

2019

The good, the bad, and the uncivil : an anlysis of uncivil members of Congress from the 45th to the 113th Congresses

Nathan L. Holm

Follow this and additional works at: <https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/allgraduate-thesesdissertations>

Recommended Citation

Holm, Nathan L., "The good, the bad, and the uncivil : an anlysis of uncivil members of Congress from the 45th to the 113th Congresses" (2019). *Graduate Research Theses & Dissertations*. 5807.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/allgraduate-thesesdissertations/5807>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research & Artistry at Huskie Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Huskie Commons. For more information, please contact jschumacher@niu.edu.

ABSTRACT

THE GOOD, THE BAD, AND THE UNCIVIL: AN ANALYSIS OF UNCIVIL MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FROM THE 45TH TO THE 113TH CONGRESSES

Nathan L. Holm, MA
Department of Political Science
Northern Illinois University, 2019
Dr. Scot D. Schraufnagel, Director

Incivility in Congress has often been attributed to partisan and ideological conflict, but there is a growing body of evidence that suggests incivility may hinge on factors concerning members' personal attitudes as defined by their life experiences. To investigate this, background and experiential factors that may lead to incivility are tested, including variables such as family dynamics, religion, occupation, and education. All of these factors are tested on the basis that they could have formative influence on a legislator's behavior and how they conduct him or herself as a member of the US Congress. Seven members of Congress from the 45th to the 113th (1877-2015) who were randomly chosen from among the 20 members of Congress who were most-implicated in acts of incivility in newspaper reports make up my sample for evaluation. Findings strongly suggest that incivility is more than partisanship and that non-political factors may lead to uncivil behavior among members of Congress. The research findings point to broad implications for the recruitment of members of Congress. Furthermore, there are distinct differences between members of Congress who may be called "partisans" and those I refer to as "radicals," the former adhering strongly to party cleavages and the latter motivated by other considerations.

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
DE KALB, ILLINOIS

MAY 2019

THE GOOD, THE BAD, AND THE UNCIVIL: AN ANALYSIS OF
UNCIVIL MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FROM
THE 45TH TO THE 113TH CONGRESSES

BY

NATHAN L. HOLM
©2019, Nathan L. Holm

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE
MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Thesis Director:
Dr. Scot D. Schraufnagel

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
INTRODUCTION	1
EXISTING SCHOLARSHIP	5
RESEARCH DESIGN	12
FINDINGS	21
Partisanship Analysis	21
Education	22
Occupation	24
Family	25
Religion	27
Individual Matched Pairs - Senate	29
Ben Tillman and Robert F. Broussard	29
Huey Long and Robert Reynolds	35
Jesse Helms and Thad Cochran	41
Individual Matched Pairs - House	47
Thomas Blanton and Robert E. Thomason	47
Richard Arme y and William Archer	52
Robert Dornan and Ronald C. Packard	55
William M. Thomas and Joe L. Barton	59

Chapter	Page
DISCUSSION	63
WORKS CITED	68
APPENDIX.....	74

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. List of Original Matched Pairs Variables—Individuals	13
2. List of Original Matched Pairs Variables—Congressional Service Controls.....	14
3. List of Control Variables added to Original Dataset	19
4. The Difference between the Voting Behavior of Civil and Uncivil Members: A consideration of both the Chamber and Party Median.....	22
5. Difference in the Educational Backgrounds of Uncivil Members and their Matched Pair ..	23
6. Difference in the Occupational Backgrounds of Uncivil Members and their Matched Pair	24
7. Difference in the Religious Backgrounds of Uncivil Members and their Matched Pair	27
A1. Difference in the Occupational Backgrounds of Uncivil Members and their Matched Pair	74
A2. Differences in the Familial Backgrounds of Uncivil Members and their Matched Pair....	75

Introduction

There is a long and interesting history when it comes to incivility between members serving in the US Congress. It ranges from politely delivered insults about intelligence, to vitriolic tirades with physical threats and the occasional bout of fisticuffs; the use of a cane optional. These acts are catnip for media outlets, showcasing debates over policy and personality that often occur in representative legislative bodies (Wolf, Strachan, and Shea 2012). A significant question that arises from this is what causes members of Congress to act in such a way towards one another. An important corollary would be what are the ramifications for such behavior. The former is the question that is the focus of this thesis on congressional incivility. The latter question is an intriguing one for two reasons; one is that members of Congress are elected to represent their constituent interests and conceivably the incivilities of members of Congress are a function of the representation role. The second reason is that the uncivil behavior is bound to bleed over and effect legislative output or productivity. These ramifications or consequences for quality representation and lawmaking are important and have been isolated going back to a seminal work in this field by Schraufnagel (2005). If uncivil behavior has consequences it seems wise to unravel what causes some members to act in uncivil ways towards their workplace colleagues while others opt for polite and civil conduct.

My plan is to delve into the personal differences, or more specifically the demographic and experiential qualities of members of Congress, that can best explain uncivil behavior. Party system polarization is often blamed as the source of incivility (Iyengar and Westwood 2015), but the premise of my thesis is that the root of incivility is in fact found in the background and personalities of members themselves. The likelihood that members of Congress will be involved

in uncivil acts will be evaluated, using factors related to upbringing and life experiences that might shape member attitudes. The hypotheses may be summarized concisely as thus: one, that polarization and politically motivated concerns are not as substantive as some current literature would suggest, and two, that background, experiential factors are primarily responsible (instead of polarization) for uncivil behavior by members of Congress. The central premise of both hypotheses, and that drives this series of case studies, is that the personal rather than the political is a better explanation for incivility in Congress.

Determining whether or not incivility has an intrinsic relation to a legislator's earlier life experiences ought to provide insight on the causes of incivility and help separate out cases where incivility, which has been chalked up to divisive political issues, may have actually been personal. The original dataset collected for this thesis uses a matched-pair approach and analysis. Members of Congress from the 45th to the 113th Congresses are the relevant sampling frame. Moreover, and more specifically, the research will use a case study approach and examine the backgrounds of the seven most-implicated members of Congress during the time period noted above. Three of the members are drawn from the Senate and four from the House of Representatives. Each of these uncivil legislators is matched with another member from their respective time period, their chamber, and party who was not ever known to engage in uncivil behavior. Four of the case study subjects selected are from the post-World War II era, with three – two of the Senators and one of the Representatives – coming from before World War II or being partially concurrent with the war years. The matched-pairs analysis focuses on assorted factors that may play into the behavior of legislators, and is heavily focused on experiential factors such as serving as a lawyer or judge, serving in the military, or serving as a state legislator or governor before becoming a member of Congress, but I will also check their

religious background, marital status, and family size. In the research design section of this thesis I will elaborate all of the different background considerations that are taken into account, focusing in detail on the theory used to justify the variables and the manner in which the data was collected.

Without getting too far ahead, it should be noted that the choice of studying the most frequently implicated members of Congress is based on the premise that those members that are regularly uncivil are also most likely to have something about themselves, personally, that is the reason for their incivility. Because this inquiry is so novel the decision was made to take advantage of the exploratory premise of a “most-likely case” design. If the argument holds up, then the consideration of broader implications will be left to future research on less frequently implicated members. If the argument fails, then (barring extenuating circumstances), it may be determined that the causes for uncivil behavior among members has more to do with each members’ representational style or the issues of the day and is less likely to be a product of member upbringing. If the most frequently implicated members have extenuating circumstances that are politically related, then there could be a problem of politics aggravating behavior that is belligerent to begin with. However, if this is the case we will still be left with the question of what specifically causes some members to behave in an uncivil manner while others in their same party, chamber, and time period decided to embrace civility norms. Separating politically and personally motivated incivility is a partial objective here, and the case studies offer a chance to do that in a way that conventional large-*n* analyses cannot.

Additionally, these case studies will allow for a distinction to be made between “partisans” and “radicals” in Congress. I consider partisans to be those members of Congress that adhere strongly to the party line and associated values. Radicals by contrast will be those

members of Congress that do not necessarily adhere to the party line, but hold strong ideological beliefs nonetheless. One example of a radical who will be discussed at length in this paper is Huey Long. Long (D-LA) was a member of the Democratic Party, but held highly differentiated issue positions from much of the party, which contributed both to his challenge to Franklin D. Roosevelt's presidential re-election bid in 1936, and his unfortunate assassination in 1935.

I will first discuss the current literature on incivility, to provide a framework for the current search of the backgrounds of members with the goal of further elucidating the issue of congressional incivility and its causes. A great deal of this summary will focus on addressing the weaknesses of the current literature, and critiquing the polarization-as-cause argument and the personal-factors-as-cause argument. The potential contribution this research makes, and the usefulness of studying the most frequent congressional delinquents, will also be presented.

Existing Scholarship

Congressional incivility can have negative consequences for the institution and its members. It can become an impediment to productivity in Congress, deepening partisan divisions. Wolf, Strachan, and Shea (2012) found that incivility did exactly that. They show how the parties have become increasingly ideologically pure for the past several decades, with Southern conservative Democrats shifting to the Republican Party, and Northeast liberal Republicans joining the Democratic Party. Wolf et al. (2012) notes the mountain of scholarship investigating this trend, with the prominent scholars Fiorina and Abrams (2009) and Abramowitz (2010) leading de facto camps that differ in opinion on what causes party polarization and the extent to which the public is polarized. Fiorina argues that voters are sorted but not polarized, aligning with their party of choice but not holding cemented beliefs. Abramowitz argues that they have deep divides, and that the polarization extends to all voters. Fiorina challenges this assertion with evidence that polarized elites and activists, as well as a sensationalist media are exasperating matters. Abramowitz counters with his own evidence that polarized issue positions, preferences, and ideologies are held by the public at large and not just the political leadership.

Wolf et al. (2012) found in their own research that Democrats and Republicans have differing ideas of what constitutes incivility, as well as whether compromise or holding firm on principle is more important. But also, whether strong partisan attitudes amplify the desire for politicians to hold firm. They find that voters dislike forceful political positions and blame parties for rising incivility and those who strongly identify with one party or the other. In this view, incivility has effectively added a second layer to party division, and any turn from or towards greater incivility is going to be due to this second layer. This research will differ

somewhat in that I see a commitment to civility in political discourse as a unique phenomenon, independent of the unique policy positions of competing partisans.

Shea and Sproveri (2012) notably find that incivility has varied across time, with the strength of civility as a norm being more or less dependent on the time period. They perform a quantitative analysis using the search terms “mean politics”, “bitter politics”, “hateful politics”, “filthy politics”, and “nasty politics” (418) used in books within a specified timeframe (roughly 1800-2000). The findings indicate that perceptions of uncivil political discourse by this metric has varied widely across the past 200 years. Shea and Sproveri suggest several possible explanations; one is that certain issues vary in terms of salience and the amount of attention certain issues receive is determined by the legislators’ priorities, “ratcheting-up” discourse when an issue is considered to be particularly important by its proponents (421). Second, is that there may be – in relation to a 30-year trend towards persistent, heightened levels of incivility – “ideological purification” occurring, or “party sorting” as the authors note (421). Shea and Sproveri suggest two implications if ideological purification is the cause; one being greater ideological gaps between the parties, the other as possible changes resulting from technology and how voters are targeted on more “personal hot button issues rather than around broad themes” (421).

Another explanation for variation in incivility, forwarded by Herbst (2010), uses strategic tool theory, which suggests civility and incivility are adhered to as a “tool” for promoting or benefiting a particular issue. Herbst notes that research on incivility and Congress have shown that members of Congress can be both passionate and civil, and that means to mediate uncivil behavior can be achieved if this evidence holds true. Herbst also acknowledges that technology—namely the internet—makes politics between citizens complicated and messy, but

that there is a degree of self-policing to prevent arguments from degenerating into disjointed rants. Herbst concludes that while mechanisms to improve civility exist, the optimal long-term goal is to embrace argumentation and adopt what may be summarized best as an immunization approach. While noting that incivility can, in small doses, occasionally be good for helping legislation move along, Herbst states that a “culture of argument” is best for democracy (148).

In a similar light, using Herbst’s case for strategic tool theory Darr (2005) suggests that civility (or lack thereof) is strategically utilized rhetoric geared toward specific audiences and that civility norms may be obeyed or broken depending on the value of incivility as a rhetorical tool. Darr (2005) states that politicians—specifically senators in his case study of the confirmation of John Ashcroft to become Attorney General—“create an appetite for personal attacks in ways that make the attacks seem justified” (324). Darr identifies policy as a linchpin, a given policy being labeled extreme and then this policy position being used as grounds for personal attacks: “[making] them appear to be the end result of careful thought and deliberation” (324). This general method of labeling and pushing certain policies—and by extension their proponents—outside what is qualified as the mainstream allows politicians to prepare the public for the personalized attacks that follow. Civility as a norm appears mixed, with Darr noting that it sometimes is appealed to in order to smother debate if debate becomes belligerent, but weak enforcement of penalties seems to suggest civility is not as important as claimed. Darr notes that highly salient issues may override civility, and that the audiences of different members of Congress can have different definitions of what constitutes a violation of civility; this means that the senators that Darr analyzed can “violate the expectations of other senators’ constituents” while acting acceptably to their own constituents (325). Darr concludes that civility needs to be “rethought in terms of these multiple audiences”; both the audiences of each senator, as the case

was with Darr's work, but also between senators themselves, and that civility is a "rhetorical enactment" (326).

An important connection to floor rhetoric is the findings of Mutz and Reeves (2005), whom find that the public loses trust in the government when they see televised incivility. The airing of different partisan opinions does not necessarily have a negative effect, even when the differences are highlighted, but when incivility is present, the public responds negatively. They find that the public does demonstrate some attraction to incivility, comparing it to the phenomenon known as "rubbernecking" where people slow down to view accidents on the road. This televised incivility can pertain to either campaigns or the goings-on of Congress—the experiment used face-to-face debate (Mutz and Reeves 2005, 4) with two hypothetical members of Congress, and measures the influence of incivility, experimentally, in order to avoid the potential bias created by self-reporting. Additionally, Meisel (2012) found that officials may not run for office when heighten incivility could bring personal matters into the public light. Meisel, additionally, found that incivility can undermine the ability of officials to govern, leading to a less productive government.

Productivity is not the only issue influenced by incivility, as research is suggesting that increased partisan divisions and declining public trust are all results of incivility as well. Even legislators themselves feel the effects beyond a professional level when they become hesitant to run for office. Productivity clearly is not the only thing that is impacted by incivility, and future research may shed more light on the additional effects of incivility like those discussed by Wolf et al. (2012), Mutz and Reeves (2005), and Meisel (2012). The ramifications of incivility are also important, and a subject which other scholars have addressed.

