

Rating United States Senators The Strength of Maine's Delegation since 1955¹

L. Sandy Maisel
Colby College

More than three decades ago, Richard Fenno noted the paradox that Americans tend to respect their own Members of Congress while holding the institution in low regard (Fenno 1978). If anything, Fenno's paradox is more evident today than when he first recognized it.

Fenno knew that citizens liked their own Congressmen because they were re-elected at incredibly high rates. Since 1950, the percentage of incumbents seeking reelection who have been defeated in general elections has been lower than 10% in every election (and 90% or more of incumbents seeking re-election have done so successfully in all but four of those 30 elections, even when primary defeats are taken into account). While more Senators lose than is true of House members, Senate reelection rates have been incredibly high in the modern era.

Political scientists have spent a good deal of time and energy explaining incumbency advantage (see, among the many examples, Stone, Fulton, Maestas, and Maisel 2010; Brady, D'Onofrio, and Fiorina 2000; Zaller 1998; Mondak 1995a; 1995 b; Jacobson and Kernell 1983; Cover and Brumberg 1982; Fiorina 1977; Mayhew 1974; Erikson 1971) . In doing so, they seek to explain a macro-level phenomenon, with all incumbents' electoral success the variable to be explained. Some case studies have examined individual campaigns, but little attention has been given to distinguishing

¹ I would like to thank the participants at the conference "United States Senators from Maine: 50 Years of Leading the Nation," held at the Goldfarb Center for Public Affairs and Civic Engagement, Colby College, October 16, 2009, particularly John Baughman and Cal Mackenzie, for their helpful comments.

among Congressmen or Senators, at least in terms of how they are viewed (see, as examples, Maisel and West 2004; Klinkner 1996; Fowler and McClure 1989).

In fact, little attention has been given to explaining differences among Congressmen or Senators at all. We have a body of literature on committees and some of that relates to power and influence; that literature is largely based on case studies. We have a large and expanding literature on voting in the House and Senate, examining party influence and median vote theory. John Kingdon (2003) and others have explored agenda-setting and decision-making by legislators, implying that some Congressmen and Senators have more influence over their colleagues than do others; influence, according to this model, tends to flow from party, committee, or state delegation leadership positions; occasionally, it follows substantive expertise. (See, as examples, Volden and Wiseman 2009; Miquel and Snyder 2006; Anderson *et al.* 2003; Schnaffer *et al.* 2003; Binder *et al.* 1998; Hall 1992; Mayer 1980; Frantzich 1979.)

We as a discipline know little about who is influential, who is respected, who is effective in the United States Congress. But we as citizens think we know something about those subjects. Who among those in Maine who follow politics has not commented on the strength of Maine's Senate delegation? What other state can boast of a delegation that has included Senate luminaries like Margaret Chase Smith, Edmund S. Muskie, William S. Cohen, George J. Mitchell, Olympia Snowe and Susan Collins over the last half century?² Mainers are rightfully proud of their Senate delegations—and those from other states point to them with amazement that so many strong leaders have come from one small state.

However, recognizing the strength of the Maine delegation raises more questions than it answers. How does one know that these Senators were and are as meritorious as Mainers think they are—and that other observers seem to agree they are as well? On what bases are these judgments made? What other senators are viewed as positively?

² One has to be more of a cognoscenti of Maine politics to rate William D. Hathaway, who served one term between 1973 and 1979 in the same category as the others, each of whom served far longer in the Senate.

What criteria are used – implicitly or explicitly – to reach these evaluations? Perhaps of most importance, what factors contribute to a senator’s influence or power? What kinds of senators are likely to build these reputations? It is to these questions that this paper is directed.

The Ratings Game

In 1948 Harvard historian Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., past president of the American Historical Association, polled a group of distinguished fellow historians, asking them to rate the Presidents from Washington through Truman. Thus began the great game of rating American presidents. Schlesinger repeated that exercise in 1952; his son and namesake did it some years later. A number of other scholarly polls – and many media polls – have followed. The list is familiar; Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, and both Roosevelts are among the “great.” Fillmore, Buchanan, and Harding generally are found near the bottom.

Scholars worry about ideological biases among those who evaluate the presidents. Popular polls are viewed with less credibility, largely because of public ignorance about the administrations of most of our presidents. But the process is viewed as having some merit. And the criterion seems to be “greatness.” How one defines that term varies from rater to rater – and therein enters the ideological bias – but generally “greatness” is viewed positively, so that if one rates one higher on that scale, one thinks more of a president.

To our knowledge, no scholar has produced a comparable study rating United States Senators or Representatives. It is not that the question is less interesting, but rather that the task is more daunting. Barack Obama is the 44th President of the United States, counting Grover Cleveland twice. One hundred United States Senators and 435 United States Representatives serve at any one time. Rating those alone would be an off-putting task; doing so after adding in their predecessors, nearly impossible.

Yet, we think we know something about rating legislators. At the time of his recent death, Edward M. Kennedy was eulogized as the last “lion of the Senate.” Lions

are powerful and dominating; it is good to be a “lion of the Senate.” We can quickly name others who have been canonized as legislative giants—Clay, Reed, Cannon, Rayburn in the House; Calhoun, Webster, Sumner, Lyndon Johnson in the Senate. But how do we know? On what criteria are they judged? By whom? How do today’s—or even yesterday’s—legislative leaders compare to these? Can we engage in a congressional ratings game with any merit?

Data and Methods

The goal of this study is to determine if it is possible to devise a schema for rating legislators, parallel in some ways to Schlesinger’s rating of the presidents. We have narrowed our focus to the United States Senate for two reasons. First, for practical reasons, there have been many fewer Senators than Representatives, though still nearly 1900 since the Republic was formed. Second, United States Senators are better known than are their House counterparts. Thus, we felt it would be easier to find individuals who would feel comfortable offering a rating.

Schlesinger and others have rated presidential greatness, but that term seemed more fitting for a president than a legislator; for a legislator, “greatness” could be interpreted in far more ways even than it could be for a president. The scholarly literature evaluates legislators in a number of ways, most dealing with power. We tried to isolate more concrete terms to rate senators, settling on influence, respect, and effectiveness (while acknowledging that each of these terms was open to rater interpretation, less so than power or greatness, but substantially nonetheless). We also determined that influence and respect required further modification—did we mean within the Senate or within the nation as a whole? Both seemed relevant in rating a Senator, and both were thus used.

While it would be possible to gather data on all United States Senators, our research has examined a subset. First, we set a temporal limit. We chose to examine those Senators elected after television became part of American life. We could have chosen have gone further back, to those Senators elected after the passage of the 17th

amendment in 1913 or after the New Deal realignment. Our reasoning was that campaigning and relating to constituents was transformed radically by television; thus how constituents see a Senator is also likely to have changed. Thus, we chose to examine all Senators first elected after 1954 for this study.

