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## SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

## 1995 Senate Staff Salaries

* The average 1995 salary across all positions for Senate personal office staff was $\$ 37,209$-- only a one percent increase since 1993. The reason for the stagnation in staff pay is clear. Senate offices have received no cost-of-living increases in their office budgets in either of the past two years.
* Washington-based Senate staff earn salaries that are, on average, a full 30 percent less than federal excecutive branch workers in the DC area $(\$ 39,414 \nu s . \$ 51,376)$. This pay gap has grown substantially since 1993, when there was a differential of 20 percent. The reason for the widening gap is that Senate pay has remained virtually constant over the past two years, while federal pay has continued to increase.
* The average pay of Senate Chiefs of Staff, the top-paid staffers in Senate personal offices, passed the $\$ 100,000$ mark this year. Senate Chiefs of Staff now earn average salaries of \$101,835.
* Among the higher-paying positions, Senate staff earn substantially more than their House counterparts. Senate Chiefs of Staff earn 26 percent more than House Chiefs of Staff, while Senate Legislative Directors (LDs), Press Secretaries, and Legislative Assistants (LAs) all earn at least 38 percent more than their House counterparts.
* Staff in Republican and Democratic Senate offices earn nearly identical salaries on average. Republican staff average $\$ 37,364,1$ percent more than the Democratic average of $\$ 37,091$.


## Gender

* The pay gap between male and female staffers narrowed markedly in 1995. On average, women in the Senate earned 87 percent of the pay of men in 1995. In 1993 and 1991, female Senate staff earned 81 percent and 78 percent of the pay of male staff, respectively. The gender pay gap has also been narrowing in the House, though not as rapidly as in the Senate. Female House personal office staffers earned 84 percent of male staffers' pay in 1994, 82 percent in 1992, and 81 percent in 1990.
* Female Senate staff earn proportionately higher salaries than female workers nationwide and in the federal executive branch. Female executive branch workers earn 70 percent of their male counterparts' salaries, while nationally women earn 67 percent of the pay of men.
* The male/female pay gap that exists in the Senate is largely due to women being overrepresented in lower paying jobs and under-represented in higher paying jobs. Women hold 37 percent of the four top positions in Senate personal offices (Chief of Staff, LD, Press Secretary, and State Director), while holding 72 percent of the lowest-paying positions.
* The percentage of Senate staff who are female has steadily declined from 62 percent in 1991 to 56 percent in 1995. However, women are still employed in the Senate in greater numbers than in the national labor force which is 45 percent female.


## Race and Ethnicity

* Minorities have lower employment rates in Senate personal offices than in the U.S. labor force. Blacks comprise 9 percent, Hispanics 3.5 percent, and Asians 1.6 percent of Senate staff. Nationally, blacks comprise 10.1 percent, Hispanics 7.5 percent, and Asians 2.6 percent of the labor force.
* Senate staff who belong to racial or ethnic minority groups earn slightly more than do minorities nationwide. Black Senate staff earn 79 percent of the pay of white Senate staff, while Hispanic staff earn 74 percent of white staff pay. Nationally, blacks earn 74 percent and Hispanics 71 percent of the pay of white workers.
* The differential between the pay of minority and white Senate staff is primarily due to the over-representation of minorities in lower paying jobs and their under-representation in higher paying jobs. Overall, minorities comprise 15.4 percent of Senate staff, but hold only 5.5 percent of the four top positions in Senate personal offices -- Chief of Staff, LD, Press Secretary, and State Director.


## Staff Tenure

* Job tenure is quite low in Senate personal offices. Thirty-two percent of Washingtonbased Senate staff have been in their present positions for one year or less, and 66 percent have been in their jobs for two years or less.
* Rapid turnover afflicts virtually every position. For example, 44 percent of Chiefs of Staff, 45 percent of LDs, and 59 percent of LAs have been in their present jobs two years or less.


## Office Benefit Policies

* Senate personal offices are much more generous than private businesses and other government employers in their paid parental leave policies. Ninety percent of Senate offices offer at least one week of paid maternity and paternity leave to their staff. In comparison, less than four percent of employees in the private sector and virtually no workers in state, local, or federal government receive any paid parental leave.


## Demographics

* Washington-based Senate personal office staff tend to be young and single. Sixty-nine percent of these staff are single. Their average age is 32 .
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## PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The congressional staff job market is a relatively free market. Salaries of staff are largely set by supply and demand forces, with very few regulations influencing the operation of the market. For example, there is no established pay scale, no job qualification requirements, and no formal candidate selection process. The only constraints facing Senate personal offices are a fixed overall office budget (that varies by the population of the state represented), a salary ceiling, and a minimum salary. Within these general constraints, the salaries of Senate staff are usually decided by negotiations between the employer and the employee.

For this negotiation process to work efficiently, economic theory tells us that both employers (buyers of labors) and employees (sellers of labor) should be knowledgeable about the activities and practices of the labor market. Without this information, buyers and sellers will have difficulty agreeing on fair market prices and the negotiation process will too often lead to inefficient agreements -- the overcompensation of some staff and undercompensation of others. A secondary effect of inefficient agreements is buyer and seller dissatisfaction and its potential for lowered morale, increased staff turnover, and needless acrimony.

The Congressional Management Foundation (CMF) produces its House and Senate Employment Studies for Members and staff to promote a fair and efficient labor market that enhances the performance and morale of congressional offices.

Prior to this 1995 edition, CMF published Senate Employment Studies in 1993, 1991, and 1988. CMF's House Employment Studies have a longer record. They were produced for 1994, 1992, 1990, 1987, 1985, 1984, 1983, 1982, and 1977.

## A Word of Caution

This report goes a long way towards describing the pay practices of Senate personal offices. It does not, however, contain all of the information needed by buyers and sellers of labor in the Senate. We cannot measure all relevant and legitimate factors that may affect staff pay. The actual negotiation process should consider a range of other possible factors such as loyalty, previous performance, political savvy, and even regional variations in the cost of living. This report should be used as one of several tools to help offices and staff better understand the Senate labor market.

## ANALYSIS OF SAMPLE

## Sample Size of the Data Base

A questionnaire was sent to the Senate personal offices of all 100 Senators. Responses came from offices representing 58 Senators ( $58 \%$ of those surveyed). These responses provided CMF with salary, tenure, and demographic data for 2,041 full-time and 105 part-time Senate personal office staff members.

## Summary

Our sample accurately reflects the actual composition of the Senate on the measures listed below. This strongly supports the conclusion that the data in this report are reliable.

## Analysis of Responses by Member Political Party

| Political Party | Responses\% | Actual (in the Senate) $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Democratic | $52 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| Republican | $48 \%$ | $54 \%$ |

Democratic Senate offices are somewhat over-represented in our sample, and Republican offices are somewhat under-represented.

## Analysis of Responses by Member Tenure

| Member Term | Responses\% | Actual\% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | $31 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| 1st term | $28 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| 3rd term | $21 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| 4th term or more | $21 \%$ | $25 \%$ |

The distribution of our sample by Member tenure very closely matches the seniority distribution of the 104th Senate, with the most senior Members being slightly underrepresented and first-term Senators being slightly over-represented in our sample.

## Analysis of Responses by State Population

| State <br> Population | Responses\% |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $<=2$ million | $31 \%$ | Actual\% |
| $2-5$ million | $31 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| $5-10$ million | $28 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| $>10$ million | $10 \%$ | $24 \%$ |
|  |  | $14 \%$ |

A review of responses indicates that our sample closely parallels the actual breakdown of Senate offices by state population, with the largest and smallest states being slightly underrepresented in the sample, and states with between two and ten million residents being slightly over-represented. ${ }^{1}$

## Analysis of Responses by Geographical Region

| Region | Responses\% |  | Actual\% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New England | $10 \%$ |  | $12 \%$ |
| Mid-Atlantic | $7 \%$ | $8 \%$ |  |
| South | $22 \%$ |  | $22 \%$ |
| Border | $10 \%$ |  | $10 \%$ |
| Midwest | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ |  |
| Plains | $16 \%$ | $12 \%$ |  |
| Rocky Mountain | $17 \%$ | $16 \%$ |  |
| Pacific Coast | $7 \%$ | $10 \%$ |  |

The sample closely parallels the actual distribution of offices by region, with offices from the Pacific Coast being somewhat under-represented and those from Plains states being somewhat over-represented. ${ }^{2}$

[^0]
## AGGREGATE DATA

## AGGREGATE DATA

## Methodology

In preparing this section of the report, we aggregated the individual salary and demographic data of 2,041 full-time ${ }^{3}$ staff members in Senate personal offices in order to better understand the demographic composition, pay, and employment trends of Senate staff.

In addition to reporting overall aggregate data (e.g., average salary, average age), we wanted to explore in greater depth the relationship among demographic variables and between demographic variables and salary (e.g., average salary by educational degree, tenure in position by gender). To conduct these cross-tabulations, we asked offices in our survey to provide the following information for every staff member in the personal office:

* age;
* race or ethnicity;
* gender;
* educational attainment;
* marital status;
* tenure in current position;
* tenure in current office;
* overall tenure in Congress; and
* level of responsibility in position (or, how closely the staffer's responsibilities matched our job description).

These individual staff demographic variables were then cross-tabulated by Member tenure (term in office) and Member party affiliation. We have included in this report those analyses that we believe are the most meaningful and that provide offices with useful management information.

Much of the aggregate data that we present have been broken down into three categories: all staff, Washington staff, and state staff.

The findings presented in this portion of the report are divided into four sections:

1) Salaries
2) Staff Tenure
3) Demographics
4) Office Structure
[^1]Finally, we have compared many of the results in this study to the results of similar surveys conducted by the Congressional Management Foundation for the U.S. House of Representatives in 1994, 1992, and 1990 and the U.S. Senate in 1993, 1991, and 1988. For readers desiring more detailed comparisons than are included here, 1994 U.S. House of Representatives Employment Practices: A Study of Staff Salary, Tenure, Demographics and Benefits is available from the Congressional Management Foundation. Wherever possible, we have also provided comparative data about the U.S. population and employees in the public and private sectors.

## PART 1: SALARIES

## Average Salary for All Senate Positions Compared to 1993 CMF Study

| Average Salary 1995: | Total | $\frac{\text { Washington }}{\$ 39,414}$ | $\underline{\text { State }}$ <br> Average Salary 1993: |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: |
| $\$ 37,209$ | $\$ 36,844$ | $\$ 38,971$ | $\$ 32,573$ |
| Dollar Increase: | $\$ 365$ | $\$ 443$ | $\$ 231$ |
| Percentage Increase: | $1.0 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |
| Average annualized <br> rate of increase: | $0.5 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |

Cost of Living Adjustments:

| 1995: | $0.0 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1994: | $\underline{0.0 \%}$ |
| Compounded Total: | $0.0 \%$ |

Over the past two years, the overall average Senate personal office staff salary has increased by only 1 percent. This extremely small increase is consistent with the fact that Senate personal offices received no cost of living adjustments during that two-year period.

In comparison to the Senate, the average House staff salary in 1994 was $\$ 35,510$.
Washington-based House staff averaged $\$ 38,807$ and district-based staff earned an average of \$31,169.

## Pay Comparison of Senate Personal Office Staff and Federal Workers ${ }^{4}$

(Table shows average pay and the "gap" or percent by which federal pay exceeds Senate pay)

| Year | DC-Based <br> Senate | DC-Based <br> Federal | $\underline{\text { Gap }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1995 | $\$ 39,414$ | $\$ 51,376$ | $30 \%$ |
| 1993 | $\$ 38,971$ | $\$ 46,783$ | $20 \%$ |
| 1991 | $\$ 35,802$ | $\$ 42,413$ | $18 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | $\frac{\text { All Senate }}{\$ 37,209}$ | $\underline{\text { All Federal }}$ | Gap <br> 1993 |
| $\$ 31,154$ | $11 \%$ |  |  |
| 1991 | $\$ 33,844$ | $\$ 37,718$ | $2 \%$ |
|  | $\$ 3,094$ | $\$ 33,736$ | $2 \%$ |

Senate staff based in Washington earn significantly less than federal executive branch workers in the Washington area. Over the past two years, this pay disparity has widened by 10 percent. Likewise, the gap between all federal workers and all Senate staff (i.e. including state staff) has widened considerably.

Senate staff also tend to earn less than their Washington-based counterparts in corporate public affairs offices, where the average salary of "Executive Head of the Office" is $\$ 143,952$, that of "Legislative Counsel/Lobbyist" is \$91,894, and that of "Legislative/Regulatory Analyst" is $\$ 70,440 .^{5}$ For full-time, year-round workers in the U.S. labor force, average earnings in 1993 were $\$ 31,241 .{ }^{6}$

[^2]Average Salary for All Positions: The Historical Record in the Senate

| Year | Avg. Salary | \% Change Since <br> Last Measured |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1995 | $\$ 37,209$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| 1993 | $\$ 36,844$ | $11.3 \%$ |
| 1991 | $\$ 33,094$ | $17.3 \%$ |
| 1988 | $\$ 28,203$ | N/A |

Overall, the average salary of Senate personal office staffers increased by 32 percent between 1988 and 1995. This equivalent to a four percent average annualized increase in pay.

## Average Salary for All Positions: The Historical Record in the House

| Year | Avg. Salary | \% Change Since <br> Last Measured |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1994 | $\$ 35,510$ | $6.4 \%$ |
| 1992 | $\$ 33,388$ | $13.0 \%$ |
| 1990 | $\$ 29,542$ | $13.1 \%$ |
| 1987 | $\$ 26,118$ | $8.2 \%$ |
| 1985 | $\$ 24,132$ | $6.0 \%$ |
| 1984 | $\$ 22,761$ | $-0.5 \%$ |
| 1983 | $\$ 22,882$ | $3.4 \%$ |
| 1982 | $\$ 22,128$ | N/A |

Between 1982 and 1994, the average pay of House personal office staffers rose by 60 percent. This translates into an average annualized increase of four percent, the same figure as in the Senate (though covering a longer period).

## Average Salary for All Positions by Member Party Affiliation

| Political Party | $\underline{\text { Total }}$ | Washington | $\underline{\text { State }}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Democratic | $\$ 37,091$ | $\$ 39,090$ | $\$ 32,965$ |
| Republican | $\$ 37,364$ | $\$ 39,850$ | $\$ 32,603$ |

The average staff salary is nearly identical in Democratic and Republican offices, with Republicans tending to pay slightly higher salaries than Democrats to their Washington staff, and Democrats paying slightly higher salaries to state staff than Republicans. Overall, Republican and Democratic salaries are separated by less than 1 percent.

In past years in both the Senate and House, the difference in average pay between the two parties has also been quite small. In Senate offices in 1993, staffers in Democratic offices
earned 2.5 percent more than their Republican counterparts, while in 1991, Republican staffers were the ones with slightly higher salaries, earning 1.2 percent more than Democrats.

In House offices in 1994, Republican staff averaged 2.5 percent more than Democrats. In 1992, House Democratic staff averaged 2.5 percent more than House Republican staff.

## Average Salary for All Positions by Member Tenure

| Member Term | Total | Washington | State |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1st term | \$35,723 | \$37,736 | \$32,031 |
| 2nd term | \$36,976 | \$39,280 | \$32,404 |
| 3rd term | \$39,490 | \$41,572 | \$35,120 |
| 4th term + | \$37,628 | \$39,957 | \$32,537 |

In general, staff tend to receive higher average salaries as Member tenure increases. This is probably due to the fact that Members with longer tenure have staff with more experience in their jobs, offices, and Congress.

## Average Salary for All Positions by Number of State Offices

| \# of State <br> Offices | $\underline{\text { Total }}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1-2$ | $\$ 38,570$ |  | $\$ 40,334$ |  |
| $3-4$ | $\$ 37,236$ |  | $\$ 39,557$ |  |
| $5-6$ | $\$ 34,968$ |  | $\$ 37,660$ | $\$ 32,612$ |
| 7 Or more | $\$ 34,269$ |  | $\$ 37,037$ | $\$ 30,317$ |
|  |  |  | $\$ 29,555$ |  |

Members with more state offices tend to pay lower average salaries to their state-based staff. This was also the case in our 1993 and 1991 surveys of Senate offices and likely reflects a tradeoff between the costs of opening additional offices and the costs of having higher paid state staff under a fixed budget. The average pay of Washington-based staff decreases to a lesser degree as the number of state offices increases.

## Average Salary for All Positions by Gender

| Gender | $\underline{\text { Total }}$ | Washington | $\underline{\text { State }}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $\$ 34,790$ | $\$ 37,434$ | $\$ 30,406$ |
| Male | $\$ 40,039$ | $\$ 41,311$ | $\$ 36,650$ |

On average, female staff earn 87 cents for every dollar earned by male staff. Among Washington staff, the figure is 91 cents; among state staff, it is 83 cents.

The 13 percent difference in average pay between male and female Senate staff is largely explained by differences in the jobs they hold. A later analysis on page 30 shows that women are under-represented in Leadership and Policy positions and over-represented in Midlevel and Clerical positions. The effect of this on the salary distribution is illustrated on page 11.

## Gender Pay Gap: The Historical Record (Female pay as a proportion of male pay)

## Senate Staff

| Year | Total | Washington | State/District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1995 | . 87 | . 91 | . 83 |
| 1993 | . 81 | . 84 | . 77 |
| 1991 | . 78 | . 82 | . 75 |

## House Staff

| 1994 | .84 | .86 | $.87^{7}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1992 | .82 | .84 | .84 |
| 1990 | .81 | .84 | .83 |

The gender pay gap in Congress has been consistently decreasing over the past six years. The most marked narrowing of the gap occurred between 1993 and 1995 in the Senate, closing by six percent in just two years.

Women on congressional staffs tend to earn comparatively more than women in other sectors of the economy. For example, among federal executive branch employees, women earn 70 percent of male workers' pay. ${ }^{8}$ In the overall U.S. labor force, 1992 statistics show that women earn 67 percent of men's pay ( $\$ 24,009$ vs. $\$ 35,711$ ). ${ }^{9}$ Among all U.S. workers with bachelor's degrees, women averaged $\$ 31,338$, which is 66 percent of the $\$ 47,181$ that men

[^3]with bachelor's degrees earn on average. ${ }^{10}$

## Average Salary Distribution by Gender

| 1995 Salary <br> (in thousands) | Female | Male <br> less than $\$ 19.9$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $\$ 20-\$ 24.9$ | $10.1 \%$ | $11.0 \%$ |
| $\$ 25-\$ 29.9$ | $16.7 \%$ | $19.9 \%$ |
| $\$ 30-\$ 34.9$ | $12.8 \%$ | $12.2 \%$ |
| $\$ 35-\$ 39.9$ | $8.2 \%$ | $10.3 \%$ |
| $\$ 40-\$ 49.9$ | $13.6 \%$ | $7.7 \%$ |
| $\$ 50-\$ 59.9$ | $6.0 \%$ | $15.3 \%$ |
| $\$ 60-\$ 79.9$ | $5.9 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ |
| $\$ 80-\$ 99.9$ | $2.4 \%$ | $8.9 \%$ |
| $\$ 100$ or more | $0.8 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ |

Compared to male staff in the Senate, female staff are more heavily represented in low pay ranges and less so at the highest pay ranges. An analysis on page 30 shows that this disparity is largely caused by differences in the types of jobs that male and female staff hold in Senate offices, not by differences in pay to men and women holding the same job.

## Difference in Pay Within Jobs by Gender

Differences in overall pay do not by themselves demonstrate that women are paid less than similarly qualified men who perform the same job. To determine if gender has a unique or independent impact on pay within jobs, we used a method called multiple regression analysis to control for the effects of all of the other demographic variables that we measured (e.g., the effects of the variables of age, education, and time in position).

In only one of the 19 positions ${ }^{11}$ analyzed in this manner, did we find that gender uniquely affected pay. That is, female staff with comparable education, experience, and demographic characteristics did not earn significantly less or more than their male counterparts in 18 of the 19 positions. Only in the Field Representative position did we find that gender had a

[^4]statistically significant impact on pay that could not be explained by any other variable that we measured. Males in this position earned significantly more than women in the position when controlling for the effects of other variables on pay.

## Average Salary for All Positions by Race and Ethnicity

| Race/Ethnicity | Total | Washington | State |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Black | \$30,294 | \$30,527 | \$29,959 |
| White | \$38,209 | \$40,342 | \$33,419 |
| Hispanic | \$28,441 | \$30,933 | \$26,759 |
| All Other | \$38,004 | \$37,410 | \$38,830 |

Black Senate staff earn 79 cents for every dollar earned by white staff. For Hispanics, the figure is 74 cents and for "all other" minority staff, 99 cents. (The category of "all other" minority staff is defined on page 32 ).

