MOBILITY FROM THE MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE: 1932 to 1962

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

John H. Reurink

1966

H — 344

21 — 012

MOBILITY FROM THE MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE: 1932 to 1962

John H. Reurink

A thesis presented as partial credit toward
the fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts

Michigan State University
College of Social Science
Department of Political Science
Fall Term, 1966

DEDICATION

To: Mary Lou

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Without the help and encouragement of various members of the staff of the Political Science Department of Michigan State University this thesis would have been an impossibility. I am deeply indebted to Dr. Robert Scigliano, who first stirred my interest in the legislative process, offered countless hours of encouragement to develop this study and graciously served as the chairman of the thesis committee. To Drs. Joseph Schlesinger and Alan Grimes my sincere thanks for serving on the thesis committee.

I wish to express my appreciation to my wife for her helpfulness in typing many working drafts and for her valuable constructive comments. To Jo Ann Mikolusky I express my appreciation for her work in typing the final manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The problem of political leadership has absorbed the time and energies of scholars for centuries. The ancient political philosophers like Plato asked: who ought to be the leaders?, while the modern political scientist asks: who are the leaders? The attempt to answer the question of who are the leaders of a society is all important for it reveals, in a large measure, the nature of that society and its governmental institutions. The answer reveals to what extent a society's government is representative of the people it governs.

One of the great American myths which has been perpetuated year after year, is that access to political office is relatively open to everyone, regardless of rank or position in the various strata of society. Donald R. Matthews has pointed out that

> The mythology of American politics is heavily influenced by a log-cabin to White House motif. Despite the growing evidence of class distinctions in American Society, the notion persists that politics is one area of life in which the American dream can come true.[1]

Much of the literature of political science which deals with the background of the American politician suggests that all citizens do not have equal access to political office. Many political scientists are agreed that the collective background of the American politician as it regards occupation and education is far above that of the average population of the various states. For example, Matthews has written that

---

[1]Donald R. Matthews, The Social Backgrounds of Political Decision-Makers, (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1954), p. 23.

> All of the facts presented.....suggest that the log-cabin to White House myth is rather far from the truth. For the most part political decision-makers are far from common men in either their origins or their achievements. This conclusion is greatly strengthened by the facts about their occupational backgrounds.[2]

Students of the United States Congress have long been aware of the fact that its members are far from representative of the constituencies which they represent in terms of their occupational and social backgrounds. Albert P. Blaustein and Charles O. Porter have stated that

> Studies of the occupational background of members of the Seventy-first to Seventy-fifth Congress showed that the proportion of lawyers in the Senate during this period ranged from 61 to 75 per cent and in the House from 56 to 65 per cent. These percentages are probably representative of the make-up of Congress since then and for many years before.[3]

Joseph Schlesinger has examined the relationship between the occupation of attorney to political survival and found that there "is a relation between the length of a man's career in politics and the likelihood that he was a lawyer."[4]

---

[2]Matthews, op. cit., p. 28.

[3]Albert P. Blaustein and Charles O. Porter, The American Lawyer, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), p. 97.

[4]Joseph A. Schlesinger, "Lawyers and Politics: A Clarified View," Midwest Journal of Political Science, I (May, 1957), p. 29.

Matthews has pointed out that

> The legal profession comprises about 0.1 per cent of the American labor force, and yet about half of the United States senators were lawyers. No other occupational group even approaches the lawyer's record.[5]

Many political scientists are now convinced that the policies initiated since the great depression, e.g., Social Security and the agricultural subsidy program, have had little impact in opening up avenues of public office for the average citizen. Charles S. Hyneman has stated that

> Those interested in speculating on the likelihood that propertyless people will in the immediate future pave their way to power by conquest of state legislative positions will be interested to learn that the New Deal overturn seems to have worked no appreciable advantage to the propertyless worker, unemployed class so far as possession of legislative seats is concerned.[6]

A similar controversy stirs today among economic analysts who contend that there has been a genuine redistribution of wealth over the past thirty years and those who contend that governmental policies have done very little in terms of redistributing the total national income among the various classes of society. For example, Gabriel Kolko has posited the thesis that

---

[5]Donald R. Matthews, U.S. Senators and Their World, (New York: Random House, 1960), p. 33.

[6]Charles S. Hyneman, "Who Makes Our Laws" Political Science Quarterly, LV (December, 1940), pp. 574-575.

> A radically unequal distribution of income has been characteristic of the American social structure since at least 1910, and despite minor year-to-year fluctuations in the shares of the income-tenths, no significant trend toward income equalization has appeared.[7]

If the social policies of the New Deal have failed to initiate a redistribution of national income, it follows that it is very likely that little or no change has occurred which would make political offices more available to the common man.

Although there have been studies which have compared the occupational and educational backgrounds of legislators with those of the general population, very few have made a comparison of the background of the legislators who seeks to move up the political ladder with the background of his peer group. David Apter has stated that

> Assuming that no one is ever truly satisfied with the system of social stratification other than conservatives, we find that the basic motive of politics then is a striving motive to expand mobility opportunities, either for some special group or for large segments of the society.[8]

Mobility according to David Apter is the very essence of the political system. The political aspirations of the participants in the governmental process make the process sensitive to the needs and the desires of the electorate.

---

[7]Gabriel Kolko, Wealth and Power in America, (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1962), p. 13.

[8]David E. Apter, "A Comparative Method for the Study of Politics," American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (November, 1958), p. 221.

Although there has been much speculation about the mobility opportunities in political life there has been very little actual scientific work done. A notable exception to this generalization is a study by Schlesinger.[9] Schlesinger examined the prior political experience of the governors of the various states between 1870 and 1952. A principal finding of the Schlesinger study was that the legislature is becoming increasingly less important as a stepping stone to the Governor's chair. Schlesinger has written that

> In the period since 1870, it is clear that the legislature has become less important as a source for governors. From a high of sixty-five per cent in the 1870's the number of governors with legislative experience had dropped to a low of 37 per cent in the 1930's. At the beginning of the time span one out of three governors came directly from the legislature. By the 1940's this was true of only one in eight.[10]

This thesis is a study of the social backgrounds and political mobility of members of the Michigan House of Representatives and Senate. It covers the period between 1932 and 1962, and it seeks to ascertain trends in social background and political mobility that occurred during this thirty-year period.

The study has two major purposes. First, it will present information on the social backgrounds of Michigan's legislators as a method of evaluating the representative character of the legislature of this state. This means, of course, that it will compare

---

[9]Joseph A. Schlesinger, How They Became Governor (East Lansing, Michigan: Governmental Research Bureau, Michigan State University, 1957).