Just fewer than 400 Senators were first elected between 1954 and 2008.³ If one were looking to measure Senator influence, however, it seemed that some length of service was a necessary (though not sufficient) qualification. We chose succeeding in two re-elections as a minimal indicator of having been in office long enough to gain respect and attain influence.⁴ President Obama might well have gone on to be a titan in the Senate had he stayed in that body, but he chose to leave. No doubt he has become more influential than he would have been in the Senate, but his influence is not because of his Senate service. By this criterion, we chose not to study anyone first elected after the 1996 election. That decision reduced our sample to 152 Senators.

However, an additional 41 Senators were first elected before 1954 but stayed in the Senate into the television era, thus meeting our longevity criterion. With the addition of those Senators, the final sample that was studied totaled 193 individuals. (They are listed in Appendix A.)⁵

Our analysis is based on two sets of data. First, we sought to gain a measure of each Senator's reputation. Doing so was not a simple matter. When Schlesinger and others have sought to gauge the reputations of presidents, they asked either historians,

³ That number includes Senators who were elected before 1954, left the Senate, and re-entered again after 1954.

⁴ Normally, this criterion would mean eighteen years of Senate service if the Senator finished his or her third term. A number of individuals in our sample did not finish that term and accordingly served fewer years. In some cases the first re-election was after a Special Election; thus those individuals qualified for our sample after having served as few as eight years (and only fourteen if they finished that term).

⁵ Our decision rule led to one unfortunate exclusion, whom we could have included due to a technicality but chose not to. Lyndon Johnson, who was first elected in 1948 and re-elected in 1954, was re-elected a second time in 1940, on the same day he was elected Vice President. However, he resigned before commencing his third term. We have no doubt that he would have rated near the top of all of our scales had he been included (Caro 2002).

journalists, or the general public to rate all of those who had served in the office up until the time of their study. Thus, none of these studies would have asked respondents to reach a judgment on more than 44 men, and all of the subjects were more or less well known.

In this case, to follow the same methodology would have meant asking respondents to rate 193 individuals (or more than 400 before our own culling), many of whom, even those who met our criterion for longevity, are hardly household names. No respondent would be likely to complete a survey asking for that much information.⁶

Moreover, it was unclear to us from whom we should seek these evaluations. One logical group was political scientists who study the Senate. The Legislative Studies Section of the American Political Science Association has several hundred members. However, many of those scholars study legislatures other than the United States Congress; many of those studying the Congress do so from a theoretical perspective, not focusing on individual Senators. We tested our survey instrument with a few members of the LSS, with disappointing results.

One of the LSS members suggested an alternative source of respondents, individuals who had served for a period of time as Congressional Fellows. The APSA has a list of former Fellows. Fellows come from various professions—political science, journalism, government service, and various medical professions. In addition, there are various international fellows programs. We chose to restrict our survey to those coming from the United States.

Our goal with the survey was to obtain a sense of the reputations of the 193 Senators in our sample. For this kind of reputational analysis, we were not seeking data

⁶ I, in fact, attempted to fill out a survey we constructed with all 193 Senators on it and quit in frustration, because it took so long, and I felt inadequate to judge so many of those on the list.

from a representative sample, rather from an informed one.⁷ For this reason, it was not necessary for each of our “informant” respondents to rate each of the Senators in our sample. We did need to assure, however, that there was no systematic bias in how respondents were assigned which Senators to rate.

Accordingly, we randomly divided the 193 Senators into eight groups of 24 or 25. Similarly, we randomly divided the 480 Congressional Fellows for whom we had valid emails into eight groups.⁸ We received a total of 106 valid responses, with at least 10 in each group. Thus, each Senator in our sample was rated by at least 10 individuals who we judge has some appropriate knowledge of the workings of the Senate. Table 1 presents the response rate on a number of relevant variables.

These respondent characteristics are presented to ascertain the amount of confidence one can have in the evaluations that have been provided. The respondent group is broadly representative of the population surveyed on the characteristics for which the population’s characteristics are known—region of the country, profession, and when they worked in Congress. The one conclusion that one can draw from these data is that the evaluations of Senators serving more recently might be given more credence than those of Senators serving earlier in the period under examination. As we will demonstrate later, not surprisingly, respondents were more likely not to be able to evaluate Senators serving in the 1950s and 1960s than those serving in the later portions of the period under examination. However, we will also see that “lions of the Senate” from the earlier period were well recognized by our respondents.

The more troubling characteristic is obviously partisan affiliation, with over two-thirds of the respondents answering that they were Democrats and only 6.6% claiming

⁷ A similar method was used to judge the qualities of potential candidates for office in the Candidate Emergence Study. See, as examples, Maisel and Stone 1997; Stone and Maisel 2003; Stone, Maisel, and Maestas 2004.

⁸ The number of emails that were delivered to potential respondents dropped to 440; respondents were lost because either their email from the APSA was not valid or they had previously opted out of receiving emails from the survey firm we used.

to be Republicans. We have no reason to think that Democrats were disproportionately likely to answer our survey. Rather, our conclusion is that more Democrats than Republicans accepted Congressional Fellowships. As the vast majority of the time period under discussion was a period of Democratic rule, and as, at least by reputation, political scientists and journalists are disproportionately Democrats, this ratio is not surprising. However, we were alerted to a partisan bias as these respondents evaluate Senators. As a result Democratic and Republican Senators are analyzed separately below. This article is based largely on this data source.

Table 1
Characteristics of Responding
Congressional Fellows
n = 106

a. Region of the Country

Northeast	16.0%
Middle	
Atlantic	20.8%
Southeast	16.0%
Midwest	12.3%
Southwest	15.1%
Mountain	3.8%
Far West	10.4%
Not in US	5.7%
	100%

b. Profession

Political Scientist	50.0%
Journalist	1.8%
Government	26.5%
Medical	
Prof.	8.5%
Other	1.3%
Retired	11.9%
	100.0%

c. When Worked in Congress (multiple answers permitted)

in the last decade	53.6%
1990s	30.0%
1980s	9.8%
1940s	0.0%
1940s	0.9%
Before	0.0%
Never	2.7%

d. Party Affiliation

Democrat	68.9%
Republican	6.6%
Independent	24.5%
	100.0%

The survey of former Congressional Fellows was administered through Survey Monkey. Each potential respondent received an email letter explaining the project and a link to the survey. One reminder was sent approximately ten days after the first mailing. An obvious concern was the comparability of our responding groups. Eventually we will do a more complete analysis but a serendipitous error gives us a high level of confidence. Accidentally Senator Hubert Humphrey's name was included in two groups.⁹ The ratings that Humphrey received on all six of the questions asked were virtually identical between the two groups. Clearly Humphrey's career is better known than that of most Senators, but we still take comfort from the similarity of the results.

⁹ Humphrey was elected and served in the Senate, resigned when he ran for and served as Vice President, and then was re-elected. Our method was to include Senators with such discontinued service only once. We missed eliminating Humphrey's second appearance on our list.

