

## Public Management Research Association

---

Representative Bureaucracy in the Federal Executive: Gender and Spending Priorities

Author(s): Julie Dolan

Source: *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART*, Vol. 12, No. 3 (Jul., 2002), pp. 353-375

Published by: Oxford University Press on behalf of the Public Management Research Association

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3525729>

Accessed: 11-03-2020 03:24 UTC

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

*Public Management Research Association, Oxford University Press* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART*

# Representative Bureaucracy in the Federal Executive: Gender and Spending Priorities

Julie Dolan  
Macalester College

## ABSTRACT

*With women's growing presence across all branches of government, scholars recently have begun to assess whether or not female political elites alter the substantive policy outputs of government. Despite clear and convincing evidence that officials in the fourth branch of government influence policy making (Meier 1993b; Rourke 1984; Aberbach, Putnam, and Rockman 1981), most research on women's distinct impact has focused on those in legislative office. Very little is known about female representation in the executive branch even though far more women serve in the executive branch than in legislative positions.*

*This article draws from two competing theories to assess whether gender influences policy outputs in the federal executive. Representative bureaucracy theory stresses that individuals' decisions are conditioned by their lifetime experiences, so we can expect female administrators to use their discretion in ways that produce positive outcomes for women in the population. Organizational socialization theory, on the other hand, argues that common working experiences within government agencies will diminish the salience of any differences between the sexes. Thus gender will have a minimal impact, if any, upon executive decision making. Using federal spending data from three surveys, the 1996 National Election Studies, the 1996 General Social Survey, and the 1996 Survey of Senior Executives, this article demonstrates that both gender and organizational socialization shape policy-relevant attitudes at the top of the federal executive.*

I am grateful to Susan Webb Hammond, Lael R. Keiser, Gregory B. Lewis, Kenneth J. Meier, Katherine C. Naff, David H. Rosenbloom, Anirudh V.S. Ruhil, Richard Waterman, and three anonymous reviewers for all of their helpful comments. An earlier version of this article was presented at the 2000 Midwest Political Science Conference.

*J-PART* 12(2002):3:353-375

With women's growing presence in all branches of government, scholars recently have begun to assess whether or not female political elites alter the substantive policy outputs of government. In 1992, a number of female candidates running for U.S. Congress repeatedly emphasized that because they are women, they would more adeptly understand and represent the concerns and worries of

353/*Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*

## *Gender and Spending Priorities*

American women (Fox 1997; Witt, Paget, and Matthews 1994). Growing empirical evidence confirms that women and men are different political animals, that women and men bring different leadership styles, policy expertise, and ways of governing to the public sector (Borrelli and Martin 1997; Fox 1997; Kathlene 1994; Rosenthal 1997; Thomas 1994; Thomas and Wilcox 1998).

Despite clear and convincing evidence that officials in the fourth branch of government influence policy making (Aberbach, Putnam, and Rockman 1981; Meier 1993b; Rourke 1984), most research on women's distinct impact has focused on those in legislative office. Very little has been written about female representation in the executive branch, even though far more women serve in executive branch positions than in legislative positions. For example, in 2000, 65 women (12.1 percent) served in the U.S. Congress, while over 1500 women (23.4 percent) served in the Senior Executive Service, the top ranks of the federal bureaucracy (CAWP 2000; OPM 2000). Executive women populate all of the cabinet level departments, as well as numerous independent agencies and regulatory commissions, allowing them access to the levers of power in all types of policy areas. If they behave at all like their elected sisters do, their presence should ensure that policy is more responsive to women's concerns.

This article draws from two competing theories to assess whether gender influences policy outputs in the federal executive. Representative bureaucracy theory stresses that individuals' decisions are conditioned by their lifetime experiences, so we can expect men and women, blacks and whites, young and old to use their discretion in ways that produce positive outcomes for their own social groups. Although women and men share many similar lifetime experiences, ample evidence demonstrates divergent political attitudes and orientations between the sexes. **Among the most consistent differences of opinion between the sexes are their attitudes about government spending. Women consistently show greater preference for increased social welfare spending and decreased military spending** (Clark and Clark 1993; Conway, Steuernagel, and Ahern 1997; Frankovic 1982; *Public Opinion* 1982; Shapiro and Mahajan 1986). If decision making in the federal executive is shaped by gender, as representative bureaucracy scholars argue, executive women should reflect the budgetary preferences of American women. Organizational socialization theory, on the other hand, assumes that common working experiences within government agencies diminish the salience of any differences between the sexes. Thus gender should have a minimal impact, if any, upon executive decision making. This article will utilize data from three survey instruments, the 1996 National

## *Gender and Spending Priorities*

Election Studies, the 1996 General Social Survey, and the 1996 Survey of Senior Executives, to determine whether or not we can expect policy outputs to differ because of greater numbers of women serving in administrative positions.

### **REPRESENTATIVE BUREAUCRACY AND ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIALIZATION**

The decision-maker's behavior reflects his perceptions of people, roles, and organization, in addition to his own values and emotions. Even the most intelligent of us act on the basis of images that include more than the objective facts of the decision situation (Alexis and Wilson 1967, 158).

This quotation illustrates a fundamental debate in the bureaucratic politics literature. Representative bureaucracy scholars have long argued that the decisions bureaucrats make are affected by their own values and attitudes (Kranz 1976; Krislov and Rosenbloom 1981; Meier 1993c). Other scholars argue that administrators are socialized by the organizations for which they work and they adopt preferences that are ultimately consistent with organizational goals, thereby minimizing the salience of their personal values on bureaucratic behavior (Downs 1967; Gawthrop 1969; Larson 1973; Meier and Nigro 1976; Simon 1957; Thompson 1976; Weber 1946). As Alexis and Wilson suggest, however, reality most likely falls somewhere between: bureaucrats are influenced by their own values, and some of these values, in turn, are shaped by their working environments. In the pages to follow, I will review the existing empirical evidence, focusing specifically on those studies that address the effects of gender on bureaucratic behavior.

Representative bureaucracy theory posits that a demographically representative bureaucracy will produce policy that substantively reflects the positions and desires of the populace.<sup>1</sup> Norton Long (1952) years ago claimed that government civil service is more ideally suited for representing diverse American needs than is Congress, since it draws from a more diverse group of citizens. Since then, many scholars have empirically assessed his claims, showing that the federal bureaucracy is fairly representative in terms of demographic characteristics such as social class, education, sex, and race, although this is truest at the lowest levels of the public service (Kellough 1990; Kranz 1976; Lewis 1994; Meier 1975; Meier and Nigro 1976; Nachmias and Rosenbloom 1973; Selden 1997).

Passive representation is expected to ensure that a diversity of perspectives is taken into account when administrators carry out the work of their agencies. But passive representation does not necessarily guarantee active representation. Rather, when administrators

<sup>1</sup>The terms *demographic* and *passive* are used interchangeably throughout this article. Both refer to the type of representation that exists when the composition of public bureaucracies mirrors the population on variables such as race, sex, age, social class, and religion. Similarly, *substantive* and *active* are used interchangeably to refer to the type of representation that occurs when the policy wishes of the represented (i.e., public) and the representative (public administrator) do not come into conflict. See Mosher (1968) for further discussion.

## *Gender and Spending Priorities*

share common experiences and attitudes with their own social groups we expect to find the greatest congruence between the discretion exercised by administrators and the benefits accruing to their own social groups. Many scholars turn to bureaucratic attitudes to gauge potential policy outputs, but the empirical evidence here is mixed. Some scholars find that sex influences bureaucratic attitudes while others find just the opposite. In one of the first studies of representative bureaucracy, Meier and Nigro (1976) find little evidence that sex or most other social origins affect federal executives' attitudes. Men and women in the former *supergrades* (since then replaced by the Senior Executive Service) respond virtually identically when they are asked about spending priorities for the federal government, leading Meier and Nigro to conclude that "agency socialization tends to overcome any tendency for the supergrades to hold attitudes rooted in their social origins" (1976, 467). Examining top-level executives in California, Reh fuss (1986) similarly finds little difference between male and female civil servants, noting that both groups apparently share a "management ideology." McGlen and Sarkees (1993) uncover very few differences between male and female civil servants in the Department of Defense, at least when it comes to their foreign policy attitudes. Although not focusing solely on public administrators, Holsti and Rosenau (1981) also find very few differences between male and female leaders when they are asked about foreign policy attitudes. Rather, they suggest that occupation exerts a stronger influence on one's attitudes than does gender. Thus the findings from these studies suggest that women and men employed in similar occupations are more similar than divergent, consistent with organization socialization theory.