One of the more prominent scholars on Congressional incivility, Schraufnagel (2005; Dodd and Schraufnagel 2012), has highlighted the impingement upon productivity in Congress caused by incivility, providing an example of how incivility has influenced judicial confirmations in the Senate (Schraufnagel 2005). He finds that while partisanship has the usual effects, incivility also demonstrates a significant influence. Schraufnagel also finds that over the time period evaluated (1977-2000), that incivility varied, showing that different congressional sessions could be friendlier or more hostile than others. He concludes that conflict between legislators may be greater than just the partisan battles and that incivility is a unique factor that has its own policy implications.

Other work relevant to productivity and issues of incivility includes work by Jamieson (1992), Uslaner (1993), and Loomis (2000). All three discuss the effects of incivility on productivity, with Uslaner (1993) being one of the first scholars to note that the civility of Congress had declined since the 1970s. Uslaner focuses on the practice of comity, the unofficial rule of reciprocity and courtesy in Congress, wherein members afford each other general respect both personally and professionally (i.e. politeness in legislative discourse and mutual support of legislation if an agreement is reached). Uslaner finds that comity can yield productive compromise on legislation, and inter-member conduct can impact the likelihood that major legislation is passed. However, both Loomis (2000) and Uslaner (1993) note how incivility can undermine the legislative process by creating conflict that can stall legislation. Jamieson (1992) also argues that politicians with ready access to the media will, in light of significant policy differences, possess an incentive to cast aspersions on other members of Congress in order to appease their party or constituency, deriving some political advantage by gaining additional support.

It is important to point out that incivility may not be all bad and can even be useful to the legislative process. Dodd and Schraufnagel (2012) find that whenever polarization is low and personal conflict is low that little major or landmark legislation is passed. The same occurs when polarization is high and personal conflict is high. Where incivility may be helpful is that it can create moderate levels of conflict when polarization is low, spurring a more productive Congress. The inverse may also be true, with a reduction in incivility during polarization leading to greater productivity. The authors argue that too much or too little conflict can be problematic, and that incivility can spur a moderate level of conflict when partisan conflict is insufficient. While the combination of distrust and unproductiveness are the two primary results of incivility, under very specific circumstances incivility can prove useful for spurring productivity.

The deleterious effects of incivility on productivity are clearly only one of the problems produced by incivility, as the decline in trust from publicly uncivil behavior can inhibit legislators' actions and willingness to run for office. The effects of incivility can be damaging to the overall efficacy and trust placed in Congress as an institution, though incivility may sometimes have its merits in promoting legislation. The question of time and place becomes relevant and will be discussed with regard to individuals that can serve as a catalyst for promoting legislation by 'shaking up' the House or Senate.

This research will seek to contribute to the ongoing debates on incivility by trying to isolate the background experiences that are most likely to associate with an uncivil predisposition. As such, this research is geared to better understanding candidate recruitment and the factors that promote a commitment to civility norms. Even if incivility is a desirable trait in certain time periods, as Dodd and Schraufnagel (2012) are suggesting, it is important to

candidate recruitment to have a firm grasp on experiential and background variables that either promote or attenuate any tendency toward incivility.

Others have found that background characteristics are predictors of college success. Schmitt et al. (2007) use several groupings of background characteristics to test college student outcomes. These background characteristics were comprised of “biographical data and situational judgement measures” (165). The biographical data (shortened to biodata) was used in conjunction with a Situational Judgement Inventory (SJI) and Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scale (BARS), which combined included such factors as knowledge, learning, artistic leaning, acceptance of diversity, leadership, career focus, adaptability, and more. Other studies have used social background characteristics to serve as an indicator for how Justices on the US Supreme Court vote. Ulmer (1973) evaluated the justices from the 1947-1956 terms using age at appointment, federal administrative experience, and religious affiliation (Protestant or non-Protestant) as background characteristics. These were compared with the percentage of criminal cases that were decided in favor of either state or the federal government as a means of explaining variance in decision-making. In Schmitt et al.’s case, the *n* was 2,771 cases, while for Ulmer there were fourteen justices that served across the years tested. This comparison of sample size demonstrates that background characteristics can be useful in both large-*n* and small-*n* research, the latter complimenting the approach taken in this thesis. Background factors are well-used for explaining outcomes in a variety of contexts, and experiential background factors such as those that will be used in my case studies are useful for isolating formative influences upon members of Congress. This will be detailed further in the following section.

Research Design

I will use the leveraging that is afforded by a Comparable-Case Design and Crucial Case Design hybrid. The Comparable-Case design approach allows one to hold constant a host of possible explanations for variation on the dependent variable. The Crucial Case design aspect takes the Comparable-Case design a step further by narrowing the case population down to a particularly important subset. The subset is specifically the top ten members of Congress from each chamber that were most frequently implicated in uncivil acts. These cases are based on a dataset using a Matched Pair analyses (i.e. a Comparable-Case Design) utilizing a most-similar case system (as opposed to a most-different case system) wherein extraneous variables are controlled for, save for the dependent variable (implication in incivility). The uncivil members are paired with a member from their same Congress, party, and chamber. I make a concerted effort to additionally control for region and tenure in Congress, and whether they held a leadership position. I also add a set of variables (discussed in depth later) comprising a measurement of background characteristics, which will vary and form the basis for testing. The variables directly related to Congress are functionally unvarying between the implicated and control groups.

Others have used matched pair analyses for longitudinal studies, where changes over time are easier to capture than in cross-case designs (Levy 2008). There is a potential problem with the most-similar case approach (and for Comparable-Case Design broadly) in that the approach does not fare as well with complex causal cases. The argument may be made that the addition of multiple variables for testing for causality undermines the comparable-case design, but this issue is avoided through the Crucial Case Design. By weighting the theoretical value of frequent

implication prior to testing, I am able to reduce the potential for confounding factors. Reducing the case studies to a smaller set also allows more precision in separating out the potential interaction effects and complex causal influences that are normally troubling for a Comparable-Case Design. The entire task becomes more manageable by regulating the number of cases, and this is accomplished systematically using the frequency of implication in uncivil acts. Tables 1 and 2 below illustrate the variables used in the original dataset to control for factors relating to congressional service.

Table 1.

List of Original Matched Pairs Variables—Individuals

Chamber	Last Name	First Name	Implicated	State	Region	Party
Senate	Broussard	Robert F.	0	LA	South	Democrat
Senate	Tillman	Benjamin	1	SC	South	Democrat
Senate	Reynolds	Robert	0	NC	South	Democrat
Senate	Long	Huey	1	LA	South	Democrat
House	Thomason	Robert E.	0	TX	South	Democrat
House	Blanton	Thomas	1	TX	South	Democrat
House	Archer	William R.	0	TX	South	Republican
House	Armey	Richard	1	TX	South	Republican
House	Packard	Ronald C.	0	CA	West	Republican
House	Dornan	Robert	1	CA	West	Republican
Senate	Cochran	Thad	0	MS	South	Republican
Senate	Helms	Jesse	1	NC	South	Republican
House	Barton	Joe L.	0	TX	South	Republican
House	Thomas	William M.	1	CA	West	Republican

Table 2.
List of Original Matched Pairs Variables—Congressional Service Controls

Last Name	Recorded Congress and Years ^a	Implicated	Tenure (House)	Interrupted Term	Tenure (Senate)	Standing Committee Chair	Party Leader
Broussard	64 th	0	18	0	3	1	1
Tillman	1915-1917	1	0	0	23	1	1
Reynolds	72 nd	0	0	0	13	1	1
Long	1931-1933	1	0	0	3 ^b	0	0
Thomason	74 th	0	16	0	0	0	0
Blanton	1935-1937	1	19	1	0	0	0
Archer	104 th	0	30	0	0	1	1
Arney	1995-1997	1	18	0	0	0	1
Packard	104 th	0	18	0	0	0	0
Dornan	1995-1997	1	18	1	0	0	0
Cochran	106 th	0	6	0	40	1	1
Helms	1999-2001	1	0	0	30	1	1
Barton	108 th	0	34	0	0	1	1
Thomas	2003-2005	1	28	0	0	1	1

^a Congress in which the implicated and unimplicated individual were both present and the uncivil act took place.

^b Was assassinated in 1935, three years into office of Senate, hence the partial term.

The original dataset was compiled and based on a large-*n* matched pairs analysis of members of Congress that have been implicated in an uncivil act in national newspaper reports (New York Times and Washington Post), providing a compilation of factors that can be correlated with incivility (Schraufnagel forthcoming). While these reports account for some personal experience, they are not quite sufficient for the in-depth analysis intended here, hence the addition of more variables that can account for additional experiential learning. A whole host of considerations are examined, but because of a lack of variation some of the variables are dropped from consideration. Nonetheless Table 3 below (page 19), and the subsequent discussion, will elaborate all of the distinct considerations that were tested. With this range of

variables accounted for, a narrative will emerge for each matched pair that was selected and offer insight into what makes these highly uncivil members of Congress tick.

As noted, newspaper reports are used to find members implicated in uncivil acts. In particular, the following two searches were conducted. The initial search uses the terms “Congress,” “House of Representatives” and “Senate” in the full text with any of the following terms; “rancor,” “comity,” “civility,” “incivility,” “courteous,” “courtesy,” “discourteous,” “discourtesy,” “trust and anger,” “discord,” and “collegiality;” also, in the full text. A second search specifies that “Congress,” “House” or “Senate” has to appear in the title and that any of the following terms needs to be in the full text; “personalities,” “grudge,” “raucous,” “insolence,” “contempt,” “amity,” “lack of good will,” “impertinence,” “brash,” “audacious,” “hot-headed,” “heated,” “disrespect,” “lack of respect,” and “discordant.”

The combined search nets over 61,000 articles from the two newspapers during the time period studied (1877-2014). Many articles are dismissed as not relevant by reading the headline or the first few sentences.¹ Others were read much more carefully to determine if there was an incivility perpetrated by a member of Congress being discussed. The articles we use mention specific instances of norm breaking incivilities, or personal conflict between members when these conflicts result in public displays of sarcasm, obvious disrespect of another member, the hurling of insults, name calling, and physical altercations. Only articles that call attention to these behaviors when the legislators are acting in their official capacity, in Washington DC, as a member of the contemporaneous Congress are used. Incivilities in election campaigns or articles on incivility which occurred in a previous Congress are not considered.

¹ Many of the easy to discard articles dealt with conflict in the African National Congress or the New York, New Jersey, and Virginia state legislatures.

Ultimately, the process nets 877 *New York Times* articles that discuss 912 incidents of incivility. Most articles discuss only a single incident, but 31 *Times* articles discuss two incidents, and two articles discuss three different personal attacks or belligerent acts. Considering the *Washington Post* there were 887 articles that mentioned 910 incidents, 864 articles mention a single incident and 23 articles mention two separate acts of incivility.² With the articles in hand, the names of the members who were implicated in the uncivil acts were pulled and a database was created. When two members are shouting back and forth both individuals are included. When a single individual is responsible for the aggression the recipient of their wrath, if there is one, is not included. The number of times a member is implicated is also tracked.

I use seven members in the qualitative analyses that follow. These members—four from the House and three from the Senate—were drawn from the top ten most implicated members of Congress from each chamber respectively. Rather than simply choosing the three or four most implicate individuals from each chamber I use the list of ten individuals from each chamber and then use a random number generator to choose seven individuals from the list of the 20 most implicated members. I stop with seven members because the level of qualitative soaking and poking that was involved precluded a larger group. The seven members are Benjamin Tillman (D-SC, 32 mentions), Huey Long (D-LA, 18 mentions), Jesse Helms (R-NC, 12 mentions), Thomas Blanton (D-TX, 7 mentions), Richard Armey (R-TX, 6 mentions), Robert Dornan (R-CA, 6 mentions), and William M. Thomas (R-CA, 6 mentions).

² To test inter-coder reliability, two graduate assistants recollected the newspaper articles from both papers, using the search detailed above. The total number of articles identified, Congress by Congress, correlates with the original values at .76 ($p < .01$).

Once identified, these seven individuals were randomly matched to another member from their same Congress, from their same political party, and their same legislative chamber. However, I also tried to match them with someone who has served roughly the same length of time in Congress and either held or did not hold a leadership position. Randomized selection of the control group members is facilitated, again, by the use of a random number generator and when a member is chosen that was also implicated as uncivil or was already in the control group their number was put back and the process was repeated until a suitable control group member was identified. Specifically, the random selection of the control group took place by limiting the population drawn from to members from the same geographic region (U.S. Census regions used), chamber, party, tenure, and party leadership position (i.e. a member of a standing committee or party leadership, including committee chairs). Regarding the pairs collectively, the distribution is almost even with three Democratic Party pairs and four Republican Party pairs.

A test to determine whether the uncivil members are more likely to be ideologues was focused on their DW-NOMINATE score compared to their matched pair's score. These scores are based on the disparate voting behavior of members. Most specifically, I compared each matched pair to both the chamber median and party median DW-NOMINATE score for the relevant Congress; i.e., the most recent or last Congress in which an incident of incivility was recorded (see Table 2 above for reference). The intention here was to test whether the uncivil group is more or less likely to contribute to party system polarization. If they are more extreme in their voting behavior we might imagine that they are simply ideologues; however, this does not discredit the possibility that background or experiential learning is not responsible for members being both an ideologue and a member more prone to uncivil acts.

All of the background analyses which follow are qualitative in focus. I will provide and examine counts of observed characteristics as I categorize the findings. The emphasis upon a qualitative approach is to maximize the details associated with each case or matched pair. The bulk of the information used to draw conclusions is almost entirely biographical, chronicling upbringing and personal experience, but also professional experiences. The count data will help reveal patterns (or lack thereof) among the match paired legislators.

For testing differences between the matched pairs, four overarching categories of variables are considered (see Table 3): education, occupation, religion, and family. Because this research is exploratory in nature I will not delineate a set of specific hypotheses regarding all of the different background factors that will be considered. However, there is some intuition here. For instance, we might imagine that members with more education would be more likely to be civil. Greater education can be taken to suggest greater socialization that would lead to more civil behavior with other individuals. Individuals trained as lawyers may be expected to be more civil because of the norms of behavior in a courtroom and experience with procedure inculcating civility as an expectation. In other instances, we might imagine that Evangelicals who hold deeper and stronger beliefs and religious feelings than mainline Protestants might be more likely to be uncivil due to greater sensitivity to some social issues. One can imagine other specific hypotheses, however as noted, this is not my intention at this point. I am most interested in exploring a whole host of possible relationships between incivility and a broad range of background variables

Table 3 below spells out these different considerations. Education included attainment level, attendance in-state or out-of-state institutions of higher education, the study of law, and attendance at a prestigious school—specifically an Ivy League school, using the official

conference listing.³ Occupation covers a wide range of types of jobs: education, law (lawyer, prosecutor), business, medicine, journalism, government service (mutually exclusive with military, prosecutor, or politician; by appointment or election, but if elected, counts for municipal level only), agriculture, military service, and politician (elected to state government or as a city mayor). Variants of each category with exception for politician and prosecuting attorney were also made for cases where the individual held authority/responsibility for other people in their job, a ‘boss’, (e.g. a chief executive officer).