As a second source, we also gathered a great deal of publicly available data on each Senator—their state, their party affiliation, the number of times they were re-elected, their vote totals in re-election bids, the office they held prior to running for the Senate (if any), party leadership posts or major committee chairmanships or ranking member positions held in the Senate, whether they were first elected or appointed, data on their state's electoral system. That data collection process remains a work in progress and is only used occasionally in this analysis.

Results

Our first question dealt with whether the respondent was familiar in general terms with the career of each of the Senators on the list. We presented the respondents with a dichotomous choice.¹⁰ On average, approximately 60% of the respondents could rate each Senator. Over 100 Senators were rated by at least two-thirds of the respondents; 59 by at least 90% of the respondents; but 32 by fewer than one in five respondents and thirteen by none at all. All save two of those in the lowest categories of familiarity were first elected in the 1970s or earlier; thus we were somewhat concerned about a generational bias in our responses. This group included four Republicans who had served in party leadership roles—though not top roles—in the early period covered under this study; it included only four who had risen to be a committee chair or a ranking member. Certainly none of the names stood out as an obvious Senate titan whom our informants had missed. Thus, the filtering question gave us confidence that we would have a number of respondents comfortable assessing the reputations of most of the Senators with whom we were concerned on the qualities that interested us.¹¹

¹⁰ Our original intent had been to eliminate those whom the respondents felt unable to judge from subsequent questions, but the software used did not permit that option. As an alternative we gave an option to select “Unable to Rate this Senator” for each subsequent question.

¹¹ At a later date, we intend to explore qualities that lead Senators to be judged poorly on the qualities of interest to us. The number without many respondents capable of judging their

We proceeded to ask five questions dealing with Senators' reputations for influence (in the Senate and nationally), respect (in the Senate and nationally), and overall effectiveness. For each question we computed three scores—the average rating by all who responded to our survey; the average rating by those who answered for a particular Senator; and the percentages of respondents who placed the Senator in the highest category, e.g. Very Influential, Highly Respected, or Very Effective. Each of these leads to a different interpretation.

In one sense the rating by those who knew enough about a Senator to rate him or her is the most valuable piece of data. However, it is also the data most susceptible to wide variation that distorts reality. As an example, only one person rated Senator Lister Hill, who represented Alabama in the Senate for 30 years, ending in the late 1970s. That person gave Hill the highest rating for Senate Influence, giving him an “average” rating of 5, the highest possible, and a higher ranking than any other Senator. But Hill, who was indeed influential in some policy areas while in the Senate, at least in part because of his longevity and committee seniority, was hardly the most influential Senator in the modern era. A number of other Senators ratings were similarly distorted.

Thus, we opted to use the average rating by all who responded in the group that contained a Senator's name. The reasoning here is that people who are highly regarded should be known by a larger number of those who are rating their reputation. We understand that there might well be a generational bias—and thus, for example, Hill might well have been rated lower on this scale than he deserves—but that can be accounted for. We also do not believe that this method severely corrupts our judgment for those on the lowest rungs of our reputational scales. If few respondents feel able to rate a Senator on a particular characteristic, that is some indication that that Senator probably is not known for that quality. We are less certain about those in the middle.

reputations on these qualities will be more troubling for that analysis than it is for our current concern, identifying Senators rated highly.

Here we enter the realm of trying to second guess our respondents. If one knows something of the career of a Senator, but if one is unclear where he or she stands on the scale measuring respect in the Senate, for instance, how does one respond? One answer is to say “Unable to Rate this Senator.” The other logical response is to place the Senator in the “Average” category. Either rating adds one to the denominator of the equation determining average respect. The first choice adds “0” to the numerator; the second, the average score of “3.” Our data do not permit us to know how respondents made this choice. Our assumption is that they made it in a manner that did not bias particular results, but we need to explore that assumption further.

The third way of measuring each variable reports the percentage in the highest category. One could argue that this measure is precisely what we should examine: how many really think that this Senator is “Very Influential”? The question comes down to this judgment. Who is more influential, a person rated in the “Above Average Influence” (or other characteristic) category by most people, or a person rated more highly by some, but less highly by many more. We opted for using average ratings because we felt that the partisan bias introduced by large percentage of our respondents who are self-reported Democrats was more likely to influence the top categories than the average. Again, this assumption will be further explored later. The tables in Appendix B present the preliminary analysis of our data using the first and third measures discussed above.

Influence

As noted earlier, Senators can be deemed to have influence within the Senate or nationally.¹² Tables 2a and 2b list the most highly rated Senators in these two

¹² One could also measure influence that a Senator has within his or her own state. We chose not to do so because we felt that few of our respondents would have knowledge of politics within the individual states. Surely in an earlier era, when Senators were elected by state legislatures and were often party leaders, many of them were powerful personages at home. This seems to be less of the case in modern times.

categories.¹³ A number of conclusions can be drawn. First, four Democrats appear on both lists; seven Republicans are repeaters. The ordering on the two lists differs, implying that our respondents understand the differences in the foci of influence.

Table 2a

**Average Senate
Influence
(by all who
responded)***

Democrats		Republicans	
Daschle, Tom	4.67	Dole, Robert	4.45
Nunn, Samuel A.	4.67	Lugar, Richard G.	4.43
Byrd, Robert C.	4.50	Dirksen, Everett	4.40
Moynihan, Daniel	4.47	Hatch, Orrin G.	4.33
Fulbright, J. Wm.	4.00	Gramm, Phil	4.33
Byrd, Harry F.	4.00	Snowe, Olympia	4.23
Lieberman, Joseph	4.00	Baker, Howard	4.07
Baucus, Max	3.93	Helms, Jesse	4.00
Muskie, Edmund	3.93	Specter, Arlen	3.93
Mansfield, Mike	3.93	Thurmond, Strom	4.00
Feinstein, Dianne	3.93		

*** Scale for this and all tables is a 6-point scale, with 5 as the "Very Influential" or parallel rating, 1 as "Not Influential" and 0 as "Unable to Rate this Senator"**

¹³ In reporting these data, we have generally listed the top ten Democrats and the top ten Republicans, but have varied this number when either ties or large gaps dictated a different cut line.

Table 2b

**National Influence
(by all who ranked)***

Democrats		Republicans	
Kennedy, Edward	4.87	Gramm, Phil	4.91
Daschle, Tom	4.73	Goldwater, Barry	4.50
McGovern, Geo.	4.73	McConnell, Mitch	4.36
Gore, Albert	4.70	Dirksen, Everett	4.27
Mitchell, George	4.60	Snowe, Olympia	4.18
Moynihan, Daniel	4.60	Baker, Howard	4.07
Sarbanes, Paul S.	4.55	Hatch, Orrin G.	4.07
Nunn, Samuel A.	4.53	Dole, Robert	4.00
Byrd, Robert C.	4.50	Thurmond, Strom	4.00
Humphrey, Hub.	4.36		

* See Table 2a

How does one explain these two types of influence? Influence in the Senate comes from one of three sources: party position (Daschle, Robert Byrd, Dole, Dirksen, Baker); policy leadership (Nunn, Moynihan, Fulbright, Harry Byrd,¹⁴ Baucus, Muskie,

¹⁴ We wondered whether respondents had in fact mistaken Senator Harry Byrd from Virginia for Robert Byrd, though we have no way of ascertaining this. Byrd, of course, was a leader in southern resistance to civil rights legislation and thus was influential in the Senate and nationally.