On the other hand, a number of studies at both the federal and the state level demonstrate that female executives are more supportive of workplace reforms that disproportionately affect women, such as child care, affirmative action, pay equity, family leave, job sharing, and flexible work schedules (Dolan 2000; Hale and Branch 1992; Hale, Kelly, and Burgess 1989; Hale, Kelly, Burgess, and Shapiro 1987; Kavar 1989; Kelly and Newman 2000; Stanley 1989), which leads scholars to conclude that gender does indeed shape attitudes, even accounting for years of organizational socialization. Further, Kelly and Newman (2000) argue that agency policy type intervenes to shape male and female workplace attitudes. They find that female administrators in state regulatory and distributive agencies are more supportive of affirmative action than are women in redistributive agencies, whereas no such differences exist amongst male administrators. Women are also disproportionately concentrated in redistributive agencies, while male administrators are fairly evenly spread across all three agency types, suggesting

## ***Gender and Spending Priorities***

that women's attitudes vary in ways consistent with their under-represented status within state agency ranks. Thus women who have the most to gain from affirmative action policies are the most supportive of these policies.

Additional research gauges whether demographic representation affects the substantive nature of bureaucratic outputs. Once again, the evidence is mixed. The evidence seems strongest for black and Latino representation and weakest for female representation. A host of articles demonstrate convincingly that increased representation of blacks and Latinos within school district leadership ranks (principals, teachers, school boards) results in fewer negative sanctions and greater positive rewards doled out to black and Latino students (Meier 1984; Meier 1993a; Meier and Stewart 1992; Meier, Stewart, and England 1991). In the federal government, greater black and Latino demographic representation is significantly associated with greater proportions of blacks and Latinos recognized as eligible for rural housing loans from the Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) (Selden 1997; Selden, Brudney, and Kellough 1998). Similarly, there is a positive relationship between the percentage of blacks employed in Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) district offices and the number of African-Americans' claims of discrimination ultimately filed with the EEOC (Hindera 1993; Hindera and Young 1998). Conversely, few studies find that female administrators adopt an advocacy role on behalf of women. The number of women who work within EEOC district offices is negatively associated with the number of gender discrimination claims filed by the office, suggesting that an increased female presence leads to fewer women's claims being recognized as worthy by EEOC staff (Hindera 1993). In the Department of Agriculture, Selden (1997) finds no correlation between the proportion of female county supervisors in FmHA district offices and the proportion of female applicants considered eligible for housing loans parceled out by the agency. The only place where female administrators appear to be responsive to the female citizenry is in making personnel decisions, as Saltzstein (1986) and Riccucci (1986) find that female mayors facilitate female access to municipal government jobs.

Why does substantive representation seem to exist for blacks and Latinos but not for women? As was alluded to earlier, some theorists argue that organizational socialization is the likely explanation. To ensure that administrative decisions correspond with the values and mores of the organization at large, organizations make attempts to imbue all employees with a common set of assumptions and way of looking at the world, a worldview that emphasizes organizational loyalty above personal sentiments (Downs 1967;

Romzek 1990; Simon 1957). Mary Guy and Georgia Duerst-Lahti (1992) describe the process as one of enculturation “whereby newcomers become aware of, and committed to, the shared interpretations and values of old-guard organization members” (p. 162). Herbert Simon (1957) claims that organizational identification, “the process whereby the individual substitutes organizational objectives . . . for his own aims” (p. 218) serves to depersonalize administrative decision making, ensuring all individuals make “correct” decisions consistent with organizational objectives. Individuals may enter the civil service with divergent views, but over time they become acclimated to the culture and values of the departments for which they work. They may adopt organization values to increase promotion and career success chances either because they feel peer pressure to do so, or simply because they come to agree with and internalize the dominant organizational values (Larson 1973; Romzek 1990; Simon 1957; Thompson 1976). Where we find few gender differences, we can assume that both men and women have adopted similar organizational viewpoints.

Are women simply more susceptible than African-Americans and Latinos to organizational efforts to socialize employees? Probably not, but it is likely that they have more in common with their male colleagues than members of different racial groups have with one another. Poole and Ziegler (1985) claim that race is a far better predictor of political attitudes than is gender and Roberta Sigel (1996) argues that males and females of the same race share many more common experiences and living conditions than do people of different races.<sup>2</sup> With less initial distance to separate them, we can expect organizational socialization efforts to have a similar effect on both sexes. And if gender differences are not as salient as racial differences to start, we would expect fewer instances in which administrative decision making would reflect a distinct gendered perspective. For this reason, a number of scholars have stressed that active representation is most likely on issues of great importance to the represented group (Meier and Stewart 1992; Rosenbloom and Kinnard 1977; Thompson 1976) or when real policy disputes exist over the political values in question (Meier 1993c). The null findings reported by Meier and Nigro (1976) may be understood in this light. In 1974, they found that male and female members of the supergrades were remarkably similar in their attitudes about federal spending. An examination of public opinion data from the time, however, shows that these women and men in the general public differed significantly on only three of the ten issues in question, suggesting the absence of a real policy dispute between the sexes.<sup>3</sup> Because of the general attitude congruence among members of the public, we should not be surprised to find few meaningful differences among elites, either. Similarly, the questions utilized by

<sup>2</sup>The Senior Executive Service is not truly representative of different racial groups in the U.S. population. Whites make up the vast majority (87%) of executives, blacks constitute the largest minority group (7%), and Asians, Hispanics, and Native Americans make up the remaining 6%. As such, racial comparisons are not investigated within this article as insufficient numbers of individuals from minority racial groups exist for meaningful statistical analysis.

<sup>3</sup>Analysis was conducted by the author, using GSS data from 1974. These data are available through the GSS webpage ([www.icpsr.umich.edu/GSS](http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/GSS)) and can be analyzed online with software provided by the Computer-assisted Survey Methods Program at the University of California at Berkeley (<http://csa.berkeley.edu:7502/>).

## *Gender and Spending Priorities*

Reh fuss (1986) may not be suitable measures for identifying active representation tendencies on the behalf of women. In order to gauge the link between active and passive representation, he asked administrators to whom they felt responsible, and not surprisingly, many of them responded that they felt they were responsible to their bosses, their clients, their departments, or to management. Showing that both sexes have similar managerial outlooks does not necessarily mean that female administrators share all the same attitudes and values as their male colleagues or that organizational socialization experiences have obliterated all attitudinal differences between the sexes. Quite possibly, a question that asked them to agree or disagree that they took the perspectives of women or minorities into account in their jobs would have elicited entirely different responses.

It is also conceivable that the lack of a critical mass of elite women works against substantive representation for women. Rosabeth Moss Kanter (1977a and b) is the most well-known proponent of such a theory. She argues that individuals in the minority of skewed groups, those groups characterized by a mix of dominants to minorities that approximates an 85 percent to 15 percent split, are regarded as tokens and face all sorts of pressures to conform to dominant values. They are highly visible, their differences from the majority are exaggerated, and their behavior is often stereotyped as typical for their social groups. In their desire to appear as normal as the next employee, and to escape increased scrutiny over their actions, tokens downplay any behavior or attitudes that draw attention to the fact that they differ from the majority of their colleagues. For females, one way to do this is to appear hostile or at least unfriendly to women's concerns. As Kanter (1977b) claims, "[T]he price of being 'one of the boys' is a willingness to occasionally turn against 'the girls'" (p. 979). McGlen and Sarkees (1993) adopt this line of reasoning in explaining the very few differences they find between women and men in the Department of Defense. Noting that decades of public opinion polls demonstrate different foreign policy attitudes between the sexes, but finding relatively insignificant differences among women and men at Defense, they argue that Defense women effectively temper their own ideology in a conservative direction, expecting that espousing traditionally feminine attitudes would be likely to draw negative, unwanted attention to themselves. Other research finds that the percentage of women in top ranking positions within an agency is associated with greater substantive representation on the part of female administrators (Bayes 1991; Dolan 2000). Bayes, through interviews with female federal career executives, found women at the male-dominated Treasury Department (where only 5 percent of the SES positions were held by women) believed they were more constrained in their



## ***Gender and Spending Priorities***

ability to adopt an advocacy role on the behalf of women than were women at Health and Human Services, a department with almost three times as many executive women. We can speculate that female county supervisors within FmHA may also have been wary of appearing to be advocates for women in a largely male-dominated agency. Since women constituted only 14 percent of USDA senior executives in 1992 and made up less than one-third of all white-collar workers within the agency (GAO 1995), these female administrators may simply have downplayed any attention to the plight of female farmers in order to divert attention from themselves in an already skewed organization.