[10]Schlesinger, op. cit., p. 51.

the backgrounds of legislators with those of the general population of Michigan. I hope to be able to answer the following questions about Michigan legislators during this period of time: How well educated were they? How much political experience did they have before entering the legislature, and what kinds and what type of occupation? In fulfilling this purpose, I am heeding O. Douglas Weeks' plea that biographical studies "should be made of legislators and more data collected on their educational qualifications, occupations, and outside connections."[11]

In the second place, this study is interested in the movement of Michigan legislators to higher political office (including movement from the Michigan House to the Michigan Senate). I shall seek answers to the following questions: What kinds of legislators, measured in terms of education, occupation, and previous political experience seek to move on to higher office? To what offices do their aspirations run? How successful are they? What kinds of legislators tend to succeed? To fail?

By mobility I mean an attempt on the part of a state legislator to move on to higher elected office. This attempt can lead to three results, each of which will be separately considered in the study: failure to get the nomination; success in getting the nomination but failure to get elected; and success in getting elected. I shall limit my search to the following higher offices: Governor,

---

[11] O. Douglas Weeks, Research in American State Legislative Process, (Ann Arbor, Michigan: J. W. Edwards, 1947), p. 34.

Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Attorney General, Auditor General, State Treasurer, U.S. Representative, U.S. Senator and in the case of Michigan representatives, Michigan senators. I shall examine both the primary and general elections to these offices from 1932 to 1962.

In addition, it is hoped that this study will give some indication as to the validity of the idea that the state legislature is a training ground for higher elected political office.

The only feasible source for a study of this nature is the historical records. The biographical data contained in the historical records are often very sketchy. However, it would have been impossible to interview all state legislators over the period of this study as many are now deceased and it would have been an insurmountable task to try to trace down those who are still alive. The occupations, education, and previous political experience of the legislators were taken from the biographical sketches found in the Michigan Manual. The same document contained the official vote canvasses which were used to determine legislative mobility.

CHAPTER II

PROFILES OF THE LEGISLATURE AND GENERAL POPULATION

This chapter attempts to determine to what extent there were similarities in the backgrounds of the general population of Michigan and the members of the Michigan legislature from 1932 to 1962 as measured by two variables. The two variables used in this comparison are level of educational attainment and occupation. This chapter also compares the Michigan House of Representatives and Senate from 1932 to 1962 adding one other variable, that of political experience as measured by previous political offices held. The chapter concludes with an overall summary of differences between the general population and the legislature and the differences between the two chambers.

Educational Background: Legislature and General Population

The general population of Michigan over the past three decades has become steadily more educated. The United States Census figures show that in 1940 only a little more than nine per cent of the population had gone beyond the high school level in educational attainment. In 1950 over twelve per cent of the population had gone beyond the high school level and in 1960 almost fifteen per cent had gone beyond that level. Although these statistics show a real advancement on the part of the general population in terms of educational attainment, this trend seems rather minimal when compared with the trend of educational attainment of the members of the Michigan legislature between 1932 and 1962.

Slightly over fifty per cent of the membership of the legislature elected to that office between 1932 and 1940 had gone beyond the high school level in their educational attainment. Between 1942 and 1950 nearly fifty-eight per cent of the legislative members had an educational achievement beyond the high school level, and between 1951 and 1962 nearly seventy-four per cent of the legislative members had gone beyond high school. (See Table I).

Table I

Educational Background:
Legislature and General Population by Ten Year Periods

	Legislature 1932-40	General Population 1940	Legislature 1942-50	General Population 1950	Legislature 1951-62	General Population 1960
Grades 1-12	40.0	90.6	35.1	87.6	18.4	85.1
College	29.8	-	33.0	-	46.1	-
Graduate School	20.3	9.4	24.6	12.4	27.7	14.9
Not Reported	9.9	-	7.3	-	7.8	-
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

General Population figures were taken from United States Census.

Thus there was during each ten-year sub-period of the period under study a great disparity between the general population and the Michigan legislature as regards educational background. A possible explanation of the fact that the legislature is relatively better educated than the general population relates to the high value which most people place upon education. Since most people have a desire to see their children achieve the goal of a higher education, they may tend to choose representatives who have attained a high level

of education. For these voters, the candidate with a high level of education is somewhat symbolic of the success that they desire their children to achieve. Another possibly more plausible explanation might be that most persons without some higher education are reluctant to step forward as candidates for legislative office.

Educational Background: Senate and House

The House and Senate were remarkably similar in their educational levels between 1932 and 1962 and yet there are several interesting differences between the two chambers. The Senate during this period had approximately ten per cent more members who had attained to some form of graduate school training, usually law school, than did the House of Representatives. About sixty per cent of the House members had gone beyond the high school level, thirty-seven per cent had completed their formal education at the college level, and twenty-three per cent had gone on to a graduate school. In the Senate, the pattern is somewhat different as a little over sixty-five per cent of the members had gone beyond the high school level, nearly thirty-two per cent completed their education at the college level while nearly thirty-four per cent had some graduate training. (See Table II).

Table II

Educational Background:
Senate and House

	Senate		House	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Grades 1-12	37	21.7	181	34.1
College	54	31.8	198	37.3
Graduate School	57	33.6	122	23.0
Not Reported	22	12.9	30	5.6
Total	170	100.0	531	100.0

Several conclusions can be drawn from a comparison of the educational profile of the general population and the legislature from 1932 to 1962 and from a comparison of the profiles of the House and Senate. First, the members of the legislature between 1932 and 1962 were significantly more educated than the members of the general population for that same time period. It has been suggested that higher educational attainment is perceived by the voter and legislative candidates as being a positive qualification for legislative office. Second, the higher educational attainment of State Senators as compared with State Representatives during the period under study seems to indicate that these jobs are perceived as being sufficiently different to warrant different types of individuals for them.

Occupational Background: Legislature and General Population

A comparison of occupational backgrounds of the general population and the Michigan legislature indicates that in regards to certain occupations the composition of the legislature has not changed

as fast as the composition of the general population and in regards to other occupations the composition of the legislature has changed faster than that of the general population. If the percentage differences in the occupational backgrounds of the legislature and general population are broken down over ten year periods between 1932 and 1962, several interesting facts are revealed.

First, the legislature had a greater percentage of its members engaged in agriculture between 1932 and 1962 than did the general population. The over-representation of agriculture in the legislature was greater from 1952 to 1962 than during either of the two prior ten-year periods studied. Although both the general population and the legislature showed a downward trend in the percentage of persons engaged in agriculture over the thirty-year period studied, over-representation of agriculture in the legislature has not decreased, but in fact has shown a significant increase. Whereas the spread between the percentage of persons engaged in agriculture in the general population and in the legislature was only six points in the 1932-40 period, it was over seven points in the 1942-50 period and nearly nine points in the 1952-62 period.

