 80-81).

It is important to pay attention that, eligible women candidates are not only more liberal and feminist than men; they are also more likely than men to prioritize "women's issues" as motivating forces behind their political engagement. Women's issues include education, health care, the environment, consumer protection, and helping the poor. "Men's issues" include military or police crises, the economy, business, agriculture, and crime control (Lawless and Fox 2010:93).

On the other hand, women presence in political position brings about more chance to other women to enter the political arena. Women appointees in the Clinton administration, moreover, appeared to select more women to serve under them than did men, thus bringing more women into the opportunity structure. As Secretary of State under the Clinton administration, Madeleine Albright launched the Vital Voices Democracy Initiative to promote the advancement of women as a U.S. foreign policy objective and attempted to improve women positions in all over the world (McGlen et al.2002: 110).

Conducted investigations indicates that women judges are more supportive toward women`s rights and provide them more assistance and try to attract their other co-workers (men) attention to gender matter and gender discrimination problems (Martin 1993: 77). Sandra Day O'Connor was very active in this field and supported women right advocators. After her presence, 8 other judges were encouraged to defend women rights. This fact that growing the number of women in high positions can be good incentives for others to reach high posts especially the judgment (O'Connor and Segal 1990: 95-104)

2.1. Women low attendance in political elite level: multi-causal explanatory

Women progress and achievement to the highest political level are considered by many people in America. Journalists, elites and academics have always tried to answer the question why this process proceeds slowly? Labor unions refer to "the sticky floors" that keep women trapped in low levels of management (Engberg 1999: 131). Virginia Valian mentions in her book titled "*why so slow*?" that in America there is not any legal barrier for equal right, despite of it women do not enjoy equal rights to men (Valian 1999: 154). She in fact points to hidden barriers which cause women low attendance in managerial fields because according to the United States constitutional law, all people are equal to each other (U. S. Department of State 2004: 19) and based on the affirmative act which was approved in 1967, no discrimination can be accepted in recruitment (Hasnas 2002: 427). Here three categories of factors which seems that composed with each other can explain limited women presence in top political elite level will be examined: political, economic and social- cultural.

3.1. Political Context

By surveying U.S constitutional law, it can be realized that there is no discrimination between genders to achieve high managerial level either economic or politic. Unlike some of the countries, "Quota system" is not imposed for women presence in congress; men and women are legally equal to each other (U.S. Department of States 2004: 19). But according to American political system, each representative can remain in his or her position in congress, unlimitedly if he or she can win the election in each period (Wolbrecht, Beckwith and Baldez 2008: 188). Today, one of the central features of American elections is "incumbency". Once candidates win an election and become members of Congress, they have substantial advantages when they run for reelection. For example, incumbents have access to the franking privilege. Since the First Continental Congress in 1775, members of Congress had the right to send mail to every one of their constituents for free; in place of a stamp, they use their signature. The idea was that this would facilitate communication between representatives and their

constituents. Members also discovered, however, that this could also help their reelection campaigns. When a person is elected for congress, there would be significant benefits for him to be selected again (Jacobson 1997: 35). In addition, incumbents have more name recognition than challengers. At least half of the people can recognize the incumbents, while challengers are typically unknown. In the early stages of a campaign, television ads repeatedly mention the candidate's name in an effort to increase recognition. Unless a major scandal develops, the local press is unlikely to provide any coverage of challengers at all, and if they are covered, the stories are usually about how they have no chance of winning. Many newspapers have a policy that if a challenger is running uncontested in the primary, they will not provide any coverage of the candidate until after the primary. If a state's primary is not until September, this means that the challenger only has six weeks to get press coverage (Palmer and Simon 2006: 35). So, applicants infrequently could accept to be candidate and compete to these incumbents. In 1992, there was a dramatic increase in the number of women running in primaries, winning primaries, and winning the general. election and that year was named as "women year" because 44 people in the House of Representatives refused to re-run and 19 of them failed in primary struggle and it increased women chance, but this event- open seats- has not been occurred again (Carroll and Jenkins 2001: 2-10).