In sum, scholars have found some attitudinal evidence that women in administrative positions heed the wishes of women in the public, but they have found little evidence that those attitudes actually translate to active representation. Although organizational socialization theory may explain the failure of female passive representation to translate into active representation, the discussion above suggests the importance of additional theoretical constructs. This article contributes to the discourse by taking into account the effects of critical mass as well as utilizing more appropriate measures to gauge the relationship.

## **EXPECTATIONS AND HYPOTHESES**

If organizations effectively socialize their employees to adopt similar goals, we should find evidence of a similar outlook on issues that are likely to be important to the organization. Of course not all values are equally important to a government bureau. Romzek (1990) suggests that "pivotal values, those that are essential to the successful functioning and survival of the organization," are most often shared by loyal, committed employees (p. 378). Departmental budgeting matters certainly qualify as pivotal values. Conventional wisdom suggests that bureaucrats attempt to maximize their budgets, or at least preserve their existing base (Downs 1967; LeLoup 1977; Niskanen 1971; Wildavsky 1964). Downs stresses that bureau ideologies generally emphasize maintaining or expanding bureau activities, not contracting them. Simon (1957) suggests that administrators, because they believe so strongly in the inherent goodness and importance of their agency's policies and programs, develop greater concern for how well the agency is carrying out its goals rather than how efficiently it is doing so, such that increased funding is always preferred to decreased or stagnant funding. Thus, we can assume that the organizational point of view stresses the increasing, not the decreasing, of budgets. Male and female administrators, if effectively socialized by their organizations, should differ very little in their preferences for government spending for their own departments.

**360/J-PART, July 2002**

## Gender and Spending Priorities

Representative bureaucracy theory leads us to hypothesize otherwise, however. The link between active and passive representation is most likely when the issue is salient to the represented group or when real policy disputes exist. Besides being important to federal administrators, federal spending priorities are suitable measures, because we know that men and women in the general public have different opinions when it comes to how government should allocate tax dollars.<sup>4</sup> Women are less likely to support increased defense spending (Clark and Clark 1993; Frankovic 1982; *Public Opinion* 1982), but they are more likely than men to support social government programs that provide assistance to the elderly, unemployed, and poor, and to support increased funding for health care, childcare, education, and the environment (Clark and Clark 1993; Conway, Steuarnagel, and Ahern 1997; Frankovic 1982; *Public Opinion* 1982; Shapiro and Mahajan 1986). Interestingly enough, most of the programs for which women prefer greater funding than do men distribute skewed benefits according to gender. Thus women's preferences for increased funding on health care, welfare, food stamps, social security, and childcare may simply reflect that women are more often beneficiaries of these programs than are men.<sup>5</sup> Women are disproportionately represented among the ranks of welfare and food stamp programs, they use health care services more often than do men and are more likely to lack health insurance, they are more often faced with making childcare decisions (as far greater numbers of women than men are single parents and because women are traditionally expected to take care of the children), and when they age, they are more likely than are men to live in poverty and need increased social security benefits (Castner and Rosso 2000; Conway, Ahern, and Steuarnagel 1999; Costello, Miles, and Stone 1999; National Center for Health Statistics 1998). That women depend more heavily on most of these government programs makes them ideal measures for assessing whether elite women, after years of government experience, remain more committed to funding these programs. If representative bureaucracy theory is accurate, we should find women and men in the SES diverge on public spending issues much like women and men in the general public, even on issues where we might expect organizational socialization to interfere.

<sup>4</sup>Meier and Nigro (1976) argue that federal spending priorities are suitable measures for assessing the link between passive and active representation because they are both relevant to elite behavior and comprehensible to the mass public. In assessing the fit between bureaucratic and mass public-policy preferences, we ideally attempt to ascertain whether the specific decisions made by bureaucrats are responsive to the citizenry. This is rather difficult in practice because bureaucratic decision making is likely to involve complex matters on which the public may not have developed specific preferences. Recognizing that Senior Executive Service members' involvement in budgetary matters is more substantial than simply indicating a preference for increased or decreased spending, general budget preferences allow for an accurate assessment of public opinion.

<sup>5</sup>Other scholars generally argue that sex role socialization explains the attitudinal differences, that women are socialized to be more caring and empathetic and such an orientation is consistent with preferences for increased spending on programs that help others (Conway, Steuarnagel, and Ahern 1997; Poole and Ziegler 1985). While not disputing the importance of socialization, we should also consider that these attitudes may reflect greater concern among women for the needs of other women.

Thus far the discussion has centered on spending for programs within the department. But what about administrators' preferences for spending on issues outside their departmental jurisdictions? What will predict senior civil servants' attitudes on these issues? Again, organizational socialization leads us to believe that they will share similar spending attitudes and generally prefer relatively less spending for programs administered elsewhere in the federal bureaucracy. If they wholeheartedly identify with their own

## *Gender and Spending Priorities*

departments' goals and objectives, as Simon (1957) and others suggest, they should place less value on policies and programs carried out elsewhere in government, a simple by-product of their own loyalty and commitment to their own programs. If so, we can expect male and female administrators, within a single department, to exhibit similar preferences on these external programs. Representative bureaucracy, on the other hand, leads us to expect that gender will continue to affect spending preferences for these programs. Again, where a gender gap exists in the general public, we should also find a gender gap within the SES.

As was discussed earlier, there is also reason to expect that the proportion of women who hold leadership positions within the department will affect the attitudes of the female executives. As others have noted, active representation is presumed to be more likely when proportionally greater numbers of the represented group work in an agency or department (Hindera and Young 1998; Meier 1993a and c; Nachmias and Rosenbloom 1973; Thompson 1976). As Kanter (1977a and b) would argue, women who work in departments where they have achieved a critical mass will feel fewer pressures to go along to get along. Their advocacy of greater spending on social programs will not mark them as deviant, as their actions are less likely to be noticed or perceived in stereotypical ways by their male colleagues. On the other hand, token women's actions are more likely to receive increased scrutiny and to be treated as though they are outside the mainstream. If so, we can expect less attitudinal distance between male and female executives in departments where women hold few top positions.

In sum, these two theories about bureaucratic behavior lead us to different expectations about male and female spending priorities within the federal executive. If socialization processes are at work, male and female public administrators within the same organization should greatly resemble each other in their preferences for government spending, especially those with greatest longevity and exposure to socialization pressures, such as SES members. These executives' attitudes should be relatively indistinguishable, shaped similarly by years of work and socialization pressures within their agencies or departments. As such, any gender gap produced in the public should disappear among SES members, as we can expect both men and women at this level to demonstrate their commitment to salient organization values. On the other hand, if representative bureaucracy theory is correct, gender should continue to shape political attitudes among SES women and men. If socialization experiences do not interfere with administrators' attitudes, where there are gender gaps in the public, we would expect the attitudes to be reproduced in the federal bureaucracy.

"To assure verbatim question wording on the surveys, I consulted the 1994 version of the NES, since the 1996 version was not yet available to the public. The 1996 NES did not reproduce all of the questions from the 1994 version, so I have supplemented my analysis with data from the 1996 GSS. The wording of the federal spending priorities is slightly different on the GSS, however. Rather than ask respondents whether they would like to see spending increased, decreased, or remain the same, the questions ask whether the respondents believe we are spending too much, too little, or about the right amount. Certainly the questions are getting at the same issues, rendering them suitable substitutes. For the NES responses, I report the percentage of those who agree that spending should be increased, while I report the percentage of those who respond we are spending too little from the GSS. The policy issues are also phrased slightly differently on the two surveys. While the NES asks about defense spending, the comparable GSS phrase is "national defense." Question wording varies slightly for spending on defense, programs that assist blacks, aid to big cities, and health care, so comparisons between senior executives and the general public should be interpreted with caution. See Appendix for exact question wording.