Second, the legislature had a greater percentage of its members engaged in business than did the general population between 1932 and 1962. The general population had a slight increase in the percentage of members engaged in business between 1940 and 1950, and between 1950 and 1960, while the legislature showed a slight decline in the percentage

of members engaged in business between each of the ten-year periods. However, there was little significant change in the over-representation of business in the legislature from 1932 to 1962, as the percentage difference between the legislature and the general population ranged between twelve and fifteen percentage points.

Third, between 1932 and 1962 the legislature regularily had a greater proportion of its members in the professions than did the general population. Representation of the professions in the legislature increased at a greater rate than did representation in the general population. Between 1952 and 1962 over-representation from the professional occupations increased at a greater rate than during any of the two prior ten year periods under study. In both the legislature and the general population the percentage of persons engaged in the professions increased significantly over the thirty year period studied.

Fourth, the legislature between 1932 and 1962 had on a percentage basis fewer of its members engaged in occupations classified as common labor than did the general population although this was by far the largest occupational grouping. Under-representation of labor in the Michigan population between 1932 and 1962 in the state legislature decreased by only two percentage points. Between 1932 and 1962 the general population showed very little significant change in the percentage of persons engaged in labor. The pattern established in the legislature is not clear but is in the direction of

increased representation of labor. Trends established over the three ten year periods do not indicate that under-representation will decrease in the near future. (See Table III).

Fifth, trends of occupational representation established in the state legislature during the three ten year periods studied, indicate that those occupations over-represented in the legislature are likely to remain over-represented in the near future. In other words, the legislature is not, nor has been, occupationally representative of the general population during the past thirty years.

Table III

Occupational Background:
Legislature and General Population by Ten Year Periods

	Legislature 1932-40	General Population 1940	Legislature 1942-50	General Population 1950	Legislature 1951-62	General Population 1960
Agriculture	17.6	11.6	13.7	6.5	11.8	3.1
Business	36.7	21.4	36.1	22.5	35.6	23.4
Labor	3.6	58.2	7.1	61.3	5.7	57.7
Professions	36.4	7.8	37.8	8.4	42.0	11.5
Not Reported	5.7	1.0	5.3	1.3	4.9	4.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

General Population figures were taken from 1940, 1950 and 1960 census. All figures are shown as percentages.

---

[12]The following are typical of the occupations included under the heading of business: banker, store-owner, real estate broker, corporation executive, salesman, etc. Under the heading of professional, the following occupations are typical: educator, engineer, journalist, lawyer, photographer, physician, and minister.

The figures in Table III indicate that, as Michigan has become increasingly urbanized over the thirty year period from 1932 to 1962, occupations which have shown an increase in legislative representation are urban-oriented occupations. The exception to the above generalization is farmers. However, the great American dream of equal access to public office seems nearly as far from reality today as it did in 1932. If occupation is used as a criterion by which representation can be measured one would be forced to conclude that the Michigan legislature was not representative of the general population in 1932 and that nothing has happened to change that profile since 1932. Between 1930 and 1940 over fifty-eight per cent of the general population of Michigan were laborers. Representation in the legislature from this occupation between 1932 and 1940 measured just over three and one half per cent. Between 1941 and 1950 labor representation increased to over seven per cent of the legislature while over sixty per cent of the general population was engaged in this occupation. Although the occupation showed an increase in the legislature this increase was partially off-set by a slight increase in the percentage of people in the general population engaged in the occupation.

Occupational Background: Senate and House

When the occupational structures of the two Houses of the legislature are compared, remarkable similarities are revealed. The House and Senate had almost identical percentages of members engaged in

agriculture and business. But there were a couple significant differences. The Senate had a much greater percentage of its members engaged in the professions, while the House had nearly twice the percentage of its members from the ranks of labor. The twelve point difference between the House and Senate in the percentage of members engaged in the professions is accounted for by the much greater proportion of lawyers in the Senate than in the House.

Table IV

Occupational Background:
Senate and House

	Senate		House	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agricultural	23	13.6	80	15.1
Business	60	35.1	190	35.8
Labor	9	5.4	49	9.2
Professional	74	43.4	165	31.1
Not Reported	4	2.4	47	8.8
Total	170	100.0	531	100.0
Attorneys*	50	29.4	94	17.6

*Included in Professional category.

During the period between 1932 and 1962 the House had a little over seventeen per cent of its membership engaged in the legal profession while the Senate had a little over twenty-nine per cent of its membership engaged in the legal profession. An explanation of this difference between the House and Senate would have to take into consideration the Schlesinger hypothesis that the longer a man is a participant in the political arena the more likely he is to be a

lawyer.[13] Over twenty per cent of the membership of the State Senate had served previously in the State House of Representatives. (See Table V). The above fact seems to indicate that the members of the House of Representatives have a tendency to view Senate seats as more prestigious than those which they occupy, although for all intents and purposes the qualifications, powers, and duties are relatively the same as those of the House except for the disbursement of those powers among 110 members in comparison to 32 members.

Political Background: Senate and House

An examination of the previous political experience of members of the House and Senate reveals some very interesting differences in the types of previous political offices held by the members of the two chambers.

Members of the Senate seemed to come from what appear to be the more prestigious local political offices. On a percentage basis, the Senate had twice as many former mayors, three times as many prosecuting attorneys, three times as many judges as the House of Representatives. As has been noted earlier, thirty-five, or over twenty per cent, of the Senate members had served in the House of Representatives. At the same time no State Senator has moved over to the House of Representatives.

---

[13]Joseph A. Schlesinger, "Lawyers and Politics: A Clarified View," Midwest Journal of Political Science, I (May, 1957), p. 29.

Table V

Political Background:
Senate and House

	Senate		House	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Township-County Supervisor	16	9.4	95	17.9
Village or City Council	9	5.3	37	7.0
Mayor	10	5.9	17	3.2
Prosecuting Attorney	9	5.3	7	1.3
Justice of the Peace	2	1.2	16	3.0
City-County-Township Clerk	1	.6	33	6.2
Judge	4	2.4	4	.8
House of Representatives	35	20.6	-	-
No Prior Experience	84	49.4	322	60.6
Total	170	100.0	531	100.0

Overall previous political experience was much greater in the Senate than in the House of Representatives. Only a little over thirty-nine per cent of the members of the House had any previous political experience, while slightly over forty-nine per cent of the members of the Senate had previous political experience.

The House of Representatives had a greater percentage of members who had experience as township and county supervisors, local council members, and as city, county, and township clerks than did the Senate.

Looking at previous political office as an indication as to the type of difference in membership between the House and Senate one fact seems to stand out. The average Senate member is significantly different from the average House member in terms of previous political offices from which he has advanced.

