

---

engagement. Scholars will want to explore how Goss's indicator of women's political efforts—appearances before Congress—compares to other forms of women's political action, both in overall historical trends and in causal associations. So, for instance, one might ask, how women's congressional testimony compares to women's voter participation, women's campaigns for public office, women's office-holding, and women's extrainstitutional (“in-the-streets”) activism. A quick look at the data shows that the overall trends are not clearly aligned. Are Goss findings concerning women's congressional appearances helpful in thinking about these other forms of political engagement? Where do the important differences among them lie? My guess is that her work is already prompting other scholars to pose such questions.

One can also ask whether Goss is correct. Her data reveal a dramatic late-twentieth-century change in women's organizations' congressional activism (measured both in terms of absolute number of congressional testimonies and as a proportion of all hearings). The root cause of the decline, according to the author, is the narrowing and focusing effect that equal-rights policies of the early 1960s had on women's second-wave activism and the resulting supplanting of traditional women's groups' membership and activism. When second-wave feminist activism quieted down, women's political presence before Congress dwindled as well. But does the best explanation lie in the policy-feedback effect that Goss points to as setting all this in motion?

To Goss's credit, she carefully sifts through the evidence to consider a host of alternative explanations, and in the end, as she sets aside a number of these explanations, her accounts are convincing. For instance, she finds that the rates of women's groups appearing before Congress, especially late in the twentieth century, have fallen behind those of other interest groups. Goss concludes that this is evidence that declining congressional openness to interest-group input more generally is not a factor driving the change for women. Nor, she finds, is women's diminished presence linked to changes in partisan control of Congress, shifting congressional agendas, and women's growing presence in the House and Senate. She also argues that policy specialization, which created expert niches for some women's groups, may limit the groups' appeal to potential constituents overall, but that the narrowing has not completely undermined their presence in Washington. Additionally, she shows that funding for feminist groups has increased since 1970, and so this, too, she argues, is not the cause of fewer appearances before Congress. Finally, she builds a strong case that women's organizations at the end of the twentieth century did not shift away from Congress into other venues, such as the courts.

One might reasonably argue, however, that rising employment has directly competed for women's time late in the twentieth century, and that this is a better and more

immediate explanation of the decline in their political engagement, at least in terms of joining organizations and leading the charge before Congress. Organizational work, especially preparing congressional testimonies and traveling to Washington, requires significant time commitments. Perhaps this is a better explanation.

As Goss reveals, the role of employment is complex. It can limit women's capacity for organizational work but it can also promote such work. Women's employment certainly can constrain their ability to offer long hours to civic associations, especially when women also have family responsibilities. But at the same time, employment can create occupational and professional interests that spark motivation for great political activism. Also, Goss points out, women's employment rises steadily across the century and thus coincides with both increases in their congressional appearances in the earlier part of the century and decreases late in the century. The relationship is clearly not a simple one. The author also cites well-known work by Nancy Burns, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Sidney Verba (2001), *The Private Roots of Public Action*, and by Robert Putnam (2000), *Bowling Alone*, showing little evidence that the increase in women's labor force participation sidelined their civic engagement. While Goss acknowledges the important demands that full-time employment can place on individuals, the influences of women's employment on women's political engagement are not straightforward.

In the end, Goss comes back to the policy-feedback effect. The equal-rights policies of the early 1960s set in motion a series of changes in women's activism, narrowing its focus to the gaining of equal legal and employment rights for women. When important gains were won, the push for change began to ebb. But as a result of this shift, traditional women's organizations that were strong in the earlier part of the century were now substantially less vibrant, and as equal-rights activism declined, women's congressional activism declined as well. The equal-rights policies of the early 1960s brought substantial change, and from *The Paradox of Gender Equality* we learn that the policies' influence was even greater than previously thought.

**Response to Holly McCammon's review of *The Paradox of Gender Equality: How American Women's Groups Gained and Lost Their Public Voice***

doi:10.1017/S1537592713003472

— Kristin A. Goss

One of the great rewards of reading Holly McCammon's excellent study alongside my own has been the revelation that, indeed, American women were incredibly active politically during the supposedly quiescent middle decades of the twentieth century. Rest in peace, June Cleaver metaphor.