<sup>7</sup>The sampling procedures and representativeness for the sample of senior executives have been reported elsewhere and are available by contacting the author.

<sup>8</sup>Although Defense and HHS are very different departments with different cultures and missions, there is no reason to expect the strength of socialization pressures to vary substantially across the two. First, we can assume that those who have risen to SES positions have demonstrated loyalty to organizational values or they would not have been promoted to such elite positions (Downs 1967; Guy and Duerst-Lahti 1992; Simon 1957). Second, both departments rely on promotion through the ranks, with entry at the bottom and advancement for those who demonstrate competence and loyalty (Lowi 1985; Meier 1993b; Stiehm 1989). Third, if job satisfaction is linked to organizational commitment, as others have reasoned (e.g., Romzek 1990), we can expect similar levels of commitment as SES employees in both department report comparable levels of job satisfaction (MSPB 1994, 27).

## DATA AND METHODS

To assess the relationship between gender and preference for federal spending, I utilize three surveys: the 1996 National Election Studies (NES), the 1996 General Social Survey (GSS), and the 1996 Survey of Senior Executives (SOSE). The NES and GSS are administered every other year and are widely regarded as valid and reliable instruments for assessing American public opinion on a variety of issues. The 1996 NES survey is based on interviews with 1,714 individuals and the 1996 GSS study includes 2904 respondents. I developed the SOSE especially for this research and reproduced a number a federal spending questions from the NES to make possible comparisons between the two samples.<sup>6</sup> After two mailings and two follow-up postcards, the response rate for the SOSE was 59 percent. Women were originally oversampled, and appropriate weights are applied here to make the sample representative of the entire SES.<sup>7</sup>

I compare federal spending priorities between executives and the general public in a couple of ways. First, I compare aggregate SES women's and men's preferences for federal spending with those of the general public. If representative bureaucracy theory is correct, a similar gender gap should exist in both groups. Second, I examine SES women and men within two departments to assess the effects of organizational socialization on spending priorities. For example, we would expect executives from the Department of Defense to prefer greater spending on defense than spending on other policies or programs if organizational socialization exerts stronger influence than gender does on public spending priorities. If a gender gap remains within the department, we must conclude that gender continues to influence political attitudes, even controlling for organizational socialization pressures. Because the sample is representative of the SES, only the Department of Defense and the Department of Health and Human Services, those departments that employ the largest numbers of Senior Executive Service members, have sufficient numbers of cases to draw any conclusions.<sup>8</sup>

An examination of two separate departments also allows me to account for the possibility that the absence of a critical mass intervenes to alter female representation. Women have never held more than 15 percent of the SES positions at Defense, while they have constituted at least 15 percent of the executive ranks at HHS since the early 1980s (Bayes 1991). If the critical mass theory is correct, we should find that women at HHS are noticeably less constrained than Defense women in advocating policy that is consistent with the preferences of the female citizenry. Defense women should be more cautious about holding stereotypically feminine viewpoints, as they

## *Gender and Spending Priorities*

will most likely be at odds with department ideology and the presumed preferences of their male colleagues. Thus we can expect that any gender gap between the male and female executives will be larger at HHS than at Defense.

### **FINDINGS**

As exhibit 1 shows, these data tentatively support representative bureaucracy expectations as SES women appear to reflect the spending preferences of women in the population. In fact, the gender gap in public opinion is reproduced in the Senior Executive Service across almost every federal spending issue. **On the vast majority of the social welfare issues, women in both samples are significantly more likely than men to favor increased federal spending.** Senior executive women also favor greater spending on environmental issues than do their male colleagues, while the reverse is true in the general public, at least in the 1996 NES data (but other research finds women are more supportive of environmental programs than men are in the public; see Frankovic 1982; *Public Opinion* 1982). Also contrary to public opinion, senior executive women favor devoting slightly less funding to dealing with crime and foreign aid, but these differences are small and not statistically significant.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup>The wording on the SOSE and NES surveys is slightly different for the foreign aid item. The SOSE asks about "foreign aid to countries of the former Soviet Union" while the NES version asks simply about "foreign aid," entirely omitting the clause about the Soviet Union. Previous versions of the NES included the clause about the countries of the former Soviet Union, so my expectation was that the question wording would remain the same in 1996. Because the SOSE was sent into the field before dissemination of the 1996 ANES results, the 1994 wording was used on the SOSE. Looking at the 1994 NES data, where the question wording is identical, the gender gap in the general public is nearly identical to that found in the SES: 5.1 percent of women and 9.3 percent of men prefer greater spending, a difference of 4.2 percent.

<sup>10</sup>The average age in the SOSE sample is 51.7 years with a standard deviation of 6.5 years, while the average age in the 1996 NES sample is 45.5 years with a standard deviation of 16.9 years. There is also very little variance amongst SES members in terms of educational attainment and racial background. In fact, 80 percent of SES members have at least one graduate degree and 87 percent identify themselves as Caucasian (no significant differences by sex).

A comparison of the magnitude of the differences between women and men provides additional evidence consistent with representative bureaucracy theory. Although we might expect to find smaller differences within the elite sample due to common working experiences in the federal government and more similar demographic characteristics,<sup>10</sup> some of the differences are actually larger among the SES members than within the general population. On twelve of the fifteen issues examined, a larger gender gap exists in the Senior Executive Service than in the general public. The percentage differences between SES women and men are larger on all issues except financial aid, social security, and assistance to blacks, suggesting greater differences of opinion among SES women and men than among the general public. These findings caution us against concluding that employment in the federal government minimizes differences of opinion between elite women and men. It appears, at least in some cases, that differences of opinion are slightly magnified.

Closer examination, however, reveals that SES women do not exactly mirror the spending preferences of women in the population, nor do SES men exactly mirror the spending preferences of the male population. In fact, contrary to conventional wisdom, SES women and men prefer noticeably *less* government spending than

## Gender and Spending Priorities

### Exhibit 1

#### The Gender Gap in Preferences for Government Spending, 1996

	Percent Who Agree Spending Should be Increased					
	Senior Executives <sup>1</sup>			General Population <sup>2</sup>		
	Women (n=111)	Men (n=444)	Difference	Women	Men	Difference
Public schools	60.4	51.6	8.8*	71.4	63.3	8.1***
Protecting the environment	52.9	43.5	9.4*	39.2	43.2	-4.0***
Child care	46.7	30.7	16.0***	56.2	47.3	8.9***
Health care <sup>†</sup>	42.9	28.7	14.2**	67.1	60.2	6.9**
Dealing with crime	41.0	44.8	-3.8	69.9	68.6	1.3
Homelessness	41.0	29.1	11.9**	62.8	51.0	11.8***
AIDS research	38.7	32.4	6.3	56.3	56.0	0.3***
Financial aid, college students	32.7	30.4	2.3	57.2	51.5	5.7***
Aid to big cities <sup>†</sup>	19.2	9.4	9.8**	28.7	23.8	4.9
Foreign aid	19.0	23.3	-4.3	5.6	5.1	0.5
Programs that assist blacks <sup>†</sup>	18.6	12.3	6.3*	31.3	22.5	8.8***
Welfare programs	13.3	4.6	8.7***	13.6	7.9	5.7***
Social security	13.1	6.0	7.1**	53.9	40.0	13.9***
Food stamps	11.4	4.1	7.3**	12.2	8.0	4.2***
Defense <sup>†</sup>	3.8	7.7	-3.9	16.4	18.9	-2.5

Chi-square statistic for differences between women and men significant at: \*\*\*p < .001, \*\*p < .01; \*p < .05

<sup>1</sup>Source: Survey of Senior Executives, N=570; <sup>2</sup>= 1996 ANES, N=1714 Women (n= 945), Men (n= 769) or 1996 GSS, N=2904 (marked with †). N for women and men varies, as not all respondents asked all questions.

does the general public. For only two issues, foreign aid and the environment, senior administrators prefer greater spending than does the public. These results run counter to a number of findings reported by other scholars, where government employment is positively correlated with preferences for greater spending (Blake 1991; Garand, Parkhurst, and Seoud 1991a and b) and suggest the need for further analysis. The results cannot be attributed to higher educational attainment or years of age among civil servants, since holding these two variables constant reproduces the original findings with few exceptions.