CHAPTER III

PROFILES OF THE MOBILE AND NON-MOBILE LEGISLATOR

This chapter examines certain aspects of mobility from the Michigan Legislature between 1932 and 1962. The chapter will deal with the questions of how many of the members of the legislature aspired to mobility? to what offices? to what extent were they successful in achieving the offices they sought? The social backgrounds of the mobility-seeking members will be measured against the backgrounds of the non-mobile legislators between 1932 and 1962. The small number of mobility-seeking legislative members will limit the comparisons of the social backgrounds of the mobility-seeking members and the non-mobile legislators to the entire thirty year period studied. Hopefully this will give more significance to the numbers and percentages involved. The chapter will first examine the social backgrounds of the legislators successful in moving from the legislature to the offices selected for this study. In addition, the backgrounds of legislators who were unsuccessful in their attempt to gain mobility from the legislature will be compared with the legislative members who did not seek higher political office. In examining the backgrounds of the legislators who were unsuccessful in their attempt at mobility an examination will be made of the differences in the social backgrounds of candidates unsuccessful in the primary, and those who were successful in the primary but who were defeated in the general election. This type of analysis is only pertinent for attempted mobility to congressional and state senatorial office as the numbers involved in the attempt for state-wide

office are so small as to be insignificant. The backgrounds of House members who sought to move from the House to the Senate will also be studied and compared with the backgrounds of House members who did not seek to move on to the state Senate.

Legislators Successful in Attempted Mobility

Successful mobility from the House to the Senate and from the entire legislature to the other political offices chosen for this study was limited. Of the seven hundred and one legislators studied over the period of time between 1932 and 1962, only fifty-four legislators were able to move successfully forward to the offices selected for this study.

Twelve were successful in capturing a state-wide political office, only six were successful in capturing a congressional seat, and thirty-six were successful in moving from the state House of Representatives to the state Senate. Almost fifty per cent of all legislative mobility occurred in the ten year period between 1952 and 1962. (See Table VI).

Table VI

Legislators Successful in Attempted Mobility by Ten Year Periods

	1932-1940		1941-1950		1951-1962		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
State-wide	4	28.6	2	14.3	6	23.1	12	22.2
Congressional	-	-	1	7.1	5	19.2	6	11.1
State Senatorial	10	71.4	11	78.6	15	57.7	36	66.7
Total	14	100.0	14	100.0	26	100.0	54	100.0

Occupational Background: Mobile Legislators

The occupational backgrounds of mobile legislators were significantly different from the backgrounds of non-mobile legislative members. Two occupational groupings showed a real significance when the two groups of legislative members were compared. Over the entire thirty-year period studied none of the legislators who were mobile came from an occupation which could be classified as labor, whereas nine per cent of the non-mobile legislators had an occupational background classified as common labor. Over forty-eight per cent of the successfully mobile legislators came from a professional occupation while only thirty-three per cent of the non-mobile legislative members came from a professional occupation. Over thirty-five per cent of the mobile legislators were lawyers, and of those legislators who were non-mobile only nineteen per cent were lawyers. (See Table VII).

Table VII

Occupational Background:
Mobile Legislators and Non-Mobile Legislators

	Mobile Legislators		Non-Mobile Legislators	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agriculture	7	13.0	96	14.8
Business	20	37.0	230	35.5
Labor	-	-	58	9.0
Professional	26	48.1	213	33.0
Not Reported	1	1.9	50	7.7
Total	54	100.0	647	100.0
Lawyers	19	35.2	125	19.3

Educational Background: Mobile Legislators

The educational backgrounds of successfully mobile legislators were superior to those of non-mobile legislators. More of the mobile legislators had attended college and graduate school than had the non-mobile members. Table VIII shows the difference in educational experience of the two groups of legislators. Over sixty-eight per cent of the mobile legislators had some form of college or graduate school training as compared to sixty per cent of the non-mobile legislators.

Table VIII

Educational Background:
Mobile Legislators and Non-Mobile Legislators

	Mobile Legislators		Non-Mobile Legislators	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Grades 1-12	16	29.6	202	31.2
College	16	29.6	236	36.5
Graduate School	21	38.9	158	24.4
Not Reported	1	1.9	51	7.9
Total	54	100.0	647	100.0

The significant fact was that over fourteen per cent more of the mobile legislators had graduate school training than did non-mobile legislators. A larger percentage of non-mobile legislators had finished their formal education at the high school level than was true of the mobile legislators. Lack of formal education at the college level probably discouraged many legislators from attempting to move on to a higher political office. (See Table VIII).

Prior Political Experience: Mobile Legislators

Non-mobile legislators had more political experience before entering the legislature than did mobile legislators. Over sixty-six per cent of the mobile legislators had no political experience before entering the legislature as compared to slightly over fifty-seven per cent of the non-mobile legislators. In only two of the political offices examined did the mobile legislators have more political experience before entering the legislature than non-mobile legislators. (See Table IX).

Table IX

Prior Political Experience:
Mobile Legislators and Non-Mobile Legislators

	Mobile Legislators		Non-Mobile Legislators	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Township-County Supervisor	5	9.3	106	16.3
Village or City Council	3	5.6	43	6.6
Mayor	2	3.7	25	3.9
Prosecuting Attorney	2	3.7	14	2.3
Justice of the Peace	1	1.8	17	2.6
City-County-Township Clerk	2	3.7	32	4.9
Judge	-	-	8	1.3
State Representative	3	5.6	33	5.0
No Prior Experience	36	66.6	369	57.1
Total	54	100.0	647	100.0

Legislators Unsuccessful in Attempted Mobility

One hundred and fifty-four members of the legislature attempted to move from the legislature to the political offices selected for this

study. Of that number exactly one hundred were unsuccessful. In round terms it is safe to say that for every legislator who is successful in gaining higher political office at least two will fail in their attempt. This portion of the study concerns itself with the legislator who was unsuccessful in his attempt to move on to a higher political office. It attempts to answer the question of what distinguishes in terms of social background the unsuccessfully mobile legislators from legislators who are successfully mobile and from their colleagues in the legislature who made no active attempt to move on to a higher political office. Unsuccessful mobility was to a great extent evenly distributed over the ten year periods from 1932 to 1962. (See Table X).

Table X

Legislators Unsuccessful in Attempted Mobility by Ten Year Periods

	1932-1940		1941-1950		1951-1962		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
State-wide	12	30.8	7	21.9	9	31.0	28	28.0
Congressional	17	43.6	10	31.3	9	31.0	36	36.0
State Senatorial	10	25.6	15	46.8	11	38.0	36	36.0
Total	39	100.0	32	100.0	29	100.0	100	100.0

Occupational Background: Non-Mobile Legislators

Several interesting differences are revealed when the occupational backgrounds of the unsuccessful aspiring legislators are compared with the occupational backgrounds of legislative members who made no attempt to move on to a higher political office. In the two groups the percentage

of lawyers is approximately the same. A greater percentage of legislators who sought higher office unsuccessfully came from the ranks of business and the professional occupations than was the case of the legislators who had made no active attempt to capture higher political office. Four per cent of the unsuccessful aspirants for higher political office came from the ranks of what can be classified as labor while nine per cent of the non-aspiring legislators came from the ranks of labor. Nineteen per cent of the unsuccessful aspiring legislators and non-aspiring legislators were lawyers. The low percentage of lawyers in both of these groups is highly significant when considered with the fact that over thirty-five per cent of the successfully mobile legislators were lawyers. (See Table XI).