4.1. Economical context

Nowadays wealth is one of the substantial factors for development and the fact is that, women do not have money as much as men. Having enough capital can help women in different fields and make it easier for them to reach to managerial posts and consequently entering into politics (Zweigenhaft and Domhoff 1998: 60). In the field of political positions and election campaign, having money, collecting relief funds and having powerful financial supporters are the most important matters that should be considered and this is the reality that, for women, collecting funds for campaigning is more difficult than men; especially women from minorities enjoy less chance because they know less famous and wealthy people. In America, the cost of election campaign at the national level is very high. The average cost of running for the Senate in 2004 was almost $2.6 million. The most expensive race in 2004 was the successful effort by Republican John Thune to unseat incumbent Democrat Tom Daschle, the Senate minority leader. The combined cost of the campaign was over $36 million in a state with only 750,000 people. The candidates spent $92.04 per vote. In 2002, women were candidates in the most expensive Senate races. Senator Elizabeth Dole (R-NC) spent almost $14 million and won her open-seat Senate campaign against Erskine Bowles, who spent $13 million. In 2004 the cost for the Senate completion was at least about $ 2.6 million. In 2009 the House of Representatives expenses for more than 2.5 $million for re-election and this amount was $ 8 million for Senate members (Schor 2009). Assuredly, supplying this huge amount of money is not easily possible for women and they do not agree to take risk. Women are not as wealthy as men because they do not enter to politics through jobs like law and business which men enter to it via them and consequently women cannot reach to high economic-social level which is the way to politics. Women prefer to seek some kind of jobs with high wage or usually work as a nurse or teacher and not will to have political jobs. One of the most prevalent explanations for the slow integration of women into Congress is "the pipeline theory." In American politics, there is a hierarchy of public office that functions as a career ladder for elected officials. A local office often serves as a springboard into the state legislature that, in turn, provides the requisite experience to run for the U.S. House of Representatives. Both the state legislature and the U.S. House serve as avenues to statewide office, the most prominent of which are governorships and the U.S. Senate. Each successive office has a larger territorial jurisdiction, a larger constituency, and an increase in salary and prestige. Before one can even enter this hierarchy, however, there are particular professions in the private sector that traditionally lead to political office, such as law and business. Although members of Congress come from a wide variety of career backgrounds, the most common by far is law. Those practicing in these professions typically form the "eligibility pool" of candidates for office. The pipeline theory maintains that once more women are in the eligibility pool; they will run for state and local office and then eventually "spill over" into Congress. The primary reason for this is that for most of American history, women were barred from entering many of the professions in the eligibility pool; the pipeline was blocked. (Palmer and Simon 2006: 6-7). People who are active in commercial affairs, have a lot of money, the fame and credit, and so enter into politics more easily. Especially lawyers and law practitioners will have more chance, but women enjoy less opportunities because they are not as active as men and do not have as much money and reputation as them (Francis and Lawrence 2000: 6). Although some organizations and centers have been established to help women for collecting money and fund in order to participate in election, this factor is one of the main obstacles women are faced. On the other hand, since entering to politic world is not

followed by high income for people in U.S and because of spending so much time and energy and low profit, women are not so desired to enter into political posts (Burns, Schlozman and Verba 2001: 62). The main point is that, American people achieve more income through private sectors than political positions with regard to time and energy that should be spent, so, entering into politics does not involve great financial benefits for them.

5.1. Social and cultural context

Perhaps socialization could be mentioned as a basic cause of limitations in women participation in top Political level in U.S. which overshadowed all aspects of people life thoroughly. Socialization is a continuing process whereby an individual acquires a personal identity and learns the norms, values, behavior, and social skills appropriate to his or her social position. A child's primary socialization begins at birth through interaction with his parents and family---the most important socialization in an individual's life. At this time, a person begins to form his identity. Opinions differ slightly about where primary socialization ends and secondary socialization begins, but secondary socialization consists of influence that takes place outside the child's initial influences or socialization; thus, children learn it relative to the values and representations already learned during primary socialization. During the process of secondary socialization through school, educational institutions, mass media, and the workplace . . . his character completes. (Farquhar 2010).

The way of men`s and women`s socialization in childhood is different in many societies a well as U.S.. Girls are trained with more or less dominance and submission behavior. Encouraging them to refrain from competition and challenging, lack of risk taking, and generally the behavior called “feminine behavior” in American culture, all are very effective on their future.