Table 3.

List of Control Variables added to Original Dataset

Education	Occupation	Family	Religion
High School Only	Education ^a	Parental Status	Catholic
Completed Advanced Degree	Lawyer ^a	Parental Vocation	Protestant
Never Left State for School	Business ^a	Exceptional Parents	Evangelical
Passed Bar	Medical ^a	Family Size	Jewish
Held a Juris Doctorate Degree	Journalism ^a	Number of Siblings	Areligious
Attended an Ivy League School	Government Service ^a	Order of Birth	Other
	Prosecuting Attorney	Married	
	Agriculture ^a	Divorced	
	Military Service ^a	Multiple Marriages	
	Politician	Children (Yes/No)	
		Number of Children	

^a An identical variable that additionally denotes a position of authority or serving as a “boss” in the particular occupation is also used.

Out of this, a careful narrative will be constructed to reason how each of the matched pairs—in relation to both the individual pairs and the collection of pairs—might have their congressional behavior explained, and what patterns may be found.

Each category is counted once if the individual performed at least one job in a given category. For example, someone who was a lawyer and later a prosecutor is counted in each

³ (Ivy League n.d.)

category. If the same individual returned to private law practice, no additional count of lawyer is recorded because they were already counted as having been a lawyer. Using another example, if an individual was a civil servant (government service) and later a judge or appointed official, they are counted for both government service and as a government service 'boss.' Family included factors such as parental marital status at birth, parental vocation, parental exceptionalism (were in public light), presence of and the number of siblings, birth order (e.g. individual was firstborn, second born, third born, etc.), marital status/history, and presence of and the number of children. The family variables can be clustered into two groups, one relating to the members' birth families and the other to their marriage and personal family. The religion variable considered the faith of each individual, using the categories of Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Evangelical (mutually exclusive with protestant), areligious, or other.

Findings

The facts discovered in the course of the investigation of these seven matched pairs reveals both some expected findings and some slightly unexpected turns, with significance varying across the variables examined. The results do reveal some distinct patterns that are noteworthy. First, the count data shall be discussed, covering the four categories; education, occupation, family, religion, and their disparate voting behavior. The clear and distinct patterns that will be revealed despite a small sample size prove useful in furthering our understanding of what set apart the uncivil legislators from the civil matched pairs. Second, the findings from deeper probing into the personal history of each individual and their matched pair shall be discussed. These individual cases will reveal some interesting personal narratives, biographies that will prove to be as much intriguing as revealing.

Partisanship Analysis

First off is the distinctive voting behavior of the two groups. If the uncivil members are always more extreme in their voting behavior this will be an important part of the story. It would suggest that ideology and partisanship are an important explanation for uncivil behavior. On the other hand, if there are instances when the matched pair (civil member) is as extreme in their voting behavior it would indicate that one must look beyond party loyalty for a complete understanding of uncivil behavior. Table 4 below exhibits this analysis.

Table 4.
**The Difference between the Voting Behavior of Civil and Uncivil Members: A
 consideration of both the Chamber and Party Median**

	Chamber Median			
	Min. Value	Max. Value	Mean	Stan. Deviation
Uncivil (n = 7)	0.003	0.561	0.229	0.205
Civil (n = 7)	0.110	0.278	0.172	0.064

	Party Median			
	Min. Value	Max. Value	Mean	Stan. Deviation
Uncivil (n = 7)	0.020	0.364	0.161	0.124
Civil (n = 7)	0.026	0.090	0.539	0.024

Note the much larger standard deviations for the uncivil group. Additionally, the minimum in both cases is closer to the chamber or party median. The minimum is closer to the party median, but the standard deviation is also greater in each case: three times for the Chamber Median, five times for the Party Median. It is difficult to conclude that partisanship is solely responsible for uncivil behavior with such wide-ranging results in the experimental (uncivil) group and the control group. For the purposes of these case studies, these results show very clearly that the uncivil members of Congress being evaluated are affected by more than just partisan feeling or their policy preferences, and I suggest that experiential, background related characteristics are capable of explaining the discrepancy.

Education

Possibly the most notable findings in the quantitative work were in the education category. Of the six variables in the education category, three out of the six variables prove to expose distinct differences between the two groups of legislators. For instance, those members that were uncivil comprised the only examples of individuals who had a high school-only level of education (see Table 5 below). The difference in advanced degrees—classified as any degree

greater than a Bachelor of Arts of Science—was noticeably different. Twice as many of the control members had advanced degrees than the uncivil members. This difference is one of the most striking, even including the other categories. However, the most significant difference between the uncivil and control groups in education was that only one uncivil member had a Juris Doctorate, whereas five of the control members had Juris Doctorates. The Juris Doctorates are not mutually exclusive with the Advanced Degree variable, and are counted as a sub-group. This remarkable difference heavily supports one of the proposed explanations for why uncivil legislators behave as they do; that those legislators who have formal legal training, specifically have the norms of conduct of behavior in a courtroom inculcated in them and will be less likely to behave in an uncivil manner. Post-secondary school that was in-state only was expected to produce members of Congress that were more ‘worldly’ and the experience of being educated in another state might socialize individuals to be more accepting of alternative views and personalities, but this proved null.

Table 5.

Difference in the Educational Backgrounds of Uncivil Members and their Matched Pair

	High School Education Only	Post-Secondary School: In-State Only	Advanced Degree (more than BA/BS)	Juris Doctorate Degree ^a
	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency
Uncivil Members (n = 7)	3 (43%)	3 (43%)	3(43%)	1 (14%)
Control Group (n = 7)	0 (0%)	2 (29%)	6 (86%)	5 (71%)

^a Not mutually exclusive with Advanced Degree, counted as sub-category.

It is also worth noting the difference in post-secondary school does not produce any particularly noteworthy results, which was expected to be a possible difference; one uncivil member more than the control group attended post-secondary school in-state only, but this minimal difference is not considered significant.

Occupation

There are three cases of positive differences found as it relates to the large number of occupations tested. These three are Business, Lawyer, and Prosecuting Attorney (see Table 6 below). The latter variable is not mutually exclusive with lawyer, and is counted as a sub-category. In the case of the business variable—these are individuals who work for a private-sector company, but not being in charge of that company, but also individuals who were self-employed in the private sector. In this instance, three uncivil members were engaged in businesses during their careers, and none of the control group was. This may suggest that there is something notable about having worked in the private sector writ large.

Table 6.
Difference in the Occupational Backgrounds of Uncivil Members and their Matched Pair

	Business	Lawyer	Prosecuting Attorney ^a
	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency
Uncivil Members (n = 7)	3 (43%)	2 (29%)	0 (0%)
Control Group (n = 7)	0 (0%)	5 (71%)	3 (43%)

^a Not mutually exclusive with Lawyer, counted as sub-category.

The lawyer variable revealed that only two uncivil members were lawyers—one of which is notably Huey Long, who passed the bar without formally earning a Juris Doctorate, also explaining the single uncivil juris doctorate earner and two uncivil lawyers—and five of the control group were lawyers. A very substantial finding, matching closely the findings regarding the Juris Doctorate variable in education. What stands out in particular however is the Prosecuting Attorney variable, of which no uncivil members were counted and three of the control group were. This finding would seem to further reinforce the case that legal training and specifically the norms of behavior expected of those with legal training seems to correlate with civil behavior in Congress. None of the other occupations proved to be substantively significant; education, medical, journalism, government service, agriculture, military service, and the politician occupations as well as all of the ‘boss’ variations of each plus the boss variation for business and lawyer (no boss variation for prosecuting attorney for self-explanatory reasons) proved to be diverse in observation and lacked any discernible pattern in the manner that business, lawyer, and prosecuting attorney did (raw data available in the Appendix, see Table A1). At the very least, it shows that even a small sampling of members of Congress demonstrates both shared professional histories and diverse work backgrounds.

Family

The family category produced a few notable findings. However, these were of the null variety. None of the variables saw a substantive difference between the uncivil and control groups. The raw data is available in the Appendix in Table A2. There is not a corresponding table in the text, as was the case with other categories, because of the null findings. It may be

concluded that family is not particularly influential, a nature vs nurture result, but there were some interesting facts to note nonetheless.

Exceptional parents—those members of Congress whose parents were in the public eye—shows some potential promise with two uncivil and no civil examples, but with one of the civil members lacking data it is tenuous to suggest that there may be a link. Future investigations and revisions may reveal information about the individual for which the information could not be found, or information may be found for other members in another case study, and a more compelling finding may be uncovered, then. The beginnings of a pattern provide a line of future inquiry.

It is noteworthy that family size varied widely, and taking away anything substantive proved difficult due to a particular outlier—the one Mormon member, also a control group member, had 16 siblings. The average for the uncivil members was four siblings, while the average for the civil control group was a little under two *if* one were to remove the Mormon member from consideration. The average otherwise jumps up to a little less than four, erasing the difference between the two groups. The order of birth consideration produced a similar finding as exceptional parents, with two gaps in information, both for control group members. Nevertheless, four of the five observations had the civil members of Congress as the eldest among their siblings, whereas out of all seven of the uncivil members, only two were the eldest. There may be a distinct pattern here, but with the lack of complete information it is difficult to say if birth order matters. There is however much more likely a pattern and future investigation and revision should shed some very helpful light. Virtually all of the variables related to the members of Congress themselves and their marital/family lives demonstrated very little difference between the two groups. Virtually all members were married at some point, with one

of the uncivil members divorced while two of the civil members divorced at some point. It is possible that the source attitude that gets the uncivil members into arguments with their peers makes them more devoted to their spouse, but this is only wild speculation. It would nonetheless be interesting to see if the pattern held for a larger group. Multiple marriages (which includes divorces) gain one additional observation due to one of the controls being a widower, bringing the difference to three to one, civil vs uncivil, but with two of those observations already recorded in divorce and the only addition being a widower, it offers little to take away in terms of a systematic difference between the two groups. The number of children that the members had was almost exactly the same for both groups and averaged about four. Family seems to be most significant when it comes to the birth family and upbringing, where there is some promise, but the information is compromised by a lack of complete information in both of the most potentially revealing categories. Marital family appears to be fairly moot, though there may be something to be found in analyzing divorce rates and civility.

Religion

The consideration of religion produces some interesting findings and variables that could correlate with incivility as shown in Table 7. Six variables were used: Catholic, Protestant, Evangelical (subcategory of Protestant), Jewish, Areligious, and Other. The categories are exhaustive and every member belongs to one of the categories. Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish denote affiliation with any denomination of each religious group. Evangelical was a subcategory of Protestant created to account for those members of Congress whom may belong to a Protestant denomination known for particularly strong religious beliefs, or otherwise strong adherence to Protestant-derived religious beliefs. Jesse Helms and Huey Long were the only two

examples of Evangelicals. Helms possessed a background that fit fairly conventionally [he was a southern Baptist with a notably devout upbringing (Helms 2005)]. Long did not hold quite as conventional a background, but biographical information states that his family attended revivals regularly and his early education involved reading from the Bible (Huey Long’s Life & Times - Education n.d.). Areligious was used to capture those individuals who were not in any way affiliated with a religion or had any religious affiliation. The ‘Other’ category was intended to capture members of other religions not listed, but none of the 14 members had a unique religious background.

Table 7.

Difference in the Religious Backgrounds of Uncivil Members and their Matched Pair

	Catholic	Protestant	Evangelical ^a
	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency
Uncivil Members (n = 7)	1 (14%)	6 (86%)	2 (29%)
Control Group (n = 7)	2 (29%)	5 (71%)	0 (0%)

^a Not mutually exclusive with Protestant, counted as sub-category.

Slightly more of the control group were Catholic, and slightly more of the uncivil members were Protestant—two who were classified as Evangelicals, with none of the control group members classified as Evangelicals. The other variables—Jewish, areligious produce null findings. Nonetheless, a minute systematic difference was present. The distribution of Catholic

and Protestant, for example, provides for some interesting insight. Especially as it relates to Evangelicals (2 versus 0).⁴

Individual Matched Pairs—Senate

Three of the seven matched pairs are from the Senate. They are Benjamin Tillman and Robert F. Broussard, Huey Long and Robert Reynolds, and Jesse Helms and Thad Cochran. In contrast to the previous section, the background of each pairing of the members of the Senate are explored at length here. This more narrative-focused approach complements the prior count data evaluation, which while limited by the small-*n* was fruitful in providing some patterns and leads that will be discernable at the individual level in the following analyses. It is worth noting in advance that for the senators, information was much more readily available. Given their longer terms of office biographical information about senators tends to be more plentiful, allowing lengthier discussion of each of the matched pairs from the Senate. The members from the House will be briefer due to this naturally occurring limitation, but will still provide plenty of room to compare and contrast between the matched pairs and what distinguished the uncivil Representatives from their civil counterparts.

Ben Tillman and Robert Broussard. The first pair to be analyzed is Ben Tillman (uncivil) and Robert Broussard (control). Benjamin Ryan Tillman was a Senator from South Carolina, born near Trenton, Edgefield County, South Carolina, August 11, 1847 (TILLMAN, Benjamin

⁴ It was determined that, in the questionable case—Robert Reynolds, whose grandfather was an evangelical Methodist, married one of his wives in a Catholic church, funeral held at an Episcopal church—that he would be counted as Protestant because of the early life influences that were likely at play and because his burial was at a Protestant denomination church, which in theory should cleave close to practiced religious beliefs in later life. Another member, Ben Tillman, from the uncivil group, did not seem to have any clear religious affiliation, but was buried at a Baptist church and was raised in the antebellum South, which grants a good probability that Protestant would be an accurate classification.

Ryan - Biographical Information n.d.). His family was a wealthy one and owned 86 slaves. The men of his family were all fighters, through and through. His father had killed a man (his father died of typhoid fever when Ben Tillman was 2), his brother John Tillman died in a feud in 1860, brother Oliver Tillman was killed in a domestic dispute shortly after that, brother George Tillman fought duels regularly and killed an innocent bystander by accident in a gambling dispute in 1865, brother Thomas Tillman died in the Mexican-American War, and yet another brother, Henry Tillman, died of Typhoid fever at 15 (Benjamin Ryan Tillman | Clemson University, South Carolina n.d.).