The differences in Senate staff pay by race/ethnicity are largely due to differences in the jobs held by minority staff as compared to white staff. A later analysis on page 36 shows that minorities are under-represented in Leadership and Policy positions and over-represented in Clerical positions. The effect of this on the salary distribution is described on the next page.

## Pay Gap by Race and Ethnicity: The Historical Record (As a proportion of the pay for white staff)

## Senate Staff

| Year | Black | Hispanic |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | .79 | .74 |  |
| 1995 | .83 | .75 | .99 |
| 1993 | .83 | .75 | .85 |
| 1991 |  |  | .95 |

## House Staff

| 1994 | .92 | .86 | .90 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 1992 | .93 | .77 | .96 |
| 1990 | .89 | .82 | N/A |

Congressional staffers from minority groups have seen very little change in their pay relative to whites in the past six years. However, over the past two years, the pay gap between black
and white staffers in the Senate increased from 83 percent to 79 percent.
These wage gaps by race and ethnicity are typical for the U.S. economy. National figures for 1992 show that blacks earned 74 percent of the pay of whites, while Hispanics earned 71 percent. ${ }^{12}$ Nationally, blacks holding professional degrees earn 79 percent of the pay of whites with professional degrees. ${ }^{13}$

## Average Salary Distribution by Race and Ethnicity

| 1995 Salary <br> (in thousands) | Black | White | Hispanic | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| less than \$19.9 | 13.9\% | 10.0\% | 17.9\% | 5.5\% |
| \$20-\$24.9 | 26.0\% | 21.4\% | 23.9\% | 21.8\% |
| \$25-\$29.9 | 23.7\% | 13.9\% | 14.9\% | 10.9\% |
| \$30-\$34.9 | 8.7\% | 11.3\% | 23.9\% | 18.2\% |
| \$35-\$39.9 | 8.7\% | 7.8\% | 7.5\% | 10.9\% |
| \$40-\$49.9 | 11.0\% | 14.9\% | 7.5\% | 16.4\% |
| \$50-\$59.9 | 5.8\% | 6.2\% | 4.5\% | 7.3\% |
| \$60-\$79.9 | 0.6\% | 8.4\% | 0.0\% | 1.8\% |
| \$80-\$99.9 | 1.7\% | 4.2\% | 0.0\% | 3.6\% |
| \$100 or more | 0.0\% | 1.9\% | 0.0\% | 3.6\% |

Compared to white staff in the Senate, black and Hispanic staff are more heavily represented in low pay ranges and less so at the highest pay ranges. An analysis on page $x x$ shows that this disparity is largely caused by differences in the types of jobs that minorities and whites hold in Senate offices, not by differences in pay between people of different races or ethnicities holding the same job.

## Difference in Pay Within Jobs by Race and Ethnicity

As with the salary differences between men and women, the disparities in salary among racial and ethnic groups by themselves do not indicate a pattern of unequal pay for similar work and qualifications. To determine if race or ethnicity has a unique or independent impact on pay within jobs, we used a method called multiple regression analysis to control for the effects of all of the other demographic variables that we measured (e.g., the variables of age, education, and time in position).

[^5]In only one of the positions ${ }^{14}$ analyzed in this manner did we find that race/ethnicity uniquely affected pay. That is, in all but one position white staff with comparable education, experience, and demographic characteristics did not earn significantly less or more than nonwhites who performed the same job. The only exception was the Legislative Assistant (LA) position, in which race/ethnicity had a statistically significant impact on pay that could not be explained by any other variable that we measured. Non-white LAs as a group earned significantly less than white LAs when controlling for the effects of other variables on pay.

## Average Salary for All Positions by Educational Attainment

|  | Total | Washington | State |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| High School or less | $\$ 31,789$ | $\$ 33,959$ | $\$ 27,800$ |
| Some College | $\$ 33,842$ | $\$ 37,952$ | $\$ 29,511$ |
| Bachelor's | $\$ 34,134$ | $\$ 34,816$ | $\$ 32,708$ |
| Master's | $\$ 48,662$ | $\$ 52,709$ | $\$ 38,920$ |
| Law | $\$ 56,052$ | $\$ 57,718$ | $\$ 46,235$ |
| Doctorate | $\$ 62,102$ | $\$ 63,815$ | $\$ 55,250$ |

Salaries increase as the level of education increases; staff with advanced degrees earn substantially more than those with only a bachelor's degree. Staff holding master's degrees earn about $\$ 14,000$ more on average than those with only a bachelor's; staff with law degrees earn about $\$ 22,000$ more. At every educational level, staff in Washington offices earn more, on average, than staff in state offices.

Senate staff salaries are somewhat higher than House staff salaries when analyzed by level of education. ${ }^{15}$ Senate staff who earned doctorates earn less than Ph.Ds in the House. For all other educational levels, Senate staff earn more than comparatively-educated House staff. Senate staff with law degrees earn six percent more and those with master's earn 10 percent more.

Senate staff salaries by educational degree also compare favorably to national averages. Nationally, people with bachelor's degrees earned about $\$ 33,000$ in 1992; people with master's degrees earned about $\$ 40,000$; and those with professional degrees earned about $\$ 75,000 .{ }^{16}$

[^6]Average Salary for All Positions by Age

| Age Group | Total | Washington | State |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| under 25 | \$21,204 | \$21,496 | \$19,977 |
| 25-29 | \$29,204 | \$30,379 | \$25,552 |
| 30-34 | \$43,366 | \$47,084 | \$35,440 |
| 35-39 | \$47,852 | \$57,343 | \$36,095 |
| 40-44 | \$50,221 | \$59,092 | \$37,085 |
| 45-49 | \$49,081 | \$57,910 | \$38,004 |
| 50-54 | \$51,200 | \$59,910 | \$41,038 |
| 55-59 | \$50,710 | \$63,469 | \$41,044 |
| 60-64 | \$41,211 | \$54,573 | \$35,866 |
| $65+$ | \$47,029 | \$67,193 | \$31,907 |

Staff under 30 years of age have the lowest salaries while staff in their forties and fifties have the highest salaries overall.

Average Salary for All Positions by Marital Status

| Marital Status | Total | Washington | $\underline{\text { State }}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Single | $\$ 32,201$ | $\$ 33,365$ | $\$ 28,865$ |
| Married | $\$ 45,390$ | $\$ 52,619$ | $\$ 36,620$ |

Married staff earn more than single staff, especially Washington-based staff. Because married staff are on average about nine years older than single staff, this difference can be attributed to age, as the previous table confirms.

## PART 2: STAFF TENURE

## Average Staff Tenure

## Years in Current Position

1995
1993
1991
1988

| Total | Washington |  | State |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.3 | 2.8 |  | 4.4 |
| 3.5 | 3.1 |  | 4.4 |
| 3.4 | 3.1 | 4.0 |  |
| 3.2 | 2.8 |  | 4.1 |

## Years in Current Office

|  | Total | Washington | $\frac{\text { State }}{}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1995 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 5.2 |
| 1993 | 4.4 | 3.9 | 5.5 |
| 1991 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 4.8 |
| 1988 |  | (data not available) |  |

## Years in Congress

|  | Total | Washington | State |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1995 | 5.7 | 5.6 | 6.1 |
| 1993 | 5.9 | 5.6 | 6.5 |
| 1991 | 5.6 | 5.7 | 5.5 |
| 1988 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.6 |

Average tenure in position, Senate office, and Congress has declined since 1993. However, none of the 1995 tenure figures are historically low if one compares them to Senate data from past years. As in 1993 and 1991, position and office turnover occurs at a much higher rate among Washington staff than among state staff.

Tenure in office data was collected to provide information on the practice of promotion-fromwithin. The smaller the difference between tenure in position and tenure in office, the less likely that staff were promoted from within the office. Our data show that most of time accumulated in an office -- 79 percent -- is accounted for by time in current position. In other words, promoting staff from one position to another within an office is more the exception than the rule. This pattern of hiring from outside the office was equally strong in the Senate in 1993. The tendency to hire from outside the office is even more prominent in House personal offices, where 89 percent of the time accumulated in an office is accounted
for by time in position.
Turnover data for other parts of the U.S. labor force is not directly comparable to our data on congressional staff, but it suggests that turnover is much higher on Capital Hill. Among federal executive branch employees, the average length of employment is 15.3 years. ${ }^{17}$ For the entire U.S. economy, employees had been with their current employer an average of 5.6 years. ${ }^{18}$

However, the average tenure data for Senate staff masks the fact that a large number of staff have little experience while a small number of staff have substantial experience. The next three tables report the distribution of experience.

## Distribution of Tenure

## Distribution of Tenure in Position

| Years | Total | Washington | State |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| <= 1.0 | 27.5\% | 31.5\% | 19.5\% |
| 1.0-2.0 | 32.5\% | 34.3\% | 29.0\% |
| 2.0-5.0 | 20.4\% | 19.2\% | 22.7\% |
| 5.0-10.0 | 11.9\% | 9.9\% | 15.9\% |
| $10.0+$ | 7.7\% | 5.2\% | 12.9\% |

While the average job tenure is 3.3 years, 28 percent of staff have held their current job for one year or less. Sixty percent have been in their job for two years or less. Among Washington staff, 66 percent have been in their job for two years or less.

[^7]
## Distribution of Tenure in Office

| Years | Total | Washington | State |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| <= 1.0 | 20.4\% | 23.4\% | 14.3\% |
| 1.0-2.0 | 29.8\% | 31.7\% | 25.9\% |
| 2.0-5.0 | 22.7\% | 22.0\% | 24.1\% |
| 5.0-10.0 | 15.7\% | 14.0\% | 19.2\% |
| $10.0+$ | 11.4\% | 8.9\% | 16.5\% |

The job tenure pattern holds true for tenure in office. The overall average of 4.2 years masks the fact that half of all staff have worked in their Senator's office for two years or less. Only 23 percent of Washington-based staff have worked in their Member's office for more than five years. Long service for a Senator is much more common for state staff: 36 percent have worked in their office for more than five years. .

## Distribution of Tenure in Congress

| Years | Total | Washington |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $<=1.0$ | $12.3 \%$ |  | $12.9 \%$ |
| $1.0-2.0$ | $27.7 \%$ |  | $10.9 \%$ |
| $2.0-5.0$ | $22.4 \%$ | $22.7 \%$ | $24.0 \%$ |
| $5.0-10.0$ | $19.3 \%$ | $17.6 \%$ | $21.8 \%$ |
| $10.0+$ | $18.4 \%$ | $17.4 \%$ | $22.8 \%$ |
|  |  |  | $20.5 \%$ |

Similarly, the average tenure in Congress of 5.7 years masks the fact that 40 percent of staff have worked in the legislative branch for two years or less.

## Tenure by Position

One possible explanation for these high turnover rates is that large numbers of staff flow in and out of entry-level positions such as Receptionist and Legislative Correspondent, while other positions experience low turnover. However, as the following table of the 21 most common Senate staff positions illustrates, rapid turnover afflicts virtually every position in Senate personal offices.

Percent of Staff with less than 1 and 2 years of Experience

|  | Time in Position |  | Time in Congress |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Washington Positions | $<=1 \mathrm{yr}$. | $<=2$ yrs. | $<=1 \mathrm{yr}$. | $<=2$ yrs. |
| AA/Chief of Staff | $29.6 \%$ | $44.4 \%$ | $5.7 \%$ | $15.1 \%$ |
| Legislative Director | $26.5 \%$ | $44.9 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ |
| Press Secretary | $50.0 \%$ | $65.4 \%$ | $19.6 \%$ | $25.5 \%$ |
| Office Manager | $23.4 \%$ | $31.9 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| Executive Assistant | $31.1 \%$ | $35.6 \%$ | $13.6 \%$ | $18.2 \%$ |
| Legislative Assistant | $42.3 \%$ | $59.2 \%$ | $14.9 \%$ | $30.1 \%$ |
| Scheduler/Appts. Sec. | $38.1 \%$ | $57.1 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ | $36.6 \%$ |
| Systems Administrator | $45.5 \%$ | $47.7 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ | $21.4 \%$ |
| Corres. Dir./Mail Mgr. | $40.7 \%$ | $51.9 \%$ | $22.2 \%$ | $40.7 \%$ |
| Dep./Asst. Press Sec. | $61.7 \%$ | $76.6 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ | $51.1 \%$ |
| Asst./Secretary to AA | $74.4 \%$ | $79.5 \%$ | $30.8 \%$ | $48.7 \%$ |
| Computer Operator | $34.4 \%$ | $43.8 \%$ | $23.0 \%$ | $26.2 \%$ |
| DC Office Assistant | $61.5 \%$ | $61.5 \%$ | $46.2 \%$ | $53.8 \%$ |
| Legislative Corres. | $74.7 \%$ | $90.1 \%$ | $49.2 \%$ | $74.6 \%$ |
| Receptionist | $82.4 \%$ | $89.0 \%$ | $75.9 \%$ | $85.1 \%$ |
| Correspondence Asst. | $83.0 \%$ | $96.2 \%$ | $62.7 \%$ | $86.3 \%$ |
| State Positions |  |  |  |  |
| State Director | $40.8 \%$ | $57.1 \%$ | $13.0 \%$ | $15.2 \%$ |
| Regional Director | $26.4 \%$ | $43.4 \%$ | $19.6 \%$ | $25.5 \%$ |
| Field Representative | $35.2 \%$ | $47.2 \%$ | $22.3 \%$ | $34.3 \%$ |
| State Caseworker | $29.9 \%$ | $45.1 \%$ | $19.3 \%$ | $34.4 \%$ |
| State Office Assistant | $45.3 \%$ | $50.7 \%$ | $36.1 \%$ | $45.8 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis for Staff with less than 1 and 2 Years of Experience

## Years in Position

Low-paying positions have large proportions of staff with limited experience, a clear indication of extremely high turnover. Seventy-five percent of Legislative Correspondents and over 80 percent of Receptionists have held their job for one year or less. Approximately 90 percent of staff in these positions have been in their jobs for two years or less.

While not as dramatic as the turnover in junior staff positions, the turnover in senior staff positions is also substantial. Less than 56 percent of AAs, LDs, Press Secretaries, and State Directors have held their job for more than 2 years.

State staff have somewhat lower turnover rates than Washington staff. In every state position, at least 40 percent of the staffers have been in their position for two years or more.

## Years in Congress

For the management positions in Senate offices, prior congressional experience seems almost essential. All Legislative Directors have at least one year of experience on Capitol Hill. Likewise, only two percent of Office Managers and six percent of AAs have been on the Hill under a year.

Prior congressional experience characterizes most other positions as well. In only 5 of the 21 positions analyzed is it typical for staff to have worked less than two years in Congress.

## Tenure by Demographics

Staff Tenure by Member Tenure

| Member Term | Position |  | Office | Congress |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1st term | 1.7 |  | 1.9 | 3.8 |
| 2nd term | 3.2 | 4.2 | 5.5 |  |
| 3rd term | 4.7 | 5.8 | 7.6 |  |
| 4th term + | 4.3 | 6.0 | 7.2 |  |

As might be expected, average staff tenure in position, office, and Congress tends to increase as Senators' tenure increases. The newer the Senator, the shorter the time that staff could have spent in their position and office and the less congressional experience they would have acquired.

## Staff Tenure by Gender

| Gender | Position |  | Office | Congress |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.9 |  | 4.8 | 6.5 |
| Male | 2.6 |  | 3.5 | 4.7 |

Women have substantially more experience than men in all three tenure categories. As with marital status, this pattern is related to age: male staffers are younger on average than their female counterparts in the Senate.

Staff Tenure by Race and Ethnicity

| Race/Ethnicity | Position | Office | Congress |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Black | 4.3 | 5.1 | 6.8 |
| White | 3.2 | 4.1 | 5.7 |
| Hispanic | 3.6 | 4.6 | 4.9 |
| Other | 4.4 | 5.0 | 6.4 |

Black staff have the highest average tenure in their jobs, offices, and in Congress. Also, black staff average 34 percent more job tenure, 24 percent more office tenure, and 19 percent more tenure in Congress than whites.

## Staff Tenure by Educational Attainment

|  |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Highest Level | Position |
| High School or less | 6.5 |
| Some College | 5.4 |
| Bachelor's | 2.7 |
| Master's | 3.2 |
| Law Degree | 2.6 |
| Doctorate | 3.0 |

Average Years in:

| Office | Congress |
| :---: | :---: |
| 7.6 | 11.1 |
| 6.5 | 9.1 |
| 3.6 | 4.7 |
| 4.1 | 6.0 |
| 3.4 | 5.2 |
| 4.3 | 6.3 |

A clear pattern emerges when tenure is broken out by educational attainment: staff without college degrees remain in their positions, offices, and Congress much longer than those with college or graduate degrees. Most of these staffers without bachelor's degrees are in clerical jobs; their low turnover rate may reflect limited opportunity for advancement.

## Staff Tenure by Marital Status

|  |  |  |  | Average Years in: |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Marital Status  Position  Office | Congress |  |  |  |
| Single |  | 2.6 |  | 3.3 |
| Married | 4.6 |  | 5.7 | 4.4 |
|  |  |  |  | 8.0 |

Married staff have approximately 70 to 80 percent more experience in their current position, their current office, and Congress than single staff. This pattern is expected given that single staff are younger than married staff.

## Regression Analysis of Staff Tenure

In addition to presenting the relationships between various factors and staff tenure as we have just done, we wanted to investigate the influence that these factors have on turnover. To do so, we used a statistical procedure called multiple regression analysis. This technique allowed us to determine the unique influence of 13 variables on tenure in position and tenure in office by controlling for the effects of the other 12 variables. These variables fall into four categories:

1) demographic (e.g., age, gender, race/ethnicity)
2) office environment (e.g., Member term)
3) salary
4) employee benefits (e.g., parental leave and merit pay)

Regression results: We analyzed tenure in position and tenure in office separately. In both cases, we found that the same three variables were statistically significant predictors of an individual's tenure. ${ }^{19}$ These variables were:

1) age
2) Member term
3) salary

Staffers with higher salaries ${ }^{20}$, those serving for Senators with more terms in Congress,

[^8]and those with higher ages tend to have lower turnover between jobs and offices.
Age and Member Term: It intuitively makes sense that the older a staffer and the longer the staffer's Senator has served, the longer the staffer is likely to have been in his job and office. If a 50 -year-old State Caseworker is working for a fourth-term Senator, it is entirely possible that the Caseworker has tenure in this job and office of twenty years. If another Caseworker is working for a freshman Senator or is 27 years old, his job and office tenure could not be very long. In addition, older staffers may simply be more stable, in the sense that they are less inclined to move between jobs and offices.

Salary: Salaries are generally thought of as financial incentives to accept and remain in one's job and office, rewards for performance, and measures of one's "worth" to the organization. Therefore, other factors being equal, those with higher salaries would tend to feel more closely attached to their job and office and remain in them longer. This seems to be the case in Senate offices.

Other Significant Variables: Staffers in offices with more generous paid maternity leave tend to have lower turnover between jobs than staffers whose offices have less generous paid maternity policies. In contrast, staffers in offices that give merit bonuses tend to have higher turnover between jobs than staffers whose offices don't give merit bonuses. Neither of these variables significantly affected turnover between offices.

Comparison with House offices: Just as in Senate offices, the variables of higher salary, higher age, and serving for Members with more seniority were significantly associated with lower turnover in House personal offices in 1994. ${ }^{21}$

[^9]${ }^{21}$ In 1993, the same three variables were significantly associated with lower turnover in Senate offices.

## Limitations of Regression Analysis Information

Regression analysis indicates which factors statistically predict or explain a dependent variable (e.g., turnover). It should be noted, however, that our analysis does not include an exhaustive list of possible factors that may impact a particular dependent variable. Thus, there may be other factors that are not measured and tested for by this study that may also affect decisions related to turnover. For example, the perception that increased crime has made Capitol Hill unsafe may cause some staff to leave their jobs.

Further, the results from the regression analysis should not necessarily be viewed as recommendations of practices that will reduce turnover. Rather, this information should be used as a guide in understanding general practices in the Senate, but not as a recommendation for specific policies or actions.

