

Ouachita Baptist University

Scholarly Commons @ Ouachita

Honors Theses

Carl Goodson Honors Program

Spring 2020

Women in the U.S. Congress: A Study on the Role of Gender in Electoral and Legislative Processes

Selby Tucker

Ouachita Baptist University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlycommons.obu.edu/honors_theses



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Tucker, Selby, "Women in the U.S. Congress: A Study on the Role of Gender in Electoral and Legislative Processes" (2020). *Honors Theses*. 768.

https://scholarlycommons.obu.edu/honors_theses/768

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Carl Goodson Honors Program at Scholarly Commons @ Ouachita. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons @ Ouachita. For more information, please contact mortensona@obu.edu.

SENIOR THESIS APPROVAL

This Honors thesis entitled

“Women in U.S. Congress;
A Study on the Role of Gender in Electoral and Legislative Processes”

written by

Selby Caroline Tucker

and submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for completion of
the Carl Goodson Honors Program
meets the criteria for acceptance
and has been approved by the undersigned readers.

Dr. Douglas Reed, thesis director

Dr. Chris Brune, second reader

Dr. Casey Motl, third reader

Dr. Barbara Pemberton, Honors Program director

April 27, 2020

Introduction

Since a young age, I have been incredibly interested in the United States government. One of my oldest memories is watching the heartless attacks of September 11, 2001 with my grandfather. Another cherished memory is sitting around a television with my father and grandfather watching George Bush win the 2004 Presidential election. As a child, I dreamed of being the first female President of the United States instead of dreaming of my wedding day. I found joy in beating the boys at recess, just to prove that girls could compete just as well. To the right is one of my favorite childhood pictures, and one in which my parents take pride. What cannot be seen from this picture is that when I extended my arms, a sparkly American flag would appear. My patriotism has always been an integral part of who I am - a valuable piece of my puzzle.



Growing up, I was very conscious of my gender and how it played into others' perception of me. I can recall one time in particular where someone explicitly said to me, "You can't do that because you're a girl!" There were numerous times I could hear the thoughts of my companions almost as clear as if it was spoken. I saw the way I was underestimated. I tried to not let show my hurt that was a result of the prejudgment of my abilities. Instead, I showed them how capable I was of all that they could do and more. I began to find confidence in myself because of all the things that made who I am - including my gender.

When selecting a topic for my senior thesis, I knew I wanted to combine parts of my world into a piece that would fully encompass all aspects of my world - my accounting degree,

political science passion, and the confidence I have as a woman. After much thought, I decided an analysis of women and their role in the United States Congress was appropriate.

In our current political climate, gender is often viewed as a limiting factor. Why should one's gender define the amount of money they can earn, what bills it is appropriate to sponsor, and what offices they can hold? The number of women that are appearing on the ballot is steadily increasing, especially in the Democratic Party. Women are making headway in the area of politics but don't seem to be content in their current positions. Despite the increase of women in office, the question still remains, is the playing field level? Or, are women just fighting their way through gender bias?

These questions are not new thoughts or ideas, but there seem to be new answers every day. I will focus intently on one key factor that I believe is crucial to having women in Congress – campaign financing. Every candidates' contribution information is available, courtesy of the Federal Election Commission, and distinct money trail from the candidate to their donors. By studying how candidates got there, I will be able to better understand how candidates operate once in office. The policy priorities of an elected official may come from their donors' specific industry. The electoral history of each official may be dependent upon their prior ability to raise funds for their campaign. Overall, the campaign finances most definitely every candidate's story.

I used a three-part methodology - review, survey, and test. First, I reviewed what literature has been written about women serving in Congress and their campaign finances, bill sponsorship, and electoral history. After reviewing, I surveyed current women serving in Congress at various levels to learn about their personal experience as women in their field. To

test, I dove deep into the finances of women currently serving in Congress to analyze their ability to raise money. Using my three-part methodology, I examined women in Congress by studying their campaign finances, bill sponsorships, electoral history, and personal testaments to draw conclusions about the ability of a woman to fairly participate in the legislative process.

Literature Review

There has been a variety of research on the topic of women in Congress. From campaign finance to bill sponsorship to electoral history, it is important to examine the multitude of knowledge that is available on the journey of women throughout the legislative process. By reading eight articles and one book, I have aimed to compile knowledge to help me better understand the role of women in the United States House and Senate and complete the first tier of my methodology.