Studies show that the boys are more encouraged and supported by their parents to reach their purposes especially to management and leadership. In School according to teachers` behavior with boys and girls, in sport activities and also due to the patterns presented in the media, prepare the ground for differences in girls` and boys` abilities. Even strengthening or weakening their special academic interests among boys and girls has different models. Studies show that how boys are encouraged to learn mathematics and girls led to areas such as education and literature (see: Skelton 1997). Although each year, women University applicants are increased (Zweigenhaft and Domhoff 1998: 54), women show less interest in Mathematics and Economics (Valian 1999: 192). Men are graduated more in these fields and women attend lower in economic colleges especially in higher levels. Low number of women professors in the field, showing their less interest in this regard (Ferber 1997: 147-148). In 2003, only 28% in computer science and engineering and only 20% were allocated to Women (Davidson and Bruke 2004: 198). Lack of confidence, self-esteem and high motivation in women has rooted in this problem and it is why women do not have enough toughness to be manager. Investigations also show that it is more important for women that having an occupation and control over their life and for this they do not attempt so much to reach to top political posts. Women feel that they are not as ready as men for some jobs and it relates to their socialization (Valian 1999: 154-155). Some of the women`s right advocators believe that in a society with patriarchy behavior, all of the social organization had been constructed by men in a way to retain women depended to themselves and the fact is true in educational, legal, political and employment systems (Sharpe 1976: 34-44). Oakley believes that "there is a directly proportional relationship between sex and job position. “The higher job position is the more masculine” (Oakley 2005: 62). It is said that, women should overcome their primary socialization, should not be afraid of their own failures and should try to be brave (Vinnicombe and Bank 2003: 244). If a woman wants to be a politician, she must first overcome her socialization in childhood (Fondas 2010). In some cases when women overcome their socialization or fundamentally were trained in a family or educational environments that provided with more equal behavioral pattern, because the others gender socialization is different, so that they have special pre-assumption about women, their competence and capabilities and cannot accept them as politicians. It should be noted that, traditionally people view to politics is as a male job and believe that women have not enjoy required capabilities to do this (Davies, Spencer and Steele 2005: 279). Another important issue that should be considered refers to the American families’ background in politics. Undoubtedly, in The United States, background and familial relationships are considered as very important tools for individuals who want to enter into politic world. Throughout the history of the country, politics has been continuing from generation to the next in a family. History is rife with politicians from different generations of the same family. Although it may be somewhat uncommon to inherit the political ambition and opportunities of these elected officials, more modest levels of political interest are often passed on within the family unit. Involvement in political associations, campaigns, community service, and school elections also affects levels of political

interest and activism. Although it may be somehow unusual to say that policy and occupying political positions is came down by inheritance, investigating familiar background of political elites in America shows that most people in high positions are from dominant and medium class and their parents or one of their family members had formerly served in top Political positions. Familiar relationships, their family member`s former performance and candidates' parents` political behavior play an important role in voters' vote and are most effective (Lawless and Fox, 2010: 64); surely women who are not from these families have low chance to win.

6.1. Political socialization and its various consequences:

According to discussion about girls and boys socialization, here the effects of political socialization and its consequences will be examined. Political socialization is a lifelong process by which people shape their ideas about politics and acquire political values. Family structure, coetaneous (peers) group, location and community can be mentioned in respect to primary agent of political sociability. Secondary agents are school, educational institute, mass media sets such as radio, TV, satellite, internet, press and magazines as well as political party, unions and syndicates can be noted (Trevor 1999: 62). The women political socialization process in the United States is so that they scarcely imagine themselves in political positions from childhood. Even in terms of judgeship, usually little girls rarely image women in that dress and the notion is formed from childhood that this position is befitting just for men. Based on stereotype behavior, creating strong motivation in men for reaching to high political position has been strengthened since childhood years, but overreaching to achieve power and high political position is less in women and this matter affects their occupation (Lawless and Fox 2010: 35-45). Former President Bill Clinton for instance, wrote in his memoir: "Sometime in my sixteenth year I decided I wanted to be in public life as an elected official. . . . I knew I could be great in public service." For many, though, the idea of running for office takes hold more slowly. The family, educational system, peer groups, and the mass media all play a role. While family and school are important early in life, what peers think and what people read in the newspaper and see on television have more influence on their political attitudes as adults (Lawless and Fox 2010: 35). Prospects for gender parity in American electoral system cannot be evaluated without an in-depth assessment of the manner in which gender interacts with and affects levels of political ambition. Patterns of traditional gender socialization – as manifested through traditional family role orientations, a masculinized ethos, and the gendered psyche – provide ample reason to suspect that women and men's attitudinal dispositions and personal experiences differ such that they are not equally likely to consider a candidacy and ultimately face the political opportunity structure. Consequences of the individuals` political socialization of in the United States have a large impact on women presence in political positions that would be continues as follow:

7.1. Politics as a manly game

From 1914 to 1958, just 155 (16%) of 9608 congress representatives were women among all elections has been hold in U.S and for a long time, politic had been called as man`s game and was authorized by white protestant Anglo-Saxons and for a long time there was cultural norms about sex and some restrictions for women because of their lack of ability and competencies. In the 1950s, women were socialized to view politics as a man's game, a game that was inconsistent with the gender roles to which women were assigned. Women attending college in the 1940s, for example, reported being cautioned about appearing too smart and earning top grades, because displays of intelligence endangered their social status on campus. Women were also reminded, typically by their parents and brothers that pursuing a career would reduce their prospects for marriage and motherhood. Even till recent decades so many women assumed policy as men`s territory (Palmer and Simon 2006: 3). Of course, some of women feel that they are not prepared to accomplish some occupations like men, they accept the fact that important occupations and political posts were assigned to men (Lawless and Fox 2010: 105). On the other hand, American people are pessimistic to politics and politicians, and think that political activities are unsuitable for women and they should not enter into politics at all, so that a research conducted in 2008 indicates that 51 % of American people believe that country is not yet prepare to accept a woman as a president (Pew Research Center 2008). However, this culture is gradually transforming, but its process proceeds very slowly (Palmer and Simon 2006: 175).