## PART 3: DEMOGRAPHICS

## AGGREGATE AGE INFORMATION

## Average Age of Staff

| Average Age | $\frac{\text { Total }}{33.7} \quad \frac{\text { Washington }}{31.9} \quad \frac{\text { State }}{37.5}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

The average age of Senate staff is about 34. As the table on the next page shows, 19 percent are 25 or younger, while 26 percent are 40 or older, and 12 percent are 50 or older. Staff in Senators' state offices tend to be older than staff in their Washington offices.

Over the past two years, the average age of Senate staff has declined by almost one year, from a 1993 average of 34.5 . Senate staff are exactly one year younger than House staff on average.

Senate staff are slightly younger than workers in the U.S. labor force, who have a median age of 36.9.22 Senate staff are much younger than federal executive branch employees, whose average age is $44.2 .{ }^{23}$

## Age by Member Tenure

|  | Average Age in Years |
| :--- | :---: |
| 1st term | 32.1 |
| 2nd term | 33.3 |
| 3rd term | 36.1 |
| 4th term + | 34.6 |

[^10]
## Age Distribution by Member Term in Office

| Age Group |  | 1st |  | 2nd |  | 3rd |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| under 25 |  | 4th or more | Total |  |  |  |
| $25-29$ | $22.1 \%$ | $18.7 \%$ | $16.2 \%$ | $18.5 \%$ |  | $19.2 \%$ |
| $30-34$ | $30.4 \%$ | $27.9 \%$ | $24.1 \%$ | $26.4 \%$ | $27.6 \%$ |  |
| $35-39$ | $18.1 \%$ | $16.8 \%$ | $14.1 \%$ | $14.5 \%$ | $16.2 \%$ |  |
| $40-44$ | $10.4 \%$ | $13.2 \%$ | $11.5 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ | $11.1 \%$ |  |
| $45-49$ | $5.4 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ | $7.3 \%$ |  |
| $50-54$ | $5.4 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ |  |
| $55-59$ | $4.5 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ |  |
| $60-64$ | $2.1 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |  |
| $65+$ | $1.0 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ |  |
|  | $0.5 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ |  |

The average age of staff tends to increase as Senators' tenure increases. Veteran Senators tend to employ more staff who are 50 or older and fewer who are under 25 than more junior Senators.

## Age by Member Party Affiliation

|  | Average Age in Years |
| :--- | :---: |
| Democrat | 33.8 |
| Republican | 33.7 |

Staff age does not vary by party affiliation.

# AGGREGATE EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT INFORMATION 

## Educational Attainment of Staff

|  | Total | Washington | State |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| High School or less | 4.7\% | 4.6\% | 5.1\% |
| Some College | 12.5\% | 9.4\% | 19.0\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 65.1\% | 65.7\% | 63.8\% |
| Master's Degree | 9.9\% | 10.5\% | 8.6\% |
| Law Degree | 6.7\% | 8.5\% | 2.9\% |
| Doctorate Degree | 1.1\% | 1.3\% | 0.6\% |

Senate staff are well-educated, with 83 percent having a minimum of a bachelor's degree and 18 percent holding advanced degrees. The educational attainment of Senate staff has changed only slightly since 1993, when 81 percent had a bachelor's degree or more and 19 percent had advanced degrees. The comparable figures for House staff in 1994 were 81 and 14 percent.

Staff based in Washington offices have greater educational training than state staff. Washington staff are almost 70 percent more likely to hold advanced degrees and 70 percent less likely not to hold a bachelor's or higher degree.

Congressional staff have significantly greater educational training than federal civilian employees, 38.3 percent of whom have at least a bachelor's degree. ${ }^{24}$ In the general U.S. adult population, approximately 20 percent have at least a bachelor's degree. ${ }^{25}$

[^11]
## AGGREGATE GENDER INFORMATION

In this section of the report we compare staff employment, educational attainment, marital status, age, and type of position by gender.

## Disaggregation by Gender and Staff Location

|  | $\underline{\text { Total }}$ |  | Washington |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $56.4 \%$ |  | $\underline{\text { State }}$ |
| Male | $43.6 \%$ |  | $52.4 \%$ |
|  | $47.6 \%$ | $35.6 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  | $35.4 \%$ |

## Female Staff in Congress: The Historical Record (Percent of staff who are female)

## Senate Staff

| Year | Total | Washington |  | State/District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1995 | .564 | .524 | .646 |  |
| 1993 | .597 |  | .558 | .677 |
| 1991 | .623 |  | .592 | .682 |

## House Staff

| 1994 | .577 | .517 | .656 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1992 | .605 | .544 | .688 |
| 1990 | .605 | .541 | .700 |

Over the past four years, the proportion of female Senate staff has declined by almost six percent. This decline has been larger in Washington offices than in state offices. Between 1991 and 1995, the proportion of women in Washington-based Senate offices declined by seven percent, from 59 percent to 52 percent.

The House has also experienced a decrease in female staff, though the decline has not been as sharp as in the Senate. After two years without change, the proportion of female staff in the House dropped by almost three percent between 1992 and 1994.

In both chambers of Congress, women tend to be more heavily represented in district and state offices than in Washington offices.

In comparison, 45 percent of federal civilian employees are women. ${ }^{26}$ Women also comprise 45 percent of the U.S. labor force. ${ }^{27}$

## Distribution of Educational Attainment by Gender and Location

|  | Total |  | Washington |  | State |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| High School or less | 1.3\% | 7.4\% | 1.1\% | 7.7\% | 1.8\% | 6.9\% |
| Some College | 5.0\% | 18.3\% | 4.9\% | 13.5\% | 5.9\% | 26.3\% |
| Bachelor's | 66.2\% | 62.6\% | 66.6\% | 64.9\% | 73.3\% | 58.6\% |
| Master's | 13.8\% | 6.4\% | 14.3\% | 7.0\% | 14.0\% | 5.5\% |
| Law | 8.8\% | 4.8\% | 10.9\% | 6.4\% | 4.1\% | 2.2\% |
| Doctorate | 1.7\% | 0.6\% | 2.1\% | 0.6\% | 0.9\% | 0.5\% |

A substantially larger proportion of men than women hold at least a bachelor's degree, a pattern that is true among Washington and state-based staff. Overall, 91 percent of male staff have at least a bachelor's degree, while for women that figure is 74 percent. In both Washington and state offices, approximately twice as many men as women hold advanced degrees.

Marital Status by Gender

|  | Married |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $37.6 \%$ |  |
| Male | $37.6 \%$ | $62.4 \%$ |
|  |  | $62.4 \%$ |

A matchmaker's paradise! Exactly equal proportions of men and women are single.

[^12]
## Age Distribution by Gender

| Age Group | Female | Male |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Under 25 | $18.3 \%$ |  |
| $25-20.4 \%$ |  |  |
| $30-34$ | $23.8 \%$ | $32.6 \%$ |
| $35-39$ | $14.0 \%$ | $19.0 \%$ |
| $40-44$ | $12.1 \%$ | $10.1 \%$ |
| $45-49$ | $8.7 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ |
| $50-54$ | $8.7 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ |
| $55-59$ | $7.6 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ |
| $60-64$ | $3.9 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| $65+$ | $2.0 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ |
|  | $1.1 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| Average Age | 35.1 | 31.9 |

Women in Senate offices are, on average, 3.2 years older than men. Seventy-two percent of all men are under the age of 35 , while 56 percent of women are younger than 35 .

## Type of Position by Gender

We report the percentage of women and men that staff each position in the "Individual Position Profiles and Analyses" section, beginning on page 43. Not surprisingly, these percentages often differ substantially from the overall averages. In the table below, we have grouped positions that are at similar levels of responsibility in the organizational hierarchy of an office staff and disaggregated them by gender.

| Type of <br> Position* | $\underline{\text { Female }}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Leadership | $36.9 \%$ |  | $\underline{\text { Male }}$ |$\quad$| Number of Staff |
| :---: |
| Policy |

In comparison to the overall composition of Senate personal staff, males hold a disproportionate share of Leadership and Policy positions. Females hold a disproportionate share of Mid-level and Clerical positions. Definitions for each "Type of Position" are listed on the following page.

Since 1993, the share of women in both leadership and policy positions has increased by approximately three percent, from figures of 33.5 percent and 40.6 percent, respectively. Their shares of mid-level and clerical jobs have decreased correspondingly.

In the House in 1994, female staff occupied 39.1 percent of leadership jobs, 40.5 percent of
policy jobs, 71.6 percent of mid-level jobs, and exactly 70 percent of clerical posts.
Women hold a much higher proportion of top positions in Congress than they do in the U.S. economy overall. A study of federal executive agencies found that less than 10 percent of all Senior Executive Service/GM 16-18 positions are filled by women. ${ }^{28}$ In a study of Fortune 2000 Industrial and Service companies, it was found that 5 percent of top management positions were occupied by women. ${ }^{29}$ The same study found that women comprise 46 percent of all executive, management, and administrative positions. As we note on page 10, women's relative earnings are also higher in Congress than in other sectors of the U.S. economy.

## * Position Category Definitions ${ }^{30}$

Leadership positions: Administrative Assistant/Chief of Staff, Legislative Director, Press Secretary/Communications Director, and State Director.

Policy positions: the four Leadership positions plus Legislative Assistant and General Counsel/Legislative Counsel.

Mid-level positions: Office Manager/Administrative Director, Systems Administrator, Correspondence Director/Mail Manager, Projects Director/Coordinator, Washington Caseworker, Regional Director, Field Representative, and State Caseworker.

Clerical positions: Receptionist, Washington Office Assistant, Computer Operator/CMS Specialist, Correspondence Assistant/Mail Room Staffer, and State Office Assistant.
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## AGGREGATE RACIAL AND ETHNIC INFORMATION

In this section of the report we compare staff employment, age, gender, educational attainment, and type of position by race and ethnicity. Offices were surveyed as to staff membership in the following racial and ethnic groups: Black/African-American, White, Hispanic, Asian, Pacific Islander, American Indian, and "other."

In the table immediately below, we show the percentage of staff in each of these seven racial/ethnic groups. However, because the numbers of Asian, Pacific Islander, and American Indian staff in Senate personal offices is small, we have combined all non-black, nonHispanic minority staff into the catch-all group titled "all other" for the remainder of the tables in this section. We have done so to protect the anonymity of individual staff members and for analytic clarity.

## Disaggregation by Race and Staff Location

|  | $\frac{\text { Total }}{}$ | Washington |  | $\underline{\text { State }}$ |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Black | $9.0 \%$ |  | $7.9 \%$ | $11.1 \%$ |
| White | $84.7 \%$ | $87.5 \%$ | $79.0 \%$ |  |
| Hispanic | $3.5 \%$ |  | $2.1 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ |
| Asian | $1.6 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ |  |
| Pacific Islander | $0.3 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |  |
| Native American | $0.4 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |  |
| Other | $0.6 \%$ |  | $0.6 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |

Overall, minorities comprise 15.4 percent of Senate personal office staff. Staffers from minority groups tend to be much more likely to work in Senators' state-based offices than in Washington offices. The historical trends in minority employment in the Senate are reported on the next page.

Employment by Race and Ethnicity: The Historical Record (Percent of staff by race/ethnicity)

## Senate Staff

| Year | Black | Hispanic | Other Minorities |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| 1995 | $9.0 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ |
| 1993 | $8.7 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ |
| 1991 | $8.1 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ |

## House Staff

| 1994 | $7.9 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1992 | $9.9 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ |
| 1990 | $9.4 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |
| 1977 | $7.0 \%^{31}$ | N.A. | N.A. |

Senate and House personal offices have similar patterns of minority employment. Minorities have lower employment rates in House and Senate offices than in the U.S. labor force or the federal government. These patterns have been relatively stable over the past six years.

Minorities comprise 22 percent of the labor force, but only 15.4 percent of Senate personal office staff and 15.5 percent of House personal office staff. Specifically, blacks comprise 10.1 percent of the U.S. labor force, Hispanics 7.5 percent, and Asians 2.6 percent. ${ }^{32}$ Among federal executive branch workers, 17 percent are black, 6 percent are Hispanic, and 4 percent are Asian/Pacific Islander. ${ }^{33}$
${ }^{31}$ Data from 1977 report of Obey Commission.
32 Howard Gleckman et al., "Race in the Workplace," Business Week, July 8, 1991.
${ }^{33}$ Christine E. Steele, "Profile of Federal Civilian Non-Postal Employees," Office of Personnel Management, March 31, 1995.

## Age by Race and Ethnicity

|  | Black | White | Hispanic | All Other |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Under 25 | $11.6 \%$ | $20.4 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ | $18.9 \%$ |
| $25-29$ | $25.8 \%$ | $27.2 \%$ | $34.4 \%$ | $32.1 \%$ |
| $30-34$ | $15.5 \%$ | $16.2 \%$ | $18.8 \%$ | $11.3 \%$ |
| $35-39$ | $16.8 \%$ | $9.9 \%$ | $15.6 \%$ | $26.4 \%$ |
| $40-44$ | $7.7 \%$ | $7.7 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| $45-49$ | $9.0 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ | $10.9 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ |
| $50-54$ | $7.7 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| $55-59$ | $2.6 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ |
| $60-64$ | $1.9 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| $65+$ | $1.3 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Age | $\mathbf{3 5 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 . 6}$ | 32.8 |

On average, black Senate staff are about two years older than staff from other groups and tend to be less heavily represented in the younger age ranges. For example, 64 percent of white staff are under 35 years old, but only 53 percent of blacks are under 35 .

## Gender by Race and Ethnicity

|  | $\underline{\text { Black }}$ |  | White |  | Hispanic |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |$\quad$|  | All Other |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | $70.1 \%$ |  | $54.6 \%$ |
|  | $64.2 \%$ | $58.2 \%$ |  |
| Male | $29.9 \%$ |  | $45.4 \%$ |
|  | $35.8 \%$ | $41.8 \%$ |  |

Women, who comprise 56 percent of Senate personal staff, constitute a clear majority of staff in every racial and ethnic group. Greater proportions of minorities than whites are female. The same patterns held for House personal offices in 1994.

Educational Attainment by Race and Ethnicity

|  | Black |  | White |  | Hispanic |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |$\quad$| All Other |
| :--- |
| High School or less |
|  |
| Some College |

The percentage of staff with graduate degrees is similar across race and ethnicity. However, among those without graduate degrees, educational attainment varies by race and ethnicity. College degrees are most common among whites and least common among blacks.

Staff Race and Ethnicity by Member Party Affiliation

|  | $\underline{\text { Black }}$ |  | White |  | Hispanic |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Democratic | $79.9 \%$ | $51.6 \%$ |  | $55.2 \%$ |  | $81.8 \%$ |
| Republican | $20.1 \%$ |  | $48.4 \%$ |  | $44.8 \%$ |  |
| Rother |  | $55.18 .2 \%$ | $44.9 \%$ |  |  |  |

Black, Hispanic, and "all other" minority staff are disproportionately employed in Democratic offices.

## Type of Position by Staff Race and Ethnicity

The "Individual Position Profiles and Analyses" section beginning on page 43 provides the percentage of each racial and ethnic group staffing each position. In the table below, we have grouped positions that are at similar levels of responsibility with respect to the organizational hierarchy of an office staff and disaggregated them by race and ethnicity. (See page 31 for position category definitions.)

| Type of <br> Position | Black |  | White |  | Hispanic |  | All Other |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

In comparison to the overall racial and ethnic composition of Senate personal staff, whites hold a disproportionate share of Leadership and Policy positions. Blacks hold a disproportionate share of Clerical positions. The same pattern occurred in Senate offices in 1993. In House offices in 1994, blacks held 5.5 percent of leadership jobs, 4.8 percent of policy jobs, 10.3 percent of mid-level jobs, and 8.9 percent of clerical posts.

The pattern in Senate and House offices is generally consistent with racial patterns in workplaces nationwide. A study of senior executives in the largest U.S. companies found that nearly 97 percent were white. ${ }^{34}$ Figures from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics show that 27.9 percent of whites are managers or professionals while the number for blacks is 16.5 percent. The disparity is worse among administrators: 31.6 percent of whites and 7.4 percent of blacks. About five percent of American professionals are black. Hispanics hold about four percent of the nation's white collar jobs, a proportion that is only half as large as their share of the labor force.

[^14]
## AGGREGATE MARITAL STATUS INFORMATION

In this section of the report we compare staff employment and age by marital status. Offices were asked whether staff were married or single. Our survey did not attempt to differentiate single staff into more refined categories.

## Marital Status of Staff

|  | $\underline{\text { Total }}$ |  | Washington |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Single | $62.4 \%$ |  | $69.1 \%$ |  |
| Married | $37.6 \%$ |  | $30.9 \%$ |  |
| State |  | $51.3 \%$ |  |  |

More than three-fifths of all Senate personal office staff are single. Marital status, however, varies dramatically by staff location with over two-thirds of Washington staff being single and more than half of state staff being married. Since 1993, the percentage of staffers who are single rose by four percent.

The marital status of Senate personal office staff is also similar to that of House personal offices. In the House in 1994, 58 percent of staffers were single, and 70 percent of those in Washington offices were single.

## Age Distribution by Marital Status

| Age Group | Single |  | Married |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Under 25 | $29.0 \%$ |  | $2.8 \%$ |
| $25-29$ | $35.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ |  |
| $30-34$ | $14.4 \%$ | $19.0 \%$ |  |
| $35-39$ | $6.9 \%$ | $18.4 \%$ |  |
| $40-44$ | $4.4 \%$ | $12.2 \%$ |  |
| $45-49$ | $3.6 \%$ | $12.5 \%$ |  |
| $50-54$ | $3.9 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ |  |
| $55-59$ | $1.6 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ |  |
| $60-64$ | $0.7 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ |  |
| $65+$ | $0.4 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Average Age | 30.3 | $\mathbf{3 9 . 6}$ |  |

On average, single staff are almost ten years younger than married staff. Single staff are especially concentrated in the under- 35 age groups, while married staff are more evenly distributed throughout all age groups.

## PART 4: OFFICE STRUCTURE

## Average Number of Full-Time Staff Per Office

|  | Total | Washington |  | State |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1995 | 35.2 | 23.5 |  | 11.7 | $\frac{\% \text { State }}{33.2 \%}$ |
| 1993 | 33.8 | 22.6 | 11.2 | $33.1 \%$ |  |
| 1991 | 35.3 | 22.6 | 12.7 | $36.0 \%$ |  |

The overall size of Senate personal office staffs rose by an average of 1.4 full-time staffers over the past two years. The average size of both Washington and state staffs increased over that period, while the percentage of staff based in state offices remained constant. ${ }^{35}$

## Average Number of Full-Time Staff Per Office by State Population

|  | Total |  | Washington |  | State |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

In general, Senators representing more populous states tend to have larger staffs. This makes sense because more citizens usually generate more constituent work for Senate offices and, in fact, Senators from more populous states receive larger office budgets to support their larger workloads.
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## Average Number of State Offices by State Population

| State Population | State Offices |
| :--- | :---: |
| $=2$ million | 4.1 |
| $2-5$ million | 3.1 |
| $5-10$ million | 4.4 |
| 10 million + | 4.5 |
|  |  |
| Overall Average | 4.0 |

Senate offices average four state offices. Every Senate office in the sample has at least one state office, and none have more than nine state offices.

## Who Determines Staff Salaries?

|  | Percent of Offices |
| :--- | :---: |
| Member | $70 \%$ |
| AA/Chief of Staff | $70 \%$ |
| State Director | $44 \%$ |
| Legislative Director | $37 \%$ |
| Other Staff | $46 \%$ |

This year, for the first time in the Senate, we asked offices which individual(s) are formally involved in making their salary decisions. In the majority of Senate offices, the Member and AA/Chief of Staff are involved in determining staff salaries. In less than one-half of offices is the State Director involved in setting salaries.

## Percent of Offices Using Different Organizational Structures

## Centralized Structure:

All Senior Staff Report to AA
Washington/State Parity Structure:
DC Staff Report to AA; State Staff
Report to State Director
$9 \%$
Functional Structure:
Junior Staff Report to Senior Staff;
Senior Staff Report Directly to Senator $9 \%$
Other $6 \%$

Over three-quarters of Senate offices are structured in such a way that all staff report to the AA who, in turn, reports to the Member. Under this centralized structure, state staffers report to the Washington AA (see charts below). This structure has become much more popular since 1993, when 49 percent of Senate offices used it.