Table XI

Occupational Background:
Non-Mobile Legislators and Non-Aspiring Legislators

	Aspiring		Non-Aspiring	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agriculture	12	12.0	84	15.4
Business	42	42.0	188	34.3
Labor	4	4.0	54	9.9
Professional	39	39.0	174	31.8
Not Reported	3	3.0	47	8.6
Total	100	100.0	54	100.0
Lawyers	19	19.0	106	19.3

Educational Background: Non-Mobile Legislators

The educational backgrounds of legislators who aspired unsuccessfully to higher political office were somewhat similar to the educational backgrounds of legislators who showed no aspirations for higher political office. Approximately thirty-six per cent of the legislative members aspiring unsuccessfully to higher political office had finished their formal education at the high school level or below, while only thirty per cent of the non-aspiring legislators had completed their formal education at that level. The fact that the average legislator who is unsuccessful in his attempt to move from the state legislature is less educated than the legislator who does not aspire to mobility may indicate that the less education a legislator has the more likely he is to perceive mobility opportunities that are non-existent. Table XII reveals that outside of the above fact there are no major differences in the educational backgrounds of the two groups.

Table XII

Educational Background:
Non-Mobile Legislators and Non-Aspiring Legislators

	Non-Mobile Legislators		Non-Aspiring Legislators	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Grades 1-12	36	36.0	166	30.3
College	38	38.0	198	36.2
Graduate School	24	24.0	134	24.5
Not Reported	2	2.0	49	9.0
Total	100	100.0	547	100.0

In both the unsuccessful mobility-seeking classification and the non-aspiring classification it is significant to note that the percentage of persons attaining some form of graduate school training is much lower than in the legislative group that was successful in attaining a higher political office.

Prior Political Experience: Non-Mobile Legislators

Legislators who aspired unsuccessfully to a higher political office had more political experience than the legislators who were successful in gaining higher political office. However, the unsuccessful legislators aspiring to higher political office had less political experience before entering the legislature than did the non-aspiring legislators. Outside of the above similarity the two groups are quite divergent in their prior political experience. (See Table XIII).

Table XIII

Prior Political Experience:
Non-Mobile Legislators and Non-Aspiring Legislators

	Non-Mobile Legislators		Non-Aspiring Legislators	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Township-County Supervisor	16	16.0	90	16.4
Village or City Council	3	3.0	40	7.3
Mayor	6	6.0	19	3.5
Prosecuting Attorney	4	4.0	10	1.8
Justice of the Peace	-	-	17	3.1
City-County-Township Clerk	6	6.0	26	4.8
Judge	-	-	8	1.5
State Representative	4	4.0	28	5.1
No Prior Experience	61	61.0	309	56.5
Total	100	100.0	547	100.0

Differences in Successful Mobility by Political Office Sought

House members who sought to move to the State Senate were more successful in their attempts than were the other members of the legislature in their attempts to move to other political offices. Seventy-two House members sought to move to the Senate, of those seventy-two a total of thirty-six were successful in their attempt. Or one of every two House members who sought to move on to the Senate were successful in their attempt.

Approximately one of four legislative members who sought state-wide office was successful. Over the thirty year period studied only one legislative member was successful in capturing the office of Governor, five were successful in capturing the office of Lieutenant Governor, no legislative members were successful in capturing the offices of United States Senator and State Attorney General. The offices of Auditor General, Secretary of State and State Treasurer were each captured twice by former legislators.

Forty-two legislators sought to move from the legislature to a congressional seat. Six legislators were successful in achieving their goal which made the chances of a legislative member one in seven of moving to a congressional seat, once he had made the decision to enter the primary election.

Differences in Social Background of Mobile Legislators by Office Gained

Occupational Background. A comparison of the occupational backgrounds of successfully mobile legislators by the offices which they

were successful in capturing reveals several interesting facts. Table XIV reveals that the occupational backgrounds of the legislators successful in achieving state-wide office were quite different from the occupational backgrounds of those who were successful in achieving congressional and state senatorial seats. The occupational backgrounds of legislators achieving a state-wide office differed from the occupational backgrounds of non-mobile legislative members, while the occupational backgrounds of legislative members successful in capturing a congressional office were somewhat similar to the occupational backgrounds of the non-mobile legislators. The occupational backgrounds of the House members who were successful in capturing a Senate seat were more similar to the occupational backgrounds of non-mobile legislators than to the occupational backgrounds of legislators successfully mobile to the other political offices chosen for this study.

Table XIV

Occupational Background:
Mobile Legislators by Office

	State-wide		Congressional		State Senate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agriculture	-	-	1	16.7	6	16.7
Business	3	25	2	33.3	15	41.7
Labor	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional	9	75	3	50.0	14	38.8
Not Reported	-	-	-	-	1	2.8
Total	12	100	6	100.0	36	100.0
Lawyers	6	50	3	50.0	10	27.8

In all three of the offices that legislators were successful in capturing not one was captured by a legislator who had an occupational background which could be classified as common labor. None of the legislators successful in capturing a state-wide political office came from agricultural occupations. Over sixteen per cent of the legislative members successful in capturing congressional offices and state senatorial offices came from the ranks of agriculture.

Seventy-five per cent of the legislators successful in gaining a state-wide political office came from the ranks of the professional occupations. Fifty per cent of the legislators capturing a congressional seat came from a professional occupation. Fifty per cent of the legislators capturing state-wide and congressional offices were lawyers. Over thirty-eight per cent of the House members who moved on to the Senate came from professional occupations. Twenty-seven per cent of the House members successful in moving to the Senate were lawyers. Eleven per cent of the House members successful in moving to the Senate had a professional occupation other than that of attorney.

Educational Background. The legislative members who were mobile to the state-wide political offices had a higher level of education than did non-mobile legislators or the legislators who were successful in capturing congressional and state senatorial offices. Seventy-five per cent of those successful in capturing a state-wide office had at least some form of college education. Only sixty-six per cent of those

successful in gaining a congressional seat or a state senatorial seat had some form of college education. The difference here is largely attributable to the high percentage of lawyers in the state legislature who were successful in capturing a state-wide office.

Table XV

Educational Background:
Mobile Legislators by Office

	State-wide		Congressional		State Senate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Grades 1-12	3	25.0	2	33.3	11	30.6
College	3	25.0	1	16.7	12	33.3
Graduate School	6	50.0	3	50.0	12	33.3
Not Reported	-	-	-	-	1	2.8
Total	12	100.0	6	100.0	36	100.0

The differences between the educational background of House members successful in gaining a state Senate seat and legislators gaining a congressional seat were very small as can be seen by an examination of Table XV.