8.1. Education, expertise and insufficient experience

The process of women socialization to achieve high degrees of education and then getting into a political position plays an important role. Little girls are inculcated to see themselves more incapable than boys or even untalented, they are guided by family to educational fields that are presumed to be more suitable for women and accordingly, job opportunities in the labor market will intensely decrease. Having experience and expertise plays a major role in their selection for political positions.

Gender segregation is quite evident in higher education, especially when climbing the career ladder. Since 2003, women have constituted slightly more than half of all doctoral recipients, up from 12 percent in 1966. But the percentage of women among tenured faculty is not appreciably higher than it was in the mid-1970s. That is, the gender gap in tenured faculty has remained constant, despite women's increasing presence in the tenure-track faculty pool. In 2009 the National Association of Law Placement in a survey concluded that only 19% of women are involved in large law offices though the number of graduated and occupied women in law is statistically high. Also, men are more dominant than women in business world, and women`s moving into managerial posts did not proceeds so fast. Four jobs of every 5 top commercial managerial posts are occupied by men and more than 70% of the bank investors, traders, brokers and shareholders are men (Lawless and Fox 2010 30-32). Women's historical exclusion from the professions that tend to lead to political careers also accounts for the gender disparities in office holding. The 111th Congress reveals that law, business, education, and politics are the leading four professions that precede congressional careers. The same is true at the state legislative level. Despite the fact that most candidates, regardless of sex, yield from these pipeline professions, far more men than women constitute them. As Janet Clark explains, "Women are not found in the professions from which politicians inordinately are chosen – the law and other broker-type businesses. Therefore, they do not achieve the higher socioeconomic status that forms the eligibility pool for elective office." (Lawless and Fox 2010 30-32). Therefore it can be said that if women are capable to progress well in one of the 4 ways (business, education and politics) and enhance their experts and experience, we can be hopeful that their tendency toward high political posts increase.

9.1. Stereotype behaviors and mass media

Women forging new political ground often struggle to receive media coverage and legitimacy in the eyes of the media and, subsequently, the public. According to some observers, journalists often hold women politicians accountable for the actions of their husbands and children, though they rarely hold male candidates to the same standards. They ask women politicians' questions that they don't ask men, and they describe them in ways and with words that emphasize their traditional roles and focus on their appearance and behavior. For example, in 1992's "Year of the Woman" campaign, in which record numbers of women – like Washington's Patty Murray – ran for and were elected to political office, news stories nonetheless commented on their hairstyles, wardrobes, weight, and physical appearance. Although there seems to have been less emphasis on the physical appearance and personality of women political candidates in the 2000, 2002, and 2004 campaigns, there were still examples of such coverage. Even though media coverage has improved, women and men in politics are still treated differently by the media, suggesting that gender stereotypes continue to pose problems for female politicians. For example, women candidates who ran for election in the 1980s and 1990s were often stereotyped by newspaper coverage that not only emphasized their "feminine traits" and "feminine issues," but also questioned their viability as candidates. In an experiment where fictitious female candidates were given the same media coverage usually accorded to male incumbents, they gained viability. However, in terms of the quality of their coverage, gender stereotypes still exist. For example, in 2002, the media paid significantly more attention to the backgrounds of female candidates and to the competence of male candidates. And the media continue to link some issues – particularly those that resonate with voters – with male candidates more often than female candidates. For example, male candidates were linked significantly more often with taxes in 2002. Perhaps not surprisingly, women candidates continue to be linked more often than men with so-called "women's issues," such as reproductive choice, and sometimes in a negative manner. And when we turn to television media, men are the leading faces of broadcast News (Lawless and fox 2010: 11). However since 2003, women`s propaganda and also their face were improved in publications (press) and now their competencies are discussed on more (Lawless and Fox 2010:174), media magnify women`s background and their private life. About women candidate, their marriage situation, their children and children`s sex will be addressed and can influence the voters. This matter is continually emphasized that whether women, considering their family affairs, are able to retain a political posts. Discussing about such things (family, sex, children and so on) cause some stereotype issues like (traditional duties, the wife, mother or family role) attracts more attention (Carroll and Fox 2006:174 - 5). Even when, competition between a man and women is argued, more articles are dedicated to men, the matters which publicly is accepted and influential like tax but adversely for women, such issues which is called generally women issues will be discussed and mostly it is addressed in a negative way (Carroll and Fox 2006:174).