Lugar, Hatch, Gramm, Helms, Thurmond); or centrist position (Lieberman, Feinstein, Snowe, Specter). It is more difficult to characterize the determinants of reputed national influence. We note that many deemed most influential nationally are also among the most well-known Senators (data not shown), including six who ran for President or Vice President (and four others who sought their party's nomination).

It is also difficult not to note the number of these influential Senators from very small states—Daschle, Robert Byrd, Fulbright, Muskie, Mansfield, Dole, Hatch, Snowe, McGovern, Mitchell, and Goldwater (at the time he served). Work in the United States Senate is clearly a path in national influence by aspiring leaders from small states; in the Senate they stand on equal footing with their colleagues from larger population centers. Finally, it is difficult not to notice that Maine is the only state that produced three names on these lists—Muskie, Mitchell, and Snowe—and that two other small states, South Dakota and Montana, were the only other states to produce two.

Respect

As noted above, Senators can be reputed to have influence for a number of different reasons. Respect seems to be less of a multi-dimensional term. Tables 3a and 3b present lists of the most respected Senators within the body and nationally, as rated by our Congressional Fellow respondents. More names appear on both lists—and ranked closer to the same on the two lists—than was the case with Influence.¹⁵ Our interpretation of this finding is that Respect is a term for which it is difficult to differentiate who has that respect. Scholars of the Congress in the 1950s and 1960s used to write about House and Senate norms or folkways and how Senators and Congressmen gained in influence by recognizing the ways the two bodies functioned (Matthews 1960; Clapp 1963).

¹⁵ The Senate Respect list for Democrats was expanded because of tied ratings. If the National Respect list had included the same number of names, three more would have appeared on both lists.

Many of the men about whom these scholars wrote—and they were virtually all men—were enormously respected within their chamber but largely unknown to the general public outside of their own states or districts. That disjuncture does not seem to be the case today, and it is notable that only Everett McKinley Dirksen and Barry Goldwater from the older generation made this list. The logical interpretation of these data is that our respondents were unable to judge the degree of respect with which those from an earlier era were held. Once again the relative overrepresentation of Senators from small states is noteworthy, with Senators Mitchell, Dole, and Hatch near the top of both lists (along with Dirksen and Lugar). However, in addition to Maine, Arizona (a small state that has become larger), Massachusetts, and Illinois all have two on these lists.

Table 3a

**Average Senate Respect
(by all who ranked)***

Democrats

Kennedy, Edward	4.80
Byrd, Robert C.	4.50
Mitchell, George	4.40
Moynihan, Daniel	4.40
Nunn, Samuel A.	4.33
Mansfield, Mike	4.00
Biden, Joseph R.	3.64
Humphrey, Hubert	3.57
Feinstein, Dianne	3.57
Kerry, John F.	3.53
Durbin, Richard	3.53
Dodd, Christopher	3.53
Graham, Bob	3.53
Inouye, Daniel K.	3.53

Republicans

Dirksen, Everett	4.73
Dole, Robert	4.27
Hatch, Orrin G.	4.13
Lugar, Richard	4.07
Snowe, Olympia	3.77
Warner, John	3.57
Simpson, Alan	3.55
Grassley, Charles	3.50
Lott, Trent	3.47
Specter, Arlen	3.47

* See Table 2a.

Table 3b

**Average National Respect
(by all who ranked)***

Democrats		Republicans	
Gore, Albert	4.30	Dirksen, Everett	4.27
Mitchell, George J.	4.20	Lugar, Richard G.	3.93
Byrd, Robert C.	4.10	Goldwater, Barry M.	3.79
Nunn, Samuel A.	4.07	Baker, Howard H., Jr.	3.71
Moynihan, Daniel P.	4.07	Hatch, Orrin G.	3.60
Humphrey, Hubert H.	4.00	Warner, John W.	3.57
Kennedy, Edward M.	4.00	Gramm, Phil	3.53
Daschle, Tom	3.80	McCain, John	3.42
Glenn, John H., Jr.	3.80	Dole, Robert	3.36

* See Table 2a.

Overall Effectiveness

The measure of Overall Effectiveness presented in Table 4 is perhaps the closest to Schlesinger's measure of Presidential Greatness. If, at the end of the day, you wanted to say "My Senator made a difference," these are the Senators one would identify. A number of these Senators have been Senate leaders—and the correlation between this list and Senate Influence is higher than with any of our other lists.¹⁶ Others are well-known for particular policy initiatives—e.g., Mitchell and Muskie and Gore on the environment, Nunn and Warner on defense policy, Lugar on foreign policy, Moynihan on welfare reform, Kennedy and Hatch on health care issues and other, and Gramm on

¹⁶ It is, of course, statistically inaccurate to correlate only the top of two lists, as there could be substantial variance further down the lists. Those analyses await further study.

the economy.¹⁷ Once again, the theme of small state Senators – and in fact, the repetition of the same small state Senators – recurs. Senators Robert Byrd, Daschle, Dole, Mansfield, Mitchell, Muskie, and Snowe appear on list after list.

Table 4
Average Overall Effectiveness
(by all who ranked)*

Democrats

Mitchell, George J.	4.67
Nunn, Samuel A.	4.60
Kennedy, Edward	4.33
Byrd, Robert C.	4.30
Moynihan, Daniel	4.20
Daschle, Tom	4.20
Mansfield, Mike	4.00
Sarbanes, Paul S.	3.93
Gore, Albert	3.80
Muskie, Edmund S.	3.79

Republicans

Gramm, Phil	4.33
Dirksen, Everett	4.20
Lugar, Richard	4.14
McConnell, Mitch	3.91
Hatch, Orrin G.	3.87
Snowe, Olympia	3.77
Lott, Trent	3.73
Dole, Robert	3.73
Baker, Howard	3.64
Specter, Arlen	3.60
Warner, John	3.57

* See Table 2a.

One cannot help but notice that a number of these Senators have demonstrated their effectiveness through accomplishments after their Senate years. For many, the Senate is the culminating point in a career. Senators Byrd, Mansfield, Dirksen, and Warner probably epitomize Senate careerists on this list, though Mansfield did later serve as U. S. Ambassador to Japan. But an old political adage holds that every Senator wakes up each morning, looks in the mirror, and sees a future President of the United

¹⁷ Dirksen is really the only Senator on this list from the earliest era in our study. We are left to wonder the timeframe in which effectiveness is measured. For instance, one could argue Al Gore has been more effective since he left public office than he was in it. Mitchell might well be thought more effective as a negotiator than as an environmental leader. Such quandaries are what make this study so interesting. One also wonders whether someone like Warren Rudman would have made this list had he stayed in the Senate longer. There are other examples of Senators who have had an important role in a limited policy arena during a short Senate tenure.