## Staff Per Office by Position

The following table shows the range of staffing within offices by position. The "Average" column describes how many staffers of each position there are, on average, in each Senate office. The "\% of Offices" column shows the percentage of offices with at least one person in a given position.

| 仡 | Average | $\%$ of Offices |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Washington Positions |  |  |
| Management / Administrative |  |  |
| Administrative Assistant/Chief of Staff | 0.98 | 97\% |
| Assistant/Secretary to the AA | 0.71 | 71\% |
| Executive Assistant/Personal Sec. | 0.81 | 78\% |
| Scheduler/Appointments Secretary | 0.78 | 76\% |
| Office Manager/Administrative Dir. | 0.86 | 86\% |
| Washington Office Assistant | 0.86 | 38\% |
| Receptionist | 1.66 | 97\% |
| Systems Administrator | 0.83 | 83\% |
| Correspondence Dir./Mail Manager | 0.48 | 48\% |
| Computer Operator/CMS Specialist | 1.14 | 74\% |
| Correspondence Asst./Mail Room Staffer | 0.95 | 67\% |
| Legislative |  |  |
| Legislative Director | 0.91 | 91\% |
| Legislative Assistant | 5.16 | 100\% |
| Legislative Correspondent | 3.29 | 95\% |
| Research Assistant/Legislative Aide | 0.31 | 17\% |
| General Counsel/Legislative Counsel | 0.41 | 40\% |
| Press and Other |  |  |
| Press Secretary/Communications Dir. | 0.95 | 91\% |
| Deputy/Assistant Press Secretary | 0.86 | 81\% |
| Projects Director/Coordinator | 0.26 | 24\% |
| Washington Caseworker | 0.14 | 12\% |

## State Positions

|  | Average |  | $\%$ of <br> Offices |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.90 | $88 \%$ |  |
| State Director | 0.98 |  | $69 \%$ |
| Regional Director/Office Manager | 3.14 | $86 \%$ |  |
| Field Representative | 3.78 | $88 \%$ |  |
| State Caseworker | 1.36 | $71 \%$ |  |
| State Office Assistant |  |  |  |

Offices display substantial diversity in the positions they fill. Only one position -- Legislative Assistant -- is found in all 58 offices in our survey. However, a core set of positions clearly exists. We define the following positions, which are filled in at least three-fourths of the offices, as the core:

Management / Administrative core: Administrative Assistant, Executive Assistant, Office Manager, Scheduler, Receptionist, and Systems Administrator.

Legislative core: Legislative Director, Legislative Assistant, and Legislative Correspondent.

Press core: Press Secretary and Deputy Press Secretary.
State core: State Director, Field Representative, and State Caseworker.

## INDIVIDUAL POSITION PROFILES AND ANALYSES

## INDIVIDUAL POSITION PROFILES AND ANALYSES

## Methodology

In this section of the report, we provide detailed analyses of 25 Senate personal office positions. Our position analyses address three primary objectives:

1) Describing the demographic make-up of the staff who work in each of these jobs and their congressional experience.
2) Determining the average 1995 salaries, changes in salary since 1993, and the salary distribution of staff for each position.
3) Determining which factors affect the pay of staff for each position.

The first two objectives were easily accomplished with simple calculations and graphs. Regression analysis was performed to fulfill the third objective.

## Explanation of Graphs

For each position, we provide a graph showing various salary ranges and the percentage of staffers' salaries within each range. For example, assume that there were 100 Press Secretaries listed on our survey with 15 of them earning between $\$ 47,500$ and $\$ 52,499$. We would indicate this by placing a dot above the midpoint of the range ( $\$ 50,000$ ), parallel to 15 percent. To generate the entire salary distribution for each position, we simply "connected the

## Press Secretary


dots" for each salary range. ${ }^{36}$ The most common salaries for each position are represented by the bulk of the shading.

## Regression Analysis of Salary

Our third objective listed above, determining which factors influence the pay of staff, required more sophisticated analyses. For each position, we used a statistical procedure called multiple regression analysis to determine the influence of eight variables on salary. This technique allowed us to determine the unique influence on salary of each variable by controlling for the effects of the other seven variables. The eight variables we analyzed were:

1) years in current position
2) prior years of experience in the present Senate office (i.e. experience in present office before taking current position)
3) prior years of congressional experience (i.e. congressional experience prior to current position)
4) years of education ${ }^{37}$
5) level of responsibility in position ${ }^{38}$
6) age
7) gender $^{39}$
8) race and ethnicity
[^16]The values we attribute to law and doctorate degrees reflect our belief that, with these degrees, the type of degree is more important than the years required to earn it. Examination of the data indicated that staff with these degrees earn similar salaries.
${ }^{38}$ This variable measures whether a staffer has more, fewer, or about the same job responsibilities as those that we provide for each position in the survey. Our definition of average responsibilities is included in each position analysis.

[^17]For each of the positions analyzed in this section, we indicate which variables are related to salary in a "statistically significant" way. ${ }^{40}$ For significant variables, we also indicate whether more units (e.g., years) of the variable are related to higher or to lower pay.

## Limitations of Regression Analysis

Regression analysis indicates which factors statistically predict or explain a dependent variable (e.g., salary). It should be noted, however, that our analysis does not include an exhaustive array of possible factors that may impact a particular dependent variable. Thus, there may be factors that are not measured and tested for by this study that may also affect salary decisions.

Further, the results from the regression analysis should not necessarily be viewed as recommendations of practices that should be used by congressional offices. For example, an office may want to make educational achievement a prime salary consideration for a job even if the regression analysis indicates that most offices do not currently do so. Therefore, our information should be used as a guide in understanding general pay practices in Senate personal offices and not as a recommendation for specific policies or actions.

[^18]
## AVERAGE TENURE IN POSITION, OFFICE, AND CONGRESS FOR ALL SENATE POSITIONS

|  | \% Change |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average | Yrs. in | Average | Average |
| Yrs. in | Position, | Yrs. in | Yrs. in |
| Position | 1993-95 | Office | Congress |

## Washington Positions

| Administrative Assistant/Chief of Staff | 4.1 | $5.1 \%$ | 6.0 | 10.3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Legislative Director | 3.5 | $-10.3 \%$ | 5.7 | 10.6 |
| General Counsel/Legislative Counsel | 2.6 | $-18.8 \%$ | 3.4 | 5.2 |
| Press Secretary/Communications Dir. | 2.6 | $-21.2 \%$ | 3.5 | 5.7 |
| Office Manager/Administrative Dir. | 5.2 | $15.6 \%$ | 7.2 | 13.2 |
| Executive Assistant/Personal Sec. | 6.3 | $8.6 \%$ | 7.2 | 10.9 |
| Legislative Assistant | 2.8 | $-6.7 \%$ | 3.7 | 5.1 |
| Projects Director/Coordinator | 2.1 | $-22.2 \%$. | 3.3 | 5.1 |
| Scheduler/Appointments Secretary | 3.5 | $12.9 \%$ | 5.0 | 5.9 |
| Systems Administrator | 3.8 | $2.7 \%$ | 5.4 | 9.3 |
| Washington Caseworker | 8.1 | $-29.6 \%$. | 9.2 | 14.1 |
| Correspondence Dir./Mail Manager | 4.3 | $19.4 \%$ | 5.2 | 7.5 |
| Deputy/Asst. Press Secretary | 1.7 | $-10.5 \%$ | 2.4 | 2.9 |
| Asst./Secretary to the AA | 1.4 | $-56.3 \%$ | 2.9 | 3.9 |
| Computer Operator/CMS Specialist | 5.2 | $-1.9 \%$ | 5.2 | 9.5 |
| Research Assistant/Legislative Aide | 0.9 | $-30.8 \%$ | 1.7 | 1.8 |
| Washington Office Assistant | 3.1 | $3.3 \%$ | 3.6 | 4.9 |
| Legislative Correspondent | 1.1 | $-15.4 \%$ | 1.7 | 1.9 |
| Receptionist | 1.4 | $7.7 \%$ | 1.5 | 1.8 |
| Correspondence Asst./Mail Rm. Staffer | 0.8 | $-46.7 \%$ | 0.9 | 2.5 |

State Positions

| State Director | 4.0 | $-18.4 \%$ | 6.9 | 8.2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Regional Director/Office Manager | 5.0 | $-15.3 \%$ | 7.3 | 7.9 |
| Field Representative | 4.5 | $2.3 \%$ | 4.9 | 5.5 |
| State Caseworker | 4.7 | $2.2 \%$ | 5.2 | 6.3 |
| State Office Assistant | 4.1 | n.a. | 4.1 | 4.7 |

## AVERAGE SALARY FOR ALL SENATE POSITIONS

|  |  | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average <br> Salary | $\underline{1993-95}$ |
|  |  |  |
| Washington Positions |  |  |
| Administrative Assistant/Chief of Staff | $\$ 101,835$ | $3.6 \%$ |
| Legislative Director | $\$ 80,138$ | $5.7 \%$ |
| General Counsel/Legislative Counsel | $\$ 61,443$ | $-9.4 \%$ |
| Press Secretary/Communications Dir. | $\$ 55,602$ | $-1.9 \%$ |
| Office Manager/Administrative Director | $\$ 51,148$ | $13.1 \%$ |
| Executive Assistant/Personal Secretary | $\$ 50,870$ | $4.9 \%$ |
| Legislative Assistant | $\$ 43,496$ | $-3.5 \%$ |
| Projects Director/Coordinator | $\$ 40,325$ | $16.6 \%$ |
| Scheduler/Appointments Secretary | $\$ 36,430$ | $3.4 \%$ |
| Systems Administrator | $\$ 36,419$ | $7.5 \%$ |
| Washington Caseworker | $\$ 33,688$ | $-14.9 \%$ |
| Correspondence Dir./Mail Manager | $\$ 30,898$ | $7.2 \%$ |
| Deputy/Asst. Press Secretary | $\$ 30,334$ | $7.5 \%$ |
| Asst./Secretary to the AA | $\$ 29,006$ | $-0.1 \%$ |
| Computer Operator/CMS Specialist | $\$ 26,524$ | $5.1 \%$ |
| Research Assistant/Legislative Aide | $\$ 24,058$ | $-9.5 \%$ |
| Washington Office Assistant | $\$ 23,665$ | $1.5 \%$ |
| Legislative Correspondent | $\$ 22,803$ | $1.8 \%$ |
| Receptionist | $\$ 20,843$ | $3.7 \%$ |
| Correspondence Asst./Mail Room Staffer | $\$ 20,205$ | $2.9 \%$ |
| State Positions |  |  |
| State Director | $\$ 65,392$ | $-0.8 \%$ |
| Regional Director/Office Manager | $\$ 38,087$ | $-2.9 \%$ |
| Field Representative | $\$ 33,116$ | $8.2 \%$ |
| State Caseworker | $\$ 26,910$ | $3.4 \%$ |
| State Office Assistant | $\$ 21,657$ | $n . a$. |
|  |  |  |

## ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT / CHIEF OF STAFF

General Job Responsibilities: Top management staff person; oversees overall office functions; supervises staff and budget; advises Senator on political matters.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | 1995 | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 70.4\% |
| in Current Position | 4.1 | 3.9 | Female | 29.6\% |
| in Current Office | 6.0 | 6.1 |  |  |
| in Congress | 10.3 | 9.3 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 22.2\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 77.8\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 0.0\% |  | Black | 0.0\% |
| Some College | 7.4\% |  | Hispanic | 0.0\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 46.3\% |  | White | 96.3\% |
| Masters' Degree | 22.2\% |  | Other | 3.7\% |
| Law Degree | 18.5\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 5.6\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 43 |

AVERAGE SALARY 1995:
AVERAGE SALARY 1993:
PERCENTAGE CHANGE:
AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE: $1.8 \%$
$($ Sample size $=57)$
\$101,835
\$98,316
$3.6 \%$

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all AAs earn within the range of the 20 th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 90,000$ and $\$ 120,000$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, an AA making $\$ 105,000$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all AAs.

## ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT / CHIEF OF STAFF

General Findings: Unlike staff in many other positions, AAs have been in their current Senate office much longer than in their current position. This difference suggests that AAs are promoted from within the office more frequently than staff in other positions.

AAs are the highest paid staff in Senate offices, as they were in 1993 and 1991.
Despite their senior status in Senate offices, AAs tend to have high rates of turnover. Thirty percent have been in their current position one year or less and 44 percent have been in their position in two years or less.

AAs tend to be highly educated: 46 percent of AAs have advanced degrees. Also, AAs are the second-oldest staff in Washington offices, with an average age of 43.

REGRESSION: One variable was found to be a statistically significant predictor of pay for the AA position, when controlling for the effects of all other variables. AAs with more years of prior congressional experience tend to earn more than AAs with less prior congressional experience. (See pages 44 to 45 for a fuller explanation of regression.)

## AA/Chief of Staff

 Salary Distribution:

From the graph, one can read that about 20 percent of all AAs earn in the $\$ 100,000$ range $(\$ 97,500$ to $\$ 102,499)$ and most earn between $\$ 80,000$ and $\$ 125,000$. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR

General Job Responsibilities: Directs legislative staff; serves as resource person for LAs; briefs Senator on all legislative matters; reviews constituent mail.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | 1995 | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 57.1\% |
| in Current Position | 3.5 | 3.9 | Female | 42.9\% |
| in Current Office | 5.7 | 6.5 |  |  |
| in Congress | 10.6 | 9.9 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 46.9\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 53.1\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 0.0\% |  | Black | 4.1\% |
| Some College | 0.0\% |  | Hispanic | 0.0\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 38.8\% |  | White | 95.9\% |
| Masters' Degree | 24.5\% |  | Other | 0.0\% |
| Law Degree | 28.6\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 8.2\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 38 |

AVERAGE SALARY 1995:
AVERAGE SALARY 1993:
PERCENTAGE CHANGE:
AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE: $\quad 2.8 \%$
$($ Sample size $=53)$
\$80,138
\$75,848
5.7\%

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all LDs earn within the range of the 20 th and the 80 th percentiles or between $\$ 70,000$ and $\$ 93,000$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, an LD making $\$ 83,800$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all LDs.

## LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR

General Findings: LDs have the second-highest average salary of any position, and their average salaries have increased by 5.7 percent since 1993.

Just as with AAs, Legislative Directors have been in their current offices considerably longer than in their current positions. This suggests that LDs are often promoted from within the office. Also, LDs tend to have quite a bit of congressional experience (an average of 10.6 years).

Individuals in this position tend to be extremely well-educated; 100 percent have graduated from college and 61 percent hold some type of advanced degree. This is the second-highest percentage of graduate degrees among all Senate staff positions, trailing only the General Counsel position.

REGRESSION: One variable was found to be a statistically significant predictor of pay for the LD position, when controlling for the effects of all other variables. LDs with higher ages tend to earn more than younger LDs. (See pages 44 to 45 for a fuller explanation of regression.)

## Legislative Director

Salary Distribution:


From the graph, one can read that about 18 percent of all LDs earn in the $\$ 85,000$ range $(\$ 82,500$ to $\$ 87,499$ ) and most earn between $\$ 65,000$ and $\$ 100,000$. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## GENERAL COUNSEL / LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

General Job Responsibilities: Provides legal advice on legislative and other policy matters.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | 1995 | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 65.2\% |
| in Current Position | 2.6 | 3.2 | Female | 34.8\% |
| in Current Office | 3.4 | 3.6 |  |  |
| in Congress | 5.2 | 4.9 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 43.5\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 56.5\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 0.0\% |  | Black | 13.0\% |
| Some College | 0.0\% |  | Hispanic | 0.0\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 13.6\% |  | White | 87.0\% |
| Masters' Degree | 4.5\% |  | Other | 0.0\% |
| Law Degree | 81.8\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 0.0\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 35 |


| AVERAGE SALARY 1995: | \$61,443 | SALARY PERCENTILES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AVERAGE SALARY 1993: | \$67,852 | 80\% -- \$73,800 |
| PERCENTAGE CHANGE: | -9.4\% | 60\% -- \$66,640 |
| AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE: | -4.6\% | 50\% -- \$61,500 |
|  |  | 40\% -- \$59,000 |
| $($ Sample size $=24$ ) |  | 20\% -- \$46,004 |
| Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all General Counsels earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 46,004$ and $\$ 73,800$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, a General Counsel making $\$ 66,640$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all General Counsels. |  |  |

General Findings: The average salary of General Counsels decreased by 9.4 percent between 1993 and 1995. This decrease was the third-largest among Senate staff. However, the small sample size for the General Counsel position -- only 24 staff-- calls into question the reliability of the data for the purpose of making comparisons over time.

General Counsels are the fourth-highest paid staff in Senate offices, trailing only Administrative Assistants, Legislative Directors, and State Directors.

As one would expect of a "counsel" position, General Counsels are extremely well-educated. Eighty-two percent of General Counsels hold law degrees. This is the highest percentage of graduate degrees in any of the Senate staff positions.

Of the 58 Senate offices that completed our survey, only 40 percent staffed this position.
REGRESSION: In the 58 offices that responded to our survey, there are only 24 General Counsels working on a full-time basis. Due to the small size of this sample, we cannot determine which variables are statistically significant predictors of pay for the position.

## General Counsel

Salary Distribution:


From the graph, one can read that about 18 percent of all General Counsels earn in the $\$ 60,000$ range ( $\$ 57,500$ to $\$ 62,499$ ) and most earn between $\$ 45,000$ and $\$ 80,000$. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## PRESS SECRETARY / COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR

General Job Responsibilities: Senator's publicity director responsible for speaking with reporters, and for producing press releases, radio and TV spots, newspaper columns, and speeches.


Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all Press Secretaries earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 43,200$ and $\$ 70,537$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, a Press Secretary making $\$ 58,484$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all Press Secretaries.

## PRESS SECRETARY / COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR

General Findings: The job tenure of Press Secretaries decreased by 21 percent between 1993 and 1995. Press Secretaries' average tenure in current office and in Congress have also decreased since 1993. The drop in the average salary of Press Secretaries over the past two years may be related to the decrease in their average job experience.

Press Secretaries have served in their present offices only slightly longer than they have been in their positions. This indicates that staffers are rarely promoted into Press Secretary jobs from within their present office. Instead, Press Secretaries are usually hired from other organizations, congressional or otherwise.

Press Secretary is the fifth-highest paid position in Senate offices and the fourth-highest paid position in Washington offices.

REGRESSION: One variable was found to be a statistically significant predictor of pay for the Press Secretary position, when controlling for the effects of all other variables. Press Secretaries with higher ages tend to earn more than younger Press Secretaries. (See pages 44 to 45 for a fuller explanation of regression.)

## Press Secretary

Salary Distribution:


From the graph, one can read that about 15 percent of all Press Secretaries earn in the $\$ 50,000$ range ( $\$ 47,500$ to $\$ 52,499$ ), another 15 percent earn in the $\$ 60,000$ range ( $\$ 57,500$ to $\$ 62,499$ ), and most earn between $\$ 40,000$ and $\$ 85,000$. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## OFFICE MANAGER / ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR

General Job Responsibilities: Office administration, including monitoring mail flow, overseeing office accounts and personnel administration, and maintaining equipment, furniture, supplies, and filing systems.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | 1995 | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 19.1\% |
| in Current Position | 5.2 | 4.5 | Female | 80.9\% |
| in Current Office | 7.2 | 6.7 |  |  |
| in Congress | 13.2 | 10.0 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 55.3\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 44.7\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 10.6\% |  | Black | 6.4\% |
| Some College | 23.4\% |  | Hispanic | 0.0\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 63.8\% |  | White | 93.6\% |
| Masters' Degree | 2.1\% |  | Other | 0.0\% |
| Law Degree | 0.0\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 0.0\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 41 |

AVERAGE SALARY 1995:

AVERAGE SALARY 1993:
PERCENTAGE CHANGE:

AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE:
$($ Sample size $=50)$
$\$ 51,148$
\$45,239
$13.1 \%$
$6.4 \%$

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all Office Managers earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 40,600$ and $\$ 63,300$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, an Office Manager making $\$ 50,600$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all Office Managers.

## OFFICE MANAGER / ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR

General Findings: The average tenure of Office Managers in their jobs, offices, and in Congress increased over the past two years. The 15.6 percent rise in their job tenure over that period was the second-largest of any position.

The average salary of Office Managers rose by 13 percent between 1993 and 1995, the second-largest increase of any Senate position. The rise in tenure experienced by Office Managers over the past two years may explain the increase in average salaries.

Office Managers are primarily (81 percent) female.
REGRESSION: Two variables were found to be statistically significant predictors of pay for the Office Manager position, when controlling for the effects of all other variables. Office Managers with more years in current position or more years of prior congressional experience tend to earn more than Office Managers without these characteristics. (See pages 44 to 45 for a fuller explanation of regression.)