Campaign Finance

First, I reviewed available research on women candidates and their campaign financing by reading three articles. In the first article, entitled “Women March onto the Ballot in 2018”, Sarah Brynar and Doug Weber discuss the gender balance among the 2018 candidates for the national legislature and evaluate the donations, in regard to the amount of total donations, and the amount of the donations from females, political action committees, and parties. Initially, Brynar and Weber cite the apparent increase the 2018 election cycle saw with participation by Democratic women. When evaluating the 2018 election, 23% of the candidate pool consisted of female candidates, which was up 7% from 2016 and 13% from 1990. Of the female candidates in the 2018 election, 75% ran on the Democratic ticket. In total, 30% of the Democratic candidates were women, while only 13% of the Republican candidates were women. In campaign funding,

contributions from women have surged. For Democratic women, donations from other women account for 44% of the total. Women are not just giving to women though, as 34% of donations to Democratic men were made by women donors. Brynar and Weber indicate that a strong correlation can be drawn between women donors and women candidates, stating that they have a positive relationship. Women candidates, generally, earn more funding from other women. That connection rang true in comparing the 2018 financing records for Kristen Gillibrand and Elizabeth Warren, among other women, who earned over 50% of their contributions from women. The outlook for women, both as candidates and as donors, has changed from 2016 to 2018, and most certainly since 2008 or 2012. The obvious shift in equal representation for women at all levels came when Hillary Clinton won the bid for the Democratic party on the presidential ticket in 2016. She was the first major party candidate to earn a majority of her donations from women, coming in at a whopping 52%.

The second article I reviewed on campaign finance was “Can Women Win Big Without Big Money? How to Close the Funding Gap.” The article, written by Avery Blake and published online on *Forbes*, was based on the principle that there is a funding gap for one reason alone – gender. Blake cited the 2018 primary election for the House in which female Democratic primary winners raised \$185,000 less than their male counterparts within their own party, and even less for their counterparts in the Republican party. The bottom line, according to Blake, is that male political candidates are still raising more money than female candidates, even in the 2018 election. Building upon her bottom line, she states a number of ways to close the apparent funding gap. These initiatives are aimed at women in an effort to empower them to help themselves. She closes by citing campaign finance laws as being responsible for the enormous

role money plays in the outcome of elections. Until that time, she wants women to empower themselves through leveraging the opportunities they have now.

The last article that evaluates the current state of campaign finance for women was entitled “If You Can’t Join ‘Em, Beat ‘Em: The Gender Gap in Individual Donations to Congressional Candidates.” Published in 2010 by Michael Cresin and Janna Deitz, the article concludes that there is an advantage for women in drawing campaign contributions from individual donors through the changing congressional donor pool full of female donor networks. They cite these donor networks, as they call them, as essential to females’ campaign financing because the candidates earn a large boost in funding from being supported by such networks. The networks provide the seed money that enables success. In comparison, those who are not supported by the network suffer in comparison to the Democratic women who make up much of the female candidate pool. In addition, Cresin and Deitz also cite the ideological preferences of donors influencing their contribution decisions and, more often than not, benefitting Democratic women. The duo draw several hypotheses from their understanding of donor networks attributing to the success of candidates and ideological preferences. They test their hypothesis in an effort to rationalize just how to beat the other side when a candidate can’t join them. They utilize the contribution data of 2,144 candidates - male and female - and evaluate female success in comparison to that of their male counterparts. Their results show that female candidates, with the help of the donor networks, raise about \$74,200 more than male candidates do, *ceteris paribus*. Overall, female candidates have had more success in raising contributions from individuals than males. They conclude by stating that the area of campaign finance is persistently influenced by

substantial partisan gender differences, which, they claim, can fuel the partisan gender gap that is growing in Congress.

Bill Sponsorship

After evaluating a female candidate's campaign financing, I evaluated the performance of those ultimately elected to serve. I first looked at what type of legislation women legislators are most likely to sponsor or what issues in which they are most likely to identify with. The first article I reviewed was entitled "Bridging the Gender Gap in Bill Sponsorship," written in 2007 by Michelle A. Barnello and Kathleen A. Bratton. By evaluating the upper and lower chamber of 15 state legislatures in 2001, they cited the tendency of women to sponsor bills that were women's and children's issues. Women's issues, according to Barnell and Bratton, are issues that focus on reproduction or other health issues, but may evolve over time. More specifically, these are issues that pertain to the equality of women, address women's needs, children's issues, protection of children, and women as caregivers. Women are likely to act just on their preferred issues to tackle, as they do not conform to party control or diversity of the legislature they are serving in. The article also addresses the question of how men respond to women's issues. How many women does it take to influence the behavior of other women in the legislature? Do women influence men's legislative behavior? The authors conclude that men are interested in the same issues as women, and there really aren't women's issues, per se. They cite Michele L. Swers stating that women bring unique experiences and viewpoints but don't limit the issues with which a woman can identify herself with.