States. Many on this list gained national recognition in runs for the presidency (and one in service as Vice President). Beyond political office, some of these most effective Senators have demonstrated their skills in other governmental or civic service—notably Mitchell as a Special Envoy, negotiating conflict situations around the globe, Gore as a Nobel Prize laureate for his work on global climate change, Baker as White House Chief of Staff, and Dole as the senior spokesman for his party, seeking bi-partisan solutions on many issues and representing World War II veterans in a most public way.

It is difficult to know how our respondents defined “overall effectiveness,” and that ambiguity was intentional—just as the definition of greatness on Schlesinger’s list was derived from examining the records of the President so selected, not from criteria presented in advance. None can doubt, however, that the Senators who appear on this list are among the giants of the modern Senate and among those most consequential in setting national policies and priorities during their time in public life. Thus, our method was successful in identifying Senate leaders. Had Kennedy or Mitchell or Mansfield, Dirksen, Dole, or Baker not been on this list, our method would have been suspect. As it stands, what is more interesting is to speculate on what aspects of the careers of some of the others led to their inclusion.

The Senators from Maine

And what about the Senators from Maine? Are they really so extraordinary? The evidence so far indicates that at least three of them—Mitchell and Muskie and Snowe—are rated highly in a number of categories. But those three never served with each other. Is the delegation really unusual in how they are viewed for influence, respect, and overall effectiveness?

Table 5 shows the rating for all Maine Senators our respondents were asked to rate, the entire set of Maine Senators since 1956, with the sole exception of William Hathaway (D), who served only one term, defeating Margaret Chase Smith in 1972 and losing to William Cohen in 1978. The table pairs Maine Senators who spent most of their careers serving together—Smith and Muskie overlapped between 1957 and 1973;

Cohen and Mitchell, between 1980 and 1995; Snowe and Collins from 1997 until the present. In each case, the rating reported in within the Senator's own political party, i.e. Muskie rated 14th among the 108 Senate Democrats who were in our sample on the question of his effectiveness within the Senate; Smith rated 47th among the 85 rated Republicans on the same scale.

Table 5
Rating Maine Senators*

Senate Influence		National Influence	
Smith	47	Smith	39
Muskie	14	Muskie	15
Cohen	20	Cohen	20
Mitchell	4	Mitchell	5
Snowe	6	Snowe	5
Collins	12	Collins	24
Senate Respect		National Respect	
Smith	38	Smith	28
Muskie	19	Muskie	12
Cohen	13	Cohen	10
Mitchell	3	Mitchell	2
Snowe	5	Snowe	12
Collins	16	Collins	22
Overall Effectiveness		* Ratings with party GOP n = 85 Dem n = 108	
Smith	33		
Muskie	10		
Cohen	19		
Mitchell	1		
Snowe	6		
Collins	16		

Again, a number of conclusions are evident. First, the overall ratings are extraordinary. At first glance the Smith-Muskie pairing might not seem to fare as well

as the others. However, recall that our respondents were less willing to rate Senators from the earlier period in our study than those from the later periods. That generational bias led to systematically lower scores for older Senators.¹⁸ Margaret Chase Smith's scores seem particularly low, especially as compared to her reputation in Maine. The generational bias clearly accounts for some of this disparity. Only Everett Dirksen and Barry Goldwater among her closest contemporaries scored higher than she did; most others ranked well below her. In addition, Smith was most well known for her famous "Declaration of Conscience," her Senate floor speech on June 1, 1950 denouncing Senator Joseph McCarthy's red baiting tactics. That speech cemented Smith's reputation for her entire career. For much of the rest of her time in the Senate, she was known for her views of defense policy; she served in the minority virtually all of that time—and at the end of her long career, her views were seen as somewhat out of touch. The ratings reflect those differences—with her rating for national respect the highest and for influence within the Senate, her lowest.

Senator Cohen's ratings also reflect the respondents' view of his career. Cohen's reputation was established when, as a young Congressman, he received a great deal of acclaim for voting to impeach Richard Nixon, a President of his own party. His reputation was enhanced when President Clinton named him as Secretary of Defense in his second term. Both instances demonstrated a type of bipartisanship that commanded national respect. While Cohen was Defense Secretary, Cohen received high marks from his former Senate colleagues. Thus, again his ratings, quite high in all categories, were highest in the two categories dealing with how much he was respected.

Cohen was paired with Mitchell, widely viewed as a Senate star—and an important national and international figure upon his retirement from the Senate. Mitchell rose to power within the Senate quickly. He commanded the respect of his peers because of the power of his intellect and his political instincts that rarely failed

¹⁸ In later analysis we intend to control for this generational bias.

him.¹⁹ He was clearly influential in the Senate and has remained so nationally. His reputation as a respected, influential, and ultimately effective national leader is unparalleled in the state's modern history and, in fact, because he so often referred back to Senator Muskie as his mentor and worked together with Senator Cohen on issues related to the State, e.g. contracts for Bath Iron Works, went a long way to establish the reputation for quality that the state's delegation has enjoyed.

When first Olympia Snowe and then Susan Collins replaced Senators Mitchell and Cohen, some observers felt that the State's delegation would suffer a blow. After all, Snowe had been a six-term member of Congress whose reputation was one for solid service but not distinguished national leadership; Collins, from a well-known Aroostook County political family, had been a Senate staffer (and briefly an administrator), had never served in elective office, and had run a disappointing campaign for Governor before her election to the Senate. Confounding those naysayers, each has built a reputation fully consistent with that of their predecessors.

The ratings of Snowe by our experts are beyond what most would have imagined possible. She rates among the top ten of all 85 Republicans serving in the last 60 year—and among the very highest rated of current Republicans—in all categories save one. She has achieved these ratings in two ways. First, she has developed the reputation as a workhorse in the Senate, a characterization viewed most positively by her colleagues and by the public at large. Her reputation is that of one who will work hard to find proximate solutions to whatever she sees as intractable problems, working in a bipartisan way whenever possible. Her reputation as a respected Senator, an influential leader, and an effective legislator has been enhanced by the recent publicity she has received during the debate on health care. However, this recent fame would not have enhanced her reputation to the point it has had she not established a public image over the last decade.

¹⁹ Some feel that one notable failing was his choice to stay in the Senate and fight for turned out to be a losing battle for health care reform during President Clinton's first term, turning now a seat on the Supreme Court that was reportedly his for the asking.

Collins' reputation has similarly been enhanced by her playing a central position in highly publicized and highly partisan policy battles in which she has sought a bipartisan compromise. Snowe and Collins have often been paired in these instances, but until the health care debate, Collins has received more national publicity than has Snowe. Snowe seems to have benefited more than Collins from these differences in styles, but Collins reputation clearly also places her among the highest echelon on GOP Senators – and the State delegation's reputation has only been enhanced.