Initially Ben Tillman attended school, growing up an avid reader, but left to join the Confederate Army in 1864 at 17 years of age. This proved to be a short-lived venture, as he was stricken with a cranial tumor for 2 years that took his left eye. He was unable to fight for the remaining duration of the war. Tillman afterwards engaged in agricultural pursuits, for 16 years, and became a very successful farmer with over a thousand acres of tillable land.

By contrast, there is Robert Foligny Broussard, (brother of Edwin Sidney Broussard), a Representative and later Senator from Louisiana; was born on the 'Mary Louise' plantation, near New Iberia, Iberia Parish, La., August 17, 1864 (BROUSSARD, Robert Foligny - Biographical Information n.d.). Broussard attended public and private schools before attending Georgetown University in Washington, DC from 1879-1882. He later became a night inspector of customs in New Orleans from 1885-1888, then was appointed assistant weigher and statistician from 1888-1889. He meanwhile studied law at Tulane University, New Orleans Louisiana., and graduated in 1889. Broussard was admitted to the bar the same year and began practicing in New Iberia, and was later elected the prosecuting attorney of the nineteenth judicial district from 1892-1897.

As noted both Tillman and Broussard were Southern Democrats who served in the Senate around the same time. Any sort of similarity between the two ends there, however. Tillman's engagement in politics began well before Broussard's, but not by serving in elected office. Tillman became a member of the Sweetwater Saber Club, a paramilitary group affiliated with the Red Shirts, a statewide paramilitary group that supported the Democratic Party in South Carolina. Tillman led a group of the Sweetwater Saber Club into Hamburg and Ellenton during the 1876 election riots, violently deterring African-American voters. Several of his men killed a black state senator, Simon Coker, whom was investigating prior reports of violence.

Tillman would go on to turn on Butler and his compatriots, including yet another former Confederate general—Wade Hampton, whom had taken a seat Tillman believed belonged to Gary—seeing them as being a new aristocratic class that kept people like Gary and Tillman himself from succeeding when they had helped the new South Carolina leadership so much. Tillman then embarked on a populist crusade against the new aristocracy, disparaging them for having ignored white farmers and mill workers. He won the governorship of South Carolina in 1890, after using vitriolic speeches, a skillful campaign organization, and calls for reform of the agricultural and industrial systems in South Carolina. He became the Democratic Party boss in the state for 15 years, removing the “Bourbon” aristocrats from power, and changing local officials from being elected to being appointed to virtually strip African-Americans of any political power, even where they were the majority by a large margin (Benjamin Ryan Tillman | Clemson University, South Carolina n.d.).

Tillman additionally instituted some of the reforms he had campaigned on, equalizing the tax code, limiting work hours in cotton mills, and reorganizing the railroad commission. He also restructured the University of South Carolina, ending its agriculture and mechanical departments,

and setting up two new colleges—Clemson and Winthrop—to specialize in agriculture and industrial mechanics.

Broussard by contrast was far less engaging in his career exploits prior to his time in the Senate. Importantly, he was considerably younger than Tillman. In fact, he was born around the same time that Tillman marched off to war. This age might explain some of the difference in the level of “accomplishment” before each began their congressional service. Broussard started off his obvious political career as a representative in the House of Representatives, serving in the Fifty-fifth Congress and the eight succeeding Congresses (March 4, 1897-March 3, 1915). He encouraged his constituents to just call him “Cousin Bob”; Broussard was a charismatic figure, and worked to make himself friendly and familiar to his constituency, and thus gave himself the nickname (Cousin Bob) (Wakefield 1990).

While serving in the House, Broussard was chair of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice (Sixty-Third Congress). Prior to becoming chair of a Congressional committee, Broussard notably sponsored House Rule 23261—the “American Hippo Bill”. An invasive plant, water hyacinth, was prevalent in the Mississippi delta after the water hyacinth had been gifted by a Japanese delegation to a cotton expo. The pale lavender flowers had been popular with the residents of New Orleans, but had become an invasive species, causing blockages in waterways and killing fish by hogging oxygen in the water. Broussard advocated using hippos to eat the plants and clear out the invasion (Mooallem 2014). The hippos could also be butchered for meat, of which there was a national shortage at the time. This point earned a recommendation from President Theodore Roosevelt himself. The bill failed, however, being just a view votes short of passage. In 1914, he became a candidate for Senator and was elected, serving from March 4, 1915 until his death in New Iberia, Louisiana on April 12, 1918 (The

Political Graveyard: Iberia Parish, La. n.d.; United States Congressional Serial Set 1920). During this time, he chaired the Senate Committee on National Banks in the Sixty-Fourth and Sixty-Fifth Congresses.

Tillman eventually one-upped his old rival Butler for a Senate seat in 1894, which caused Tillman to lose some of his hold on South Carolina politics as he turned his attention elsewhere, but he was still powerful in the state. He was re-elected to the Senate in 1901, 1907, and 1913, and served from March 4, 1895 until his death. He fashioned himself a champion of farmers, though he never aligned himself with radicals in the Farmer's Alliance, and never identified himself as a Populist, the political party most closely aligned with farming interests. His own base of support in fact rivaled the Farmer's Alliance and made the Populists a non-factor in South Carolina. He ran on an agrarian platform—much like he had as governor—and supported the free coinage of silver, a major issue at the time. Tillman also backed a federal income tax and railroad regulations, openly distrusting Eastern monied interests. The debate over silver led to a split from the Democratic presidential nominee Grover Cleveland, which led Tillman to declare that “[Cleveland] is an old bag of beef and I am going to Washington with a pitchfork and prod him in his old fat ribs.” Tillman was henceforth known as “Pitchfork Ben”, a nickname that would follow him as he built a national reputation as the champion of farmers and a defender of racial segregation (Simkins 1964).

Tillman spoke at the 1896 Democratic National Convention, hoping for a presidential bid. His own tactics would be his undoing, however, as the cursing, haranguing of enemies, and sectionalism thoroughly alienated his audience. William Jennings Bryan, “Boy Orator of the Platt”, would secure the nomination instead. Tillman retreated to state politics from then on, and focused on leading opposition to Republican presidents. He supported the Spanish-American

War in 1898, but denounced the colonization that followed on racist grounds, and voiced suspicions of business interests involved in the War. He held a grudge against Theodore Roosevelt from 1902 onward after a dinner invitation to the White House was rescinded due to Tillman assaulting his fellow Senator from South Carolina, John L. McLaurin. The Senate censured him for his actions.

Tillman continued to be influential, however, continuing to win re-election and forcing McLaurin to retire, despite having previously been friends before their falling-out. In 1908 and 1910, strokes partially paralyzed him and reduced his energy and influence. When Woodrow Wilson was elected to the White House, he was too old and infirm to head the very prestigious Appropriations Committee, which he was due by seniority. Tillman was relegated to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and was a rubber stamp for Wilson's administration, only opposing him on women's suffrage, and at that ardently. He continued to engineer elections, and secured the acquittal of his nephew, Lieutenant Governor James H. Tillman, for murder. Tillman's hold could not last forever though, and while continuing to win re-election himself, his favored candidate lost the governorship of South Carolina in the election of 1912 to a spurned supporter. Tillman died in Washington.

It is hard to imagine two men, Broussard and Tillman, being more different. Broussard, a good old boy from Louisiana, insisting he be called "Cousin Bob"; and "Pitchfork Ben" Tillman, a venom spitting, one-eyed fighter, both literally and metaphorically. Both were born to well-off families, and both served in Congress, but there is little else to compare. Violence and death surrounded the Tillman family, with Ben Tillman himself contributing to this by his participation in the bloody and violent 1876 elections in South Carolina. Broussard, by contrast, was learning at Georgetown University in Washington D.C., and would serve a few jobs before getting his law

degree. Where Tillman was fighting against someone somewhere, Broussard was making connections and becoming a candidate for election. Tillman, after being rejected by the South Carolina Democratic Party machine, *became* the machine, and would dominate South Carolina politics for decades. Broussard is remarkable largely for supporting the importation of hippos. Tillman, for being the meanest snake in the grass that ever served in Congress. Broussard was very affable and cultivated such an image and practiced it. Tillman was always looking for a fight, and his incivility is proof of it.

This close look at these two individuals suggests that their family backgrounds, educational experiences, and occupations prior to serving in the Senate are all responsible, in part, to their very different performances as members of the Senate. Party, the South, and the Upper Chamber do not explain their differences. Other background and experiential learning are, however, consistent with their uniquely distinctive Senate experiences. It should not be left unstated that Broussard's experience as a member of the House of Representatives before becoming a senator might help to explain his more civil behaviors. One might imagine that the Lower Chamber played a role in socializing Broussard in the norms of courtesy and reciprocity that many senators embraced during the time period being considered. This may be especially influential relative to Tillman, whose first political forays were marked with the same uncivil attitudes and behavior as would define his political career. Broussard may have had some of his civility inculcated by experience, whereas Tillman allowed no such opportunity, pre-empting any possibility of learning proper conduct in Congress by adopting a belligerent attitude straight out of the gate in all of his political endeavors.

Huey Long and Robert Reynolds. The second pair to be analyzed is Huey Long (uncivil) and Robert Rice Reynolds (control). Huey Long was a Senator from Louisiana, born on a farm

near Winnfield, Winn Parish, La., August 30, 1893 (LONG, Huey Pierce - Biographical Information n.d.). After attending the public-school system of Winnfield, Long worked as a book peddler, auctioneer, and traveling salesman. It was a job full of ups and downs, and he met his future wife, Rose McConnell, during his work. He went to the University of Oklahoma School of Law after the sales job started to fall through due to a bad economy, but left for a sales job at the end of one semester. Long's oldest brother, Julius, encouraged him to continue studying law at Tulane University, New Orleans, La. Julius gave Long a list of classes to take, and enough money to last him and his wife for a year. Long obtained special permission to take the bar exam orally before the examining committee, and passed to be admitted to the bar after 1 year of classes (Huey Long's Life & Times - Education n.d.). He was just 21, and was admitted to the bar in 1915. He practiced in Winnfield before moving to Shreveport, La., in 1918. Long's most prolific case was arguing a lawsuit as the chairman of the Public Service Commission against a telephone company for unjustly raising its rates, and doing so before the Supreme Court. He won the case, earning 80,000 people a refund for being overcharged, and the compliments (at a later date) of then Chief Justice William Howard Taft. Long was just 28. Long became a railroad commissioner from 1918-1928, and was a commission chairman from 1924-1928.

Long's first run for office was an unsuccessful bid for the Democratic nomination of Governor of Louisiana in 1924. He nonetheless became the Democratic National committeeman from 1928-1935, and was elected Governor of Louisiana in 1928 (Huey Long's Life & Times - Louisiana Governor Huey P. Long n.d.). Long served from May 21, 1928, earning the nickname "Kingfish" (the biggest fish in the pond of Louisiana), until he resigned from office on January 25, 1932, having been elected Senator for the 1930 election cycle. His term started March 4, 1931, but he continued as Governor until January 25, 1932. As a Senator, Long's "Share our

Wealth” movement that he had developed from his days as governor (the old slogan was “Every man a king!”) earned him few friends for his staunchly radical beliefs (Huey Long’s Life & Times - Senator Huey P. Long n.d.). Long served as a Senator until his death. He announced that he would run for the Democratic nomination for President in August 1935 dissatisfied with Franklin D. Roosevelt’s New Deal programs, seeing them as not going far enough. After many death threats, arson, and a drive-by shooting as well as an instance of the National Guard to stop a paramilitary group that seized a courthouse in Baton Rouge, Long had already beefed up his personal security—already significant from potential threats when he was governor—and had state troopers working to protect him as well (Huey Long’s Life & Times - Presidential Candidate n.d.). Nevertheless, he was shot by an assassin—a relative of a political enemy—on September 8, 1935 in the State Capitol in Baton Rouge during a special session that would have ended the career of the political enemy his assassin was related to (Huey Long’s Assassination - Who Killed Huey Long n.d.). He died 2 days later, September 10, 1935. His final words were “God, don’t let me die. I have so much to do.”

Robert Rice Reynolds was a Senator from North Carolina, born in Asheville, Buncombe County, N.C., June 18, 1884 (REYNOLDS, Robert Rice - Biographical Information n.d.). After attending local public schools, he went to Weaverville (N.C.) College and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Reynolds studied law during his higher education, and was admitted to the bar in 1907, practicing in Asheville, N.C. He would go on to serve as prosecuting attorney of the fifteenth judicial district of North Carolina from 1910-1914.

Reynolds was an unsuccessful candidate for nomination for lieutenant governor in 1924 and for United States Senator in 1926. He was also a presidential elector in 1928 on the Democratic ticket. He was elected as a Democrat to the United States Senate on November 8,

1932 to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Lee S. Overman for the term ending March 3, 1933, and on the same day was elected for the term beginning March 4, 1933. Reynolds was re-elected in 1938 and served from December 5, 1932 to January 3, 1945. He was not a candidate for re-election in 1944. Reynolds came from humble origins and would travel in his late teens, hitching rides on train cars much like a hobo when he lacked money, working odd jobs along the way (Pleasants 2000). This experience no doubt influenced his politics, winning and keeping his office as a class warrior, framing himself as campaigning against plutocrats. He singled out Prohibition, immigration, trusts, tariffs, and Wall Street, as his targets. He fully backed FDR's New Deal, and initially backed the court-packing plan, though he later would help kill the bill by sending it back to the Judiciary Committee. Reynolds would become more pro-business over time, but remained an isolationist when it came to foreign policy. He was a proponent of "Fortress America", supporting a strong national defense, and opposing changes to the Neutrality Acts (Platt n.d.).