10.1. Sex division of labor (family responsibilities)

Despite of transformations which have been actually shaped, the way of dealing with family responsibilities and issues are not identical among men and women. However having family and children may have no negative effect on men career, for women may cause interruption or cessation of work for ever (Fondas 2010). Some women are forced to wait until their children grow up, and this gap will have been associated with a great impact. In addition women give higher priority to their family than their jobs so they loss opportunities for being upgraded. In other word, in one hand women do not have equal opportunities to men because of family priority and in the other hand, if they try to prioritize their job to their family duty, their private life may expose to risk. Another major barrier that has affected women candidates is a public perception that women with children (especially young children) are less suited for public office. According to one woman state legislator serving in the 1970s who had postponed running until her children were older: "to be very frank I couldn't have done it. I really couldn't have been an effective legislator if my children were little….I would have carried too much of a load of guilt." Until recently, the conflict between parenthood and politics channeled many women away from not only elected office but also partisan or campaign activity, at least while their children were young. This gave women a late start in partisan politics, which had important ramifications on the eventual success of women in getting into office. Even if a woman could reject or overcome the alleged incompatibility of the two roles of mother and politician, she might not run for office for fear of the public's or her own family's negative reaction. What clearly emerges from this analysis is the fact that women, across all generations, face a more complex set of choices. It is irrefutable that, unlike men, women continue to confront the difficulty of reconciling their careers and their families. For many women in the pool of eligible candidates, entering the electoral arena would simply be a third job, which is quite unappealing because they already have two (Lawless and Fox 2010: 88). There is, however, evidence that these attitudes about the compatibility of motherhood and public office are changing but the election of young women to congressional offices is still quite uncommon. (Palmer and Simon 2006: 66).
There are political consequences to running later in life. Entry into the leadership structure of Congress depends upon longevity and seniority. This is especially true within the committee system where the key positions, chairs and ranking members, are based upon continuous service on committees and subcommittees. As Shakow explained, "Women need to get in early, and stay in, so that more leadership positions are open to them. In Washington, political tenure equal[s] political power." To date, women have not been well represented in the leadership hierarchy. When a woman grows up with this kind of thought and looks at maternity and acting as a wife as a job, so she does not have enough time to practice as a politician out of house. Therefore most of women enter into policies in their old years, over 40 years, when their children go to school and no need to be cared at home (Lawless and Fox 2010: 106).

On the other hand, having a job out of house helps woman to acquire required skills and experiment to involve in policy (Palmer and Simon 2006: 65) because most of senators have had prior political experiences (Lawless and Fox 2010: 93) but their tardiness due to family issues causes they would not be so successful because they had less experiences on the subject (McGlen et al.2002: 96). They usually wait to grow their children, and then they enter into policy and in fact these post are considered as a third job for them (Lawless and Fox 2010: 88). Married women in high positions are forced to show their voters they are good wife and mother as well as they have potential to be good politicians, they have to prove that they are able to do the job beside of their family affairs in order to satisfy their advocators and remove their anxiety (Palmer and Simon 2006: 55). Conducted researches in 1992 indicates a decreasing in women legislators` age, however solving the political problems, politician women prefer to have less children or even do not have any children at all, sometimes to be single or married to a person with similar position or divorced because of their political occupation. Thus, women are apparently confronted with a conflict between their roles as mothers and wives and their political roles. When faced with this role conflict, following the pattern of women in other high-powered careers, women politicians appear to solve the problem either by remaining childless, having fewer children, delaying their political career until their children are older, remaining single, or marrying a supportive spouse (McGlen et al.2002: 99).

11.1. Sex discrimination in political context

In the past, there was considerable reason to believe that the male gatekeepers of public office, the party leaders, were not very supportive of women candidates. They often had to contact party leaders to seek their support. Leaders did not come to them to ask them to run. Moreover, women who sought party support were often discouraged from running, particularly for statewide or national office. When women were recruited to run, they were often meant to serve as "sacrificial lambs" in races they could not be expected to win. Representative Patricia Schroeder, however, presents a realistic view of the process: "A