If one combines the reputations of these three generations of Maine Senators – and compares them to those of Senators from any other state, large or small, the Maine delegation emerges on top. What Mainers feel about those who represent them in the Senate are positive evaluations shared by experts throughout the country.

Conclusion

The goal of this paper was two-fold: to determine if it was possible to devise a scale to rate the reputations of United States Senators, and then to see if the reputation of Maine's Senators, so highly prized in the State is reflected in the judgment of more objective observers.

We have succeeded in the first goal. A series of panels of objective observers applied the scale devised successfully; we were able to rate all 193 Senators who were reelected more than once since 1953. This enterprise has not been without problems – and devising solutions to some of those problems remains a task for the broader project of which this is the first product. We do not believe that we can eliminate the problem of partisan bias among our respondents, but we think we can come to understand its impact more precisely. We do believe that, with time for further analysis and applying appropriate statistical techniques, we can eliminate the effect of the generational bias seen in the analysis above. In addition, while some signs lead us to be confident that there is intergroup reliability, further tests are needed to confirm our ability to judge a series of Senators by different groups of respondents.

We have reached a firm conclusion on our second goal. Put bluntly, the Senators from Maine have indeed comprised the kind of outstanding delegations in which Mainers have expressed such pride. Within their generations, Smith and Muskie, Cohen and Mitchell, Snowe and Collins have been among the leaders in their respective parties. Mitchell and Snowe, on scale after scale, rate among the top Senators who have served their states in Washington.

This paper represents just the first stage in a larger project. Determining that finding a rating scale was possible is a big step. Confirming the reputations of Maine Senators was a fun finding, especially for those of us from Maine. But the ultimate goal of the project is to determine what factors lead to positive (or negative) reputations. Determining those factors will involve gathering a good deal of objective data on all Senators. Senators from Maine and from other small states seem to be overrepresented among those with the highest reputations. Are they also overrepresented among those with the lowest reputations? We do not yet know. What leads to some Senators from a state having a reputation for influence and others from that same state not? Why are some party leaders deemed more influential, respected, or effective than others? It is to these questions that we turn next.

Appendix A
Senators Who Were Rated

Allott, Gordon (R-CO)	Dirksen, Everett (R-IL)
Anderson, Clinton (D-NM)	Dodd, Christopher J. (D-CT)
Baker, Howard H., Jr. (R-TN)	Dole, Robert (R-KS)
Barkley, Alben W. (D-KY)	Domenici, Pete V. (R-NM)
Baucus, Max (D-MT)	Dorgan, Byron L. (D-ND)
Bayh, Birch (D-IN)	Douglas, Paul (D-IL)
Bennett, Robert (R-UT)	Durbin, Richard (D-IL)
Bennett, Wallace (R-UT)	Durenberger, David F. (R-MN)
Bentsen, Lloyd M. (D-TX)	Dworshak, Henry (R-ID)
Bible, Alan (D-NV)	Eagleton, Thomas F. (D-MO)
Biden, Joseph R., Jr. (D-DE)	Eastland, James (D-MS)
Bingaman, Jeff (D-NM)	Ellender, Allen (D-LA)
Bond, Kit (R-MO)	Enzi, Michael (R-WY)
Boren, David L. (D-OK)	Ervin, Samuel J., Jr. (D-NC)
Boxer, Barbara (D-CA)	Exon, J. James (D-NE)
Bradley, Bill (D-NJ)	Feingold, Russell (D-WI)
Breaux, John (D-LA)	Feinstein, Dianne (D-CA)
Bridges, Styles (R-NH)	Fong, Hiram L. (R-HI)
Brownback, Sam 3 (R-KS)	Ford, Wendell H. (D-KY)
Bumpers, Dale (D-AR)	Fulbright, J. William (D-AR)
Burdick, Quentin N. (D-ND)	Garn, E. J. "Jake" (R-UT)
Burns, Conrad (R-MT)	Glenn, John H., Jr. (D-OH)
Bush, Prescott (R-CT)	Goldwater, Barry M. (R-AZ)
Butler, John (R-NY)	Gore, Albert (D-TN)

Byrd, Harry F., Jr. (I-VA)	Graham, Bob (D-FL)
Byrd, Harry F., Sr. (D-VA)	Gramm, Phil (R-TX)
Cannon, Howard W. (D-NV)	Grassley, Charles E. (R-IA)
Capehart, Homer (R-IN)	Gregg, Judd (R-NH)
Carlson, Frank (R-KS)	Griffin, Robert (R-MI)
Case, Clifford P. (R-NJ)	Harkin, Tom (D-IA)
Case, Francis (R-SD)	Hart, Philip A. (D-MI)
Chafee, John H. (R-RI)	Hartke, Vance (D-IN)
Chavez, Dennis (D-NM)	Hatch, Orrin G. (R-UT)
Chiles, Lawton M., Jr. (D-FL)	Hatfield, Mark O. (R-OR)
Church, Frank (D-ID)	Hayden, Carl (D-AZ)
Cochran, Thad (R-MS)	Heflin, Howell T. (D-AL)
Cohen, William S. (R-ME)	Heinz, H. John, III (R-PA)
Collins, Susan (R-ME)	Helms, Jesse (R-NC)
Conrad, Kent (D-ND)	Hickenlooper, Burke (R-IA)
Cooper, John Sherman (R-KY)	Hill, Joseph Lister (D-AL)
Cotton, Norris (R-NH)	Holland, Spessard (D-FL)
Craig, Larry E. (R-ID)	Hollings, Ernest F. (D-SC)
Cranston, Alan (D-CA)	Hruska, Roman L. (R-NE)
Curtis, Carl T. (R-NE)	Humphrey, Hubert H. (D-MN)
D'Amato, Alfonse M. (R-NY)	Hutchison, Kathryn Ann Bailey (R-TX)
Danforth, John C. (R-MO)	Inhofe, James (R-OK)
Inouye, Daniel K. (D-HI)	Packwood, Robert W. (R-OR)
Jackson, Henry M. (D-WA)	Pastore, John (D-RI)
Javits, Jacob K. (R-NY)	Pearson, James B. (R-KS)
Jeffords, Jim (R/I-VT)	Pell, Claiborne (D-RI)
Johnson, Tim (D-SD)	Percy, Charles H. (R-IL)
Johnston, J. Bennett, Jr. (D-LA)	Prouty, Winston L. (R-VT)