In "Women's Issues and Their Fates in Congress," Craig Volden, Alan E. Wiseman, and Dana E. Wittmer defined the concept of women's issues and tracking the success of bills with

those topics through the legislative process. Volden, Wiseman, and Wittmer drew attention to other possible ways to define women's issues, such as those that the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues supports, but ultimately included the following: healthcare, children, education, sexual discrimination, abortion, and those that advance feminist outcomes. Women introduce bills relating to these topics more often than men. The three used a dataset of 119,845 bills from the U.S. House of Representatives from 1973-2002 to track the success, or lack thereof, of bills pertaining to these issues. They concluded that women are more likely to help push through the legislative bills that address "women's issues." They first categorized bills into their respective policy areas and earmarked if they were women's issues or not. Next, they analyzed their initial sponsor by sex. To complete the process, they tracked the bills' success through the legislature. Their results showed that no attention was given in committee whatsoever to 93% of the bills introduced by women, and 95% of those bills were the subject of women's issues. They conclude that bills supported by women do not succeed like those that earn the backing and sponsorship by men. In my independent study, however, I found that according to GovTrack, as many as 7% of bills do not make it out of committee at all. Their results were no different than the standard for bills in the 93rd – 107th Congresses.

Mary Layton Atkinson and Jason Harold Windett wrote in their article, entitled "Gender Stereotypes and the Policy Priorities of Women in Congress," about the challenges that stem from gender on the campaign trail and their own take on what can be categorized as a "women's issue." The two acknowledged that women are just as likely as men to win Congressional races, but claim that more sex-related obstacles exist on the campaign trail for women than men. When seeking office, women candidates most often have challengers and are more likely to face

opponents. It is commonly believed that women seeking office are more likely to gain challengers because of the gender stereotype that doubts the ability of women to handle important issues (foreign affairs, defense, etc.). Atkinson and Windett examined the success women have in overcoming the stereotypes that plague them and concluded that women are partially successful and, because of their success, aid in creating diverse legislatures filled with an abundant variety of topics covered in bill sponsorship. Women, as a result of their steadfastness, have widened their areas of expertise to include a variety of topics, including masculine issues that seemingly disadvantage women. The fruit of their efforts is an increase in competence over an increased range of topics, hoping to increase their future electoral success. Because of their already grounded interest in district and women's topics, the addition of new issues to their repertoire will allow them to appear more balanced and competent to do the job of congresswoman. By testing the bills introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1963-2000, the two concluded that females introduce more bills than men across a wider range of issues. The implications of their findings state that women's high efforts and increased knowledge over a large array of issues and areas does not advantage them. Instead, it puts them on a level playing field.

Electoral History

In order to further study the effect gender has on the electoral process, I found it necessary to study the electoral history of women. The first article I read directly assessed the factor of gender in elections in the 1970s and 1980s. James G. Benze, Jr. and Eugene R. Declercq entitled their article "The Importance of Gender in Congressional and Statewide Elections" that they published in 1985. Benze and Declercq noted that the number of women

both seeking and winning office has been increasing since the 1970s. They cited the increase to be mostly in offices that seemed to be less important to the general public, such as the state legislature, Secretary of State, or other offices that are considered to be “women’s offices”, because women have more difficulty in more “important” races. They first evaluated the campaign styles of each gender and concluded that fundraising was the most important for both genders and overall the styles were very similar. Women do face challenges when it comes to raising money, such as the perception that women can’t win, they are less competent than males, and women do not have access to the established network of fundraisers the male challengers do. It is apparent to Benze and Declercq that females have less political experience than their male counterparts. Through their studies, they found gender to not be a determinant variable when evaluating congressional and statewide campaigns but did conclude it was important. Gender was identified as a factor in half of the races they studied. They concluded that losers tend to see gender as a problem, whereas winners do not. Overall, the gender-based difficulties in campaign financing and, thus, electoral victory seem to be dwindling, but female candidates seem to still have barriers to overcome.

Eric R. A. N. Smith and Richard L. Fox study the underrepresentation of women in Congress in their article “The Electoral Fortunes of Women Candidates for Congress,” published in 2001. To begin, they call attention to the apparent blatant prejudices held by Americans against women in politics. Smith and Fox hypothesize that the stereotypes that surround both men and women politicians actually benefit men. They then counter by claiming that other voters show biases in favor of politicians. Using data from the 1988, 1990, and 1992 elections for the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, Smith and Fox concluded that women are

preferred by voters in House races, but the same preference is not given to women in Senate races. They also found evidence suggesting well-educated women voters strongly support women candidates, which is seen as a contributing factor to the small advantage held by women candidates running against a challenger or incumbent. Women also hold an advantage if there is no incumbent running in the race, thus being deemed an “open-seat” race, because women voters support women candidates. In closing, they also draw from their studies that to male voters, the gender of the candidate was not a significant factor.