Prior Political Experience. The legislative members who were successful in capturing state-wide and congressional offices had more prior political experience than did the House members who were successful in capturing state senatorial seats. Table XVI shows the small percentage of House members who had previous political experience before entering the House and moving on to a state Senate seat.

Table XVI

Prior Political Experience:
Mobile Legislators by Office

	State-wide		Congressional		State Senate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Township-County Supervisor	1	8.3	1	16.7	3	8.3
Village-City Council	1	8.3	-	-	2	5.6
Mayor	-	-	-	-	2	5.6
Prosecuting Attorney	1	8.3	-	-	1	2.8
Justice of the Peace	-	-	-	-	1	2.8
City-County-Township Clerk	1	8.3	1	6.7	-	-
Judge	-	-	-	-	-	-
State Representative	2	16.7	1	16.7	-	-
No Prior Experience	6	50.0	3	50.0	27	75.0
Total	12	100.0	6	100.0	36	100.0

The prior political experience of the legislative members successful in moving to a higher political office reveals very little from which any generalization can be made.

Differences in Social Background: Non-Mobile Legislators by Office Sought

Occupational Background. The occupational backgrounds of the unsuccessful legislative members who sought to move on to a higher political office were significantly different when compared by the office sought. The interesting difference is in the agricultural and professional occupational categories. On a percentage basis more legislators who sought state-wide office unsuccessfully came from the professional occupations and fewer from an agricultural background than was true of the other offices.

A greater percentage of legislators who were unsuccessful in their attempt to gain a congressional seat were engaged in an agricultural occupation than was true of legislators who were unsuccessful in a bid for a state-wide political office. Fewer of the unsuccessful legislators who sought congressional office had been engaged in a professional occupation than was true of legislators who sought state-wide office.

House members who sought to move to a senate seat and were unsuccessful had an occupational background which closely resembled that of the legislature between 1932 and 1962. In the above category the professional occupation had on a percentage basis a smaller representation than did the group of legislators seeking state-wide and congressional seats unsuccessfully. Those seeking a state senate seat had a very high percentage of persons engaged in the business occupations.

Of real significance is the fact that of all the offices sought by legislative members the percengage of lawyers who were unsuccessful decreases from over thirty-two percent for state-wide office, to slightly over sixteen and one half per cent for a congressional seat, and down to just over eleven per cent for House members seeking a senate seat. (See Table XVII).

Table XVII

Occupational Background:
Non-Mobile Legislators by Office

	State-wide		Congressional		State Senate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agriculture	2	1.1	4	11.1	6	16.6
Business	13	46.4	13	36.1	16	44.5
Labor	-	-	3	8.3	1	2.8
Professional	12	42.9	14	38.9	13	36.1
Not Reported	1	3.6	2	5.6	-	-
Total	28	100.0	36	100.0	36	100.0
Lawyers	9	32.1	6	16.6	4	11.1

Educational Background. In looking at the educational backgrounds of legislative members who sought political mobility unsuccessfully no major difference shows up across the offices sought. Fifty per cent of the legislators seeking a congressional seat unsuccessfully had completed their education at the college level. In comparison to the other offices sought, legislators who sought a congressional seat, had a very small percentage of members who had graduate school training. Table XVIII shows that a very large percentage of legislative members who sought state-wide political offices, and House members who sought a senate seat had completed their formal education at the high school level.

Table XVIII

Educational Background:
Non-Mobile Legislators by Office

	State-wide		Congressional		State Senate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Grades 1-12	10	37.1	12	33.3	14	38.9
College	8	29.6	18	50.0	12	33.3
Graduate School	8	29.6	6	16.7	9	25.0
Not Reported	1	3.7	-	-	1	2.8
Total	28	100.0	36	100.0	36	100.0

The high percentage of unsuccessful legislative members, who sought state-wide and senatorial seats, and who had a low level of educational achievement suggests the fact that persons with a low educational level are unlikely to perceive the reality of a political situation.

Prior Political Experience. Legislative members who sought state-wide offices unsuccessfully had more previous political experience than those legislators who unsuccessfully sought congressional and state senatorial seats. Only slightly over ten and one half per cent of the legislators who ran unsuccessfully for state-wide political office had previous political experience as township or county supervisors. This is interesting when compared with the fact that almost fourteen per cent of those unsuccessful for a congressional office were former township and county supervisors. Twenty-two per cent of the House members seeking to move to the Senate had prior political experience as township and county supervisors. (See Table XIX).

Table XIX

Prior Political Experience:
Non-Mobile Legislators by Office

	State-wide		Congressional		State Senate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Township-County Supervisor	3	10.7	5	13.8	8	22.2
Village-City Council	-	-	3	8.3	-	-
Mayor	3	10.7	2	5.6	1	2.8
Prosecuting Attorney	3	10.7	1	2.8	-	-
Justice of the Peace	-	-	-	-	-	-
City-County-Township Clerk	1	3.6	2	5.6	3	8.3
Judge	-	-	-	-	-	-
State Representative	3	10.7	1	2.8	-	-
No Prior Experience	15	53.6	22	61.1	24	66.7
Total	28	100.0	36	100.0	36	100.0

Legislators Defeated in the Primary Election Seeking Congressional and State Senatorial Seats

Occupational Background. Generally legislators who sought congressional seats and were defeated in the primary election had occupational backgrounds that were quite dissimilar from the occupational backgrounds of their colleagues who did not choose to move on to a higher political office. What is extremely significant is the fact that of the House members, who sought congressional office and were defeated in the primary seeking a senate seat, only slightly over four per cent were lawyers. (See Table XX).

Table XX

Occupational Background:
Legislators Defeated in the Primary Election
Seeking Congressional and State Senatorial Seats

	Congressional Office		State Senate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agriculture	4	13.3	3	12.5
Business	8	26.7	12	50.0
Labor	3	10.0	-	-
Professional	13	43.3	9	38.5
Not Reported	2	6.7	-	-
Total	30	100.0	24	100.0
Lawyers	5	16.6	2	4.2

Educational Background. The educational background of House members seeking senate office and legislators seeking a congressional office was almost identical. Both groups had the same percentage of members who had completed their formal education at the high school or a lesser level, and both groups had the same percentage of members who had some form of college and graduate school training. Further, the educational background of the legislators defeated in the primary was not significantly different from the legislators who were successfully mobile to those offices. The percentage of House members having graduate school training and seeking a state senate office who were defeated in the primary was greater than the percentage of legislators having graduate school training and seeking congressional office who were also defeated in the primary. (See Table XXI).