Jolhnston, Olin (D-SC)	Proxmire, William (D-WI)
Jordan, B. Everett (D-NC)	Pryor, David H. (D-AR)
Kassebaum, Nancy L. (R-KS)	Randolph, Jennings (D-WV)
Kefauver, Estes (D-TN)	Reed, Jack (D-RI)
Kennedy, Edward M. (D-MA)	Reid, Harry (D-NV)
Kerr, Robert (D-OK)	Ribicoff, Abraham A. (D-CT)
Kerry, John F. (D-MA)	Riegle, Donald W., Jr. (D-MI)
Kohl, Herbert (D-WI)	Roberts, Pat (R-KS)
Kuchel, Thomas H. (R-CA)	Robertson, A. Willis (D-VA)
Kyl, Jon (R-AZ)	Rockefeller, John D. IV (D-WV)
Landrieu, Mary (D-LA)	Roth, William V., Jr. (R-DE)
Lautenberg, Frank R. (D-NJ)	Russell, Richard (D-GA)
Leahy, Patrick (D-VT)	Saltonstall, Leverett (R-MA)
Levin, Carl M. (D-MI)	Sarbanes, Paul S. (D-MD)
Lieberman, Joseph (D-CT)	Sasser, James R. (D-TN)
Long, Russell (D-LA)	Schoeppel, Andrew (R-KS)
Lott, Trent (R-MS)	Scott, Hugh D. (R-PA)
Lugar, Richard G. (R-IN)	Sessions, Jeff (R-AL)
Magnuson, Warren (D-WA)	Shelby, Richard (D/R-AL)
Mansfield, Mike (D-MT)	Simpson, Alan K. (R-WY)
Mathias, Charles McC., Jr. (R-MD)	Smathers, George (D-FL)
Matsunaga, Spark M. (D-HI)	Smith, Margaret Chase (R-ME)
McCain, John (R-AZ)	Snowe, Olympia (R-ME)
McClellan, John (D-AR)	Sparkman, John (D-AL)
McClure, James A. (R-ID)	Specter, Arlen (R/D-PA)
McConnell, Mitch (R-KY)	Stafford, Robert T. (R-VT)
McGee, Gale W. (D-WY)	Stennis, John (D-MS)

McGovern, George (D-SD)	Stevens, Ted (R-AK)
McIntyre, Thomas J. (D-NH)	Symington, Stuart (D-MO)
Metcalf, Lee (D-MT)	Talmadge, Herman E. (D-GA)
Metzenbaum, Howard (D-OH)	Thomas, Craig (R-WY)
Mikulski, Barbara (D-MD)	Thurmond, Strom (D/R-SC)
Mitchell, George J. (D-ME)	Tower, John G. (R-TX)
Monroney, A. S. (Mike) (D-OK)	Wallop, Malcolm (R-WY)
Morse, Wayne (R-OR)	Warner, John W. (R-VA)
Moss, Frank E. (D-UT)	Weicker, Lowell P., Jr. (R-CT)
Moynihan, Daniel P. (D-NY)	Wiley, Alexander (R-WI)
Mundt, Karl (R-SD)	Williams, Harrison A., Jr. (D-NJ)
Murray, Patty (D-WA)	Williams, John (R-DE)
Muskie, Edmund S. (D-ME)	Wyden, Ron (D-OR)
Nelson, Gaylord (D-WI)	Yarborough, Ralph W. (D-TX)
Nickles, Don (R-OK)	Young, Milton (R-ND)
Nunn, Samuel A. (D-GA)	

Appendix B
Ratings Using Alternative Measures
Average Senate Influence
by those who ranked

Democrats		Republicans	
Hill, Joseph Lister	5.00	Dole, Robert	4.90
Russell, Richard	4.83	Dirksen, Everett	4.71
Barkley, Alben W.	4.75	McConnell, Mitch	4.55
Humphrey, Hubert	4.69	McCain, John	4.50

Daschle, Tom	4.67	Lugar, Richard G.	4.43
Nunn, Samuel	4.67	Baker, Howard, Jr.	
Fulbright, William	4.67	Thurmond, Strom	4.36
Byrd, Harry F., Sr.	4.62	Hatch, Orrin G.	4.33
Kennedy, Edward	4.60		
Mitchell, George J.	4.60		

**Percentage in Highest
Category of Senate Influence**

Democrats		Republicans	
Kennedy, Edward	80	Dole, Robert	81.8
Mitchell, George J.	73.3	Dirksen, Everett	66.7
Byrd, Robert C.	70	McConnell, Mitch	50.6
Daschle, Tom	66.7	Hatch, Orrin G.	46.7
Nunn, Samuel A.	66.7	Gramm, Phil	46.7
Humphrey, Hubert	64.3	Lott, Trent	46.7
Fulbright, William	61.5	McCain, John	45.5
Mansfield, Mike	61.5	Lugar, Richard G.	42.9
Moynihan, Daniel	60	Baker, Howard, Jr.	42.9
Biden, Joseph R., Jr.	54.5	Goldwater, Barry	42.9
Byrd, Harry F., Sr.	53.3		

**Average National Influence
by those who ranked**

Democrats		Republicans	
Kennedy, Edward	4.87	Dole, Robert	4.89
Fulbright, J. William	4.80	McCain, John	4.89

Humphrey, Hubert	4.80	Goldwater, Barry	4.85
Reid, Harry	4.78	Baker, Howard, Jr.	4.75
Muskie, Edmund S.	4.75	Dirksen, Everett	4.57
Daschle, Tom	4.73		
McGovern, George	4.73		
Bentsen, Lloyd M.	4.70		
Gore, Albert	4.70		
Humphrey, Hubert	4.69		

Percentage in Highest Category of National Influence

Democrats

Kennedy, Edward M.	86.7
Daschle, Tom	73.3
Moynihhan, Daniel P.	73.3
Gore, Albert	70
Byrd, Robert C.	70
Reid, Harry	70
Humphrey, Hubert	69.2
Muskie, Edmund S.	69.2
McGovern, George	66.7
Fulbright, J. William	66.7
Mitchell, George	60
Nunn, Samuel	60

Republicans

Goldwater, Barry M.	84.6
Dole, Robert	80
McCain, John	80
Baker, Howard H., Jr.	69.2
Dirksen, Everett	60
Helms, Jesse	46.7
Thurmond, Strom	45.5
Lott, Trent	40.6

**Average Senate Respect
by those who ranked**

Democrats		Republicans	
Kennedy, Edward	4.80	Simpson, Alan K.	4.88
Mitchell, George	4.71	Lugar, Richard G.	4.75
Mansfield, Mike	4.67	Dirksen, Everett	4.73
Russell, Richard	4.67	Dole, Robert	4.70
Nunn, Samuel	4.64	Baker, Howard H., Jr.	4.36
Magnuson, Warren	4.64		
Barkley, Alben	4.60		
Humphrey, Hubert	4.55		

Percentage in Highest Category of Senate Respect

Democrats		Republicans	
Kennedy, Edward	80	Lugar, Richard G.	83.3
Byrd, Robert C.	70	Dirksen, Everett	73.3
Mitchell, George J.	66.7	Dole, Robert	70
Mansfield, Mike	66.7	Simpson, Alan K.	70
Russell, Richard	62.5	Baker, Howard H., Jr.	38.5
Moynihan, Daniel	53.3	Hatch, Orrin G.	33.3
Magnuson, Warren	50	Warner, John W.	30.8
Humphrey, Hubert	46.2	Gramm, Phil	28.6