A breakdown of the data by cabinet department sheds further light on the matter (see exhibit 2). Women and men within the Defense Department remain less committed to spending increases than do their public counterparts of the same sex on all but one issue, foreign aid (see second and third columns and fifth and sixth columns of data on exhibit 2 for these comparisons), while HHS women and men are more inclined than the general public to favor spending increases on a minority of the issues (seven of the fifteen for HHS women and five of the fifteen for HHS' men). Defense executives are clearly more conservative than HHS executives

## Gender and Spending Priorities

### Exhibit 2 Gender and Spending Priorities

Spending Issue	Percent Who Agree Spending Should be Increased					
	Women			Men		
	HHS (n=15)	Public <sup>1</sup>	Defense (n=14)	HHS (n=29)	Public <sup>1</sup>	Defense (n=105)
Public schools	73.3	71.4	53.8	61.5	63.3	43.1
Child care	71.4	56.2	35.7	34.6	47.3	23.8
Dealing with crime	35.7	69.9	50.0	43.5	68.6	58.1
Health care†	64.3	67.1	30.8	46.2	60.2	22.1
Homelessness	64.3	62.8	28.6	23.1	51.0	25.0
Protecting the environment	50.0	39.2	23.1	48.4	43.2	33.3
Financial aid, college students	50.0	57.2	28.6	36.0	51.5	19.2
AIDS research	42.9	56.3	35.7	20.0	56.0	30.5
Programs that assist blacks†	30.8	31.3	7.7	24.0	22.5	6.8
Aid to big cities†	28.6	28.7	0.0	3.8	23.8	4.0
Welfare programs	26.7	13.6	7.1	15.4	7.9	0.0
Food stamps	21.4	12.2	7.1	16.7	8.0	0.0
Social security	14.3	53.9	7.1	10.7	40.0	2.9
Foreign aid	13.3	5.6	15.4	10.7	5.1	26.7
Defense†	0.0	16.4	14.3	0.0	18.9	15.2

<sup>1</sup>Source: 1996 ANES, N=1714 Women (n= 945), Men (n= 769) or 1996 GSS, N=2904 (marked with †). N for women and men varies, as not all respondents were asked all questions.

(2.78 vs. 3.45 on a 5-point scale of liberalism,  $p=0.001$ ), and thus understandably they are less enthusiastic about spending increases than are their colleagues at HHS. What is interesting about these findings is that males and females within each department largely resemble one another in their attitudes about government spending. Senior executive women and men at HHS prefer greater spending than the public does on four common issues: the environment, foreign aid (consistent with findings for the entire sample), welfare, and food stamps, while senior men and women at Defense likewise resemble one another, both advocating greater spending on foreign aid. These results suggest common outlooks among colleagues within each department. Thus we cannot dismiss the importance of organizational socialization altogether in shaping senior administrator attitudes. Without the benefit of panel data, it is not possible to determine whether male and female administrators began their government service with different attitudes and orientations toward government spending, but the overall attitudinal similarities are consistent with organizational socialization expectations.

Even though senior administrators within each department resemble members of the opposite sex in terms of spending priorities, a gender gap persists, which lends support to the representative

366/*J-PART*, July 2002



## Gender and Spending Priorities

### Exhibit 3

#### Attitudinal Differences in the Department of Health and Human Services, by Gender, 1996

Spending Issue	Percent Who Agree Spending Should be Increased					
	Senior Executives, HHS <sup>1</sup>			General Population <sup>2</sup>		
	Women (n=15)	Men (n=29)	Difference	Women (n=893)	Men (n=821)	Difference
Public schools	73.3	61.5	11.8	71.4	63.3	8.1***
<b>Child care</b>	71.4	34.6	36.8*	56.2	47.3	8.9***
<b>Health care†</b>	64.3	46.2	18.1	67.1	60.2	6.9**
Homelessness	64.3	23.1	41.2**	62.8	51.0	11.8***
Protecting the environment	50.0	48.4	1.9	39.2	43.2	-4.0***
Financial aid, college students	50.0	36.0	14.0	57.2	51.5	5.7***
<b>AIDS research</b>	20.0	42.9	-22.9	56.3	56.0	0.3***
Dealing with crime	35.7	43.5	7.8	69.9	68.6	1.3
<b>Welfare programs</b>	26.7	15.4	11.3	13.6	7.9	5.7***
Programs that assist blacks†	30.8	24.0	6.8	31.3	22.5	8.8***
Aid to big cities†	28.6	3.8	24.8*	28.7	23.8	4.9
Food stamps	21.4	16.7	4.7	12.2	8.0	4.2***
Social security	14.3	10.7	3.6	53.9	40.0	13.9***
Foreign aid	13.3	10.7	2.6	5.6	5.1	0.5
Defense†	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.4	18.9	-2.5

Items in bold fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health and Human Services.

Chi-square statistic for differences between men and women is significant at \*\*\*p < 0.001; \*\*p < 0.01, \*p < 0.05

<sup>1</sup>Source: Survey of Senior Executives; <sup>2</sup>= 1996 ANES, N=1714 or 1996 GSS (n=2904; marked with †).

bureaucracy hypothesis (see exhibits 3 and 4). In the Department of Health and Human Services (exhibit 3), male and female executives diverge in their preferences for government spending in ways that mimic the public gender gap. Since statistical significance is more difficult to achieve with smaller numbers of cases, it is instructive to examine the magnitude of gender differences where they exist. Doing so, a larger gender gap exists in the senior executive service than in the general public on eleven of the fifteen issues examined. The only policy areas where the public gender gap is larger are the environment, programs that assist blacks, social security, and defense.

Turning to programs administered by HHS, we find additional evidence of a gender gap. With regard to spending for three of these issues (childcare, health care, and welfare), the size of the gender gap is actually larger between male and female executives than it is in the general public. If organizational socialization were at work, we would expect male and female administrators to have more-similar attitudes, especially on issues that fall under their department's jurisdiction. Instead, the sexes diverge much as they do in the general public. One notable exception is funding for AIDS



## *Gender and Spending Priorities*

research. Whereas women and men in the general public have virtually identical preferences for increased funding on this issue, female executives at HHS are considerably less willing to increase funding for AIDS research than are their male colleagues. This finding is especially odd since AIDS research falls under the jurisdiction of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), an agency within HHS. Why would 20 percent more men than women support increased funding on this issue? One possible explanation lies in the composition of the workforce at NIH. Proportionally fewer executive women are employed at NIH (33 percent) than either the Administration for Children and Families (46 percent) or the Health Care Financing Administration (45 percent), agencies with jurisdiction over childcare, health care, and welfare issues. On the other hand, NIH employs a far greater number of SES employees than do the other two agencies, suggesting a higher probability that randomly selected HHS administrators work for NIH than for HCFA or ACF.<sup>11</sup> Unfortunately, the possibility that spending preferences vary across HHS agencies is not empirically verifiable through my data.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup>Department of Health and Human Services, unpublished data. Accessed through personal interview with HHS official.

<sup>12</sup>Agency affiliation may also partially explain the gender gap on the other three issues (health care, childcare, and welfare), such that executives' attitudes are shaped by their personal involvement in these particular programs. In order to obtain Institutional Review Board approval for my survey instrument, I was required to remove any questions pertaining to agency affiliation so as to protect the confidentiality of the respondents. Thus my data do not allow assessing the impact of agency affiliation upon spending priorities.

<sup>13</sup>Because socialization pressures are expected to be greatest for those with longest tenure within the department, I also examined the gender gap by excluding noncareer SES from the sample, who have significantly fewer years of service than do career members (2.8 years vs. 19.8 years;  $p < 0.001$ ). With the noncareer appointees excluded, the findings are nearly identical. Compared to the full sample, senior executive women now favor slightly less funding than do their male colleagues on food stamps, Social Security, and programs that assist blacks. None of these differences are statistically significant. It is not clear why SES women would be less supportive of these government programs, especially since neither set of hypotheses expected such an outcome. Career women and men are of similar age (52.2 and 53.8 years, respectively;  $p = 0.60$ ), have similar tenure within the department (19.3 and 20.1 years;  $p = 0.84$ ), and are ideologically similar (females 0.2 points more liberal, on a 5 point ideology scale;  $p = 0.30$ ).