Both of our books spotlight the importance of mass membership groups, such as the League of Women Voters and the Business and Professional Women's Clubs, through which American females organized relentlessly both for gender equality issues, such as the right to serve on juries, and for public goods, such as a peaceful world. The books remind us what women accomplish when they combine *as women*, but for some reasons not well understood, gender-based organizing has become more difficult.

McCammon's insightful review raises important questions about how we arrived at this crossroads. The issues she identifies in my book are those with which I most struggled. My work advances an argument that is consistent with the assembled evidence, but as I note, there are big challenges inherent in explaining a century of change.

When I began to analyze the data and see the major trends—the rise, then fall, of women's groups' presence on Capitol Hill and the broadening, then narrowing, of their policy agendas—I thought it *had* to be a story rooted in changing patterns of women's labor force participation. Quite obviously, jobs compete with volunteer groups for people's time. I continue to believe that women's work enters the picture in key ways—by, for example, sapping volunteer energies from leading women's associations and by alienating women from groups emphasizing traditional helpmate roles.

Ultimately, however, I became convinced that “more women working” was just one piece of a complex puzzle. As McCammon notes, women's labor force participation moved monotonically upward throughout the twentieth century, yet the activism of women's organizations followed an up-and-down pattern. The asymmetry in the trends makes it hard to finger “women working” as the key explanatory variable.

Instead, the patterns seemed consistent with a policy-driven reconceptualization of “women's issues.” During the first half of the twentieth century, women's groups interpreted their mission broadly, consistent with the suffrage amendment's mandate for civic inclusion and its invitation to women to bring their unique understandings to bear on all manner of public issues. By the 1960s, however, a new federal policy regime developed by the three branches of government was inviting women to make claims against the state for gender-based rights and protections. Facilitating this reconfiguration of women's relationship with the state, new single-issue groups were displacing multipurpose women's groups from long-standing public-interest-oriented policy niches. From the mid-1960s onward, we see a stunning increase in the fraction of women's policy claims that focused on women's equality and a parallel decline in their presence on Capitol Hill.

Like McCammon, I believe that my book is hardly the last word on the evolution of U.S. women's organizations over the past century. The book ended on a discouraging note for those who believe that women still

have distinctive perspectives on policy questions. I am eager to see new and different approaches for studying the voice of women's groups—and women as individuals—in democratic governance.

### **The U.S. Women's Jury Movement and Strategic**

**Adaptation.** By Holly J. McCammon. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012. 298p. \$99.00.  
doi:10.1017/S1537592713003393

— Kristin A. Goss, *Duke University*

American women won the constitutional right to vote in 1920, and for years afterward chroniclers portrayed the victory as something of a dud, with women's collective civic energies reportedly dissipating. Holly McCammon's splendid new book joins a growing body of work giving lie to that narrative. In fact, as she demonstrates, post-suffrage women launched entirely new movements across the states to secure another right and privilege of citizenship—jury service. In a work with great relevance to modern reform efforts, McCammon asks why some state jury-service movements succeeded relatively swiftly while others floundered.

To tell the story, long overlooked by scholars, McCammon scoured women's organization archives and public records in 15 culturally diverse states and assembled case studies of the movements and how they evolved over time. In the year in which suffrage was enacted, three-quarters of states barred women's jury service or effectively precluded it, and so women's advocates had a lot of work to do. The author analyzes the key players, their tactics, and their legislative journeys. Using the case studies and a method known as qualitative comparative analysis, she systematically isolates combinations of elements that seemed to distinguish the relatively “swift” states (those that secured jury-service law in faster than average time) from the “slow” states. She also analyzes the introduction of those same elements to see how it might explain the eventual success of slow-state movements.

The key difference between the leaders and laggards, according to McCammon, is *strategic adaptation*. Movements that obtained jury laws relatively quickly were better than their sister organizations in slow states at reading signals in the political environment, assessing movement tactics in light of those signals, and adjusting the tactics accordingly. If hostile lawmakers asserted that women did not want to serve on juries, adaptive movements conducted surveys and letter-writing campaigns to prove the men wrong. If rank-and-file women seemed indifferent, leaders distributed flyers and dispatched speakers to explain the stakes involved. If certain women were not swayed by appeals to equal citizenship rights, advocates switched gears and emphasized the distinctive womanly perspective that mothers and wives could bring to legal disputes, especially those involving children.