## Office Manager

Salary Distribution:


From the graph, one can read that 20 percent of all Office Managers earn in the $\$ 50,000$ range ( $\$ 47,500$ to $\$ 52,499$ ) and most earn between $\$ 35,000$ and $\$ 70,000$. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT / PERSONAL SECRETARY

General Job Responsibilities: Assists with Senator's personal matters, including filing, correspondence, and travel arrangements.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | 1995 | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 8.9\% |
| in Current Position | 6.3 | 5.8 | Female | 91.1\% |
| in Current Office | 7.2 | 6.6 |  |  |
| in Congress | 10.9 | 10.9 | MARITAL | TATUS: |
|  |  |  | Single | 60.0\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 40.0\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETH | ICITY: |
| High School or less | 9.1\% |  | Black | 2.2\% |
| Some College | 31.8\% |  | Hispanic | 0.0\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 59.1\% |  | White | 97.8\% |
| Masters' Degree | 0.0\% |  | Other | 0.0\% |
| Law Degree | 0.0\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 0.0\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 42 |

AVERAGE SALARY 1995:
AVERAGE SALARY 1993:

PERCENTAGE CHANGE:
AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE:
(Sample size $=47$ )
$\mathbf{\$ 5 0 , 8 7 0}$
\$48,502
$4.9 \%$
$2.4 \%$

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all Executive Assistants earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 35,000$ and $\$ 64,296$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, an Executive Assistant making $\$ 55,000$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all Executive Assistants.

## EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT / PERSONAL SECRETARY

General Findings: The Executive Assistant position has experienced increases in job and office tenure between 1993 and 1995. The 8.6 percent rise in average job tenure experienced by Executive Assistants was the third-largest of any Senate position.

Executive Assistants have the second-most experience in their jobs and the third-most congressional experience of all Senate staff.

Executive Assistants' average salaries increased by 4.9 percent in the last two years. The rise in the average job and office tenure of Executive Assistants between 1993 and 1995 may explain why they received an above-average salary increase over that period.

Executive Assistants are overwhelmingly (91 percent) female.
REGRESSION: Two variables were found to be statistically significant predictors of pay for the Executive Assistant position, when controlling for the effects of all other variables. Executive Assistants with more years in current position or more job responsibilities tend to earn higher salaries than Executive Assistants without these characteristics. (See pages 44 to 45 for a fuller explanation of regression.)

## Executive Assistant

Salary Distribution:


From the graph, one can read that about 23 percent of all Executive Assistants earn in the $\$ 60,000$ range ( $\$ 57,500$ to $\$ 62,499$ ), most earn less than $\$ 65,000$, and two percent earn $\$ 80,000$ or more. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT

General Job Responsibilities: Briefs Senator on votes and hearings; prepares legislation, speeches and record statements.


AVERAGE SALARY 1995:
AVERAGE SALARY 1993:
PERCENTAGE CHANGE:
AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE: $-1.7 \%$
(Sample size $=299$ )
\$43,496
\$45,057
$-3.5 \%$

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all LAs earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 33,360$ and $\$ 53,000$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, an LA making $\$ 45,000$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all LAs.

## LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT

General Findings: Legislative Assistant is the most commonly staffed position in the Senate. There is an average of more than five LAs per Senate office.

The educational attainment of LAs is quite high: 100 percent of LAs have bachelor's degrees and 47 percent have received advanced degrees. This is the third-highest percentage of graduate degrees among Senate office positions.

LAs are the youngest Senate staffers in a "policy" position. (See page 31 for a description of "policy" positions).

REGRESSION: Five variables were found to be statistically significant predictors of pay for the LA position, when controlling for the effects of all other variables. LAs with more years in current position, more job responsibilities, more education, or higher ages tend to earn more than LAs without these characteristics. Also, non-white LAs tend to earn lower salaries than white LAs when holding all other measured variables constant. (See pages 44 to 45 for a fuller explanation of regression.)

## Legislative Assistant

Salary Distribution:


From the graph, one can read that about 20 percent of all LAs earn in the $\$ 45,000$ range ( $\$ 42,500$ to $\$ 47,499$ ), most earn between $\$ 35,000$ and $\$ 75,000$, and virtually none earn $\$ 85,000$ or more. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## PROJECTS DIRECTOR / COORDINATOR

General Job Responsibilities: Assists in obtaining federal and private funding and addresses needs of state and local governments and other constituents.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | 1995 | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 73.3\% |
| in Current Position | 2.1 | 2.7 | Female | 26.7\% |
| in Current Office | 3.3 | 4.3 |  |  |
| in Congress | 5.1 | 5.7 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 60.0\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 40.0\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 0.0\% |  | Black | 0.0\% |
| Some College | 6.7\% |  | Hispanic | 0.0\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 80.0\% |  | White | 100.0\% |
| Masters' Degree | 13.3\% |  | Other | 0.0\% |
| Law Degree | 0.0\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 0.0\% |  | AVERAGE | AGE: 31 |

AVERAGE SALARY 1995:

AVERAGE SALARY 1993:
PERCENTAGE CHANGE:
AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE:
$($ Sample size $=15)$
$8.0 \%$
\$40,325
\$34,570
$16.6 \%$

40\% -- \$35,400

20\% -- \$29,648

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all Projects Directors earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 29,648$ and $\$ 47,202$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, a Projects Director making $\$ 40,600$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all Projects Directors.

## PROJECTS DIRECTOR / COORDINATOR

General Findings: Projects Directors received the largest salary increase of any Senate position between 1993 and 1995. The average salaries of Projects Directors rose by 16.6 percent during that period. However, the small sample size for this position -- only 15 staff -- calls into question the reliability of the data for the purpose of making comparisons over time.

The average job, office, and congressional tenure of Projects Directors declined over the past two years. This is particularly surprising in light of the sharp rise in their average salaries.

Of the 58 Senate offices that completed our survey, only one-quarter staffed this position.
REGRESSION: In the 58 offices that responded to our survey, there are only 15 Projects Directors working on a full-time basis. Due to the small size of this sample, we cannot determine which variables are statistically significant predictors of pay for the position.

## Projects Director <br> Salary Distribution:



From the graph, one can read that about 27 percent of all Projects Directors earn in the $\$ 40,000$ range ( $\$ 37,500$ to $\$ 42,499$ ) and most earn between $\$ 30,000$ and $\$ 50,000$. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## SCHEDULER / APPOINTMENTS SECRETARY

General Job Responsibilities: Schedules Senator; reviews and researches invitations; makes arrangements for appointments.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | $\underline{1995}$ | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 9.5\% |
| in Current Position | 3.5 | 3.1 | Female | 90.5\% |
| in Current Office | 5.0 | 4.3 |  |  |
| in Congress | 5.9 | 7.0 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 73.8\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 26.2\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 2.4\% |  | Black | 2.4\% |
| Some College | 14.3\% |  | Hispanic | 0.0\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 83.3\% |  | White | 92.9\% |
| Masters' Degree | 0.0\% |  | Other | 4.8\% |
| Law Degree | 0.0\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 0.0\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 33 |

AVERAGE SALARY 1995:
AVERAGE SALARY 1993:
PERCENTAGE CHANGE:
AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE: $1.7 \%$
(Sample size $=45$ )
\$36,430
$\$ 35,237$
$3.4 \%$

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all Schedulers earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 25,000$ and $\$ 47,500$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, a Scheduler making $\$ 37,000$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all Schedulers.

## SCHEDULER / APPOINTMENTS SECRETARY

General Findings: There has been little change in the salaries of Schedulers between 1993 and 1995. Schedulers' average salary has risen by 3.4 percent over this period.

The average tenure of Schedulers in their present jobs and in their present offices has increased over the past two years, while their average tenure in Congress has declined.

Schedulers are overwhelmingly (91 percent) females.
REGRESSION: One variable was found to be a statistically significant predictor of pay for the Scheduler position, when controlling for the effects of all other variables. Schedulers with higher ages tend to earn more than younger Schedulers. (See pages 44 to 45 a fuller explanation of regression.)

## Scheduler

Salary Distribution:


From the graph, one can read that about 23 percent of all Schedulers earn in the $\$ 30,000$ range ( $\$ 27,500$ to $\$ 32,499$ ), most earn between $\$ 25,000$ and $\$ 55,000$, and none earn $\$ 80,000$ or more. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR

General Job Responsibilities: Manages all computer hardware and software used by office; liaison with vendors and Senate Information Systems; responsible for in-Senate systems training of staff.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | 1995 | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 56.8\% |
| in Current Position | 3.8 | 3.7 | Female | 43.2\% |
| in Current Office | 5.4 | 5.0 |  |  |
| in Congress | 9.3 | 8.4 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 65.9\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 34.1\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 13.6\% |  | Black | 9.1\% |
| Some College | 29.5\% |  | Hispanic | 2.3\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 52.3\% |  | White | 86.4\% |
| Masters' Degree | 4.5\% |  | Other | 2.3\% |
| Law Degree | 0.0\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 0.0\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 35 |


| AVERAGE SALARY 1995: | $\$ 36,419$ | SALARY PERCENTILES |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| AVERAGE SALARY 1993: | $\$ 33,870$ | $80 \%-$ - $\$ 41,932$ |
| PERCENTAGE CHANGE: | $7.5 \%$ | $60 \%-\$ 38,000$ |
| AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE: | $3.7 \%$ | $50 \%-\$ 37,000$ |
|  |  | $40 \%-\$ 35,000$ |
| (Sample size $=48)$ | $20 \%-\$ 28,336$ |  |

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all Systems Administrators earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 28,336$ and $\$ 41,932$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, a Systems Administrator making $\$ 38,000$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all Systems Administrators.

## SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR

General Findings: Systems Administrators experienced a 7.5 percent salary increase between 1993 and 1995, the fourth-largest increase of any Senate position.

The average job, office, and congressional tenure of Systems Administrators increased over the past two years. This may explain the above-average salary increase that Systems Administrators received.

The Systems Administrator position is filled by similar numbers of women and men.
REGRESSION: No variables were found to be statistically significant predictors of pay for the Systems Administrator position, when controlling for the effects of all other variables. (See pages 44 to 45 for a fuller explanation of regression.)

## System Administrator

Salary Distribution:


From the graph, one can read that about 30 percent of all Systems Administrators earn in the $\$ 40,000$ range ( $\$ 37,500$ to $\$ 42,499$ ), most earn between $\$ 25,000$ and $\$ 50,000$, and none earn $\$ 65,000$ or more. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## WASHINGTON CASEWORKER

General Job Responsibilities: Handles constituent casework; meets/talks with constituents, contacts agencies, and notifies constituents of case resolution.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | 1995 | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 12.5\% |
| in Current Position | 8.1 | 11.5 | Female | 87.5\% |
| in Current Office | 9.2 | 11.2 |  |  |
| in Congress | 14.1 | 16.4 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 37.5\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 62.5\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 12.5\% |  | Black | 25.0\% |
| Some College | 12.5\% |  | Hispanic | 0.0\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 75.0\% |  | White | 75.0\% |
| Masters' Degree | 0.0\% |  | Other | 0.0\% |
| Law Degree | 0.0\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 0.0\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 42 |

AVERAGE SALARY 1995:
AVERAGE SALARY 1993:

PERCENTAGE CHANGE: $-14.9 \% \quad 60 \%-$ - $\$ 38,436$
AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE: -7.2\%
$($ Sample size $=8)$
\$33,688
\$39,587

40\% -- \$29,100
20\% -- \$23,060

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all Washington Caseworkers earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 23,060$ and $\$ 44,427$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, a Washington Caseworker making $\$ 38,436$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all Washington Caseworkers.

## WASHINGTON CASEWORKER

General Findings: Washington Caseworkers have the most experience in their positions, current offices, and Congress of any position in the Senate, despite the fact that their average tenure decreased sharply over the past two years.

The average salary of Washington Caseworkers decreased by 15 percent between 1993 and 1995, the largest decrease of any Senate position. The salary decrease may be related to the drop in the tenure of Washington Caseworkers over the same period. However, the small sample size for the Washington Caseworker position -- only 8 staff -- calls into question the reliability of the data for the purpose of making comparisons over time.

Of the 58 Senate offices that completed our survey, only about one-eighth staffed this position.

REGRESSION: In the 58 offices that responded to our survey, there are only eight Washington Caseworkers working on a full-time basis. Due to the small size of this sample, we cannot determine which variables are statistically significant predictors of pay for the position.

## Washington Caseworker <br> Salary Distribution:



From the graph, one can read that about 28 percent of all Washington Caseworkers earn in the $\$ 30,000$ range ( $\$ 27,500$ to $\$ 32,499$ ), most earn between $\$ 30,000$ and $\$ 50,000$, and none earn $\$ 55,000$ or more. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## CORRESPONDENCE DIRECTOR / MAIL MANAGER

General Job Responsibilities: Supervises opening, routing, and production of mail and all staff involved in these processes.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | $\underline{1995}$ | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 51.9\% |
| in Current Position | 4.3 | 3.6 | Female | 48.1\% |
| in Current Office | 5.2 | 4.4 |  |  |
| in Congress | 7.5 | 7.7 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 74.1\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 25.9\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 0.0\% |  | Black | 11.1\% |
| Some College | 22.2\% |  | Hispanic | 3.7\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 59.3\% |  | White | 85.2\% |
| Masters' Degree | 14.8\% |  | Other | 0.0\% |
| Law Degree | 3.7\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 0.0\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 33 |

AVERAGE SALARY 1995:

AVERAGE SALARY 1993:
PERCENTAGE CHANGE:
AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE:
(Sample size $=28$ )
\$30,898
\$28,834
$7.2 \%$
$3.5 \%$

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all Correspondence Directors earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 21,500$ and $\$ 41,800$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, a Correspondence Director making $\$ 32,648$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all Correspondence Directors.

## CORRESPONDENCE DIRECTOR / MAIL MANAGER

General Findings: The average job and office tenure of Correspondence Directors rose by 19.4 percent and 18.2 percent, respectively, between 1993 and 1995. Correspondence Directors had a slight drop ( 2.6 percent) in average congressional experience over that period.

Correspondence Directors experienced the sixth-largest salary ( 7.2 percent) of any Senate position between 1993 and 1995. This may be explained by the rise in average job and office tenure experienced by Correspondence Directors over the past two years. In other words, Senate offices may be paying Correspondence Directors more because they are more experienced.

Correspondence Directors are primarily single.
REGRESSION: In the 58 offices that responded to our survey, there are only 28 Correspondence Directors working on a full-time basis. Due to the small size of this sample, we cannot determine which variables are statistically significant predictors of pay for the position.

## Correspondence Director <br> Salary Distribution:



From the graph, one can read that about 22 percent of all Correspondence Directors earn in the $\$ 35,000$ range ( $\$ 32,500$ to $\$ 37,499$ ), about 19 percent earn in the $\$ 25,000$ range ( $\$ 22,500$ to $\$ 27,499$ ), and none earn $\$ 55,000$ or more. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## DEPUTY / ASSISTANT PRESS SECRETARY

General Job Responsibilities: Assists Press Secretary in range of media activities.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | 1995 | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 48.9\% |
| in Current Position | 1.7 | 1.9 | Female | 51.1\% |
| in Current Office | 2.4 | 2.2 |  |  |
| in Congress | 2.9 | 2.7 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 72.3\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 27.7\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 4.3\% |  | Black | 2.1\% |
| Some College | 0.0\% |  | Hispanic | 2.1\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 83.0\% |  | White | 93.6\% |
| Masters' Degree | 12.8\% |  | Other | 2.1\% |
| Law Degree | 0.0\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 0.0\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 27 |

AVERAGE SALARY 1995:
AVERAGE SALARY 1993:
PERCENTAGE CHANGE:
AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE:
$($ Sample size $=50)$
\$30,334
\$28,230
$7.5 \%$
$3.7 \%$

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all Deputy/Assistant Press Secretaries earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 24,480$ and $\$ 35,000$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, a Deputy/Assistant Press Secretary making $\$ 31,000$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all Deputy/Assistant Press Secretaries.

## DEPUTY / ASSISTANT PRESS SECRETARY

General Findings: Deputy/Assistant Press Secretaries have among the lowest tenure of all Senate staff positions. Only Research Assistants, Legislative Correspondents, Receptionists, Assistants/Secretaries to the AA, and Correspondence Assistants/Mail Room Staffers have less experience in their current jobs than Deputy/Assistant Press Secretaries.

Deputy/Assistant Press Secretaries received the fourth-largest salary increase of any Senate position between 1993 and 1995. Their average salaries rose by 7.5 percent over that period.

Equal numbers of men and women fill the Deputy/Assistant Press Secretary position.
REGRESSION: One variable was found to be a statistically significant predictor of pay for the Deputy/Assistant Press Secretary position, when controlling for the effects of all other variables. Deputy/Assistant Press Secretaries with higher ages tend to earn more than younger Deputy/Assistant Press Secretaries. (See pages 44 to 45 for a fuller explanation of regression.)


From the graph, one can read that about 30 percent of all Deputy/Assistant Press Secretaries earn in the $\$ 30,000$ range ( $\$ 27,500$ to $\$ 32,499$ ), most earn between $\$ 25,000$ and $\$ 45,000$, and only 2 in 50 earns $\$ 55,000$ or more. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## ASSISTANT / SECRETARY TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

General Job Responsibilities: Assists AA in various administrative and management areas.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | 1995 | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 20.0\% |
| in Current Position | 1.4 | 3.2 | Female | 80.0\% |
| in Current Office | 2.9 | 4.1 |  |  |
| in Congress | 3.9 | 4.9 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 85.0\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 15.0\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 5.0\% |  | Black | 5.0\% |
| Some College | 20.0\% |  | Hispanic | 5.0\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 70.0\% |  | White | 90.0\% |
| Masters' Degree | 2.5\% |  | Other | 0.0\% |
| Law Degree | 0.0\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 2.5\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 32 |

AVERAGE SALARY 1995:
AVERAGE SALARY 1993:
PERCENTAGE CHANGE:
AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE: $0.0 \%$
$($ Sample size $=41)$
\$29,006
\$29,035
$-0.1 \%$

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all Assistants to the AA earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 24,200$ and $\$ 33,488$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, an Assistant to the AA making $\$ 29,000$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all Assistants to the AA.

## ASSISTANT / SECRETARY TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

General Findings: The average job tenure of Assistants/Secretaries to the Administrative Assistant (AA) decreased by 56 percent between 1993 and 1995, the largest decline of any Senate position. Over the same period, the average office tenure of Assistants/Secretaries to the AA dropped by 29 percent and their average congressional experience dropped by 20 percent.

Despite their huge decreases in tenure, the average salary of Assistants/Secretaries to the AA changed by only $\$ 29$ between 1993 and 1995.

Assistants/Secretaries to the AA are primarily female and single.
REGRESSION: No variables were found to be statistically significant predictors of pay for the Assistant/Secretary to the AA position, when controlling for the effects of all other variables. (See pages 44 to 45 for a fuller explanation of regression.)

## Secretary to AA

Salary Distribution:


From the graph, one can read that about 42 percent of all Assistants/Secretaries to the AA earn in the $\$ 30,000$ range ( $\$ 27,500$ to $\$ 32,499$ ), most earn between $\$ 25,000$ and $\$ 50,000$, and none earn $\$ 65,000$ or more. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

General Job Responsibilities: Responds to mail requiring personalized "form letter" responses; coordinates input/output of names, codes, paragraphs, and mailing lists.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | $\underline{1995}$ | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 19.7\% |
| in Current Position | 5.2 | 5.3 | Female | 80.3\% |
| in Current Office | 5.2 | 5.9 |  |  |
| in Congress | 9.5 | 9.6 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 48.5\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 51.5\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 34.9\% |  | Black | 48.5\% |
| Some College | 33.3\% |  | Hispanic | 3.0\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 27.0\% |  | White | 42.4\% |
| Masters' Degree | 4.8\% |  | Other | 6.1\% |
| Law Degree | 0.0\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 0.0\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 35 |

AVERAGE SALARY 1995:
AVERAGE SALARY 1993:
PERCENTAGE CHANGE:
AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE: $2.5 \%$
(Sample size $=66$ )
\$26,524
\$25,244
$5.1 \%$

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all Computer Operators earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 20,100$ and $\$ 31,000$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, a Computer Operator making $\$ 26,000$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all Computer Operators.