Reynolds strongly opposed involvement in World War II early on, opposing the Lend-Lease Act to aid Britain, and started an ultra-nationalist, isolationist, nativist, anti-Semitic, and anti-communist organization that served to spread his opinions. This went poorly for him however, as he came into association with American Nazis, fascists, and anti-Semitic demagogues (Pleasants 2000). While those he was most closely affiliated with had hidden their actual beliefs, they had still managed to insert anti-British and anti-Semitic press releases into the Congressional Record and disseminated them using the franking (no postage cost) privileges Reynolds had. Endorsements of Reynolds' statements on the war by pro-Nazi and fascist groups did not help either. North Carolinians by contrast, on the whole were supportive of Britain and pro-military. After the attack on Pearl Harbor, Reynolds and the isolationists voted for war

against the Axis, unable to deny the need for America to fight. Reynolds renamed his organization that he had previously formed to reflect greater national unity and pro-war attitudes. Reynolds, upon leaving Congress, warned of Soviet expansionism, and voted against peacetime conscription, higher taxes, and entry into the United Nations. During his tenure in office, he served as chairman for the Committee on the District of Columbia (Seventy-seventh Congress), and on the committee on Military Affairs (Seventy-seventh and Seventy- eighth Congresses). Reynolds was an unsuccessful candidate for the United States Senate again in 1950, having lost most popularity and credibility. After his time in Congress, Reynolds practiced law in Washington D.C. and operated a large estate near Asheville, N.C. He died in Asheville, N.C. on February 13, 1963.

Huey Long was considered a socialist, radical, and demagogue by his critics, and Long didn't pull punches hitting back. Long believed he was on a crusade for the working man, the poor man, the honest man. A thorough-going populist, Long was dedicated to solving economic issues for the working class. He never made a point of campaigning on race issues, or any other issues for that matter. It was always about fighting poverty and improving the common man's lot. He never was able to fully realize his redistributive policies though, and was killed for his trouble. Long was a powerful man, with a popularity that rivaled FDR and Charles Lindbergh, the third most photographed man after them in the 1930s. He was a man with a bullseye on him for some time, and it was really a matter of time until an attempt with enough determination would kill him. Long was a hard-working man with unpopular sentiments, and a sentimentality for the average citizen. There was little he wouldn't do to fight for the people he wanted to help.

Reynolds was a strict isolationist, and determined to keep America out of war. While he was associated with some pro-fascist individuals, this was largely a one-way street, as Reynolds

never supported fascism himself. His only goal was to keep America out of politics and conflicts that he thought had nothing to do with America. His opposition to the Lend-Lease Act to support Britain financially was an example of Reynolds' determination to ensure America had no ties to the growing conflict in Europe. As war became a reality for America, and North Carolina became a staging ground for America's forces, Reynolds lost influence and credibility. He rebranded his newspaper to be more unifying, supporting the war effort and encouraging the purchase of war bonds to fund the war, but his political career was already on the decline. Even leaving office, his true beliefs—anti-communist and isolationist through and through—burned as much as ever.

How Reynolds maintained decorum on the Senate floor is a bit of a mystery, but not so mysterious regarding Huey Long. Long never backed down from any fight he believed in so long as he lived, and pulled no punches in turn. Sadly, that attitude may very well have gotten him killed. No radical is feared more than the forthright one, especially when they are as popular as Long was—he was the third most photographed man of the era, after Franklin D. Roosevelt and Charles Lindbergh (*Huey Long's Life & Times - Presidential Candidate* n.d.). Long was always willing to argue his case, even against long odds. The Long and Reynolds had many similarities—both were from the Old South (Louisiana and North Carolina, respectively), both were populist (Long far more than Reynolds, but isolationism was a semi-popular policy before WWII), and both served short terms. Long's was cut short by aggressive lead poisoning, and Reynolds' was cut short by supporting the wrong policies and (tacitly) supporting the wrong people at the worst possible time. All in all, the two had vastly different policy priorities, but were personally very similar. Nonetheless, Long's crusade put him at odds with others, and incivility was inevitable. Reynolds was more willing to be cordial, despite substantial differences

of opinion with others. Long was unique as a radical, holding very strong ideological beliefs albeit not in lockstep with the party, and uncivil behavior came with his different attitudes, never backing down and conducting himself in a way that even Reynolds—with his very unpopular beliefs, especially with the onset of war—did not.

Family, education, and occupation all played different roles in each individuals' behavior. Both had similar, albeit different experiences and educations growing up, and embarked on very different careers. While Reynolds and Long both had humble origins, their family upbringing and young adult lives took very different paths. These influences shaped their careers and led to pursuits that reflected their natural tendencies towards facing challenges, but with different approaches. The difference in time spent in Congress and the difference in how each approached politics may explain the differences in civility. Reynolds spent significantly more time in Congress, whereas Long did not. While both had very impassioned approaches to politics, Reynolds was more subtle compared to Long, who was more openly willing to directly challenge others.

Jesse Helms and Thad Cochran. Jesse Helms was a Senator from North Carolina, born in Monroe, Union County, N.C., October 18, 1921 (HELMS, Jesse - Biographical Information n.d.). He was educated in the public-school system of Monroe, before going to Wingate Junior College, and Wake Forest College for journalism. Helms had started writing sports articles for local papers at the age of 18, and sought to advance his education in journalism. He continued writing articles, as a job for the university while washing dishes at the boarding house he lived at. A lucky meeting with the managing editor of the *Raleigh News & Observer* led to an overnight proofreader job with the paper. After holding down four jobs while attending college for a time, Helms withdrew from the university to pursue a full-time news career, having gone

from overnight proofreader to full-time sports writer after a series of fortuitous events and a dauntless work ethic (Senator Helms Biography n.d.). He says in his memoir (printed 2005): “My own purpose back then wasn’t to get a diploma, it was to get the foundation needed for the jobs I wanted to have.” Helms met his future lifelong wife at the *News & Observer*, an editor for the society pages. They married on October 31, 1942, lasting until Helms’ death in 2008. In fall of 1941, Helms joined the *Raleigh Times* after his time with the *News & Observer*, as a regular news reporter and assistant city director. Helms served in the United States Navy from 1942-1945, as a recruiter. He was unable to join active service despite multiple applications, including once to be an officer trainer, but was always rejected because of hearing loss in his left ear. Helms then transitioned into radio, becoming the News Director of WCBT in Roanoke Rapids, North Carolina. Helms was an administrative assistant to United States Senators Willis Smith from 1951-1953 and Alton Lennon in 1953. He afterwards became the executive director of the North Carolina Bankers Association from 1953-1960. Helms was a member of the Raleigh City Council from 1957-1961. Helms never fully stepped away from broadcasting, continuing to be involved in it from 1960-1972, as Executive Vice President for News Operations of WRAL-TV and Capitol Broadcasting. During that time, he delivered 2700 episodes of a daily editorial program that made him a household name and put the station in the national spotlight.

Helms was elected as a Republican to the United States Senate in 1972 after some reluctance to run, and was somewhat surprised by his victory after a long campaign, recalling himself being mentioned by news legend Walter Cronkite: “Down in North Carolina, a fellow named Jesse Helms has been elected to the United States Senate.” Helms was re-elected in 1978, 1984, 1990, and 1996, serving from January 3, 1973, to January 3, 2003. He became known as “Senator No” by the *News & Observer* for his strong conservative convictions, a nickname he

considered a compliment (Senator Helms Biography n.d.). Helms was invaluable in establishing the bi-partisan Senate Steering Committee, a committee designed to formally organize conservative public policy positions. Helms was not a candidate for re-election in 2002, choosing to retire. During his Senate service, Helms was chair of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry (Ninety-seventh to Ninety-ninth Congresses), and the Committee on Foreign Relations (One Hundred Fourth to One Hundred Sixth Congresses; One Hundred Seventh Congress [January 3, 2001; January 20, 2001-June 6, 2001]). Helms, after working closely with Senator Joe Biden to reform the United Nations, became the first legislator in history to speak before the United Nations Security Council. Helms was a resident of Raleigh, North Carolina, until his death on July 4, 2008. He was interred in Oakwood Cemetery, Raleigh, North Carolina.

A contemporary of Helms was William Thad Cochran (commonly referred to as just Thad Cochran) is a Senator and former Representative from Mississippi, born in Pontotoc County, Miss., December 7, 1937 (COCHRAN, William Thad - Biographical Information n.d.). He was a member of 4-H, a Scout, and an athlete, achieving the rank of Eagle Scout and helping found a new scout troop at Spring Ridge Methodist Church, serving as its first Junior Assistant Scout Master. Cochran also earned varsity letters in football, basketball, baseball, and tennis. He gave a piano and voice recital his senior year, and was class valedictorian. He was educated in the public-school system of Mississippi, and worked various jobs and several regular jobs during his junior and senior years, once as a “car hop”, another time as a clerk at a grocery store, and helped his father and brother on the family’s cattle farm (Biography - About - Senator Thad Cochran n.d.). Cochran graduated from the University of Mississippi, Oxford 1959, where he completed a major in psychology and a minor in political science. He was president of his social fraternity, a company commander in the Navy ROTC, student body vice president, and was

selected to be a member of Omicron Delta Kappa, a national honorary leadership fraternity. Cochran was a life guard during summers at Livingston Lake near Jackson Mississippi.

Cochran served in the United States Navy from 1959-1961, as an ensign in the U.S. Naval Reserve. He eventually became the legal officer of the ship he was assigned to, the USS MACON after graduating as an honor student from the U.S. Navy School of Justice in Newport, Rhode Island. Cochran attended the University of Mississippi Law School starting 1961, graduating in 1965. He earned the Frederick Hamel Memorial Award for having the highest scholastic average in the first year of class, was selected for membership in the honorary legal fraternity Phi Delta Phi, served on the editorial board of the Mississippi Law Journal, argued before the Mississippi Supreme Court as a moot court finalist, and was elected chairman of the Honor Council. Cochran was awarded a Rotary Foundation Graduate Fellowship and studied international law and jurisprudence at Trinity College, University of Dublin, Ireland his final year just before graduating from 1963-1964. He spoke before numerous Rotary Clubs and other groups in Ireland on the civil rights struggle in Mississippi and the United States. He also won the Hillary Term Moot Court competition sponsored by the Dublin Law Society (Biography - About - Senator Thad Cochran n.d.).

Cochran served as Article Editor of the Mississippi Law Journal his last year of law school, and was selected to be a member of Phi Kappa Phi, an honorary scholastic fraternity. Several years later when he delivered the graduation address at the law school, Dean Parham Williams stated that Cochran's law school grade point average was the third highest of all students who had graduated from the Ole Miss law school during the decade of the 1960s. During his summer vacation in the years of 1962, '63, and '64, Cochran returned to active duty in the Navy and taught military law and naval orientation at the Office Candidate School in

Newport, Rhode Island. He was also promoted to the rank of Lieutenant in the Naval Reserve.

Cochran was admitted to the Mississippi bar in 1965, practicing in Jackson Mississippi. He joined a law firm respected across the state and became a partner in two and a half years.

Cochran was involved in various prestigious civic activities, including as member of the board of the Jackson Rotary Club and organized the first Mississippi chapter of the American Field Service, serving as its charter president to sponsor foreign exchange programs for high school students. He also received a variety of young-lawyer awards (Biography - About - Senator Thad Cochran n.d.).

Cochran's family had a history of political activity, with Cochran's first forays being endorsement of a man for sheriff and writing talking points for a governor's campaign. He became more directly involved with the 1968 campaign for Richard Nixon, serving as Executive Director of Mississippi Citizens for Nixon-Agnew. Cochran was elected as a Republican to the Ninety-third Congress in 1972, and was re-elected to the Ninety-fourth and Ninety-fifth Congresses, serving from January 3, 1973, until his resignation on December 26, 1978. During this time, he was appointed to the House Public Works and Transportation Committee. Cochran was not a candidate for re-election to the House of Representatives, but he was elected in 1978 to the United States Senate for the term commencing January 3, 1979. He was subsequently appointed by the Governor of Mississippi on December 27, 1978 to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of James O. Eastland for the Senate term ending January 3, 1979. Cochran was re-elected in 1984, 1990, 1996, 2002, 2008, and again in 2014 for the term ending January 3, 2021. Cochran's wife of five decades, marrying in 1964, died in 2014 (Hall 2014). Cochran would remarry quietly in 2015 (Hall 2015). Cochran chose to retire in 2018, due to health issues (Sullivan and Kane 2018). During his Senate service, he was chair of the Senate Republican

Conference (1991-1997), and chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry (One Hundred Eighth Congress), as well as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations (One Hundred Ninth, One Hundred Fourteenth, and One Hundred Fifteenth Congresses).

Helms and Cochran are much alike. Both are exemplars of industriousness, Helms in his working multiple jobs at once and Cochran in his many academic accolades. Both are southerners whom have worked to the benefit of their communities, becoming highly involved in civic organizations prior to being elected to office. Where they differ is that Helms was a hardliner, earning his “Senator No” nickname from his resistance to liberal policies. Helms has also been accused of racism on more than one occasion. Helms denied being racist in any way in any of the incidences where he was believed to have acted in a racist manner, and the Jesse Helms Center—an organization that promotes the values that the man himself did—has a webpage dedicated to disproving these accusations, and others (Fictional vs Factual n.d.). Another example is of a purported threat directed towards Bill Clinton (the president at the time of the remark). They record the statement Helms issued after his remark as being during an informal interview about Bill Clinton—that he wasn’t popular on North Carolina military bases, and that if he came down there, he’d need a bodyguard—which was an off the cuff and joking statement, nothing serious or literal. Helms nonetheless did not lack for antagonistic opponents given his hardline conservatism, and his voting history—including opposing the Civil Rights Act—may very well have fueled the ire of his opponents. Cochran did not make quite as many enemies, though he earned disapproval from his lack of support for an apology by the Senate for failing to enact anti-lynching laws in the past (Thomas-Lester 2005). The state of Mississippi that Cochran represents had the most lynching incidents of any state, and this didn’t go over well with all the other Senators (Cochran was 1 of 20 that did not support the apology).

Both Helms and Cochran had fairly humble upbringings, with similarities in family and wide differences in education and occupation. Helms was a born defender of conservatism, and a pull-yourself-up-by-your-bootstraps kind of man. He was heavily involved in foreign policy, the process of which showed some bipartisan spirit. Cochran was an academic par excellence, a very high achiever with a prestigious position as chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Two incredibly similar, but distinct men, differentiated most by Helms' more rugged background and approach to politics, reflected in his unorthodox education and bouncing around jobs. Helms' approach as an ideologue—an ideologically strong and party-loyal member of Congress—makes him seem likely to be an example of polarization being responsible for incivility, but more thorough examination of his background shows that politics, while a motivating factor, may not be a causal factor when compared with Helms' experience and attitudes. Cochran by contrast had the essentials of civil behavior ingrained for years before setting foot in Congress, and his decades in Congress without drawing undue attention to himself shows how much his background influenced his behavior.