With the exception of very few issues, then, gender intervenes to shape the spending attitudes of senior administrators at HHS. Although years of employment appear to affect spending attitudes to some degree, gender differences apparent in the public are also duplicated in the elite ranks of the bureaucracy. Further, there is little to suggest that employment at HHS affects one's attitudes on programs that fall outside the department's jurisdiction, as gender differences remain consistent with those found in the public. As such, it does not appear that women and men in HHS have been socialized to the point where individual attitudes no longer exert influence over their decisions.<sup>13</sup>

These findings are affirmed at the Defense Department. Women prefer less spending on defense than do their male colleagues, but the difference is not statistically significant and is quite similar to the difference observed in the general public (see exhibit 4). At first blush, this finding suggests that organizational pressures have produced virtually identical opinions across the sexes. However, the similar result in the general public confuses the interpretation. Previous research has consistently demonstrated larger gaps between the sexes in their preferences for defense spending, leading me to expect an opportunity to tease out the effects of government employment on administrative attitudes. However, the absence of a current public gender gap on this item makes it difficult to decipher whether organizational socialization or personal attitudes exert greater influence on executives' attitudes. The other spending items produce evidence consistent with representative bureaucracy

**Exhibit 4**

**Attitudinal Differences in the Department of Defense, by Gender, 1996**

Spending Issue	Percent Who Agree Spending Should be Increased					
	Senior Executives, Defense <sup>1</sup>			General Population <sup>2</sup>		
	Women (n=14)	Men (n=105)	Difference	Women	Men	Difference
Public schools	53.8	43.1	10.7	71.4	63.3	8.1***
Dealing with crime	50.0	58.1	-8.1	69.9	68.6	1.3
Child care	35.7	23.8	11.9	56.2	47.3	8.9***
AIDS research	35.7	30.5	5.2	56.3	56.0	0.3***
Health care†	30.8	22.1	8.7	67.1	60.2	6.9**
Homelessness	28.6	25.0	3.6	62.8	51.0	11.8***
Financial aid, college students	28.6	19.2	9.4	57.2	51.5	5.7***
Protecting the environment	23.1	33.3	-10.2	39.2	43.2	-4.0***
Foreign aid	15.4	26.7	-11.3	5.6	5.1	0.5
<b>Defense†</b>	14.3	15.2	-0.9	16.4	18.9	-2.5
Programs that assist blacks†	7.7	6.8	0.9	31.3	22.5	8.8***
Social security	7.1	2.9	4.2	53.9	40.0	13.9***
Welfare programs	7.1	0.0	7.1**	13.6	7.9	5.7***
Food stamps	7.1	0.0	7.1**	12.2	8.0	4.2***
Aid to big cities†	0.0	4.0	-4.0	28.7	23.8	4.9

Items in bold fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense.

Chi-square statistic for differences between men and women is significant at \*\*\*p < 0.001; \*\*p < 0.01, \*p < 0.05

<sup>1</sup>Source: Survey of Senior Executives; <sup>2</sup>= 1996 ANES, N=1714 or 1996 GSS (n=2904; marked with †).

<sup>14</sup>Again, because noncareer executives have significantly less tenure within the department, I excluded them and reran the crosstabs. Doing so, a gender gap of at least 5 points remained on eleven of the fifteen issues, with eight larger than they were originally. Women careerists in Defense also average fewer years of tenure within the department compared to their male colleagues (12.7 vs. 18.8 years; p<0.11). To account for the possibility that fewer years of tenure are associated with more liberal spending attitudes, I ran separate crosstabs for those with thirteen years or less experience and those with fourteen or more years experience. Doing so reveals a smaller gender gap among the less experienced executives, with these women and men more similar to one another than are the more experienced men and women. Closer examination shows that socialization pressures seem to weigh more heavily on the male officials, though. Men with less tenure more consistently prefer greater spending than men with greater tenure, while no such pattern exists among the female executives. Because of the small sample sizes, these findings should be interpreted with caution.

expectations. Again, the small sample size makes it more difficult to achieve statistical significance, but the gender differences across the other issues are quite instructive. On all of the issues except one (assistance to blacks), a gender gap is still apparent among male and female defense administrators, consistent with the public gender gap. For ten of the fifteen issues, larger percentage differences exist between executives than those found in the general population, indicating agency socialization has not erased individual preferences across these issues. Thus gender continues to influence the federal spending priorities of senior executives in the Department of Defense.<sup>14</sup>

Turning to the impact of a critical mass on female executive attitudes, the findings provide tentative support (see exhibit 5). Caution is necessary because of the very small sample sizes, but a larger gender gap exists at HHS than at Defense, which is consistent with expectations. On average, the gender gap amongst HHS executives is twice as large as the gender gap within the Department of Defense (13.9 percent at HHS and 6.9 percent at Defense). Looking at the individual spending questions, the gender gap is larger among executives at HHS than it is at Defense on almost

## Gender and Spending Priorities

### Exhibit 5

#### The Gender Gap in the SES, Defense, and HHS Compared

Spending Issue	Percent Who Agree Spending Should be Increased					
	Senior Executives, HHS			Senior Executives, Defense		
	Women (n=15)	Men (n=29)	Difference	Women (n=14)	Men (n=105)	Difference
Public schools	73.3	61.5	11.8	53.8	43.1	10.7
Child care	71.4	34.6	36.8*	35.7	23.8	11.9
Dealing with crime	35.7	43.5	-7.8	50.0	58.1	-8.1
Health care	64.3	46.2	18.1	30.8	22.1	8.7
Homelessness	64.3	23.1	41.2**	28.6	25.0	3.6
Protecting the environment	50.0	48.4	1.9	23.1	33.3	-10.2
Financial aid, college students	50.0	36.0	14.0	28.6	19.2	9.4
AIDS research	20.0	42.9	-22.9	35.7	30.5	5.2
Programs that assist blacks	30.8	24.0	6.8	7.7	6.8	0.9
Aid to big cities	28.6	3.8	24.8*	0.0	4.0	-4.0
Welfare programs	26.7	15.4	11.3	7.1	0.0	7.1**
Food stamps	21.4	16.7	4.7	7.1	0.0	7.1**
Social security	14.3	10.7	3.6	7.1	2.9	4.2
Foreign aid	13.3	10.7	2.6	15.4	26.7	-11.3
Defense	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	15.2	-0.9
			Mean = 13.89			Mean = 6.89

Chi-square statistic for differences between men and women is significant at \*\*\*p < 0.001; \*\*p < 0.01, \*p < 0.05

two-thirds of the issues (nine of the fifteen), indicating that women and men at Defense are closer to one another in their opinions about federal spending priorities than are their colleagues at HHS. This is consistent with Kanter's theory of proportional representation. At HHS, a department in which women hold a critical mass of the leadership positions, the female executives show little evidence of modifying their attitudes to correspond with those of their male colleagues. On the other hand, female executives at Defense, where women have not yet reached a critical mass, are more similar to their male colleagues, consistent with expectations about trying to fit in and divert attention from themselves.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup>Without the benefit of panel data, it is not clear that either women or men are adjusting their attitudes to fit in. However, some analysis is instructive. I compared women at HHS with women at Defense and men at HHS with men at Defense. On the majority of issues (nine of fifteen), greater attitudinal distance separates the two groups of women than the two groups of men. This finding is consistent with the expectation that Defense women have more to gain by altering their attitudes in a direction consistent with their working environment.

### CONCLUSION

This research contributes to our understanding of the impact of organizational socialization and gender on bureaucratic behavior. Both factors appear to affect the spending attitudes of elite federal administrators. Again, women and men across the entire SES differ on the amount of resources they would devote to various programs, much like women and men in the general public do. Even within individual departments, women continue to prefer significantly more spending than do their male colleagues on a number of issues,

370/*J-PART*, July 2002

## *Gender and Spending Priorities*

reaffirming that agency socialization has not wiped out the role gender plays in shaping personal attitudes and preferences. However, organizational socialization is clearly at work as women and men within each department share attitudes in fairly consistent and predictable ways. Women and men within each department are closer to one another in terms of their spending preferences than they are with colleagues of their own gender from other departments, confirming that employment within a particular department does indeed appear to influence budgeting perspectives.