## COMPUTER OPERATOR / CMS SPECIALIST

General Findings: There is a higher proportion of minorities ( 57.6 percent) in the Computer Operator position than in any other Senate office position.

Computer Operators tend to be less educated than Senate office staff in general. Sixty-eight percent do not have bachelor's degrees, and 4.8 percent have received graduate degrees.

Computer Operators received an increase of 5.1 percent in their average salaries between 1993 and 1995.

Computer Operators are primarily ( 80 percent) female.
REGRESSION: Two variables were found to be statistically significant predictors of pay for the Computer Operator position, when controlling for the effects of all other variables. Computer Operators with more years in current position or more years of prior congressional experience tend to earn more than Computer Operators without these characteristics. (See pages 44 to 45 for a fuller explanation of regression.)

## Computer Operator <br> Salary Distribution:



From the graph, one can read that about 31 percent of all Computer Operators earn in the $\$ 30,000$ range ( $\$ 27,500$ to $\$ 32,499$ ) and most earn between $\$ 20,000$ and $\$ 45,000$. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

General Job Responsibilities: Provides legislative research support for the LD, LAs, and LCs.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | 1995 | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 38.9\% |
| in Current Position | 0.9 | 1.3 | Female | 61.1\% |
| in Current Office | 1.7 | 2.1 |  |  |
| in Congress | 1.8 | 2.7 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 0.0\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 0.0\% |  | Black | 5.6\% |
| Some College | 0.0\% |  | Hispanic | 0.0\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 88.9\% |  | White | 94.4\% |
| Masters' Degree | 5.6\% |  | Other | 0.0\% |
| Law Degree | 5.6\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 0.0\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 24 |


| AVERAGE SALARY 1995: | \$24,058 | SALARY PERCENTILES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AVERAGE SALARY 1993: | \$26,579 | 80\% -- \$27,500 |
| PERCENTAGE CHANGE: | -9.5\% | 60\% -- \$ 24,778 |
| AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE: | -4.6\% | 50\% -- \$23,500 |
|  |  | 40\% -- \$22,800 |
| $($ Sample size $=18)$ |  | 20\% -- \$21,884 |
| Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all Research Assistants earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 21,884$ and $\$ 27,500$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, a Research Assistant making $\$ 24,778$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all Research Assistants. |  |  |

## RESEARCH ASSISTANT / LEGISLATIVE AIDE

General Findings: The average salary of Research Assistants decreased by 9.5 percent between 1993 and 1995. This decrease was the second-largest among Senate staff. However, the small sample size for the Research Assistant position -- only 18 staff -- calls into question the reliability of the data for the purpose of making comparisons over time.

Research Assistants have the second-shortest average job tenure of all Senate positions, averaging less than one year in their current position. Only Correspondence Assistants/Mail Room Staffers average less.

Research Assistants are similar to Legislative Correspondents in their ages, educational backgrounds, and turnover, but Research Assistants are paid approximately six percent more than Legislative Correspondents.

Of the 58 Senate offices that completed our survey, only 17 percent staffed this position.
REGRESSION: In the 58 offices that responded to our survey, there are only 18 Research Assistants working on a full-time basis. Due to the small size of this sample, we cannot determine which variables are statistically significant predictors of pay for the position.

## Research Assistant

Salary Distribution:


From the graph, one can read that about 55 percent of all Research Assistants earn in the $\$ 25,000$ range ( $\$ 22,500$ to $\$ 27,499$ ), another 40 percent earn in the $\$ 30,000$ range ( $\$ 27,500$ to $\$ 32,499$ ), and none earn $\$ 35,000$ or more. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## WASHINGTON OFFICE ASSISTANT

General Job Responsibilities: Handles clerical responsibilities such as typing, filing, FAXing, and answering telephones.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | $\underline{1995}$ | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 11.5\% |
| in Current Position | 3.1 | 3.0 | Female | 88.5\% |
| in Current Office | 3.6 | 2.7 |  |  |
| in Congress | 4.9 | 4.2 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 84.6\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 15.4\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 15.4\% |  | Black | 19.2\% |
| Some College | 23.1\% |  | Hispanic | 0.0\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 57.7\% |  | White | 76.9\% |
| Masters' Degree | 3.8\% |  | Other | 3.8\% |
| Law Degree | 0.0\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 0.0\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 27 |

AVERAGE SALARY 1995:
AVERAGE SALARY 1993:
PERCENTAGE CHANGE:
AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE:
(Sample size $=28$ )
\$23,665
\$23,318
$1.5 \%$
$0.7 \%$

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all Washington Office Assistants earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 18,744$ and $\$ 28,072$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, a Washington Office Assistant making $\$ 23,500$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all Washington Office Assistants.

## WASHINGTON OFFICE ASSISTANT

General Findings: The average job, office, and congressional experience of Washington Office Assistants increased over the past two years. For example, Washington Office Assistants' average tenure in their present Senate office increased by 33 percent between 1993 and 1995.

Washington Office Assistants tend to be less educated than Senate staff in general. Thirtynine percent do not have bachelor's degrees.

Only 38 percent of Senate offices fill the Washington Office Assistant position. However, those that fill it typically have two or more Washington Office Assistants in their offices.

Washington Office Assistants are overwhelmingly (89 percent) female.
REGRESSION: In the 58 offices that responded to our survey, there are only 28 Washington Office Assistants working on a full-time basis. Due to the small size of this sample, we cannot determine which variables are statistically significant predictors of pay for the position.

## Office Assistant

## Salary Distribution:



From the graph, one can read that just over 40 percent of all Washington Office Assistants earn in the $\$ 25,000$ range ( $\$ 22,500$ to $\$ 27,499$ ), most earn between $\$ 20,000$ and $\$ 35,000$, and none earn $\$ 45,000$ or more. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## LEGISLATIVE CORRESPONDENT

General Job Responsibilities: Responsible for answering legislative correspondence.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | $\underline{1995}$ | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 59.0\% |
| in Current Position | 1.1 | 1.3 | Female | 41.0\% |
| in Current Office | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |  |
| in Congress | 1.9 | 2.0 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 91.3\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 8.7\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 0.0\% |  | Black | 6.0\% |
| Some College | 3.3\% |  | Hispanic | 2.2\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 91.8\% |  | White | 89.1\% |
| Masters' Degree | 4.4\% |  | Other | 2.7\% |
| Law Degree | 0.5\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 0.0\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 25 |

AVERAGE SALARY 1995:
AVERAGE SALARY 1993:
PERCENTAGE CHANGE: $1.8 \%$

AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE: $0.9 \%$
(Sample size $=191$ )
\$22,803
\$22,411
$1.8 \%$

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all LCs earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 20,280$ and $\$ 25,000$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, an LC making $\$ 23,000$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all LCs.

## LEGISLATIVE CORRESPONDENT

General Findings: Legislative Correspondents have the third-highest job turnover of any Senate office position. They have been in their job for an average of only 1.1 years and in their current office for only 1.7 years. Seventy-five percent have served as LCs for less than a year, and 90 percent have served for less than two years.

Legislative Correspondent is the third most commonly staffed position in Senate offices. On average, there are over three LCs per office.

LC is also the fourth-lowest paid Senate job, with an average salary of $\$ 22,803$.
LCs are among the youngest employees in Senate offices (with an average age of 25) and are overwhelmingly single.

REGRESSION: Four variables were found to be statistically significant predictors of pay for the LC position, when controlling for the effects of all other variables. LCs with more years in current position, more years of prior congressional experience, more job responsibilities, or higher ages tend to make more money than LCs without these characteristics. (See pages 44 to 45 for a fuller explanation of regression.)

## Legislative Correspondent

Salary Distribution:


From the graph, one can read that over 60 percent of all LCs earn in the $\$ 25,000$ range ( $\$ 22,500$ to $\$ 27,499$ ) and less than 6 percent earn $\$ 35,000$ or more. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller discussion).

## RECEPTIONIST

General Job Responsibilities: Serves at the front desk -- greeting visitors, answering telephones, responding to general constituent requests, and arranging tours.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | 1995 | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 22.0\% |
| in Current Position | 1.4 | 1.3 | Female | 78.0\% |
| in Current Office | 1.5 | 1.4 |  |  |
| in Congress | 1.8 | 1.8 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 86.8\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 13.2\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 4.4\% |  | Black | 8.8\% |
| Some College | 6.6\% |  | Hispanic | 3.3\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 85.7\% |  | White | 85.7\% |
| Masters' Degree | 3.3\% |  | Other | 2.2\% |
| Law Degree | 0.0\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 0.0\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 26 |

AVERAGE SALARY 1995:
AVERAGE SALARY 1993:
PERCENTAGE CHANGE:
AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE:
(Sample size $=96$ )
\$20,843
\$20,107
$3.7 \%$
$1.8 \%$

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all Receptionists earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 18,000$ and $\$ 22,500$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, a Receptionist making $\$ 20,000$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all Receptionists.

## RECEPTIONIST

General Findings: Receptionists have the second-shortest average tenure in their offices and the fourth-shortest in their jobs of any Senate position.

Receptionist is the fifth most commonly staffed position in Senate offices. There are, on average, about 1.7 Receptionists per office.

Receptionists receive the second-lowest average pay of any Senate position $(\$ 20,843)$, trailing only Correspondence Assistants/Mail Room Staffers.

Receptionists tend to be well-educated, with 89 percent holding at least a bachelor's degrees.
Demographically, Receptionists are primarily young, single females.
REGRESSION: One variable was found to be a statistically significant predictor of pay for the Receptionist position, when controlling for the effects of all other variables. Receptionists with more years in current position tend to make more money than Receptionists with fewer years in position. (See pages 44 to 45 for a fuller explanation of regression.)

## Receptionist <br> Salary Distribution:



From the graph, one can read that just under 50 percent of all Receptionists earn in the $\$ 20,000$ range ( $\$ 17,500$ to $\$ 22,499$ ) and less than 10 percent earn $\$ 35,000$ or more. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## CORRESPONDENCE ASSISTANT / MAIL ROOM STAFFER

General Job Responsibilities: Opens, logs, and routes mail.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | 1995 | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 73.6\% |
| in Current Position | 0.8 | 1.5 | Female | 26.4\% |
| in Current Office | 0.9 | 1.7 |  |  |
| in Congress | 2.5 | 1.8 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 92.5\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 7.5\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 5.7\% |  | Black | 15.1\% |
| Some College | 13.2\% |  | Hispanic | 1.9\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 79.2\% |  | White | 81.1\% |
| Masters' Degree | 1.9\% |  | Other | 1.9\% |
| Law Degree | 0.0\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 0.0\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 26 |

AVERAGE SALARY 1995:
AVERAGE SALARY 1993:
PERCENTAGE CHANGE: $2.9 \%$

AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE: $1.4 \%$
(Sample size $=55$ )
\$20,205
$\$ 19,640$
$2.9 \%$

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all Correspondence Assistants earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 18,000$ and $\$ 21,500$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, a Correspondence Assistant making $\$ 20,000$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all Correspondence Assistants.

## CORRESPONDENCE ASSISTANT / MAIL ROOM STAFFER

General Findings: Correspondence Assistants/Mail Room Staffers receive the lowest average pay of any Senate staffers. Their average pay is $\$ 20,205$.

The average tenure that Correspondence Assistants/Mail Room Staffers spend in their jobs and offices declined sharply between 1993 and 1995. In fact, the 46.7 percent drop in average job tenure that Correspondence Assistants/Mail Room Staffers experienced over that period was the second-largest percentage decrease among all Senate staff positions.

Correspondence Assistants/Mail Room Staffers are among the youngest staff in Senate offices (their average age is 26 ) and are overwhelmingly single.

REGRESSION: Two variables were found to be statistically significant predictors of pay for the Correspondence Assistant/Mail Room Staffer position, when controlling for the effects of all other variables. Correspondence Assistants/Mail Room Staffers with more years in current position or more years of prior congressional experience tend to earn more than Correspondence Assistants/Mail Room Staffers without these characteristics. (See pages 44 to 45 for a fuller explanation of regression.

## Correspondence Assistant

Salary Distribution:


From the graph, one can read that just under 50 percent of all Correspondence Assistants/Mail Room Staffers earn in the $\$ 25,000$ range ( $\$ 22,500$ to $\$ 27,499$ ) and another 45 percent earn in the $\$ 20,000$ range ( $\$ 17,500$ to $\$ 22,499$ ). (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## STATE DIRECTOR

General Job Responsibilities: Manages all state offices; directs overall state operation and work flow; represents Senator at meetings and events.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | 1995 | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 58.3\% |
| in Current Position | 4.0 | 4.9 | Female | 41.7\% |
| in Current Office | 6.9 | 7.5 |  |  |
| in Congress | 8.2 | 8.3 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 24.5\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 75.5\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 0.0\% |  | Black | 2.0\% |
| Some College | 12.2\% |  | Hispanic | 4.1\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 55.1\% |  | White | 91.8\% |
| Masters' Degree | 24.5\% |  | Other | 2.0\% |
| Law Degree | 6.1\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 2.0\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 44 |

AVERAGE SALARY 1995:
AVERAGE SALARY 1993:
PERCENTAGE CHANGE:
AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE:
(Sample size $=52$ )
\$65,392
\$65,913
$-0.8 \%$
$-0.4 \%$

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all State Directors earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 48,906$ and $\$ 80,348$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, a State Director making $\$ 66,619$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all State Directors.

## STATE DIRECTOR

General Findings: Turnover among State Directors has increased over the past two years. Average tenure in position declined by 18.4 percent between 1993 and 1995, while tenure in office has dropped by eight percent.

State Director is the highest paid position in state offices and the third-highest paid position overall. The pay of State Directors has declined by less than one percent over the past two years.

Close to one-third of all State Directors hold advanced degrees.
With an average age of 44, State Directors are the oldest staffers in the Senate.
REGRESSION: No variables were found to be statistically significant predictors of pay for the State Director position, when controlling for the effects of all other variables. (See pages 44 to 45 for a fuller explanation of regression.

## State Director

## Salary Distribution:



From the graph, one can read that about 16 percent of all State Directors earn in the $\$ 70,000$ range ( $\$ 67,500$ to $\$ 72,499$ ), another 16 percent earn in the $\$ 50,000$ range $(\$ 47,500$ to $\$ 52,499$ ), and most earn between $\$ 45,000$ and $\$ 95,000$. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## REGIONAL DIRECTOR / OFFICE MANAGER

General Job Responsibilities: Manages activities of a single state office; represents Senator at meetings and events; helps shape Senator's schedule in region.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | 1995 | $\underline{1993}$ | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 18.9\% |
| in Current Position | 5.0 | 5.9 | Female | 81.1\% |
| in Current Office | 7.3 | 8.1 |  |  |
| in Congress | 7.9 | 10.3 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 37.7\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 62.3\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 3.8\% |  | Black | 5.7\% |
| Some College | 20.8\% |  | Hispanic | 5.7\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 60.4\% |  | White | 86.8\% |
| Masters' Degree | 9.4\% |  | Other | 1.9\% |
| Law Degree | 3.8\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 1.9\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 41 |


| AVERAGE SALARY 1995: | $\$ 38,087$ | SALARY PERCENTIL |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| AVERAGE SALARY 1993: | $\$ 39,243$ | $80 \%-\mathbf{\$ 4 5 , 0 0 0}$ |
| PERCENTAGE CHANGE: | $-2.9 \%$ | $60 \%-\$ 40,000$ |
| AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE: | $-1.4 \%$ | $50 \%-\$ 36,000$ |
|  |  | $40 \%-\$ 35,000$ |
| (Sample size $=57)$ | $20 \%-\$ 28,642$ |  |

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all Regional Directors earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 28,642$ and $\$ 45,000$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, a Regional Director making $\$ 40,000$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all Regional Directors.

## REGIONAL DIRECTOR / OFFICE MANAGER

General Findings: Regional Director is the second-highest paid position in state-based offices and the tenth-highest in Senate offices overall. The average salary of Regional Directors declined by 2.9 percent between 1993 and 1995, the largest drop among state positions.

Regional Directors average eight years of congressional experience, the second-highest figure among state staff and the ninth-highest overall.

Regional Directors are primarily (81 percent) female.
REGRESSION: Four variables were found to be statistically significant predictors of pay for the Regional Director position, when controlling for the effects of all other variables. Regional Directors with more years in current position, more years of prior experience in their current office, more years of prior congressional experience, or more education tend to earn more than Regional Directors without these characteristics. (See pages 44 to 45 for a fuller explanation of regression.)

## Regional Director <br> Salary Distribution:



From the graph, one can read that about 22 percent of all Regional Directors earn in the $\$ 45,000$ range ( $\$ 42,500$ to $\$ 47,499$ ), most earn between $\$ 25,000$ and $\$ 65,000$, and none earn $\$ 80,000$ or more. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## FIELD REPRESENTATIVE

General Job Responsibilities: Works under the direction of the State Director; represents Senator at meetings and events; shapes Senator's state schedule; accompanies Senator to functions.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | 1995 | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 48.9\% |
| in Current Position | 4.5 | 4.4 | Female | 51.1\% |
| in Current Office | 4.9 | 5.3 |  |  |
| in Congress | 5.5 | 6.4 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 46.6\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 53.4\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 1.7\% |  | Black | 10.2\% |
| Some College | 15.4\% |  | Hispanic | 6.8\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 71.4\% |  | White | 80.7\% |
| Masters' Degree | 6.9\% |  | Other | 2.3\% |
| Law Degree | 4.0\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 0.6\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 37 |

AVERAGE SALARY 1995:

| AVERAGE SALARY 1993: | $\$ 30,600$ | $80 \%-$ - $\$ 40,499$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| PERCENTAGE CHANGE: | $8.2 \%$ | $60 \%-\$ 34,000$ |
| AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE: | $4.0 \%$ | $50 \%-\$ 32,000$ |
|  |  | $40 \%-\$ 30,000$ |
| (Sample size $=182)$ | $20 \%-\$ 25,000$ |  |

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all Field Representatives earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 25,000$ and $\$ 40,499$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, a Field Representative making $\$ 34,000$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all Field Representatives.

## FIELD REPRESENTATIVE

General Findings: The average salary of Field Representatives increased by 8.2 percent between 1993 and 1995, the largest increase among state positions and the third-highest among all Senate positions.

This is the fourth most commonly staffed position, with an average of over three Field Representatives per Senate office.

Equal numbers of men and women fill the Field Representative position.
REGRESSION: Five variables were found to be statistically significant predictors of pay for the Field Representative position, when controlling for the effects of all other variables. Field Representatives with more years in current position, more years of prior congressional experience, more education, or higher ages tend to earn more than Field Representatives without these characteristics. Also, gender was a significant predictor of pay: males in the Field Representative position tend to earn higher salaries than females in the position when holding all other measured variables constant. (See pages 44 to 45 for a fuller explanation of regression.)

## Field Representative

Salary Distribution:


From the graph, one can read that about 30 percent of all Field Representatives earn in the $\$ 35,000$ range ( $\$ 32,500$ to $\$ 37,499$ ) and most earn between $\$ 25,000$ and $\$ 50,000$. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## STATE CASEWORKER

General Job Responsibilities: Handles constituent casework; meets/talks with constituents, contacts agencies, and notifies constituents of case resolution.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | 1995 | 1993 | GENDER: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male | 28.4\% |
| in Current Position | 4.7 | 4.6 | Female | 71.6\% |
| in Current Office | 5.2 | 5.1 |  |  |
| in Congress | 6.3 | 5.8 | MARITAL STATUS: |  |
|  |  |  | Single | 57.2\% |
|  |  |  | Married | 42.8\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |  |
| High School or less | 5.5\% |  | Black | 12.4\% |
| Some College | 19.1\% |  | Hispanic | 7.4\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 67.8\% |  | White | 75.2\% |
| Masters' Degree | 5.5\% |  | Other | 5.0\% |
| Law Degree | 2.0\% |  |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 0.0\% |  | AVERAGE | GE: 36 |

AVERAGE SALARY 1995:
AVERAGE SALARY 1993:
PERCENTAGE CHANGE:
AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE: $1.7 \%$
$($ Sample size $=219)$
\$26,910
\$26,016
$3.4 \%$

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all State Caseworkers earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 21,420$ and $\$ 32,000$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, a State Caseworker making $\$ 26,520$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all State Caseworkers.

## STATE CASEWORKER

General Findings: State Caseworker is the second most commonly staffed position in Senate offices and the most commonly staffed position within state offices. There is an average of 3.8 State Caseworkers per Senate office.