Individual Matched Pairs—House

Thomas Blanton and Robert E. Thomason. The fourth pair and first pair from the House is Thomas Lindsey Blanton and Robert Ewing Thomason. Thomas Blanton was a Representative from Texas, and was born in Houston, Harris County, Tex., on October 25, 1872 (BLANTON, Thomas Lindsay - Biographical Information n.d.). Blanton was born to a Methodist family, and attended the public school system of Houston and La Grange before graduating with a law degree from the University of Texas in 1897 (Cottrell 2010; Miller 2010). Blanton married two years later and had five children. Blanton practiced law until being elected a district judge in

1908, and won reelection in 1912. In 1916 Blanton ran and was elected to the House as a Democrat, serving from 1917-1929. In 1921 Blanton was censured for abuse of leave to print, Blanton ran for Senate in 1928 but failed. In 1930 when his successor to the House died, Blanton returned to serving in the House until 1937. Blanton served at various times on the committees on claims, education, irrigation and arid lands, women's suffrage (his sister was the first woman elected to state office in Texas (Cottrell 2010)), Indian affairs, and the District of Columbia. He also served on the appropriations committee from 1932-1937. After leaving Congress, defeated in 1936, Blanton practiced law in Washington until 1938, before returning to Albany Texas to continue practicing law. He also engaged in the raising of Hereford cattle while in Albany. Blanton died on August 11, 1957 in Albany, Texas, and was interred in Albany Cemetery.

Blanton's upbringing on a dairy farm made him a self-described self-built man (Blanton Expulsion from House Asked 1921). He demonstrated an intellectual acumen that allowed him to become a successful lawyer, judge, and politician. Blanton also proved a very principled man, earning himself political enemies quickly; among them was Samuel Gompers, a powerful leader among the labor movement. During World War I Blanton supported a "work or fight" amendment to the draft law. He also opposed the Railroad strike of 1921. In 1924 Blanton proposed a bill that would stop all immigration for five years, and in 1928 proposed another bill that would stop immigration for seven years, require all aliens to register, and deportation of all aliens that did not become citizens. In 1926 Blanton was able to force the resignation of a District of Columbia commissioner for overcharging the guardian fees of veterans, and drove an investigation at St. Elizabeth's Hospital that led to a court declaring forty-five inmates sane and released. Blanton even went as far, in 1935, as to introduce a bill to outlaw Communists in the United States. Blanton was also no fan of the fringe benefits of being a member of Congress, in

1919 introducing a resolution that would request all government departments provide a list of employees that were earning money outside the government and the names of any relatives on the government payroll. All of the other Representatives from Texas voted against the resolution, and Blanton's general opposition to congressional junkets and other benefits did earn him some ill feeling from his colleagues.

When censured by the House for the material he had entered into the record—labeled as obscene by the House—he was at first contrite but became heated, believing that what he had done was right. The obscene material in question was a letter containing profanity, the contents of which provided evidence of the enmity held by the union and non-union printers' groups in the Government printery (Blanton Expulsion from House Asked 1921). Blanton's hostility towards organized labor led to his involving himself in the issue, and while the profane statements were abbreviated to mirror that of what was in the Texas court records, Blanton was held responsible for the printing of obscene material into the public record. A resolution for expulsion failed, as other representatives pleaded for censure, since there was no malicious intent on Blanton's part and censure was severe enough of a reprimand (Blanton Censured, Falls Later in Faint 1921). This instance is both the most prolific moment of Blanton's career, and in a sense a defining one. Blanton was a hard-nosed sort of politician, and it got him into trouble more than once with his colleagues, though only ever once formally.

Robert E. Thomason was a Representative from Texas, born in Shelbyville, Bedford County, Tennessee, on May 30, 1879 (THOMASON, Robert Ewing - Biographical Information n.d.). He was brought with his parents to Gainesville, Cooke County, Texas in 1880, where he would have a largely Methodist upbringing and attend the public-school system (Thomason 1971). Thomason graduated from Southwestern University, Georgetown Texas, in 1898 and

earned his LL.D. at the University of Texas at Austin in 1900. Thomason was admitted to the bar a year later and began practicing law in Gainesville before becoming the prosecuting attorney for Cooke County from 1902-1906. Thomason practiced law again for a few years before moving to El Paso in 1911, where he continued practicing law. He was elected to the state house of representatives in 1917 and served until 1921, serving as speaker from 1920-1921. Thomason returned to law before being elected the mayor of El Paso from 1927-1930, and was elected as a Democrat to the House in 1930, serving until 1947, when he left on account of having been appointed as a district judge for the western district of Texas. Thomason retired as a senior judge and lived in El Paso until his death on November 8, 1973; he was interred at Restlawn Cemetery.

Thomason was the son of a Confederate veteran and graduate of the College of Medicine and Surgery at Cincinnati, Ohio. His mother died when he was six, and his father remarried and had four children. Thomason got on well with his new family. He also became the law partner of his father-in-law after marrying in 1905. Thomason and his wife had two children after moving to El Paso in 1912, and was successful in law there. While in state office, Thomason served on the committee that investigated the misconduct of then-Governor James E. Ferguson, who was impeached. Thomason's wife died in 1921, shortly after he left state office and returned to his legal practice. Thomason remarried in 1927 shortly after becoming mayor of El Paso, in which capacity he administered several civic works, including building the first El Paso airport (Ray 2010). In Congress, Thomason served on the Military Affairs Committee, and successfully lobbied for bills building a dam and the first national park in Texas. Thomason became a senior member of the House Armed Services Committee, and was a proponent of universal military training, selective service, and was involved in almost all war legislation. An act named for him, the Thomason Act, provided for a year's army training for special students in 1939. Thomason

also supported the formation of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) and the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), though he voted against an antilynching bill and the Fair Employment Practice Committee bill. Thomason, like most members of Congress, was on the New Deal bandwagon and remained involved in politics until appointed a federal district judge by Truman; he was sworn in on August 1, 1947, leaving on June 1, 1963, shortly after turning eighty-four.

Thomason's career was defined by the law, whether it was challenging it, enforcing it, passing it, or adjudicating it. In some ways, Thomason was the model example of a member of Congress—a trained lawyer with substantial experience, and an able legislator. Thomason found his niche in Congress, and aside from some home projects—which most legislators engage in—largely stuck to that niche, save for when larger issues like the AEC, TVA, and New Deal were involved. Looking at Thomason's history and background, it is somewhat unsurprising that he is an example of a civil legislator and serves as the control for Blanton.

Compared with Blanton, Thomason represents the sort of steady reliability that—especially in contemporary politics—consists of the desired traits one may look for in a member of Congress or the Courts. Blanton by contrast represents the more headstrong and passionate sort of politician, the kind that treats their duty as a crusade as much as a job. They had different familial backgrounds, but not in a way as seemed to affect them significantly. In terms of education and occupation, Blanton and Thomason were incredibly similar. Between the two, it becomes easy to see that Blanton had a tendency towards conflict that could be traced to his own innate nature, with both Blanton and Thomason having been well-educated, both having served as lawyers, and both having been prolific members of Congress—albeit in different ways. It is in these different ways that their dissimilarity is most striking, and where their personalities, despite similar educational and occupational backgrounds, defined their service. A somewhat

unexpected finding, but the presence of attitudinal differences in spite of many similarities offers an explanation that—while not the one being looked for—seems fairly clear due to the great similarities.

Richard Arme y and William Archer. The second pair from the House is Richard Arme y and William Reynold Archer. Richard Arme y was a Representative from the state of Texas, born in Cando, Towner County, North Dakota on July 7, 1940 (ARMEY, Richard Keith - Biographical Information n.d.). He graduated from Cando High School in 1958, and went on to acquire a B.A. from Jamestown College in Jamestown, ND in 1963. Arme y earned his M.A. at the University of North Dakota at Grand Forks in 1964, and earned a Ph.D. at the University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, OK, in 1968. Arme y went on to be a professor at the University of Montana in Missoula, then an assistant professor at West Texas Agricultural and Mechanical University in Canyon, Texas, then an assistant professor at Austin College in Sherman, Texas, and later served as faculty and an administrator at the University of North Texas in Denton, as well as was a distinguished fellow of the Fisher Institute in Dallas, Texas. Arme y was elected to the Ninety-ninth Congress and to the eight succeeding Congresses, serving from January 3, 1985-January 3, 2003. He was majority leader for the One Hundred Fourth through One Hundred Seventh Congresses, upon which he did not run for reelection in 2002.

Arme y is an interesting case, a lifelong professor who crisscrossed the country in his education and teaching, as is sometimes the case for life academics. However, Arme y eventually chose to enter politics, and was heavily influenced by libertarian economics (Rothbard 1994). It is difficult to say what made Arme y be uncivil on the House floor, but when responsible for the infamous “Barney Fag” comment, it is even more difficult to say that Arme y was unafraid of or unwilling to make very pointed barbs at his colleagues across the aisle (Rich 1995). Whether it

was ideological difference, personal vexation, or just waking up on the wrong side of the bed that day, it is impossible to say. As a professor, a certain degree of decorum may be expected of Arme y, who spent most of his adult life in academia before going to Washington. What might be said for his behavior though is that there is nothing in his background that sticks out, and that while ideology could be blamed—Arme y was among those who were part of the Republican surge in 1984, Reagan’s second election—it is possible that Arme y, a *former* academic, could have found a facet of himself brought out by the environment of Congress, and the many challenges and debates it brings, any of which could lead any member of Congress to act a bit unbecoming. What separates the civil from the uncivil however, is that even in spite of this environment, only some act uncivilly, while many do not; which leads to Arme y’s control pair, William Archer.

William Reynolds Archer Jr. was a fellow Representative from Texas, born in Houston, Harris County on March 22, 1928 (ARCHER, William Reynolds, Jr. - Biographical Information n.d.). He attended the private schools in Houston before attending Rice University from 1945-1946. Archer earned his B.B.A. and LL.B. at the University of Texas, Austin, attending from 1946-1951. He was admitted to the Texas Bar in 1951 and practiced in Houston. Archer did not practice law for long however, joining the Air Force and attaining the rank of Captain during the Korean Conflict from 1951-1953. Afterwards, Archer became president of Uncle Johnny Mills, Inc., from 1953-1961.⁵ Archer then moved on to being councilman and mayor pro tem for Hunters Creek Village, Texas, from 1955-1962. There is then a five year gap, in which he more

⁵ It is indeterminate whether this was an “inherited” position from his father or not, as the company seems to be defunct, with the only readily available documentation being a court case involving the company in 1955: Uncle Johnny Mills V. Artesia Alfalfa Growers Association, (Supreme Court of New Mexico 1955).

likely than not, though unconfirmed, practiced law before becoming the director of Heights State Bank from 1967-1970. At the same time, Archer was elected to the Texas house of representatives from 1967-1970. Archer then ran for and was elected to the national Congress, serving from 1971-2001. From the One Hundred Fourth through One Hundred Sixth Congresses he was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. Archer was not a candidate for reelection to the One Hundred Seventh Congress.

Archer's life was defined by living in largely upper-class circles, and in Congress was dedicated to bipartisanship—especially once on the Ways and Means Committee—and to reforming tax and health care law (Namesake - The Archer Center n.d.). In these respects, he appears a model politician, namely of the cooperative variety. Whether his blue-blooded background is responsible for his civility or not is not a given, but it would seem to have shaped his behavior in Congress. Cooperative decision-making and a focus on budgeting can be found both in his high-ranking positions in the private sector and Congress. Compared with Arme y, there is little noticeably in common; both were well-educated, and both had unremarkable family backgrounds. This contrast would make occupation as a potential source of difference in behavior more substantive, but the occupations of both would suggest civility. Arme y would seem to be the one for whom Congress brought out a more confrontational part of himself, whereas for Archer it seems none too different from life before politics. Occupation may have had a preparatory effect on Archer that Arme y lacked, but the individual temperament of each may have also influenced their career paths. Occupation could have then reinforced their individual temperaments, and when each became elected officials, they had very different attitudes toward Congress. It is arguable that the professorship of Arme y would lend towards civility as much as being a boardroom executive, as proper conduct in an academic setting is

important for retaining respect both with peers and students. This makes individual differences hinge more on personality, and something more intrinsic to Armev and Archer than more extrinsic factors like occupation. Both Armev and Archer moved around from one position and location to another in their careers, and the case may be made that both have a similar breadth of experience before being elected. I argue, in light of this case and probable similarity of decorum in their careers, that their respective attitudes in Congress were a product of Armev and Archer's own individual responses to their shared political environment, and conducted themselves differently because that was how they were innately predisposed to do so; the oppositional nature of politics resulted in different responses from Armev and Archer, with each responding differently based on their own personality differences. Armev embraced the oppositional nature of politics, while Archer treated Congress similarly to his business experience and took ideological differences in stride, seeking cooperation. This is a problematic result, outside the scope of expected findings; nonetheless, it offers an intriguing explanation, and one that suggests a need to tease out potential endogeneity. If temperament, personality, attitudes, etc., are potentially significant and separate influences from the extrinsic factors like religion, family, education, and occupation, then future evaluation will need to accommodate intrinsic factors as a form of endogenous influences. Personality may influence educational and occupational choices, and be formative in the same way as experience is. The relationship may also be reciprocal, creating further complexity. Regardless of the case however, politics as cause seems to be less certain because of an alternative explanation that provides for circumstances like Armev and Archer, who both were fairly strong ideologues but conducted themselves differently.

Robert Dornan and Ronald C. Packard. Dornan and Packard are the third House pair, and are a very unique control pairing. Of all of the members of Congress compared, these two are

perhaps the most varied in background. Dornan was a Representative from California, born in New York City on April 3, 1933 (DORNAN, Robert Kenneth - Biographical Information n.d.). He attended parochial schools before graduating from Loyola High School in California in 1950. Dornan Attended Loyola University for three years before joining the Air Force, attaining the rank of Captain, and serving from 1953-1958. He afterwards became a member of the Air Force Reserve from 1958-1975. Dornan floated through several jobs over the years; commercial pilot, broadcaster-journalist, television producer, later becoming affiliated with KHJ-TV and KTLA-TV from 1967-1973. Dornan was a delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1976, 1980, 1984, and 1988, and was elected to the Ninety-fifth through Ninety-seventh Congresses, serving from 1977-1983. He ran for Senate but lost, and pursued election again in the Ninety-ninth Congress, which he won. He then served for another five terms, from 1985-1997. Dornan was an unsuccessful candidate for reelection in the One Hundred Fifth Congressional election and tried to contest the election of his successor but failed. He tried to run for election again for the One Hundred Sixth Congress but failed again and discontinued attempting to be elected to Congress.