lot of women think they're going to be asked to run. But this is not a dance. There are a lot of sharp elbows try to get to the front of the line. "More recent research finds little continued discrimination by party leaders. Women and men were equally as likely to be recruited by party leaders, although there is evidence that women are still disproportionately encouraged to run in unwinnable races or where the seat is a "woman's seat", that is, one previously held by a woman. African American women and other women of color often face a special or double burden in running for political office because both their race and their gender limit their chances for success. They are more severely underrepresented than African American men. Minority women are especially hampered by their perceived lack of credibility as serious candidates (McGlen et al.2002: 99-100). Historically, sex discrimination has been a powerful deterrent to political activity. Unfortunately, discrimination is difficult to study or document. Few men are willing to admit that they discriminate. Additionally, what many women see as discrimination against them may be viewed otherwise by men who feel they are simply complying with traditional cultural mores or widely accepted patterns of political behavior. Two factors seem to motivate most sex discrimination: (1) cultural stereotypes about the abilities and appropriate position of women in politics and (2) self-interest on the part of male voters and politicians who are reluctant to share their power with women or any other "out group." It is difficult, however, to determine where cultural attitudes end and self-interest begins. Shirley Chisholm, (the first black woman representative), who faced opposition from male political leaders in her first race for congress, noted that "Black males feel that the political seats are owed to them because of historical circumstances; therefore, opportunities should redound to them first of all. (McGlen et al.2002: 78). Throughout the history, sex discrimination has always been a powerful obstacle to women`s political activities. Susan Carroll had conducted a research in 1976 which showed women always are forced to argue with leaders to accept their wills and they do not ask women to handle the affairs. Sanbonmatsu has conducted a research a few decades later, in 2006. She also mentioned that although this kind of discrimination is weaker than before, it exists nowadays; parties are inclined to select men and generally women are less encouraged by parties` leaders (Lawless and Fox 2010: 96). Women remain less likely than men to receive the suggestion to run for office from each type of electoral gatekeeper. Certainly, not all political offices are alike, and patterns of recruitment might vary across level of office. But the overall gender gap is noteworthy, especially in light of the fact that the women and men in this sample of eligible candidates exist in the same tier of professional accomplishment and express comparable levels of political participation and political interest. Because encouragement to run for elective office is perceived more seriously as the number of recruitment contacts increases Turning first to professional differences, women attorneys and educators are far less likely than men to be tapped to run for office by party leaders, elected officials, and political activists.

12.1. Old- boy networks

First and foremost, the decision to run for the Senate is not an arbitrary choice made by members of the House. Acquaintance with famous people is effective for choosing women to managerial positions. If women have the opportunity to communicate with more administrators, it can be helpful for them to enter the high-level management. Upper class women are more fortunate in this regard. According to Ghiloni, most of the women managers which had been interviewed, said that their familiarity with men manager and boss of corporations through colleges, schools or cultural organizations helped them to be selected for management easier (Fergusons: 261-271). But "old-boy network" as the whole did not historically include women. Differences in attitude and behavior between men and women are mentionable. The way of behaving to strange people, stress, communication and contact with people are partly different. In politics, Old boys club against women is an obstacle for their legal equality. Men lawyers and merchants connect with so many influential people who encourage them to become candidate; women are offered less for entering into political area because of this limited connection with influential people (Lawless and Fox 2010: 102). For many judge women, Old boys club is the main cause of their less presence because this club influences judicial election very much and so men enjoy more chance to win. Male- domination and also "inappropriate interactions" is dominant because of men`s relations. According to some women judges, they are respected less than their male colleagues (Randstad 2008). Encouraging parties` members to enter into politics plays an important role. Examining life of congresswomen, we can find the important role of parties` leaders` encouragement and political elites in women candidateship (candidature) and give them sense of qualified. Surely support from parities` leaders is not influential by itself but it playas very important role (Lawless and Fox 2010: 90), if party do not support women; they will have less chance to win. Encouragement on behalf of friends, family and participation offering to women is less than men. It should be noticed encouragement and assurance is

very synergetic for women to enter into policy (Palmer and Simon 2006: 54). On the other hand, organizational and institutional aid historically was for women less than men, how much women are protected and provided by facilities is by itself another problem for women (Carroll 1994: 51-56).

4. Discussions

In this paper, primarily, women's situation in U.S. politics was described in order to answer a main question of why, according to statistics, women`s presence at the political elite level is lower than men and over the years their progress was very slow. Women received equal opportunity to participate in the political process when they gained suffrage under the 19th Amendment but later, the statistics suggest that the American women still lack competitive equality in running and holding offices. Here at first women presence in U.S political context described and statistic indicated that women participation is less than men in American political positions while they are more than half of the country population (U.S. Census Bureau 2009). Essay findings along answering to main question show a series of political, economic social factors cause women less participation to men in American community`s political positions. Well- qualified women are less likely than their male counterparts to consider running for office. Even if direct discrimination might have disappeared, there are various other kinds of discrimination that still impede women's political participation. Women's lesser interest in office holding is linked to a number of factors: lower income, less external support for a candidacy, more demanding household obligations, self-perceptions and lack of confidence. The main reason relates to people socialization which forms stereotype. The effect of this factor on men and women creates special behavior. According to different researches more women participation at American political level can be associated with positive effects. Their presence decrease stereotype which causes women to be ignored (Joy 2003: 8). A great deal of research confirms differences between men and women in political attitudes and there are reasonably sound arguments to increase women participation in politics. Since women are more oriented to peace and social issues like education, health, environment, etc. their more participation in American political context can influence its policymaking and to challenge the inequalities that women currently confront in many areas, including among others politics, employment and education. According to mentioned matters in this paper, it can be said that if obstacles are removed from women participation in high managerial positions and they exploit their knowledge and capabilities, many ways will be prepared for their blooming. The basic implication of the pipeline explained that as more and more women come to occupy the careers that are most likely to lead to political candidacies, more and more women will acquire the objective qualifications and economic autonomy necessary to pursue elective office. Accordingly, we can assume that an increasing number of women will run for office, contest open seats, and face no discrimination at the polls. Obviously, as women increase their proportions in the pipeline professions that precede political careers, there will be an increase in the number of women candidates. The data on career patterns suggest, however, that these increases may be very incremental. Full integration of women into all of the pipeline professions, however, may take decades. As said in this paper, the "Quota System" can be useful to increase women participation in the United States. Almost half the world's countries have either voluntary or compulsory gender quota systems for political representation. Successful results in women's political participation in Northern Europe; quick increase of women's participation in Northern Europe; quotas have been one of the most successful means to securing women's political participation. It can effectively improve traditional man-centered politics and help women and new comers to participate in politics because the primary goal of a quota system is to let more women advance into politics in a short time and the secondary goal is to encourage many young women to take interest in politics and become prospective politicians over the longer term. Quotas help to counter the historic gender barriers facing women seeking public office. Rather than create a backlash against women, quotas can reduce gender discrimination, and since the US has a big role in international relations, more women in congress can be influential in domestic and also foreign policies. There are a lot of instants in America's history that women's tendency is more in to peace and quiet and they have been more against war, so using this kind of system in a short term can help women to be more active and run for office.