**Average National Respect
by those who ranked**

Democrats

Kefauver, Estes	4.73
Fulbright, William	4.70
Nunn, Samuel A.	4.69
Humphrey, Hubert	4.67
Mansfield, Mike	4.64
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr.	4.63
Barkley, Alben W.	4.60
Muskie, Edmund	4.55
Mitchell, George J.	4.50

Republicans

Baker, Howard H., Jr.	4.73
Dirksen, Everett	4.57
McCain, John	4.56
Goldwater, Barry M.	4.42
Smith, Margaret Chase	4.40
Lugar, Richard G.	4.23
Cohen, William S.	4.18
Heinz, H. John, III	4.17

Percentage in Highest Category of National Respect

Democrats

Humphrey, Hubert H.	61.5
Mansfield, Mike	58.3
Fulbright, J. William	58.3
Muskie, Edmund S.	54.5
Mitchell, George J.	53.3
Gore, Albert	50
Nunn, Samuel A.	50

Republicans

Baker, Howard H., Jr.	66.7
Dirksen, Everett	64.3
McCain, John	55.6
Dole, Robert	55.6
Goldwater, Barry M.	53.8
Lugar, Richard G.	30.8

Average Overall Effectiveness

by those who ranked

Democrats

Hayden, Carl	4.88
Fulbright, William	4.70
Mitchell, George J.	4.67
Mansfield, Mike	4.67
Hart, Philip A.	4.67
Kennedy, Edward	4.64
Humphrey, Hubert	4.63
Nunn, Samuel A.	4.60
Magnuson, Warren	4.60

Republicans

Case, Francis	5.00
Dole, Robert	4.56
Dirksen, Everett	4.50
Lugar, Richard G.	4.46
Snowe, Olympia	4.45
Gramm, Phil	4.33
Javits, Jacob K.	4.33
McConnell, Mitch	4.30

Percentage in Highest Category of Overall
Effectiveness**Democrats**

Byrd, Robert C.	70
Mitchell, George J.	66.7
Nunn, Samuel A.	66.7
Mansfield, Mike	66.7
Kennedy, Edward M.	64.3
Moynihn, Daniel P.	64.3
Fulbright, J. William	58.3
Muskie, Edmund S.	53.8
Daschle, Tom	50
Proxmire, William	50
Humphrey, Hubert	50

Republicans

Dole, Robert	66.7
Lugar, Richard G.	61.5
Dirksen, Everett	50
Snowe, Olympia	45.5
Baker, Howard H., Jr.	38.5
Gramm, Phil	33.3
McConnell, Mitch	30
Simpson, Alan K.	30
Stevens, Ted	30

References

- Anderson, William D., Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, and Valeria Sinclair-Chapman. 2003. "The Keys to Legislative Success in the U.S. House of Representatives." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 28: 357-386.
- Binder, Sarah, Forrest Maltzman, and Lee Sigelman. 1998. "Senators' Home-State Reputations: Why Do Constituents Love a Bill Cohen So Much More Than an Al D'Amato?" *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 23:545-60.
- Brady, David W., Robert D'Onofrio, and Morris P. Fiorina. 2000. "The Nationalization of Electoral Forces Revisited." In *Continuity and Change in House Elections*, eds. David W. Brady, John F. Cogan, and Morris P. Fiorina. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Caro, Robert A. 2002. *The Years of Lyndon Johnson*, vol. 3. *Master of the Senate*. New York: Knopf.
- Clapp, Charles. 1961. *The Congressman: His Work as He Sees It*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Cover, Albert D., and Bruce S. Brumberg. 1982. "Baby Books and Ballots: the Impact of Congressional Mail on Constituent Opinion." *American Political Science Review* 76 (June):347-59.
- Erikson, Robert S. 1971. "The Advantage of Incumbency in Congressional Elections." *Polity* 3 (Spring):395-405.

- Fenno, Richard F., Jr. 1978. *Hone Style: House Members in Their Own Districts*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- Fiorina, Morris P. 1977. *Congress: Keystone of the Washington Establishment*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Fowler, Linda L. and Robert McClure. 1989. *Political Ambition: Who Decides to Run for Congress*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Frantzich, Stephen. 1979. "Who Makes Our Laws? The Legislative Effectiveness of Members of the U.S. Congress." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 4: 409-428. Jacobson, Gary C. and Samuel Kernell. 1983. *Strategy and Choice in Congressional Elections*: New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hall, Richard L. 1992. "Measuring Legislative Influence." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 17: 205-231. Kingdon, John W. 2003. *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies*. Second Ed. New York, NY: Addison-Wesley.
- Klinkner, Paul A. 1996. *Midterm: The Elections of 1994 in Context*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Maisel, L. Sandy and Walter J. Stone. 1997. "Determinants of Candidate Emergence in U.S. House Elections: An Exploratory Study." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 22: 79-96.
- Maisel, L. Sandy and Darrell West. 2004. *Running on Empty? Political Discourse in Congressional Elections*. Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Matthews, Donald R. 1960. *U.S. Senators and Their World*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Mayhew, David. 1974. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Meyer, Katherine. 1980. "Legislative Influence: Toward Theory Development through Causal Analysis." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 5: 563-585.
- Miguel, Gerard Padro I, and James M. Snyder, Jr. 2006. "Legislative Effectiveness and Legislative Careers." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 31: 347-381.
- Mondak, Jeffery J. 1995a. "Elections as Filters: Term Limits and the Composition of the U.S. House." *Political Research Quarterly* 48 (4): 701-28.
- Mondak, Jeffrey J. 1995b. "Competence, Integrity, and the Electoral Success of Congressional Incumbents." *Journal of Politics* 57 (December): 1043-69.
- Schaffner, Brian F., Wendy J. Schiller, and Patrick J. Sellers. 2003. "Tactical and Contextual Determinants of U.S. Senators' Approval Ratings." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 28:203-23.
- Stone, Walter J., Sarah A. Fulton, Cherie D. Maestas, and L. Sandy Maisel. 2010. "Incumbency Reconsidered: Prospects, Strategic Retirement, and Incumbent Quality in U.S. House Elections," *Journal of Politics*, forthcoming.

Stone, Walter J. and L. Sandy Maisel. 2003. "The Not-So-Simple Calculus of Winning: Potential U.S. House Candidates' Nomination and General Election Chances." *Journal of Politics* 65:951-77.

Stone, Walter J., L. Sandy Maisel, and Cherie Maestas. 2004. "Quality Counts: Extending the Strategic Politician Model of Incumbent Deterrence." *American Journal of Political Science*. 48:479-95.

Volden, Craig and Alan E. Wiseman. 2009. "Legislative Effectiveness in Congress." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago.
http://psweb.sbs.ohio-state.edu/faculty/awiseman/VW_Legeffect MP SA09.pdf

Zaller, John. 1998. "Politicians as Prize Fighters: Electoral Selection and Incumbency Advantage." In *Politicians and Party Politics*, ed. John G. Geer. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.