‘B-1 Bob’ Dornan, as he was nicknamed for his defense of the strategic bomber program and his fiery speeches in both in and out of Congress’ chambers (Claiborne 1998; Robert K. Dornan: U.S. Congressman 1977-1997 n.d.). Dornan did many things in life, and consistently found himself in the limelight, which in Congress he took as an opportunity embrace the cause of the Republican party. Dornan was very much a firebrand, though much of his belligerence with Democrats may be attributed to his personal style and flair, which Dornan himself labeled “the courage to be flamboyant” (Clines 1995). Ideology serves as the cause without question, but the

nature of Dornan's invective comes from what is decidedly his own unique approach to challenging his political opponents.

Ronald C. Packard, by contrast, is notable for being much more affable, and very politically independent. Packard was also a Representative from California, born to a Mormon family in Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, January 19, 1931 (PACKARD, Ronald C. - Biographical Information n.d.). He attended Meridian Elementary school, graduated from Meridian High School, and began attending Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah in 1948. After two years there, Packard attended Portland State University, Portland, Oregon from 1952-1953. From 1953-1957, Packard earned his D.M.D. at the University of Oregon Dental School. Packard then joined the United States Navy Dental Corps, attaining the rank of lieutenant, serving from 1957-1959. Packard then worked for many years as a private practice dentist, eventually moving to Carlsbad, California. He was a member of the Carlsbad City Council from 1976-1978, whereupon he was elected mayor from 1978-1982. Packard then became the fourth successful write-in candidate for Congress, and the first in a three-way race, with a Republican and Democrat both already on the voting ballot. He served from 1983-2001, consistently winning reelection before retiring from Congress.

Packard is another example of a model politician, this time of the everyman type. Mostly at least—Packard's family was fairly poor, and large, with sixteen siblings in all (The Packard Family - ensign n.d.). When Packard was roughly ten years old, his father, on a construction job on Wake Island, became a civilian prisoner of the Imperial Japanese forces after Pearl Harbor was bombed. The family struggled but persevered, as Packard's father eventually returned home safely, though with health issues. Ronald Packard would carry his upbringing with him in life, and would find it both in his career as a dentist and as an elected official, his civic-mindedness

and orientation towards public service in any form no doubt influenced by the importance of family and charity. Packard worked hard in office, and secured funding for home-district projects like a senior's home. Packard generally was low profile in office, and only ever broke ranks with the Republican party—whom he primarily identified with after his write-in victory—on issues of giving aid to the poor (Perlman 1986). Packard could be very well summarized as possessing the friendly demeanor of a good dentist while holding unbreakable religious and personal beliefs informed by his upbringing. To say that he was a civil and productive member of Congress would be to potentially undersell him.

Looking between Dornan and Packard, it is clear that there is a wide personality gap, with individual attitudes and approaches to politics that are wholly different. Dornan embraced the role of firebrand, while Packard embraced the duty of a citizen-representative. Dornan went to Congress expecting a fight; Packard went to Congress expecting challenges, to be sure, but mainly expecting the diligence expected of him by his constituents. With very divergent occupations and backgrounds, Dornan and Packard were different arguably because of their distinct life experiences, with their ideological differences with their opponents playing little role in their behavior. Dornan very deliberately chose to be combative; while conservatism was his cause, he conscientiously accepted the role of combative legislator. Dornan and Packard, despite different upbringings, careers, and personalities, are similar in that both were consistent to a certain extent with their individual backgrounds and their own individual attitudes. The endogeneity problem of occupation and personality as competing but overlapping explanations is presented again, and this time there is enough dissimilarity in occupation that it is difficult to say it did not have an effect. Nonetheless, the consistency between attitude and career offers a strong alternative to differences of political opinion—Packard had a very conservative voting record,

and during the Reagan years no less, and yet was still very civil. The amount of public attention that Dornan and Packard received/sought (or did not) can be attributed to their conduct, which brings the discussion back to the individual attitudes of each.

Ideological difference and polarization do not appear to have been major factors in Dornan's incivility, and the inherently political nature of confrontation between members of Congress presents a potential endogeneity problem—incivility may be blamed on political differences, but the source of almost all contention in Congress is bound to be over political issues. Whether or not these political differences lead to actual incivility is questionable when almost all disagreements will be political; the common variable that is present across these is the people involved however, and how they handle these disagreements varies. These individual differences are the basis of this analysis, and Dornan and Packard present a strong case that these individual, rather than political, differences are the cause of incivility. Both were arguably ideologues, party-loyal and highly ideologically motivated, but their personal backgrounds in family, education, and occupation reveal more at play than just politics when examining their respective tendencies towards civility or incivility.

William M. Thomas and Joe L. Barton. The seventh overall pair, fourth House pair, and last pair altogether to be analyzed is William Marshall Thomas and Joe Linus Barton. Thomas was a Representative from California, born in Wallace, Shoshone County, Idaho on December 6, 1941 (THOMAS, William Marshall - Biographical Information n.d.). At some point he or his family moved to California, where he earned his A.A. at Santa Ana Community College in 1961, earned his B.A. and M.A. at San Francisco State University in 1963 and 1965, respectively. Thomas then became a faculty member at Bakersfield Community College, Bakersfield, California, where he remained from 1965-1974 (William Marshall Thomas n.d.). Thomas was

elected to the California state assembly in 1974, and served for four years until 1978, and then was elected to the national Congress, serving from January 3, 1979-2007. While in Congress Thomas served as chair for the House Oversight Committee (One Hundred Fourth to One Hundred Fifth Congresses), chair for the Committee on House Administration (One Hundred Sixth Congress), and chair of the Committee on Ways and Means (One Hundred Seventh to One Hundred Ninth Congresses). Thomas did not run for reelection to the One Hundred Tenth Congress in 2006, retiring.

On the surface Thomas appears to be another productive and prolific legislator and was so for most of his career. However, in 2003 Thomas called the Capitol Police to eject Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee from a Committee library, a moment of anger with the Democrats that boiled over (Stolberg 2003). He apologized profusely for his actions, but Thomas habitually had a tendency to rub his fellow members of Congress the wrong way (Weisman 2006). Thomas routinely controlled the Ways and Means Committee by keeping both parties at arm's distance and then forcing votes on bills, even very large and complex ones, that generally devolved into party-line voting. Thomas was both a skillful but very tough politician, much of his irritation to other members of Congress deriving from an efficiency that tolerated little in the way of obstruction of any sort. This made Thomas a headache for his own party as well as the Democrats. Some of this efficiency and orderliness may be traced to his days as a professor, though as with the other matched pairs it is difficult to say for certain; Thomas could have been a strict professor, or more easygoing until entering Congress, approaching it differently. Thomas' own attitudes likewise could be responsible, but politics do not seem to be the source of his incivility—especially since some of his fellow Republicans would likely claim some friendly fire from Thomas' methods of conducting business.

Thomas' matched pair is Joe Linus Barton, formerly a Representative from Texas, born in Waco, McLennan County, Texas on September 15, 1949 (BARTON, Joe Linus - Biographical Information n.d.). He graduated from Waco High School in 1968, and attended Texas A&M University at College Station, Texas, earning his B.A. in 1972. Barton earned an M.S. at Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana in 1973. Barton went to work, eventually becoming a business executive. In 1981, Barton was selected for the White House Fellow Program, in which he served as an aide to the then-Energy Secretary James B. Edwards (Joe Barton n.d.; Joe Barton's Biography - Vote Smart n.d.). Barton returned to the private sector after a year, before running for election in 1985, serving until 2019, at which point he retired. During his tenure, Barton was chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce from the One Hundred Eighth to One Hundred Ninth Congresses.

Barton was a fairly staunch Republican, and a friend to traditional Republican causes of market freedom and tax reform. He was also involved in energy policy, with his history in the private sector offering him familiarity with private sector energy (Joe Barton Congressman - 6th District of Texas 2010). Barton additionally promoted funding of research for health issues and internet privacy laws. Barton does not stand out in any particular way, aside from heading a committee. He was embroiled in a scandal over explicit photos that surfaced online, leading to a larger incident over affairs Barton had been conducting (Bernstein 2017). However, this had nothing to do with his behavior in Congress, and while his behavior received disapproval, Barton neither before, during, or after the incident conducted himself uncivilly on the floor. Overall, Barton was an ideologically standard Republican—if the liberty to describe him as such may be taken—who got caught in an affair and had a resulting scandal, but conducted himself in Congress professionally throughout his career.

Neither William Thomas or Joe Barton have anything in their educational or occupational backgrounds that would suggest they would be prone to incivility in Congress, leaving personality as the most likely explanation, as with Armev and Archer; the natural disposition of each seems to be the cause, as both Thomas and Barton were—relative to one another—fairly similar ideologically, yet handled themselves very differently. A case may be made that both are ideologues, party-loyal and ideologically motivated, but they conducted themselves differently and these differences can be traced with significant evidence that their individual attitudes were potential causes; again, their backgrounds reveal little in the way of suggestable causes. If one case of personality being a potential explanation because of weak similarities in experience and background is an anomaly, then two is a trend. It could be chance that two of the seven matched pairs proved to be fairly similar, and both were from the House of Representatives, on whom less information is readily available for teasing out differences. However, the possibility of influential factors innate to members of Congress that might explain incivility in contrast to external ones like experience may be worth addressing in future research. With this final matched pair, the analyses are concluded, and discussion of the findings and what implications they may hold can be conducted.

Discussion

The personal nature of incivility in Congress is intriguing and reveals a great deal about how politics are conducted and how productive Congress can—or cannot—be. Incivility has a history of ebbing and flowing, with some politicians becoming infamous for their time in Congress, like with Ben “Pitchfork” Tillman. The diverse backgrounds of these politicians offers both a microcosm of the country as a whole and also a golden opportunity for comparing the uncivil with the civil, allowing the nuanced context of these wide-ranging backgrounds to reveal key information that might explain the behavior of different legislators. While some of the count data yielded mixed findings, it nonetheless showed distinctly that certain aspects of education were definitely tied to the behavior of a legislator on the floor of Congress. Specifically, how advanced their education was, and if legal training was a part of it, as well as occupation—working in business at the lower levels, or as a lawyer and/or prosecutor. Some preliminary findings worth picking up and expanding upon in relation to family or religion may reveal patterns in those areas as well. Future research may reveal if there is more to upbringing and religion, possibly by going into greater depth with interviews if possible.

The mixed results drawn from DW-NOMINATE scores for testing partisanship showed with some certainty that polarization, that party politics and partisanship, cannot be entirely responsible for incivility. The background factors that have been tested suggest that while politics are connected in some cases, there is often a more wholistic, persona-typing involved. Another way of describing the phenomena, is a sort of role-playing by some members of Congress, taking on the role of troublemaker or peacemaker as best fits their own style and approach. This more psychological explanation goes beyond the bounds of these case studies,

but may be worth pursuing in future case studies. Additionally, further research into the conscientiousness of approaching and messaging political issues should consider how incivility (or lack thereof) is utilized as a tool, much as described by Darr (2005), as a “rhetorical enactment.”

It may otherwise prove difficult to gain sufficient understanding of the role played by experiences with a simple count of certain characteristics, which is certainly a limiting factor in the first-level of analysis. These backgrounds still proved useful though, sometimes coinciding with arguable personality-related causal influences, other times not. Additional research into personality type, or measures of general aspects of behavior arranged in a typology, either borrowed from psychology or created specifically for evaluating members of Congress, could help tease out the endogeneity problem between occupation and personal attitudes that repeatedly showed up in this study. While personality and choices regarding education and occupation may be demonstrable at low levels with each pairing, Armev and Archer, Dornan and Packard, and to a certain extent Tillman and Broussard stand out the most as examples where personality is an explanation that may be an alternative to or competitor with experiential factors. With respect to the case studies collectively, polarization and ideological friction both proved to be weak explanations in every case, which may lend to additional case studies. On closer examination, as done here, politics seems to be less influential than it is often given credit for in affecting legislators’ behavior, possibly because polarization is frequently taken in aggregate. Evaluation at an individual level versus a collective level suggests that alternative explanations may be valid and worth pursuing.

As to the uncivil members of Congress and their matched pairs, there is a great deal of opportunity to compare and contrast. One general finding is that the motivations behind incivility

may vary widely. Some may be for more personal reasons, a facet of personal flair and style—for example Ben Tillman and Robert Dornan—while for others it may be related more to how politics is approached, borrowing from personal inclination towards a more belligerent attitude, but serving a useful purpose. Huey Long and Jesse Helms may fit this second category, not pulling punches when challenged but not choosing to be combative deliberately. What was consistent was that, whether differences in background were great or small, inferential estimations of what sort of affect a given members' education or career may have had on their behavior in Congress was complimented by persistent evidence of personal attitudes and approaches to life that were distinct from the matched pairs. This endogeneity issue is the most vexing finding, and makes it difficult to make a conclusive statement as to the cause of incivility, beyond this; polarization is not as certain when in-depth small-*n* examination is conducted, and that personal attributes—experiential, attitudinal, or both—are definitely plausible causes for either civil or uncivil behavior.

The implications if both of these conclusions are true are twofold. First, it confirms that the conduct of members of Congress is less influenced by politics than believed, which suggests that polarization may not be solely responsible for deadlock, and could in fact be constructive. To follow Dodd and Schraufnagel's (2012) lead, if partisans in Congress are highly cooperative, some more uncivil, rough around the edges type behaviors could help kick-start Congress into gear, and promote better legislation by establishing meaningful dialogue on varied policy prescriptions. On the other hand, low incivility even when there is high polarization may lead to successful legislation by allowing compromises to be hashed out. A state of Congress in which there is conflict both politically and personally will most assuredly end in unproductiveness, while a Congress in which there is a great deal of cross-cutting politics between the parties and a

great degree of personal cooperation may lead to lax standards and legislating. The ramifications for legislative productivity based on the validity of polarization and personal incivility both could determine whether or not a lack of polarized politics is as desirable as is believed when said lack is affiliated with productivity. The reverse could prove true, either with unproductive legislation due to too much complacency or productive thanks to personal differences acting as a spur where political differences are absent. The conditional nature of productivity, when placed in this lens, makes determining whether or not there are more factors involved in legislative productivity than just political differences even more important.

Secondly, the evidence of these case studies would suggest that cooperation is not contingent on political differences alone, and if individual behavior is significant, then it would present a factor of productivity that—should legislators be self-conscious of the fact—could allow productivity to be manipulated, increasing it when polarization is high by making concerted efforts to be more cooperative, or prodding other legislators towards constructive competition when polarization is low. If Herbst (2010) is correct that civility is used as a tool conscientiously, then legislators may be more capable of affecting the atmosphere—and more importantly, productivity—of Congress than one may be led to believe if polarization is the primary cause of deadlock. If incivility is independent of polarization, then determining how and to what extent—picking up and continuing where this work leaves off—may provide the evidence necessary to ascertain how Congress' productivity is affected for certain. If additional work provides such evidence, it may change how polarization and the conduct of members of Congress, at the individual level is understood. Only further study will be able to fully elucidate these possibilities, but these case studies alone show that polarization may be over-emphasized at the expense of alternative explanations that have been neglected. Such neglect can be remedied,

and the potential results suggest that Congress may be more capable of productivity in times of ideological polarity than is sometimes thought. This is encouraging for those concerned with the productive and effective operation of democratic government.