As former U.S. representative Patricia Schroeder observes: "we've passed laws, but we haven't changed attitudes; we must now engage in some serious culture-cracking." (McGlen et al. 2002: 111). So, if attitudes are changed, cultural strict gaps are removed, and quota system is used in the short term, women`s presence in political positions will increase in the U.S**.**

Acknowledgements:

Authors are grateful to the International Relations, CCNU for support to carry out this work.

Corresponding Author:
Shabnam Dadparvar
PHD student of International Relations, CCNU

References

1. Baxter, Sandra and Marjorie Lansing (1980) *Women and Politics: The Invisible Majority*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
2. Burns, Nancy, Kay Lehman Schlozman and Sindey Verba (2001) *The Private Roots of Public Action, Gender, Equality and Political Participation*. Massachusetts: President and Fellows of Harvard College.
3. Bystrom, Dianne (2006) "Gender and Campaign Communication: TV Ads, Web Sites, and Media Coverage" UC Berkeley: *Institute of Governmental Studies*: 1-25.
4. Carroll, Susan J. (1994) *Women as Candidates in American Politics*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
5. Carroll, Susan J. and Richard L. Fox, (2006) *Gender and Elections: Shaping the Future of American Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
6. Carrroll, Sue and Krista Jenkins, (2001) "Term Limits and the Representation of Women Minorities, and Minority Women": Evidence from the State Legislative Elections of 1995. Availableat:<http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/research/topics/term_limits.php> and also see: <http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/research/topics/documents/TermLimits98-00.pdf> (last access 21-12-2011
7. Davies, Paul G. and Steven J. Spencer and Claude M. Steele (2005) "Clearing the Air": Identity Safety Moderates the Effects of Stereotype, Threat on Women's Leadership Aspirations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology: 276 - 287. See it on: <http://arts.uwaterloo.ca/~sspencer/spencerlab/articles/2005-Davies-Spencer-Steele.pdf > (last access 21-12-2011).
8. Faludi, Susan (2006) *Backlash (The Undeclared War Against American Women)*. NY: Three Rivers Press.
9. Farquhar, June (2010) "Differences Between Primary& Secondary Socialization". Available at.<http://www.ehow.com/list_7255943_differences-between-primary-secondary-socialization.html > (last access 21-12-2011).
10. Federal Judges (2008) available at:<http://www.america.gov/st/usg-english/2008/May/20080522224217eaifas0.5669672.html> (last access 20-02-2011).
11. Feenan, Dermot, (2009) *Editorial Introduction: Women and Judging*. NY: Springer Science and Business Media B.V.
12. Fondas, Nanette (2010) "Women in Management: Why Progress has Stalled?"<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/nanette-fondas/women-in-management-whyp_b_770263.html> and see also: <http://www.referenceforbusiness.com/encyclopedia/For-Gol/Gender-and-Leadership.html <http://www.referenceforbusiness.com/encyclopedia/For-Gol/Gender-and-Leadership.html> (last access 21-12-2011).
13. Fox, Richard (2003) "Gender, Political Ambition and the Decision Not to Run for Office" New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University, *Center for American Women and Politics*: 1-15.
14. Francis, Wayne and Lawrence Kenny (2000) *Up the Political Ladder: Career Paths in U.S. Politics*. California: Thousand Oaks.
15. Grafton, John (1999) *Great Speeches,* NY: Dover Publications.
16. Hakim, Joy (1950) *War, Peace, and All That Jazz*. New York: Oxford University Press.
17. Jacobson, Gary (1997) *The Politics of Congressional Elections*, New York: HarperCollins.
18. Jeydel, Alana S. (2004) *Political Women*, *The Battle for Women's Suffrage and The ERA*. Taylor& Francis Group, NY: Routledge.
19. Joy, Lois (2003) "Advancing Women Leader" available at: < http://www.catalyst.org/file/229/wco_wbd_web.pd > (last access 21-12-2011).
20. Klebanow, Diana and Franklin L. Jonas, (2003) *People's Lawyers: Crusaders for Justice in American History*. NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
21. Lawless, Jennifer L. and Richard L. Fox, (2010) *It Still Takes A Candidate: Why Women Don't Run for Office*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
22. Manning, E. Jennifer (2012) "Women in the United States Congress: 1917-2012", *Congressional Research Service*.1-107.
23. Markovitz, Hal (2009) *Nancy Pelosi, Women of Achievement.* NY: Chelsea House Publishing.
24. Martin, Elaine (1993) "The Representative Role of Women Judges" *Judicature 77*, November/December. *Available at:* < http://www.springerlink.com/content/h235r23597266448/fulltext.pdf> (last access 21-12-2011).
25. Matthews, Gellena (2000) *American Women's History*. New York: Oxford University Press.