Although State Caseworkers, along with State Office Assistants, are the youngest staffers in state offices (with an average age of 36), they are still four years older than the average Washington-based Senate staffer.

There is a higher proportion of minorities ( 25 percent) in the State Caseworker position than in most other Senate office position.

REGRESSION: Four variables were found to be statistically significant predictors of pay for the State Caseworker position, when controlling for the effects of all other variables. State Caseworkers with more years in current position, more years of prior experience in their current office, more years of prior congressional experience, or more education tend to earn more than State Caseworkers without these characteristics. (See pages 44 to 45 for a fuller explanation of regression.)

## State Caseworker

Salary Distribution:


From the graph, one can read that about 40 percent of all State Caseworkers earn in the $\$ 25,000$ range ( $\$ 22,500$ to $\$ 27,499$ ), most earn between $\$ 20,000$ and $\$ 45,000$, and none earn $\$ 60,000$ or more. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## STATE OFFICE ASSISTANT

General Job Responsibilities: Handles constituent casework; meets/talks with constituents, contacts agencies, and notifies constituents of case resolution.

| WORK EXPERIENCE: | 1995 | 1993 | GENDER: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average years: |  |  | Male $\quad 17.6 \%$ |
| in Current Position | 4.1 | n.a. | Female $\quad 82.4 \%$ |
| in Current Office | 4.1 | n.a. |  |
| in Congress | 4.7 | n.a. | MARITAL STATUS: |
|  |  |  | Single 56.8\% |
|  |  |  | Married 43.2\% |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY: |
| High School or less | 16.2\% |  | Black 18.9\% |
| Some College | 35.3\% |  | Hispanic 10.8\% |
| Bachelor's Degree | 42.6\% |  | White 67.6\% |
| Masters' Degree | 5.9\% |  | Other $\quad 2.7 \%$ |
| Law Degree | 0.0\% |  |  |
| Doctorate Degree | 0.0\% |  | AVERAGE AGE: 36 |
| AVERAGE SALARY 1995: | \$21,657 |  | SALARY PERCENTILES |
| AVERAGE SALARY 1993: | N.A. |  | 80\% -- \$25,500 |
| PERCENTAGE CHANGE: | N.A. |  | 60\% -- \$21,200 |
| AVERAGE ANNUALIZED CHANGE: | N.A. |  | 50\% -- \$20,400 |
|  |  |  | 40\% -- \$20,000 |
| $($ Sample size $=79$ ) |  |  | 20\% - \$ 17,500 |

Using Percentiles: Percentiles describe the distribution of salaries. For example, sixty percent of all State Office Assistants earn within the range of the 20th and the 80th percentiles or between $\$ 17,500$ and $\$ 25,500$. Percentiles also describe where an individual stands relative to others in the same job. For example, a State Office Assistant making $\$ 21,200$ has a higher salary than sixty percent of all State Office Assistants.

## STATE OFFICE ASSISTANT

General Findings: State Office Assistant is the lowest-paid position in state offices and the third lowest paid position in Senate offices overall.

Because we did not collect data on the State Office Assistant position in 1993, we cannot make comparisons for the position over time.

Although State Office Assistants, along with State Caseworkers, are the youngest staffers in state offices (with an average age of 36), they are still four years older than the average Washingtonbased Senate staffer.

State Office Assistants are primarily ( 82 percent) female.
REGRESSION: No variables were found to be statistically significant predictors of pay for the State Office Assistant position, when controlling for the effects of all other variables. (See pages 44 to 45 for a fuller explanation of regression.)

## State Office Assistant

## Salary Distribution:



From the graph, one can read that about 39 percent of all State Office Assistants earn in the $\$ 20,000$ range ( $\$ 17,500$ to $\$ 22,499$ ), another 39 percent earn in the $\$ 25,000$ range ( $\$ 22,500$ to $\$ 27,499$ ), none earn $\$ 50,000$ or more. (See "Explanation of Graphs" on pages 43 to 44 for a fuller description).

## CONCLUSIONS: INFLUENCES ON PAY

As in our 1993 and 1991 Senate and our 1994, 1992, and 1990 House studies, the variable most frequently related to salary in the Senate was years in current position. Years in position had a significant and positive influence on pay in 10 of the 19 Senate office positions on which we conducted regression analyses. ${ }^{41}$ On-the-job experience is highly valued in Congress and offices are willing to pay greater salaries to staff who acquire expertise by staying in their jobs.

Years of prior congressional experience was a significant and positive influence on salary for eight of the 19 positions analyzed through regression analysis. Obviously, Senate offices often value the experience gained by spending time on Capitol Hill.

Education significantly influenced pay in only four positions. Legislative Assistants, Regional Directors, Field Representatives, and State Caseworkers with more education were paid significantly more than staffers in those positions with less education. The small number of positions for which education was a major factor in predicting salary is surprising, but is consistent with the findings of our previous studies. It is the case, however, that staff in higher paying positions have more education. Apparently, offices are using educational attainment to select candidates for positions, but not to determine their salaries within positions.

Level of job responsibility influenced salaries in only three positions. Executive Assistants, Legislative Assistants, and Legislative Correspondents with more job responsibilities received higher salaries than those with fewer responsibilities. As was the case with the education variable, this result was consistent with our findings in our prior Senate studies, but still was somewhat surprising. While it is intuitive that offices would compensate staff in accordance with their level of responsibility, the subjectivity of this variable may mean that this likely effect is not picked up accurately in our regression analyses.

Age was a significant and positive influence on salary in seven positions, six of which were in the Washington office. For each of these seven positions, higher ages are associated with higher pay. While at first glance it may seem that offices are discriminating against younger staffers, age is likely representative of factors that are difficult to measure, but which can only be acquired over time. For example, older workers may be regarded as having greater maturity, better judgment, or more loyalty.

[^19]Prior years in current office was a significant, positive influence on salary in only two positions, Regional Director and State Caseworker. In our earlier Senate and House studies, this variable also had a significant influence on very few positions.

Gender was a significant influence on salary in only one position. Men in the Field Representative position, on average, earned more than similarly qualified women.

Race/ethnicity was a significant influence on salary in only one position. ${ }^{42}$ Non-white Legislative Assistants (LAs) averaged lower salaries than similarly qualified white LAs.

[^20]
## COMPARISON OF SENATE \& HOUSE STAFF

COMPARISON BETWEEN SENATE AND HOUSE STAFF POSITIONS

|  | Salary |  | \% Senate Salary Exceeds House Salary | Tenure in Position |  | Tenure in Congress |  | Avg. <br> Age |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Senate | House* |  | $\underline{\mathbf{S}}$ | H | $\underline{\mathbf{S}}$ | H | S | H |
| Administrative Assistant | \$101,835 | \$81,166 | 25.5\% | 4.1 | 4.2 | 10.3 | 9.3 | 43 | 41 |
| Legislative Director | \$80,138 | \$51,326 | 56.1\% | 3.5 | 2.8 | 10.6 | 7.9 | 38 | 34 |
| State/District Director | \$65,392 | \$52,290 | 25.1\% | 4.0 | 4.6 | 8.2 | 6.1 | 44 | 43 |
| Press Secretary | \$55,602 | \$39,840 | 39.6\% | 2.6 | 2.6 | 5.7 | 3.8 | 36 | 33 |
| Office Manager | \$51,148 | \$37,606 | 36.0\% | 5.2 | 4.1 | 13.2 | 9.3 | 41 | 36 |
| Legislative Assistant | \$43,496 | \$31,476 | 38.2\% | 2.8 | 1.8 | 5.1 | 3.0 | 32 | 28 |
| Projects Dir./Coordinator | \$40,325 | \$31,979 | 26.1\% | 2.1 | 2.2 | 5.1 | 3.3 | 31 | 34 |
| Washington Caseworker | \$33,688 | \$38,481 | -12.5\% | 8.1 | 6.6 | 14.1 | 10.1 | 42 | 46 |
| Field Representative | \$33,116 | \$31,313 | 5.8\% | 4.5 | 4.0 | 5.5 | 4.8 | 37 | 39 |
| State/District Caseworker | \$26,910 | \$26,468 | 1.7\% | 4.7 | 4.2 | 6.3 | 5.3 | 36 | 39 |
| Computer Operator | \$26,524 | \$26,554 | -0.1\% | 5.2 | 3.6 | 9.5 | 6.4 | 35 | 29 |
| Legislative Correspondent | \$22,803 | \$21,802 | 4.6\% | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 25 | 24 |
| Receptionist | \$20,843 | \$21,618 | -3.6\% | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 26 | 26 |

Senate offices typically staff the following positions separately, while House offices typically combine each pair into one position.

| Executive Assistant | $\$ 50,870$ | $\$ 37,139$ | 6.3 | 3.9 | 10.9 | 8.0 | 42 | 36 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Scheduler | $\$ 36,430$ |  | 3.5 |  | 5.9 |  | 33 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Systems Administrator | $\$ 36,419$ | $\$ 27,614$ | 3.8 | 3.0 | 9.3 | 5.4 | 35 | 31 |
| Correspondence Director | $\$ 30,898$ |  | 4.3 |  | 7.5 |  | 33 |  |

[^21]
## SENATE - HOUSE COMPARISONS

The following analyses compare Senate and House staff within positions by salary, tenure in Congress, age, and education. Senate and House offices have 13 positions that are directly comparable. There are four other positions that Senate offices tend to staff separately while House offices tend to combine the functions of these four jobs into two positions.

## Salaries

Among higher paying positions, Senate staff receive substantially higher salaries than their House counterparts. For example, Senate AAs earn 26 percent more than House AAs, while Senate LDs, Press Secretaries, and LAs earn at least 38 percent more than their House counterparts. However, salaries are similar for positions that average less than $\$ 30,000$ in both the Senate and House.

## Tenure in Congress

For all but the lowest-paying position (Receptionist), Senate staff have more tenure in Congress than their House counterparts.

## Average Age

In the Washington positions, Senate staff tend to be older than House staff. The positions with the largest differences are Legislative Director, Press Secretary, Office Manager, Legislative Assistant, and Computer Operator. When comparing state and district staff, though, there is very little difference between their ages.

## Educational Attainment

Virtually no differences exist between Senate and House staff when comparing the proportion of staff who hold at least a bachelor's degree. When the comparison is narrowed to those holding graduate degrees, however, Senate staff have substantially greater educational attainment in four of the 13 directly comparable positions. Moreover, these positions include two of the three highest paying jobs: Legislative Director and State/District Director. The educational attainment comparison between House and Senate staff is not shown on the chart on the previous page.

## Conclusions and Hypotheses

Approximate parity exists between Senate and House staff for positions with an average salary of less than $\$ 30,000$, while for higher paying positions Senate staff earn up to 56 percent more than their House counterparts.

What accounts for this pattern? Our survey collects information that describes current employment practices in the Senate and House but does not explain conclusively the patterns that exist. Consequently, we have provided several hypotheses that are generally consistent with a portion of the data. None of these hypotheses, however, is consistent with all of the data.

Age and Experience. The conventional wisdom is that Senate staff are older and more experienced; in fact, this is generally true. Senate staff are older than House staff in most positions and, for virtually all of the positions, have more experience in their jobs and in Congress as a whole.

Larger Senate Budgets. Senate offices may use their larger personnel budgets to pay a significant premium over House offices for top-level staff, while electing to pay lower-level staff approximately the same as in the House.

Responsibility. Senate staff in certain positions have more responsibility than their House counterparts. Senate AAs and LDs, for example, supervise more staff and need to coordinate staff work on a broader range of issues.

Specialization. Specialists tend to be more highly compensated than generalists and Senate staff are more likely to be specialists. Senate LAs, for example, cover fewer issues than their House counterparts and may be expected to be more knowledgeable on a given issue.

Flexibility. Several lower-paying positions that are staffed separately in Senate offices are combined in House offices. Consequently, House staff may be valued for their ability to perform different tasks. If so, this would offset specialization among Senate staff and explain the approximate parity in salary among lower paying positions.

## EMPLOYEE BENEFITS POLICIES

## OFFICE POLICIES ON STAFF BENEFITS

Certain benefits for congressional staff are subject to the discretion of Members of Congress. We asked offices to describe their policies for two categories of benefits that vary by Member: policies affecting pay raises and bonuses and policies affecting vacation, sick, and parental leave. For each question below, we provide the overall response. If responses varied by party affiliation or Member term in the Senate, we also provide that information.

## RAISE AND BONUS POLICIES

Did your office give any merit raises last year?

|  | Yes | No |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| All Offices | $63 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| By Party |  |  |
| Democratic $67 \%$ <br> Republican $58 \%$ | $33 \%$ |  |
|  |  | $42 \%$ |

Did your office give any merit bonuses last year?

|  | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Offices | $63 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| By Party |  |  |
| Democratic  <br> Republican $49 \%$ | $51 \%$ |  |
|  | $81 \%$ | $19 \%$ |

Close to two-thirds of Senate offices gave merit raises and merit bonuses last year. Merit bonuses were more frequent in Republican offices than in Democratic offices, while merit raises were more common in Democratic offices. ${ }^{43}$

[^22]
## LEAVE POLICIES

## Vacation Leave

Minimum vacation leave earned by all full-time staff, in days per year

$$
\underline{1-10} \quad \underline{11-15} \quad \underline{16-20}
$$

| All Offices | $26 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| By Party <br> Democratic | $12 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| Republican <br> By Term <br> 4th Term + | $45 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
|  | $48 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $8 \%$ |

The majority of Senate offices provide a minimum of 2-3 weeks of vacation leave. Democratic offices tend to be much more generous in their vacation policies than Republican offices. While only 12 percent of Democratic offices give 2 weeks or less, 45 percent of Republican offices do so. In addition, the most senior Senators tend to have vacation policies that are less generous than more junior Senators.

Maximum vacation leave that can be earned annually by full-time staff, in days per years
$\underline{1-10} \quad \underline{11-15} \quad \underline{16-20} \quad \underline{21+}$
All Offices
8\%
$22 \%$
$41 \%$
29\%

Do staff with longer tenure in your office earn additional vacation time?

|  | Yes | No |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| All Offices | $55 \%$ | $45 \%$ |

Do staff with longer tenure in Congress, though not accumulated in your office, earn additional vacation time?
Yes No
All Offices
$34 \%$
$66 \%$

For purposes of comparison, we have summarized vacation policies for four other types of employers in the following table: federal executive agencies, state and local governments, large and medium-sized private firms (generally 100 or more employees), and small private firms.

Comparative Vacation Policies (Average Annual Days of Vacation) ${ }^{44}$

| Years of Service | Federal <br> Government | State \& Local <br> Government | Medium \& Large <br> Private Firms | Small <br> Private Firms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 13 |  |  |  |
| 3 | 20 | 12 | 9 | 8 |
| 5 | 20 | 14 | 11 | 10 |
| 10 | 20 | 16 | 14 | 12 |
| 15 | 26 | 18 | 17 | 14 |
| 20 | 26 | 20 | 19 | 15 |
|  |  | 22 | 20 | 15 |
| \% of Employees Earning | $100 \%$ | $90 \%$ |  |  |
| Paid Vacation Leave |  |  | $96 \%$ | $90 \%$ |

Average Senate office vacation policies most closely resemble the policies of federal agencies, which, as the preceding chart illustrates, are relatively generous. In the federal government, all employees start at 13 days annually and earn 20 days annually after 3 years of service. Furthermore, an employee's years of federal service are transportable from agency to agency.

State and local governments are less generous. Only 90 percent of their employees are eligible for paid vacation leave, and those who do earn vacation earn less for each year of service than federal employees.

Medium and large private firms are closer to state and local governments than to the federal government in their vacation policies. Small private firms tend to be less generous with paid vacation leave than their larger counterparts.
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## SICK LEAVE

Minimum sick leave earned by all full-time staff, in days per year

|  | $\underline{1-10}$ | $\underline{11+}$ | Other $^{45}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Offices | $26 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $41 \%$ |

Maximum sick leave that can be earned annually by full-time staff, in days per years
$1-10 \quad$ Other
All Offices
$16 \%$
$33 \%$
$51 \%$

The maximum annual sick leave granted to employees differs only slightly from the minimum. Approximately one-third of Senate offices give their staff more than two weeks of paid sick leave per year. The sick leave policies of Senate offices are very similar to those of House offices.

In comparison, all federal civilian employees receive at least 13 days of paid sick leave annually.

[^24]
## PAID PARENTAL LEAVE ${ }^{46}$

## Paid maternity leave, in weeks

| None | $1-3$ | $4-6$ | $7+$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $7 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $41 \%$ |

Paid paternity leave, in weeks

|  | None | $\underline{1-3}$ | $\underline{4-6}$ | $\underline{7+}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Offices | $10 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $22 \%$ |

Parental leave is readily available in Senate offices. Close to 90 percent of offices provide a minimum of 4 weeks paid maternity leave, and 41 percent provide for at least 7 weeks. Ninety percent provide for at least one week of paid paternity leave.

A higher percentage of Senate offices maintain official parental leave policies in 1993 than did so in 1993, when 77 percent gave 4 or more weeks of paid maternity leave and 66 gave 1 or more weeks of paid paternity leave.

In House offices, parental leave is not as readily available as in the Senate. In 1994, 36 percent of House personal offices gave 4 or more weeks of paid maternity leave, and 31 percent gave 1 or more weeks of paid paternity leave.

As the table on the following page indicates, Senate (and House) personal offices are much more generous than private employers or the federal, state, and local governments in their paid parental leave policies.

[^25]
## Comparative Paid Parental Leave Policies ${ }^{47}$

|  | Federal <br> Government | State \& Local <br> Government | Medium \& Large Small <br> Private Firms Private Firms |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% of Employees Eligible <br> for Paid Maternity Leave | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| \% of Employees Eligible <br> for Paid Paternity Leave | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
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## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A: STATE POPULATION CATEGORIES

For purposes of reporting data, we grouped states into four categories using Census Bureau population estimates for July 1, 1994. ${ }^{48}$ Our categories and the states in each category are as follows:

1. Up to 2 million people: Alaska, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming.
2. 2 to 5 million people: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Oregon, and South Carolina.
3. 5 to 10 million people: Georgia, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin.
4. More than 10 million people: California, Florida, Illinois, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas.

## APPENDIX B: GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS

| South | Border | New England | Mid-Atlantic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alabama | Kentucky | Connecticut | Delaware |
| Arkansas | Maryland | Maine | New Jersey |
| Florida | Missouri | Massachusetts | New York |
| Georgia | Oklahoma | New Hampshire | Pennsylvania |
| Louisiana | West Virginia | Rhode Island |  |
| Mississippi |  | Vermont |  |
| N. Carolina |  |  |  |
| S. Carolina |  |  |  |
| Tennessee |  |  |  |
| Texas |  |  |  |
| Virginia |  |  |  |
| Midwest | Plains | Rocky Mountain | Pacific Coast |
| Illinois | Iowa | Arizona | Alaska |
| Indiana | Kansas | Colorado | California |
| Michigan | Minnesota | Idaho | Hawaii |
| Ohio | Nebraska | Montana | Oregon |
| Wisconsin | N. Dakota | Nevada | Washington |
|  | S. Dakota | New Mexico |  |
|  |  | Utah |  |
|  |  | Wyoming |  |
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## APPENDIX C

## Cost of Living Differences: The ACCRA Cost of Living Index

A factor that offices may wish to consider in their salary policies is the cost of living in any given locale. About two-thirds of Senate staff live and work in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area while the other one-third are scattered across the country. The cost of living can vary dramatically between Washington and state offices or even between different offices in a state. ACCRA (the national association of applied community and economic development researchers) produces the ACCRA Cost of Living Index quarterly to provide a reasonably accurate measure of living cost differences among approximately 300 urban areas. The Index measures relative price levels for goods and services in different areas at a given point in time. The Index does not measure inflation.

The ACCRA survey depends upon staff or volunteers from local chambers of commerce or similar organizations to report the necessary data. Unfortunately, a number of larger metropolitan areas do not participate in the survey; no comparable information is available for them. We have listed the composite cost of living index for approximately 300 metropolitan areas and cities. For more information, consult the ACCRA Cost of Living Index.

## Using the Index

The average of all participating areas equals 100 , and each area's index is read as a percentage of the average. Juneau, Alaska, for example, has a rating of 135.8 , indicating that the cost of living in Juneau is 35.8 percent higher than average. ACCRA cautions that because its index is based upon a limited number of consumer goods and services, percentage differences between areas should not be treated as exact measures. Furthermore, small differences should not be construed as significant.