Table XXI

Educational Background:
Legislators Defeated in the Primary Election
Seeking Congressional and State Senatorial Seats

	Congressional Office		State Senate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Grades 1-12	10	33.3	8	33.3
College	15	50.0	9	37.5
Graduate School	5	16.7	7	29.2
Not Reported	-	-	-	-
Total	30	100.0	24	100.0

Prior Political Experience. Ten per cent of the legislative members defeated in the primary election in their attempt to gain state-wide office had experience as a township or county supervisor. Another ten per cent had experience as former village or city council members. Just slightly over sixty per cent of the legislators who ran for a congressional seat and were defeated in the primary had no previous political experience.

Twenty-five per cent of the House members defeated in the primary election in their attempt to move from the House to Senate had previous political experience as township and county supervisors. Sixty-two and one half per cent of the House members defeated in the primary election had no previous political experience. (See Table XXII).

Table XXII

Prior Political Experience:
Legislators Defeated in the Primary Election
Seeking Congressional and State Senatorial Seats

	Congressional Office		State Senate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Township-County Supervisor	3	10.0	6	25.0
Village-City Council	3	10.0	-	-
Mayor	2	6.6	1	4.2
Prosecuting Attorney	1	3.3	-	-
Justice of the Peace	-	-	-	-
City-County-Township Clerk	2	6.6	2	8.3
Judge	-	-	-	-
State Representative	1	3.3	-	-
No Prior Experience	18	60.2	15	62.5
Total	30	100.0	24	100.0

Legislators Defeated in the General Election Seeking Congressional and State Senatorial Seats

A total of eighteen legislative members successful in a primary election to a congressional or state senatorial seat were defeated in the general election.

Occupational Background. The significant fact which shows up in Table XXIII is that of the House members seeking state senatorial office and legislators seeking congressional office, only slightly over sixteen and one half per cent were lawyers. Twenty-five per cent of the House members who were defeated in the general election in their attempt to move on to a senate seat came from an agricultural occupation. Over eighty-three per cent of the legislators defeated in the general election in attempting to move to a congressional seat came from the ranks of business.

Table XXIII

Occupational Background:
Legislators Defeated in the General Election
Seeking Congressional and State Senatorial Seats

	Congressional Office		State Senate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agriculture	-	-	3	25.0
Business	5	83.1	4	33.3
Labor	-	-	1	8.4
Professional	1	16.0	4	33.3
Not Reported	-	-	-	-
Total	6	100.0	12	100.0
Lawyers	1	16.7	2	16.7

Educational Background. Legislators who were defeated in the general election seeking a congressional seat had a higher formal educational attainment than did their colleagues who sought a state senate office. Sixty-six per cent of the legislative members seeking congressional office had some form of college or graduate school training as compared to their colleagues seeking state senate office who had forty-one per cent with college and graduate school training. Significantly, only fifty per cent of the House members seeking a senate seat defeated in the general election had completed their formal education at the high school level or below. (See Table XXIV).

Table XXIV

Educational Background:
Legislators Defeated in the General Election
Seeking Congressional and State Senatorial Seats

	Congressional Office		State Senate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Grades 1-12	2	33.3	6	50.0
College	3	50.0	3	25.0
Graduate School	1	16.7	2	16.7
Not Reported	-	-	1	8.3
Total	6	100.0	12	100.0

Prior Political Experience. Legislators defeated in the general election in an attempt to move to a congressional or state senatorial seat had a very limited amount of political experience before entering the legislature. Thirty-three per cent seeking congressional office had experience as township or county supervisors compared to only sixteen per cent of the House members seeking to move on to a senate seat. Sixty-six per cent of the legislative members seeking a congressional seat had no previous political experience while seventy-five per cent of the House members attempting to move to the Senate had no previous political experience. (See Table XXV).

Table XXV

Prior Political Experience:
Legislators Defeated in the General Election
Seeking Congressional and State Senatorial Seats

	Congressional Office		State Senate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Township-County Supervisor	2	33.3	2	16.6
Village-City Council	-	-	-	-
Mayor	-	-	-	-
Prosecuting Attorney	-	-	-	-
Justice of the Peace	-	-	-	-
City-County-Township Clerk	-	-	1	8.4
Judge	-	-	-	-
State Representative	-	-	-	-
No Prior Experience	4	66.7	9	75.0
Total	6	100.0	12	100.0

CHAPTER IV

THE MOBILE LEGISLATOR IN PERSPECTIVE

The chief purpose of this study has been to gain an insight of the social backgrounds of the mobile legislator and the legislator seeking mobility from the Michigan legislature between 1932 and 1962. Also an examination has been made of some of the social characteristics of the general population and the characteristics of the collective legislature between 1932 and 1962. One of the questions posed in chapter one of this thesis was to what extent is the Michigan legislature accessible to the average person? Or to put the question in other words was the Michigan legislator from 1932 to 1962 significantly different in his social background from the average man? The second question raised in the first chapter was whether the Michigan House of Representatives differed from the Michigan Senate? A third question raised was whether the Michigan legislature serves as a training ground for legislators moving up the political ladder? To what extent was experience in the Michigan House of Representatives and Senate a liability or an asset to the legislator who envisioned himself moving on to a state-wide or a congressional office?

Conclusions and Comparisons with Prior Research

The comparisons made in chapter two of this thesis of the social backgrounds of the Michigan legislature and the general population have shown that the Michigan legislator is significantly superior to the average citizen of the state in both educational attainment and in his placement within the occupational structure of society.

The facts revealed in chapter two of this thesis indicate that legislative office in the State of Michigan is not accessible to the average citizen. Nearly two-thirds of the members of the legislature had some form of college or graduate school training. The 1960 United States Census figures reveal that only fifteen per cent of Michigan's general population had some form of college education. Between 1952 and 1962 over seventy-three per cent of the legislative members had at least some form of college education or above.

Gabriel Kolko has stated that the distribution of income within the American society has been radically unequal since 1910[14] so too it is possible for the student of the Michigan legislature to state that since 1932 there has been an unequal distribution of legislative seats among the groups within the social structure of Michigan.

The findings of this thesis regarding the occupational structure of the Michigan legislature compare well with previous studies done on the occupational structure of state legislatures.

The Hyneman study[15] covering the period between 1925 and 1935 and dealing with thirteen lower chambers and twelve senates revealed

---

[14]Gabriel Kolko, Wealth and Power in America, (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1962), p. 13.

[15]Charles S. Hyneman, "Who Makes Our Laws," Political Science Quarterly, LV (December, 1940), pp. 556-581.

that twenty-eight per cent of all the members of these twenty-five legislative bodies were lawyers. For comparison, during the period between 1932 and 1962 the Michigan legislature had twenty-three and one half per cent of its members engaged in the legal profession. Twenty-one and one half per cent of the legislative members studied by Hyneman were engaged in an agricultural occupation which compared to approximately sixteen per cent of the members of the Michigan legislature engaged in a similar occupation. The fact that the occupational composition found in both of these studies is similar is remarkable considering the fact that the Hyneman figures are an average of several states including such divergent states as Mississippi and New York.