Previous scholars have amply demonstrated that budgeting is an inherently political process (LeLoup 1977; Wildavsky 1964), and this research provides preliminary evidence that budgeting decisions are conditioned by gender. **Although Congress is responsible for appropriating funds to federal agencies, agency executives like Senior Executive Service members routinely appear before Congress to justify their budget requests** (LeLoup 1977; Ripley and Franklin 1991). Because women and men have different opinions when it comes to government spending, female executives are likely to shape internal budget strategies and decisions in ways that incorporate women's perspectives. And we can expect them to do so more regularly where females have secured greater representation in the agency's leadership ranks.

These findings stand in contrast with much other research that has investigated the link between passive and active representation among female administrators, but they are consistent with the growing wealth of research on legislative women. Why have we reached such different conclusions? I suggest these findings reaffirm the importance of locating a policy issue that is of particular concern to the represented group when one is attempting to determine whether a demographically representative bureaucracy produces substantively responsive outputs. Some of the previous research has quite possibly tapped into policy issues without great resonance among American women and has consequently found organizational socialization pressures weighing more heavily on administrative decisions. A gender gap on a number of federal spending priorities has existed for over twenty years, suggesting a real policy disagreement between the sexes that is also relevant for administrative decision making. For the women and men who have been studied here, organizational socialization does not appear to eradicate values that are rooted in gender. However, critical mass appears to intervene, such that women in skewed groups become more similar to their male colleagues than do those who are employed in more balanced work groups.

As long as public spending priorities remain important concerns among the public, and as long as SES members continue

## *Gender and Spending Priorities*

to play a role in shaping federal government spending decisions, a logical corollary of this research is that it is imperative that women continue to hold policy-making positions in the uppermost echelons of government. If not, we should be wary that governmental decision makers might overlook the distinct spending preferences of female citizens.

### **APPENDIX**

#### **Wording of Federal Spending Survey Questions**

---

##### **Wording on National Election Studies and Survey of Senior Executives:**

If you had a say in making up the federal budget this year, for which of the following programs would you like to see spending increased and for which would you like to see spending decreased?

1. Improving and protecting the environment
2. Foreign aid to countries of the former Soviet Union (1994); Foreign aid (1996)
3. AIDS research
4. Social security
5. Welfare programs
6. Food stamps
7. Public schools
8. Solving the problem of the homeless
9. Child care
10. Dealing with crime
11. Financial aid for college students
12. Health care (not asked on 1996 NES)
13. Aid to big cities (not asked on 1996 NES)
14. Programs that assist blacks (not asked on 1996 NES)
15. Defense (not asked on 1996 NES)

Respondents were allowed the following choices:

- a. Decrease spending
- b. Increase spending
- c. Keep spending about the same

##### **Wording on General Social Survey:**

We are faced with many problems in this country, none of which can be solved easily or inexpensively. I'm going to name some of these problems, and for each one I'd like you to tell me whether you think we're spending too much money on it, too little money, or about the right amount. Are we spending too much, too little, or about the right amount on . . .

1. Health
2. Assistance to big cities
3. Assistance to blacks
4. National defense

Respondents were allowed the following choices:

- a. Too little
  - b. About the right amount
  - c. Too much
-

REFERENCES

- Aberbach, Joel D.; Putnam, Robert D.; and Rockman, Bert A.  
1981 *Bureaucrats and Politicians in Western Democracies*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Alexis, Marcus, and Wilson, Charles Z.  
1967 *Organizational Decision-Making*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Bayes, Jane.  
1991 "Women in Public Administration in the United States." *Women & Politics* 11:3:85-109.
- Blake, Donald E.  
1991 "Policy Attitudes and Political Ideology in the Public Sector." In Andre Blais and Stephane Dion, eds. *The Budget-Maximizing Bureaucrat: Appraisals and Evidence*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Borrelli, MaryAnne, and Martin, Janet M.  
1997 *The Other Elites: Women, Politics, and Power in the Executive Branch*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner.
- Castner, Laura, and Rosso, Randy.  
2000 *Characteristics of Food Stamp Households, Fiscal Year 1998*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Analysis, Nutrition and Evaluation.
- Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP).  
1998 *Women Appointed to Presidential Cabinets: Fact Sheet*. New Brunswick, N.J.: National Information Bank on Women in Public Office, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University.  
2000 *Women in the U.S. Congress 2000: Fact Sheet*. New Brunswick, N.J.: National Information Bank on Women in Public Office, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University.
- Clark, Cal, and Clark, Janet.  
1993 "The Gender Gap in 1988: Compassion, Pacifism and Indirect Feminism." In Lois Lovelace Duke, ed. *Women in Politics: Outsiders or Insiders?* Englewood Hills, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Conway, M. Margaret; Ahern, David W.; and Steuernagel, Gertrude A.  
1998 *Women and Public Policy*, 2d ed. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc.
- Conway, M. Margaret; Steuernagel, Gertrude A.; and Ahern, David W.  
1997 *Women and Political Participation*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly.
- Costello, Cynthia B.; Miles, Shari E.; and Stone, Anne J., eds.  
1998 *American Woman 1999-2000: A Century of Change—What's Next?* New York: Norton.
- Dolan, Julie.  
2000 "The Senior Executive Service: Gender, Attitudes, and Representative Bureaucracy." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10:3:513-29.
- Downs, Anthony.  
1967 *Inside Bureaucracy*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Fox, Richard Logan.  
1997 *Gender Dynamics in Congressional Elections*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE.
- Frankovic, Kathleen A.  
1982 "Sex and Politics—New Alignments, Old Issues." *PS* 15:3:439-48.
- Garand, James C.; Parkhurst, Catherine T.; and Seoud, Rusanne Jourdan.  
1991a "Bureaucrats, Policy Attitudes, and Political Behavior: Extension of the Bureau Voting Model of Government Growth." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 1:2:177-212.  
1991b "Testing the Bureau Voting Model: A Research Note on Federal and State-Local Employees." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 1:2:229-33.
- Gawthrop, Louis C.  
1969 *Bureaucratic Behavior in the Executive Branch*. New York: Free Press.
- Guy, Mary E., and Duerst-Lahti, Georgia.  
1992 "Agency Culture and Its Effects on Managers." In Mary E. Guy, ed. *Women and Men of the States: Public Administrators at the State Level*. Armonk, N.Y.: Sharpe.
- Hale, Mary M., and Branch, M. Frances.  
1992 "Policy Preferences on Workplace Reform." In Mary E. Guy, ed. *Women and Men of the States: Public Administrators at the State Level*. Armonk, N.Y.: Sharpe.
- Hale, Mary M.; Kelly, Rita Mae; and Burgess, Jayne.  
1989 "Women in the Arizona Executive Branch of Government." In Mary M. Hale and Rita Mae Kelly, eds. *Gender, Bureaucracy, and Democracy: Careers and Opportunity in the Public Sector*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood.
- Hale, Mary M.; Kelly, Rita Mae; Burgess, Jayne; and Shapiro, Rhonda.  
1987 "Women in the Executive Branch of Government." In Rita Mae Kelly, ed. *Women and the Arizona Political Process*. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America.
- Hindera, John J.  
1993 "Representative Bureaucracy: Imprimis Evidence of Active Representation in the EEOC District Offices." *Social Science Quarterly* 74:1:95-108.
- Hindera, John J., and Young, Cheryl.  
1998 "Representative Bureaucracy: The Theoretical Implications of Statistical Interaction." *Political Research Quarterly* 51:3:655-71.
- Holsti, Ole R., and Rosenau, James N.  
1981 "The Foreign Policy Beliefs of Women in Leadership Positions." *Journal of Politics* 43:2:326-47.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss.  
1977a *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.