## ACCRA Cost of Living Index

Fourth Quarter, 1994
(Copyright, ACCRA; reprinted with permission)

| Average City, USA | 100.0 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Alabama |  |
| Anniston | 93.5 |
| Birmingham | 99.1 |
| Cullman County | 91.6 |
| Decatur | 92.8 |
| Gadsden | 95.3 |
| Huntsville | 95.1 |
| Mobile | 92.6 |
| Alaska |  |
| Anchorage | 126.5 |
| Fairbanks | 127.9 |
| Juneau | 135.8 |
| Kodiak | 157.0 |
| Arizona |  |
| Flagstaff | 108.9 |
| Lake Havasu City | 100.9 |
| Phoenix | 101.2 |
| Prescott | 109.2 |
| Scottsdale | 102.5 |
| Tucson | 99.7 |
| Yuma | 95.3 |
| Arkansas |  |
| Fort Smith | 89.9 |
| Hot Springs | 91.5 |
| Jonesboro | 89.5 |
| Little Rock | 87.2 |
| California |  |
| Bakersfield | 107.6 |
| Fresno | 107.7 |
| L.A.-Long Beach | 123.9 |
| Palm Springs | 116.0 |
| Riverside City | 110.5 |
| San Diego | 122.3 |
| Santa Rosa | 122.4 |
| Visalia | 110.1 |


| Georgia |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Albany | 92.0 |
| Americus | 90.8 |
| Atlanta | 97.2 |
| Augusta-Aiken | 93.2 |
| Bainbridge | 91.0 |
| Carrollton | 93.5 |
| Columbus | 92.3 |
| Douglas | 92.4 |
| Tifton | 96.3 |
| Valdosta | 93.8 |
| Warner Robins | 94.8 |
| Idaho |  |
| Boise | 101.4 |
| Pocatello | 102.9 |
| Twin Falls | 97.7 |
| Illinois |  |
| Bloomington-Normal | 102.8 |
| Champaign-Urbana | 102.3 |
| Danville | 94.2 |
| Decatur | 90.4 |
| Freeport | 97.3 |
| Peoria | 97.0 |
| Quad Cities | 95.6 |
| Quincy | 99.8 |
| Rockford | 105.3 |
| Indiana |  |
| Anderson | 97.4 |
| Bloomington | 99.9 |
| Evansville | 94.9 |
| Fort Wayne | 94.0 |
| Indianapolis | 94.7 |
| Lafayette | 101.3 |
| LaPorte-Michigan City | 95.6 |
| Muncie | 98.9 |
| South Bend | 91.5 |
| Terre Haute | 98.1 |


| Michigan |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Holland | 102.1 |
| Lansing | 104.2 |
| Minnesota |  |
| Minneapolis | 101.5 |
| Rochester | 99.5 |
| St. Cloud | 96.6 |
| Mississippi |  |
| Hattiesburg | 92.0 |
| Jackson | 95.2 |
| Laurel/Jones County | 89.9 |
| Missouri |  |
| Columbia | 94.3 |
| Joplin | 88.9 |
| Kansas City | 95.0 |
| Kennett | 85.2 |
| Kirksville | 97.4 |
| Lee's Summit | 97.8 |
| Nevada | 92.0 |
| Poplar Bluff | 89.0 |
| St. Charles | 101.9 |
| St. Joseph | 96.5 |
| St. Louis | 97.8 |
| Springfield | 91.7 |
| Montana |  |
| Billings | 103.4 |
| Bozeman | 107.3 |
| Great Falls | 100.0 |
| Helena | 109.2 |
| Missoula | 104.0 |
| Nebraska |  |
| Grand Island | 97.2 |
| Hastings | 91.9 |
| Kearney | 96.7 |
| Lincoln | 90.5 |
| Omaha | 92.1 |

## Nevada

Carson City 105.1
Elko 104.0
Las Vegas 109.0
Reno-Sparks 111.9
New Hampshire
Manchester
111.6

New Mexico
Albuquerque 103.4
Carlsbad 93.5
Clovis-Portales 92.6
Farmington 98.7
Hobbs 92.1
Las Cruces 97.7
Los Alamos 122.0
Roswell 90.7
Santa $\mathrm{Fe} \quad 121.7$
New York
Albany 107.1
Binghamton/Broome Co. 97.1
Cortland 109.4
Glens Falls 107.0
Jamestown 101.3
New York City (Mhttn.) 228.3
Syracuse 104.6
Utica-Rome 105.8
North Carolina
Albemarle 89.8
Burlington 94.0
Charlotte 98.7
Dare County 102.1
Fayetteville 93.5
Greenville 96.7
Hickory 96.5
Marion/McDowell Co. 89.9
Raleigh-Durham 98.0
Statesville 97.6
Winston-Salem 97.5

| North Dakota |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Bismarck-Mandan | 102.1 |
| Fargo-Moorhead | 102.8 |
| Grand Forks | 95.5 |
| Minot | 94.5 |
| Ohio |  |
| Akron | 94.5 |
| Canton/Stark County | 104.6 |
| Cincinnati | 101.0 |
| Cleveland | 104.3 |
| Columbus | 104.3 |
| Dayton-Springfield | 99.1 |
| Findlay | 97.0 |
| Mansfield | 97.5 |
| Marietta | 99.0 |
| Mt. Vernon/Knox Co. | 96.2 |
| Newark/Licking County | 97.7 |
| Toledo | 98.8 |
| Youngstown-Warren | 93.5 |
| Oklahoma |  |
| Ardmore | 90.4 |
| Bartlesville | 91.6 |
| Muskogee | 89.1 |
| Oklahoma City | 92.9 |
| Pryor Creek | 89.9 |
| Stillwater | 96.7 |
| Tulsa | 91.0 |
| Oregon |  |
| Eugene | 111.8 |
| Klamath Falls | 98.1 |
| Lincoln County | 107.1 |
| Medford | 102.8 |
| Portland | 109.7 |
| Salem | 103.2 |

Texas
Abilene ..... 92.5
Amarillo ..... 91.1
Austin ..... 95.5
Beaumont ..... 93.2
Bryan-College Station ..... 89.9
Corpus Christi ..... 94.0
Dallas ..... 101.9
El Paso ..... 94.2
Ft. Worth ..... 93.7
Georgetown ..... 96.6
Harlington ..... 88.7
Houston ..... 97.0
Killeen ..... 94.0
Longview ..... 90.7
Lubbock ..... 92.3
McAllen ..... 92.6
Midland ..... 94.4
Odessa ..... 95.9
San Antonio ..... 94.9
San Marcos ..... 98.4
Texarkana ..... 92.1
Tyler ..... 100.2
Victoria ..... 92.5
Waco ..... 92.3
Weatherford ..... 90.2
Wichita Falls ..... 92.9
Utah
Cedar City ..... 92.7
Logan ..... 101.8
Provo-Orem ..... 96.8
St. George ..... 102.2
Salt Lake City ..... 108.0
Vermont
Barre/Montpelier ..... 108.1
Burlington ..... 113.2
VirginiaBristol87.4
Danville ..... 96.0
Lynchburg ..... 91.6
Prince William ..... 112.8
Richmond ..... 100.9
Roanoke ..... 91.3
Washington
Bellingham ..... 104.2
Pullman ..... 105.9
Richland ..... 108.1
Tacoma ..... 104.0
Yakima ..... 104.1
West Virginia
Charleston ..... 98.0
Huntington ..... 99.9
Martinsburg/Berkeley Co. ..... 91.8
Wisconsin
Appleton ..... 98.5
Eau Claire ..... 103.4
Fond du Lac ..... 101.2
Green Bay ..... 96.9
Janesville ..... 103.9
Marinette ..... 98.4
Marshfield ..... 101.0
Sheboygan ..... 98.7
Wausau ..... 103.4
Wyoming
Casper ..... 104.0
Cheyenne ..... 96.6
Gillette ..... 98.9
Laramie ..... 98.7

## APPENDIX D

## Regression Statistics

Here we report the R-squared and F statistics for each of the 19 Senate personal office positions on which we conducted regression analysis.

|  | R-squared |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Washington Positions |  |  |
| AA/Chief of Staff | .3816 | 3.16 |
| Legislative Director | .3887 | 2.78 |
| Press Secretary | .6660 | 8.47 |
| Office Manager | .6523 | 8.44 |
| Executive Assistant | .5762 | 4.76 |
| Legislative Assistant | .4291 | 22.55 |
| Scheduler/Appointments Secretary | .7470 | 10.70 |
| Systems Administrator | .6030 | 5.69 |
| Dep./Asst. Press Secretary | .4215 | 2.91 |
| Assistant/Secretary to AA | .3610 | 1.48 |
| Computer Operator | .6594 | 10.89 |
| Legislative Correspondent | .3918 | 12.16 |
| Receptionist | .6303 | 14.49 |
| Correspondence Assistant/Mail Room Staffer | .5867 | 7.10 |
|  |  |  |
| State Positions |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| State Director | .1471 | 0.69 |
| Regional Director | .4518 | 4.22 |
| Field Representative | .4417 | 12.46 |
| State Caseworker | .4811 | 18.43 |
| State Office Assistant | .3729 | 3.94 |

## CMF PUBLICATIONS LIST

SETTING COURSE: A CONGRESSIONAL MANAGEMENT GUIDE. Now in its fifth edition, Setting Course is a comprehensive guide to setting up and managing a congressional office for newly elected Members of Congress and key aides. Veteran offices also draw heavily upon the management advice it offers. This book was revised for the 104th Congress. (1994; 372 pages)

FRONTLINE MANAGEMENT: A GUIDE FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT/STATE OFFICES. This book discusses the various functions of district/state offices -- casework, projects and grantsmanship, scheduling, planning events -- and provides congressional offices guidance for improving these functions in their offices. The book also provides general advice on managing district/state offices. (1989; 225 pages)

SENATE STAFF EMPLOYMENT: 1995 SALARIES, TENURE, DEMOGRAPHICS AND BENEFITS. This report studies Senate personal office staff and the factors that influence their pay. The study provides aggregate data on the salary, age, education, work experience, race/ethnicity, and gender of Senate staff. Twenty-five staff positions are individually analyzed. (1995, 116 pages)

1994 U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES: A STUDY OF STAFF SALARY, TENURE, DEMOGRAPHICS AND BENEFITS. Similar to the Senate study, this report studies House personal office staff and the factors that influence their pay. (1994; 97 pages)

WORKING IN CONGRESS: THE STAFF PERSPECTIVE. Based on the first-ever employee opinion survey of congressional staff, this report details what staff find rewarding and frustrating about their work and concludes with staff-supported recommendations for improving the internal operations of Congress. Quotes from focus groups and interviews with staff are included in the text. (1995; 70 pages)

A CONGRESSIONAL INTERN HANDBOOK. This nuts-and-bolts guide to working in a congressional office is used by hundreds of offices to orient each new wave of interns. It presents the do's and don'ts, where's and why's of Capitol Hill in a succinct, yet comprehensive and enjoyable style. A new version of this book is scheduled for an early 1996 release. (1989; 88 pages)

POLITICIANS AND THEIR SPOUSES' CAREERS. Written for Members with working spouses, this manual explores the potential problems that can result from the public attention focused on elected officials. By consulting congressional families, the book addresses realistic problems and solutions. (1985; 103 pages)

## ABOUT THE CONGRESSIONAL MANAGEMENT FOUNDATION

The Congressional Management Foundation (CMF) is a nonprofit, nonpartisan educational organization dedicated to helping Members of Congress and their staff better manage their workloads. CMF is an independent organization that works with both Democratic and Republican offices and takes no position on policy matters. CMF simply advocates good government through good management. The Foundation does this by tailoring private-sector management tools to the congressional environment in three ways: staff training, office consulting, and management publications.

## Staff Training

CMF offers extensive professional development and training opportunities for staff. Seminars, classes, and workshops are held throughout the year, free of charge. Management topics specifically geared to congressional office needs include: strategic planning, motivating staff and reducing staff turnover, managing the mail, personnel management, conflict management, ethical decision-making in Congress, project planning, time and paperwork management, and office communications.

## Office Consulting

Consultations are the most individualized service CMF provides. CMF conducts detailed studies of Members' offices, providing Members and staff with a comprehensive internal assessment that helps offices identify weaknesses and find ways of improving performance. CMF also provides offices with targeted assistance for specific management challenges such as: setting office goals, facilitating office retreats, improving office mail systems, establishing personnel systems, using productive time and paperwork management practices, and building effective teams.

## Management Publications

CMF's publications provide valuable management information and advice for Members of Congress and their top staff. These publications include:

- Setting Course: A Congressional Management Guide
- Frontline Management: A Guide for Congressional District/State Offices
- House and Senate Staff Salary and Employment Practices Reports
- Working in Congress: The Staff Perspective
- A Congressional Intern Handbook


## For Further Information:

The Congressional Management Foundation is a $501(\mathrm{c})(3)$ organization that is supported by grants from private corporations and foundations. If you would like more information about CMF, please call (202) 546-0100.

## CORNING

## Georgia-Pacific



Philip Morris Companies Inc.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Appendix A on page 109 lists the states in each population category.
    ${ }^{2}$ Appendix B on page 109 lists the states in each geographical region.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ All data in this report reflect full-time staffers only, except where specifically noted otherwise.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ Comparative data for 1995 and 1993 are taken from Christine E. Steele, "Profile of Federal Civilian Non-Postal Employees," Office of Personnel Management (OPM), March 31, 1995 and March 31, 1993. 1991 data are based on communication with OPM staff.

    5 Foundation for Public Affairs' 1995-96 Washington Office Compensation Survey. Cited with permission.
    ${ }^{6}$ Income, Poverty - Valuation of Non-Cash Benefits: 1993, Income Statistics Branch, Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce.

[^3]:    ${ }^{7}$ It may appear to be an anomaly that the pay gaps between Washington and district staff are all higher than the overall pay gap between males and females in the House. This is explained by the fact that a much higher percentage of female staffers than male staffers work in district offices, where average salaries are lower than in Washington offices.
    ${ }^{8}$ U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
    ${ }^{9}$ Average salary data for year-round, full-time workers from 1992 Population Survey, Income Statistics Branch, Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce.

[^4]:    ${ }^{10}$ Report of the Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, March 1995, p. 162.
    11 There were not enough General Counsels, Correspondence Directors, Research Assistants, Projects Directors, Washington Office Assistants, and Washington Caseworkers in the offices responding to our survey to permit us to conduct valid regression analyses of these positions. For each of the 19 Senate office positions not listed above, we have performed individual regression analyses.

[^5]:    ${ }^{12}$ Data for full-time, year-round workers from 1992 Population Survey, Income Statistics Branch, Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce.
    ${ }^{13}$ Glass Ceiling Commission, p. IV.

[^6]:    ${ }^{14}$ There were not enough General Counsels, Correspondence Directors, Research Assistants, Projects Directors, Washington Office Assistants, and Washington Caseworkers in the offices responding to our survey to permit us to conduct any valid regression analyses of these positions.
    ${ }^{15}$ For this analysis, we used 1994 House data for comparison. Because House offices received no increases in their personnel budgets in 1995, the unadjusted 1994 data is our best estimate of House practices in 1995.
    ${ }^{16} 1992$ Population Survey, Income Statistics Branch, Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce.

[^7]:    ${ }^{17}$ Christine Steele, "Profile of Federal Civilian Non-Postal Employees," Office of Personnel Management, March 31, 1995.
    ${ }^{18}$ U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, supplement to the Current Population Survey, released in June 1992 (data for 1991).

[^8]:    ${ }^{19}$ In order to be classified as a "statistically significant" predictor of tenure, a variable had to have a $t$-statistic that is significant at the .05 level against the two-sided null hypothesis.
    ${ }^{20}$ In these regressions, we used two salary variables: (1) each individual's annual salary (an absolute measure of reward), and (2) the differential between each individual's salary and the median salary for his/her position (a relative measure of reward). Higher levels of relative salary variable were significantly correlated with lower turnover between offices and jobs, while the absolute salary variable was significantly correlated with higher turnover between

[^9]:    jobs. For simplicity, we will refer to both variables jointly as "salary" in the remainder of this section.

[^10]:    22 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, unpublished data for 1991.
    ${ }^{23}$ Christine E. Steele, "Profile of Federal Civilian Non-Postal Employees," Office of Personnel Management, March 31, 1995.

[^11]:    ${ }^{24}$ Christine E. Steele, "Profile of Federal Civilian Non-Postal Civilian Employees," Office of Personnel Management, March 31, 1995.
    ${ }^{25}$ U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 174.

[^12]:    ${ }^{26}$ Christine E. Steele, "Profile of Federal Civilian Non-Postal Civilian Employees," Office of Personnel Management, March 31, 1995.
    ${ }^{27}$ U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, unpublished data, March 1991.

[^13]:    ${ }^{28}$ "Report of a Study of Federally Employed Women," Federally Employed Women, 1991.
    ${ }^{29}$ Frank Swoboda, "Glass Ceiling' Firmly in Place, Panel Finds," Washington Post, March 16, 1995, p. A1.
    ${ }^{30}$ These position categories cover most, but not all, Senate staff positions. A few positions were not included in this analysis because they did not clearly fit into any of the four categories. In addition, please note that all of the "Leadership positions" are also included in the "Policy position" category.

[^14]:    ${ }^{34}$ All of the statistics in this paragraph are taken from Howard Gleckman et al., "Race in the Workplace," Business Week, July 8, 1991.

[^15]:    ${ }^{35}$ While we exclude part-time staff from all of our analyses for clarity and consistency, we collect data on their employment in Senate personal offices. In 1995, each Senate office employed an average of about two part-time workers, 71 percent of whom were based in state offices.

[^16]:    ${ }^{36}$ We used the same salary ranges for all of the positions: the salary ranges cover every $\$ 5,000$ interval between the lowest range of $\$ 7,500$ to $\$ 12,499$ and the highest range of $\$ 127,500$ to $\$ 132,49$.
    ${ }^{37}$ On the survey we asked offices to indicate the educational attainment, or highest degree earned, of each staff member. To improve our regression analyses, we converted educational attainment into years of education as follows:
    

[^17]:    ${ }^{39}$ See page 98 for additional information of the influence of gender and race/ethnicity on salaries within positions.

[^18]:    ${ }^{40}$ In order to determine whether or not a variable was a "significant" predictor of pay, we tested the two-sided null hypothesis at the .05 significance level using $t$-statistics.

[^19]:    ${ }^{41}$ We performed regression analyses on 19 of the 25 Senate office positions listed on our survey. There were too few General Counsels, Correspondence Directors, Research Assistants, Projects Directors, Washington Office Assistants, and Washington Caseworkers reported on our surveys for us to conduct valid regression analyses on those positions. The R-squared and F statistics for each of the 19 positions on which we performed regression analyses are listed in Appendix D on page 116.

[^20]:    ${ }^{42}$ As we describe on pages 13 and 14, we grouped all non-whites together for the purposes of the regression analyses.

[^21]:    * These are the average House salaries from CMF's 1994 House employment study. We have not adjusted these figures because House personal offices received no increases in their personnel budgets for 1995.

[^22]:    43 We cannot accurately compare the 1995 raise and bonus policies of Senate offices to those of Senate offices in 1993 or 1991 because we worded the raise and bonus questions differently in 1993 and 1991 than we did this year.

[^23]:    ${ }^{44}$ Sources for this information include: Communication with staff at the Office of Personnel Management and three U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics publications, Employee Benefits in State and Local Government, 1992, July 1994; Employee Benefits in Medium and Large Firms, 1993, November 1994; and Employee Benefits in Small Private Establishments, 1992, May 1994.

[^24]:    ${ }^{45}$ Many Senate offices have sick leave policies that defy easy categorization; these have been grouped under the heading "other."

[^25]:    ${ }^{46}$ Senate (and House) offices are covered by the Family and Medical Leave Act, which stipulates that they provide their staff with 12 weeks of unpaid parental leave. However, this Act does not stipulate that any amount of paid parental leave be given to staff. Below, we report only the paid parental leave policies of Senate offices.

[^26]:    ${ }^{47}$ Sources for this information include: Communication with staff at the Office of Personnel Management (October 1995) and three U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics publications, Employee Benefits in State and Local Government, 1992, July 1994; Employee Benefits in Medium and Large Firms, 1993, November 1994; and Employee Benefits in Small Private Establishments, 1992, May 1994.

[^27]:    ${ }^{48}$ U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Census Bureau, Economics and Statistics Administration, CB95-39, March 1, 1995.