One of the principal findings of the Hyneman study is that working class persons are very unlikely to gain access to state legislative seats.[16] The findings of this thesis are very comparable to those of the Hyneman study. Only a very small percentage of the Michigan legislators could be identified as coming from an occupation which required a degree of manual labor.

Hyneman found between 1925 and 1935 that several upper chambers differed significantly in occupational structure from their counterpart lower chambers.[17] In several key states studied by Hyneman the Senate

---

[16]Hyneman, op. cit., p. 574-75.

[17]Ibid.

had a greater percentage of lawyers than did the lower chambers. Also the senates were shown to have a smaller percentage of persons engaged in an agricultural occupation than was true of the lower chambers.

The findings of this thesis reinforce the findings of the Hyneman study, as in Michigan, the Senate had a greater percentage of lawyers than did the House of Representatives. Also the Michigan Senate had a smaller percentage of members engaged in agricultural occupations than did the House of Representatives.

The information gained from this study correlates with the findings of Schlesinger in his study on the longevity of lawyers within the political process.[18] His principal finding was that the longer a man is engaged in the political process the more likely he is to be a lawyer. From data presented in this thesis it would be possible to infer that the Schlesinger findings are reinforced. Over thirty-five per cent of the members of the House of Representatives who were successful in moving to the state Senate were lawyers as compared to the fact that overall the legislature had only slightly over twenty-three per cent of its members engaged in the legal profession. Nineteen per cent of all non-mobile legislators were lawyers.

The findings of earlier studies previously cited tend to confirm the validity of the findings of this study regarding the social

---

[18]Joseph A. Schlesinger, "Lawyers and Politics: A Classified View," Midwest Journal of Political Science, I (May, 1957), p. 29.

characteristics of the Michigan legislature between 1932 and 1962. The findings of Schlesinger in his study of the political backgrounds of state governors tends to confirm at least a portion of this study dealing with mobility from the legislature.[19] He states that the legislature is becoming increasingly less important as a source of state executives.

This study has shown that during the period between 1932 and 1962 the Michigan legislature could in no sense be classified as a training ground for state executives. Over that time-span only one state legislator moved to the Governor's office and that only via the office of the Lieutenant Governor. Only eleven other men were successful in capturing the other state-wide offices. Six legislators were successful in capturing a congressional office. From the statistics presented in this thesis it is possible to say that the Michigan legislature is not a training ground for the political offices which constitute a much broader base than does a normal legislative district. The data presented indicated that the men who have political aspirations of a state-wide or congressional nature would in all probability fare as well in gaining a state-wide or congressional office if they by-passed the temptation to use the state legislature as a stepping stone to that office.

---

[19]Joseph A. Schlesinger, How They Became Governor, (East Michigan, Governmental Research Bureau, Michigan State University, 1952), p. 51.

State legislators who have aspirations to move from the legislature to a higher political office increase their chances for success greatly if they have a law degree.

Overall the data which have been presented shows that the average state legislator is far superior to the average citizen in educational achievement and occupational background. It also shows that the educational and occupational backgrounds of mobile legislators are superior to those of non-mobile legislators.

The data also showed that non-mobile legislators have more previous political experience before entering the legislature than do the politically mobile legislators. The study has also shown that prior political experience does not indicate major differences as regards mobile legislators and non-mobile legislators.

Proposals for Further Research

One of the prime areas of concern in the public mind is whether state legislators are compensated proportionately to their task and qualifications. Each time the subject of a legislative pay raise is brought up in the legislative sessions one of the justifications forwarded is that increased pay will result in the attraction of more competent and qualified men to the legislature. To what extent does a legislative pay increase attract different types of legislative members? Does a pay increase substantially change the educational, occupational and previous political experience composition of the legislature? Research dealing with the above problems

would do much to aid the legislature in making its decision and certainly it would relieve the minds of the general public could it be proven that each pay increase attracts a different and more qualified type of candidate to legislative office.

The second area of further research could be done in the area of constituency differences among the mobile legislators and non-mobile legislators. From the data presented in this study one would have to present as a tentative hypothesis the thought that the social characteristics of a legislative constituency would have some bearing on whether a legislator were mobile. The fact that legislators from an agricultural background were elected to congressional seats but failed election to the state-wide office would tend to confirm the idea that the pecularities of a constituency are factors in mobility. However, concrete facts are needed in this area and it would be an interesting and fruitful area of research.

A third possible area of further research lies in the social backgrounds of various members of legislative committees over a specified period of time. Would the social backgrounds of the committee members differ significantly from those of the mobile legislators? How would the social backgrounds of the committee members compare with the social backgrounds of committee chairmen and non-mobile legislators?

A fourth possible area for research would be the extent of political mobility from the recent Michigan Constitutional Convention.

A relevant question to be asked would be how did the mobility from the Michigan Constitutional Convention compare with mobility from the Michigan legislature, and what were the significant differences in the social backgrounds of the members of the two political bodies?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apter, David E. "A Comparative Method for the Study of Politics," American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (November, 1958), pp. 221-237.

Blaustein, Albert P. and Charles O. Porter. The American Lawyer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Calloway, George B. The Legislative Process in Congress. New York: Thomas R. Crowell Company, 1964.

Gross, Bertram M. The Legislative Struggle: A Study in Social Combat. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953.

Hyneman, Charles S. "Who Makes Our Laws." Political Science Quarterly, LV (December, 1940), pp. 556-581.

Jewell, Malcolm E. The State Legislature Politics and Practice. New York: Random House, 1962.

Kolko, Gabriel. Wealth and Power in America. New York: Frederick M. Praeger, 1962.

Lockard, Duane. "Legislative Politics in Connecticut," American Political Science Review. XLVIII, (March, 1954), pp. 166-173.

Lubell, Sam. The Future of American Politics. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

Matthews, Donald R. The Social Backgrounds of Political Decision-Makers. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1954.

Matthews, Donald R. U.S. Senators and Their World. New York: Random House, 1960.

Moscow, Warren. Politics in the Empire State. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948.

Patterson, Samuel C. "The Role of the Deviant in the State Legislative System: The Wisconsin Assembly," Western Political Quarterly XIV (June, 1961), pp. 460-472.

Schlesinger, Joseph A. How They Became Governor. East Lansing, Michigan: Governmental Research Bureau, Michigan State University, 1954.

Schlesinger, Joseph A. "Lawyers and Politics: A Clarified View," Midwest Journal of Political Science, I (May, 1957), pp. 26-39.

Weeks, O. Douglas. Research in American State Legislative Process. Ann Arbor, Michigan: J. W. Edwards, 1947.

Zeller, Belle, ed. American State Legislatures. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1954.