## Gender and Spending Priorities

- 1977b "Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses in Token Women." *American Journal of Sociology* 82:5:965-90.
- Kathlene, Lyn.  
1994 "Power and Influence in State Legislative Policymaking: The Interaction of Gender and Position in Committee Hearing Debates." *American Political Science Review* 88:3:560-76.
- Kawar, Amal.  
1989 "Women in the Utah Executive Branch." In Mary M. Hale and Rita Mae Kelly, eds. *Gender, Bureaucracy, and Democracy: Careers and Opportunity in the Public Sector*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood.
- Kellough, J. Edward.  
1990 "Integration in the Public Workplace: Determinants of Minority and Female Employment in Federal Agencies." *Public Administration Review* 50:5:557-66.
- Kelly, Rita Mae, and Newman, Meredith A.  
2000 "The Gendered Bureaucracy: Agency Mission, Equality of Opportunity, and Representative Bureaucracy." *Women & Politics* 22:3:1-33.
- Kranz, Harry.  
1976 *The Participatory Bureaucracy: Women and Minorities in a More Representative Public Service*. Lexington, Mass.: Heath.
- Krislov, Samuel, and Rosenbloom, David H.  
1981 *Representative Bureaucracy and the American Political System*. New York: Praeger.
- Larson, Arthur D.  
1973 "Representative Bureaucracy and Administrative Responsibility: A Reassessment." *Midwest Journal of Public Administration* 7:1:79-89.
- LeLoup, Lance T.  
1977 *Budgetary Politics: Dollars, Deficits, Decisions*. Brunswick, Ohio: Kings Court Communications.
- Lewis, Gregory B.  
1994 "Women, Occupations, and Federal Agencies: Occupational Mix and Interagency Differences in Sexual Inequality in Federal White-Collar Employment." *Public Administration Review* 54:3:271-76.
- Long, Norton E.  
1952 "Bureaucracy and Constitutionalism." *American Political Science Review* 46:3:808-18.
- Lowi, Theodore J.  
1985 "The State in Politics: The Relation Between Policy and Administration." In Roger G. Noll, ed. *Regulatory Policy and the Social Sciences*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- McGlen, Nancy E., and Sarkees, Meredith Reid.  
1993 *Women in Foreign Policy: The Insiders*. New York: Routledge.
- Meier, Kenneth J.  
1975 "Representative Bureaucracy: An Empirical Analysis." *American Political Science Review* 69:2:526-42.  
1984 "Teachers, Students, and Discrimination: The Policy Impact of Black Representation." *Journal of Politics* 46:1:252-63.  
1993a "Latinos and Representative Bureaucracy: Testing the Thompson and Henderson Hypotheses." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 3:4:393-414.  
1993b *Politics and the Bureaucracy: Policy Making in the Fourth Branch of Government*. Pacific Grove, Calif.: Brooks/Cole.  
1993c "Representative Bureaucracy: A Theoretical and Empirical Exposition." *Research in Public Administration* 2:1:1-35.
- Meier, Kenneth J., and Nigro, Lloyd G.  
1976 "Representative Bureaucracy and Policy Preferences: A Study in the Attitudes of Federal Executives." *Public Administration Review* 36:4:458-69.
- Meier, Kenneth J., and Stewart, Joseph Jr.  
1992 "The Impact of Representative Bureaucracies: Educational Systems and Public Policies." *American Review of Public Administration* 22:2:157-71.
- Meier, Kenneth J.; Stewart, Joseph Jr.; and England, Robert E.  
1991 "The Politics of Bureaucratic Discretion: Educational Access as an Urban Service." *American Journal of Political Science* 35:1:155-77.
- Mosher, Frederick.  
1968 *Democracy and the Public Service*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nachmias, David, and Rosenbloom, David H.  
1973 "Measuring Bureaucratic Representation and Integration." *Public Administration Review* 33:6:590-97.
- National Center for Health Statistics.  
1998 *Vital and Health Statistics: Current Estimates from the National Health Interview Survey, 1995*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control.
- Niskanen, William A.  
1971 *Bureaucracy and Representative Government*. Chicago: Aldine Atherton.
- Poole, Keith T., and Zeigler, L. Harmon.  
1985 *Women, Public Opinion and Politics: The Changing Political Attitudes of American Women*. New York: Longman.
- Public Opinion.  
1982 "Opinion Roundup. Women and Men: Is a Realignment Under Way?" April/May, pp. 21, 27-32.
- Reh fuss, John A.  
1986 "A Representative Bureaucracy? Women and Minority Executives in California Career Service." *Public Administration Review* 46:5:454-59.
- Riccucci, Norma M.  
1986 "Female and Minority Employment in City Government: The Role of Unions." *Policy Studies Journal* 15:1:3-15.

## Gender and Spending Priorities

- Ripley, Randall B., and Franklin, Grace A.  
1991 *Congress, the Bureaucracy, and Public Policy*, 5th ed. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth.
- Romzek, Barbara S.  
1990 "Employee Investment and Commitment: The Ties That Bind." *Public Administration Review* 50:3:374-82.
- Rosenbloom, David H., and Kinnard, Douglas.  
1977 "Bureaucratic Representation and Bureaucrats' Behavior: An Exploratory Analysis." *Midwest Review of Public Administration* 11:1:35-42.
- Rosenstone, Steven J.; Kinder, Donald R.; Miller, Warren E.; and the National Election Studies.  
1999 *American National Election Study, 1996: Pre- and Post-Election Survey* (computer file), 4th release, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Center for Political Studies, producer, 1999. Ann Arbor: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, distributor, 1999.
- Rosenthal, Cindy Simon.  
1997 "A View of Their Own: Women's Committee Leadership Styles and State Legislatures." *Policy Studies Journal* 25:4:568-600.
- Rourke, Francis.  
1984 *Bureaucracy, Politics, and Public Policy*, 3d ed. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Saltzstein, Grace Hall.  
1986 "Female Mayors and Women in Municipal Jobs." *American Journal of Political Science* 30:1:140-64.
- Selden, Sally Coleman.  
1997 *The Promise of Representative Bureaucracy*. Armonk, N.Y.: Sharpe.
- Selden, Sally Coleman; Brudney, Jeffrey L.; and Kellough, J. Edward.  
1998 "Bureaucracy as a Representative Institution: Toward a Reconciliation of Bureaucratic Government and Democratic Theory." *American Journal of Political Science* 42:3:717-44.
- Shapiro, Robert Y., and Mahajan, Harpreet.  
1986 "Gender Differences in Policy Preferences: A Summary of Trends from the 1960s to the 1980s." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 50:1:42-61.
- Sigel, Roberta S.  
1996 *Ambition and Accommodation: How Women View Gender Relations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Simon, Herbert A.  
1957 *Administrative Behavior*, 2d ed. New York: Macmillan.
- Stanley, Jeanie R.  
1989 "Women in the Texas Executive Branch of Government." In Mary M. Hale and Rita Mae Kelly, eds. *Gender, Bureaucracy, and Democracy: Careers and Opportunity in the Public Sector*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood.
- Stewart, Joseph Jr.; England, Robert E.; and Meier, Kenneth J.  
1988 "Black Representation in Urban School Districts: From School Board to Office to Classroom." *Western Political Quarterly* 41:2:287-305.
- Stiehlm, Judith Hicks.  
1989 *Arms and the Enlisted Woman*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Thomas, Sue.  
1994 *How Women Legislate*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, Sue, and Wilcox, Clyde, eds.  
1998 *Women and Elective Office: Past, Present, & Future*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thompson, Frank J.  
1976 "Minority Groups in Public Bureaucracies: Are Passive and Active Representation Linked?" *Administration and Society* 8:2:201-26.
- U.S. Department of Defense.  
1996 *Women in Defense—DoD Leading the Way*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense.
- U.S. General Accounting Office.  
1995 *Equal Employment Opportunity: Women and Minority Representation at Interior, Agriculture, Navy, and State*. Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office.
- U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board.  
1994 *Working for America: An Update*. Washington, D.C.: Merit Systems Protection Board.
- U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM).  
2000 *Senior Executive Service: Demographics*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Personnel Management. Online. <http://www.opm.gov/ses/chart4.html>. Accessed 26 June 2000. Last modified May 11, 2000.
- Weber, Max.  
1946 *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, eds. and trans. London: Oxford University Press.
- Wildavsky, Aaron.  
1964 *The Politics of the Budgetary Process*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Witt, Linda; Paget, Karen M.; and Matthews, Glenna.  
1994 *Running as a Woman: Gender and Power in American Politics*. New York: Free Press.