WORKS CITED

- “ARCHER, William Reynolds, Jr. - Biographical Information.”
<http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=A000215> (April 11, 2018).
- “ARMEY, Richard Keith - Biographical Information.”
<http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=A000217> (April 11, 2018).
- “BARTON, Joe Linus - Biographical Information.”
<http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=B000213> (April 11, 2018).
- “Benjamin Ryan Tillman | Clemson University, South Carolina.”
<https://www.clemson.edu/about/history/bios/ben-tillman.html> (October 5, 2017).
- Bernstein, Aaron. 2017. “Republican Congressman Apologizes after Nude Photo, Lewd Text Surface.” *NBC News*. <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/politics-news/texas-congressman-joe-barton-apologizes-after-nude-photo-surfaces-n823426> (March 19, 2019).
- “Biography - About - Senator Thad Cochran.”
<https://www.cochran.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/biography> (November 7, 2017).
- “Blanton Censured, Falls Later in Faint.” 1921. *New York Times*.
<https://timesmachine.nytimes.com/timesmachine/1921/10/28/98761507.pdf>.
- “Blanton Expulsion from House Asked.” 1921. *The New York Times*.
<https://timesmachine.nytimes.com/timesmachine/1921/10/26/98759862.pdf>.
- “BLANTON, Thomas Lindsay - Biographical Information.”
<http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=B000549> (April 11, 2018).
- “BROUSSARD, Robert Foligny - Biographical Information.”
<http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=b000896> (October 5, 2017).
- Claiborne, William. 1998. “‘B-1 Bob’ Dornan Is on the Attack Again.” *Washington Post*.
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/campaigns/keyraces98/stories/dornan051698.htm> (May 9, 2018).
- Clines, Francis X. 1995. “Appearing Nightly: Robert Dornan, Master of the Put-Down.” *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/1995/06/27/us/appearing-nightly-robert-dornan-master-of-the-put-down.html> (May 9, 2018).
- “COCHRAN, William Thad - Biographical Information.”
<http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=C000567> (November 7, 2017).

- Conrad, Glenn R., ed. 1988. *A Dictionary of Louisiana Biography*. New Orleans, La: Louisiana Historical Association, In Cooperation With The Center For Louisiana Studies, University of Southwestern Louisiana.
- Cottrell, Debbie Mauldin. 2010. "BLANTON, ANNIE WEBB." <https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fbl16> (March 11, 2019).
- Darr, Christopher R. 2005. "Civility as Rhetorical Enactment: The John Ashcroft 'Debates' and Burke's Theory of Form." *Southern Communication Journal* 70(4): 316–28.
- Dodd, Lawrence C., and Scot Schraufnagel. 2012. "Congress and the Polarity Paradox: Party Polarization, Member Incivility and Enactment of Landmark Legislation, 1891–1994." *Congress & the Presidency* 39(2): 109–32.
- "DORNAN, Robert Kenneth - Biographical Information." <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=D000435> (April 11, 2018).
- "Fictional vs Factual." *The Jesse Helms Center*. <https://jessehelmscenter.org/fictional-vs-factual/> (October 23, 2018).
- Hall, Sam R. 2014. "Wife of GOP Sen. Thad Cochran of Mississippi Dies." *USA TODAY*. <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2014/12/12/thad-cochran-wife-rose-cochran-dies/20298599/> (May 11, 2018).
- . 2015. "Cochran Marries Longtime Aide Kay Webber." *The Clarion Ledger*. <https://www.clarionledger.com/story/politicalledger/2015/05/25/thad-cochran-marries-kay-webber/27912807/> (May 11, 2018).
- "HELMS, Jesse - Biographical Information." <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=H000463> (November 7, 2017).
- Herbst, Susan. 2010. *Rude Democracy: Civility and Incivility in American Politics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- "Huey Long's Assassination - Who Killed Huey Long." <http://www.hueylong.com/life-times/assassination.php> (November 21, 2017).
- "Huey Long's Life & Times - Education." <http://www.hueylong.com/life-times/education.php> (November 21, 2017).
- "Huey Long's Life & Times - Louisiana Governor Huey P. Long." <http://www.hueylong.com/life-times/governor.php> (November 21, 2017).
- "Huey Long's Life & Times - Presidential Candidate." <http://www.hueylong.com/life-times/presidential-candidate.php> (November 21, 2017).

- “Huey Long’s Life & Times - Senator Huey P. Long.” <http://www.hueylong.com/life-times/senator.php> (November 21, 2017).
- “Ivy League.” *Ivy League*. <https://ivyleague.com/> (February 15, 2019).
- Iyengar, Shanto, and Sean J. Westwood. 2015. “Fear and Loathing across Party Lines: New Evidence on Group Polarization: FEAR AND LOATHING ACROSS PARTY LINES.” *American Journal of Political Science* 59(3): 690–707.
- Jamieson, Kathleen Hall. 1992. *Dirty Politics: Deception, Distraction, and Democracy*. Oxford University Press.
- “Joe Barton.” <http://www.nndb.com/people/357/000032261/> (December 17, 2018).
- “Joe Barton Congressman - 6th District of Texas.” 2010. <https://web.archive.org/web/20100621055328/http://joebarton.house.gov/Back.aspx?Page=Biography> (December 17, 2018).
- “Joe Barton’s Biography - Vote Smart.” *Vote Smart*. <http://votesmart.org> (October 2, 2018).
- Levy, Jack S. 2008. “Case Studies: Types, Designs, and Logics of Inference.” In *Conflict Management and Peace Science*.
- “LONG, Huey Pierce - Biographical Information.” <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=L000418> (November 21, 2017).
- Loomis, Burdett A. 2000. *Esteemed Colleagues: Civility and Deliberation in the U.S. Senate*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Maisel, L. Sandy. 2012. “The Negative Consequences of Uncivil Political Discourse.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 45(3): 405–11.
- Miller, Thomas Lloyd. 2010. “BLANTON, THOMAS LINDSAY.” <https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fbl17> (May 8, 2018).
- Mooallem, Jon. 2014. “Lake Bacon: The Story of The Man Who Wanted Us to Eat Mississippi Hippos.” <https://www.thedailybeast.com/lake-bacon-the-story-of-the-man-who-wanted-us-to-eat-mississippi-hippos> (October 24, 2017).
- Mutz, Diana C., and Byron Reeves. 2005. “The New Videomalaise: Effects of Televised Incivility on Political Trust.” *The American Political Science Review* 99(1): 1–15.
- “Namesake - The Archer Center.” *The Archer Center*. <http://www.archercenter.org/namesake.html> (November 6, 2018).

- “The Packard Family - Ensign.” <https://www.lds.org/ensign/1984/02/the-packard-family?lang=eng> (December 17, 2018).
- “PACKARD, Ronald C. - Biographical Information.” <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=P000005> (April 11, 2018).
- Perlman, Jeffrey A. 1986. “Packard Known for His Independence : Constituent-Oriented Congressman Breaks With GOP on Social Issues - LA Times.” http://articles.latimes.com/1986-06-15/local/me-11333_1_social-issues (May 9, 2018).
- Platt, Rorin. “Senator Robert Rice Reynolds: An Atypical Tar Heel Politician and Isolationist.” *North Carolina History Project*. <http://northcarolinahistory.org/commentary/senator-robert-rice-reynolds-an-atypical-tar-heel-politician-and-isolationist/> (November 21, 2017).
- Pleasants, Julian M. 2000. *Buncombe Bob: The Life and Times of Robert Rice Reynolds*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- “The Political Graveyard: Iberia Parish, La.” <http://politicalgraveyard.com/geo/LA/IB-buried.html> (December 17, 2018).
- Ray, Joseph M. 2010. “THOMASON, ROBERT EWING.” <https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fth47> (May 8, 2018).
- “REYNOLDS, Robert Rice - Biographical Information.” <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=R000179> (November 21, 2017).
- Rich, Frank. 1995. “Journal; Closet Clout.” *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/1995/02/02/opinion/journal-closet-clout.html> (May 8, 2018).
- “Robert K. Dornan: U.S. Congressman 1977-1997.” <http://www.bobdornan.com/bio.html> (May 11, 2018).
- Rothbard, Murray N. 1994. “Washington Post Archives: Newt Gingrich Is No Libertarian.” http://www.antiwar.com/rep/wp_auth.html (March 12, 2019).
- Schmitt, Neal et al. 2007. “The Use of Background and Ability Profiles to Predict College Student Outcomes.” *The Journal of Applied Psychology* 92(1): 165–79.
- Schraufnagel, Scot. 2005. “Testing the Implications of Incivility in the United States Congress, 1977–2000: The Case of Judicial Confirmation Delay.” *The Journal of Legislative Studies* 11(2): 216–34.
- . (forthcoming). “Legislative Conflict: Are Ideologues More Uncivil.” Paper presented at the *Southern Political Science Association* conference (2018).

- “Senator Helms Biography.” *The Jesse Helms Center*. <https://jessehelmscenter.org/senator-helms-biography/> (October 23, 2018).
- Shea, Daniel M., and Alex Sproveri. 2012. “The Rise and Fall of Nasty Politics in America.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 45(03): 416–21.
- Simkins, Francis Butler. 1964. *Pitchfork Ben Tillman, South Carolinian*. Gloucester, Mass.: P. Smith.
- Stolberg, Sheryl Gay. 2003. “Lawmaker Apologizes for ‘Poor Judgment.’” *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2003/07/24/us/lawmaker-apologizes-for-poor-judgment.html> (May 9, 2018).
- Sullivan, Sean, and Paul Kane. 2018. “Mississippi’s Thad Cochran to Resign from Senate after Four-Decade Congressional Career.” *Washington Post*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/powerpost/mississippis-sen-thad-cochran-to-resign-from-the-senate-after-four-decade-congressional-career/2018/03/05/be8477d4-20c0-11e8-94da-ebf9d112159c_story.html (March 18, 2019).
- Supreme Court of New Mexico. 1955. “Uncle Johnny Mills V. Artesia Alfalfa Growers Association.”
- “THOMAS, William Marshall - Biographical Information.” <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=T000188> (April 11, 2018).
- Thomas-Lester, Avis. 2005. “A Senate Apology for History on Lynching.” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/06/13/AR2005061301720.html> (November 8, 2017).
- Thomason, Robert Ewing. 1971. *Thomason; The Autobiography of a Federal Judge*. ed. Joseph M. Ray. El Paso, Texas: Western Press.
- “THOMASON, Robert Ewing - Biographical Information.” <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=T000189> (April 11, 2018).
- “TILLMAN, Benjamin Ryan - Biographical Information.” <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=t000274> (October 5, 2017).
- Ulmer, S. Sidney. 1973. “Social Background as an Indicator to the Votes of Supreme Court Justices in Criminal Cases: 1947-1956 Terms.” *American Journal of Political Science* 17(3): 622.
- United States Congressional Serial Set*. 1920. U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Uslaner, Eric M. 1993. *The Decline of Comity in Congress*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

- Wakefield, Ann. 1990. "The Broussard Papers of the University of Southwestern Louisiana: New Light on Louisiana Progressivism." *Louisiana History: The Journal of the Louisiana Historical Association* 31(3): 293–300.
- Weisman, Jonathan. 2006. "Ways and Means Chairman to Step Down." <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/03/06/AR2006030600997.html> (May 9, 2018).
- "William Marshall Thomas." http://prabook.com:443/web/william_marshall.thomas/3529383 (December 17, 2018).
- Wolf, Michael R., J. Cherie Strachan, and Daniel M. Shea. 2012. "Incivility and Standing Firm: A Second Layer of Partisan Division." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 45(3): 428–34.

APPENDIX

Table A1.
Difference in the Occupational Backgrounds of Uncivil Members and their Matched Pair^a

	Uncivil Members (n=7) ^b	Control Group (n=7) ^b	% of Members in Each Occupation Category ^c
Educator	2	0	14
Education Administrator	1	0	7
Lawyer	2	5	50
Law Executive	0	1	7
Businessman	3	0	21
Business Executive	1	2	21
Medical Professional	0	1	7
Medical Profession Administrator	0	0	0
Journalist	0	2	14
Journalism Executive	0	2	14
Government Service	1	2	21
Government Official	5	3	57
Prosecuting Attorney	0	3	21
Agriculture	1	1	14
Large-scale Agriculture	1	0	7
Military Service	2	0	14
Military Officer	1	2	21
Politician	2	3	36

^aEach category is the cumulative results of binary observations (e.g., at least one instance observed that qualifies for a given category: for example, an individual qualifying as a Businessman multiple times is recorded as a 1; the cells above count how many individuals scored for a 1). All categories are mutually exclusive, e.g. all observations count at least one instance in which a job was held, and no categories overlap. For example, Businessman denotes at least one observed instance, distinct from any observed instance(s) of Business Executive. Another example is that a two-time CEO/Director of a company may be counted as a Business Executive, but not counted as Businessman.

^bn=14

^cTotal frequency, counting both Uncivil Members and Control Group.

Table A2.
Differences in the Familial Backgrounds of Uncivil Members and their Matched Pair

	Freq. (%) ^a	Uncivil Members (n=7) ^b	Control Group (n=7) ^b
Parental Marital Status ^c	100	7	7
Parental Vocation	29	2	2 (1)
Exceptional Parents	14	2	0 (1)
Had Siblings	79	5	6
Size of Family	<i>N/A</i> ^e	5	2.83 ^d
Number of Siblings	<i>N/A</i> ^e	4	1.83 ^d
Order of Birth	<i>N/A</i> ^e	3.86	1.2 (2)
Married	100	7	7
Divorced	21	1	2
Married Multiple Times	29	1	3
Had Children	93	7	6
Number of Children	<i>N/A</i> ^e	4.29	4

^aTotal frequency, counting both Uncivil Members and Control Group.

^bn=14; number of missing observations counted in parentheses if applicable.

^cAll observations were identical.

^dExcluding Ron Packard, whom was an extreme outlier with a family size of 17 and 16 siblings.

^eNon-binary categories provide averages, with *Not Available (N/A)* in Frequency row.