26. McGlen, Nancy et al. (2002) *Women, Politics, and American Society*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
27. National Women's Law Center (2009) available at:http://lawprofessors.typepad.com/files/numberofwomeninjudiciary09.pdf>(last access 20-02-2011).
28. Navarro, Bob (2010) *The Emergence of Power,* Indiana: Xlibirs Corporation.
29. O'Connor Karen and Jeffrey A. Segal, (1990**)** ″The Supreme Court's Reaction to Its First Female Member"**.** *Women & Politics*, 95-104. Available at: <http://www.american.edu/spa/wpi/faculty_publications.cfm> (last access 21-12-2011).
30. O'Connor Karen and Jeffrey A. Segal, (1990**)** ″The Supreme Court's Reaction to Its First Female Member"**.** *Women & Politics*, 95-104. Available at: <http://www.american.edu/spa/wpi/faculty_publications.cfm> (last access 21-12-2011).
31. Palmer, Barbara and Dennis Simon (2006) *Breaking the Political Glass Ceiling*: *Women and Congressional Elections*. New York: Routledge.
32. Pew Research Center (2008) "Men or Women? Who's the Better Leader?"available at:http://pewsocialtrends.org/files/2010/10/gender-leadership.pdf.
33. Randstad: (2008) "Women Leaving Law Firms due to Male Domination", available at: <http://www.randstad.com/the-world-of-work/women-leaving-law-firms-due-to-male-domination-say-experts?c=2399> (last access 21-12-2011).
34. Rau, Dana Meachen (2006) *Great Women of the Suffrage Movement,* Minnesota: Compass Point Books.
35. Schor, Elana (2009) "Campaign Contributions up Despite Economic Downturn: Tightest Races Draw More Money in First Quarter Than Last Cycle," *Washington Independent*, April 17. Available at: <http://washingtonindependent.com/39299/campaign-contributions-up-despite-economic-downturn> (last access 21-12-2011).
36. Sharpe, Sue (1976) *Just Like a Girl: How Girls Learn to be Women*. Harmondsworth and New York: Penguin.
37. Smith, Tom (1984) "The Polls: Gender and Attitudes toward Violence", *Public Opinion Quarterly* 48, 384-396.
38. Sora, Steven (2003**)** *Secret Societies of America's Elite*. Rochester Vermont: Inner Traditions- Bear & company.
39. Thief, Hat "Women in the 112th Congress" (2010): available at: <http://hatthief.blogspot.com/2010/11/women-in-112th-congress.html> (last access 20-02-2011).
40. Trevor, Margaret C. (1999) "Political Socialization, Party Identification and the Gender Gap", American Association for Public Opinion Research: *Public Opinion Quarterly*: 62-89.
41. U.S. Census Bureau (2009) available at: < http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/00000.html> and also see: http://www.census.gov/main/www/popclock.html (last access 05-08-2011).
42. U.S. Department of State (2004*) About America*: The Constitution of the United States of America with Explanatory Notes. Bureau of International Information Programs.
43. Valian, Virginia (1999) *Why so Slow? The Advancement of Women*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
44. Whitaker, Louis Duke (2008) *Voting The Gender Gap*. Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
45. Wolbrecht, Christina, Karen Beckwith and Lisa Baldez (2008) *Political Women and American Democracy*. (New York: Cambridge University Press.
46. Woods, Harriett (2000) *Stepping up to power* . New York: Westview press.
47. Zaeske, Susan, (2003) *Signatures of Citizenship, Petitioning, Antislavery& Women's Political Identity*. North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press.
48. Zweigenhaft, Richard L. and William, G. Domhoff, **(**1998**)** *Diversity in the Power Elite*. New Heaven& London: Yale university press.

12/2/2012