To conclude the topic of electoral history, I felt it necessary to look back to the very beginning of women being represented in Congress. To do so, I read “Women in Congress (1917-2006)” which was prepared under the direction of the House Administration Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives while Vernon J. Ehlers served as chairman and Juanita Millender-McDonald served as ranking member. This book tells the story of women in congress starting from the time of no representation to now, serving in party leadership roles. They note that the change of the gender makeup of Congress has been unique, sometimes imperceptible, and other times bold. The authors state that women, while serving in Congress, take one of two approaches. The first approach is to adapt to the institution and not emphasize their differences as two separate genders with separate issues. Others have used their office to speak out on behalf of women or aim to advance feminist or other “women’s issues.” Neither approach is incorrect, but some women seem to prefer one strategy more than the other. Initially, women seemed to assimilate to the legislative institution, while more modern congresswomen have sought to embrace their given gender and role, challenging the norms of the institution. The book breaks down Congressional history into four groups – Women Pioneers (1917-1934), The Age of Crisis

(1935-1954), *The New Face of Women in Congress* (1955-1976), and *Recent Trends Among Women in Congress* (1977-2006). When studying women pioneers on Capitol Hill, it is completely necessary to discuss what was known as the “widow’s mandate,” stating that upon the death of a husband, who served in Congress until his death, his widow would be appointed to fill his office. The idea of widow succession was the avenue in which most women got a seat in the legislature in the early days of female representation. Women who were serving in Congress stuck to topics such as caregiving, education, and consumer roles because they were “gender-appropriate” for them. Some of the very first women to set foot in Congress were Jeannette Rankin of Montana, who also was the only member of Congress to vote against the U.S. participation in World War I and II, Alice Mary Robertson of Oklahoma, and Hattie Caraway of Arkansas, the first female Senator. When the age of crisis came, women were advancing politically. Among this second generation of female legislators, half of them had served at the state level. Because of increased political experience, women were able to secure coveted committee assignments like never before, ranging from committees on Armed Services to Interior and Internal Affairs. While serving in such capacities, women were able to bring domestic perspectives to many debates held during the time of the Great Depression and World War II. These women did not carve out an area of legislation to be their issues and simply advocate for that, but, instead, chose to be well-rounded legislators. Despite their efforts, institutional and cultural barriers remained for women such as Elizabeth H. Gasque of South Carolina, Jessie Sumner of Illinois, and Caroline O’Day of New York, who served in this second era. Starting in 1955 and going until 1977, women legislators seemed to evolve from traditionalist to feminists. In addition, the racial diversity among women was ever-increasing.

The type of woman elected to serve in this era was now well-educated and professional with some type of specialized training. Women also had increased political experience from state legislatures and other legislative institutions. Opposite from what previous women who served in Congress had done, women in this third era legislated on issues that pertained to their gender. Their belief of equality among genders in society, politics, and economics led their feminist legislative agenda. One of their most notable causes was the requirement of equal pay for similar work. Aside from economics, women of this era took a strong interest in consumer affairs, education, foreign affairs, and the transparency of government. Women such as Martha Wright Griffiths of Michigan, Patsy T. Mink of Hawaii, and Yvonne Brathwaite Burke of California, challenged the institution of Congress by not conforming to traditional dress codes and questioning their male colleagues. The most recent group of women in Congress is the largest and most diverse. In this new era, political experience and professional expertise speak more for women than their familial ties. More women are elected with more electoral experience and higher education. In 1977, at the beginning of this new era for women in Congress, the Congresswoman's Caucus was formed with the mission to inform others about women's issues, create and advance women's legislation, and ensure federal initiatives affecting women are being monitored. The fifteen women who joined the caucus opened the door for what is now the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, which now accepts membership from males. Women of this era are on virtually every committee, even some having leadership on their committees and representation in every area of legislation. The Decade of Women (1992-2002), which falls in this era, saw women across the nation becoming energized to become politically active, whether at the polls or on the ballots. Women celebrated when California Democratic

Representative Nancy Pelosi became the first woman to serve as party leader and, now, Speaker of the House. Her success was made possible by the efforts of Jennifer Dunn of Washington, Tillie Fowler of Florida, and Deborah Pryce of Ohio, who all came before her.

To conclude my literature review, I believe it is evident that women do not have it “easy” in the legislative process. Whether it be campaign financing, bill sponsoring, or getting elected, women must be diligent in their efforts to be known and make a difference.

The Women Behind the Office

In order to fulfill the second part of my methodology, I surveyed women currently working in Congress today. I was named the 2019 Ben Elrod Scholar by the Carl Goodson Honors Program at Ouachita Baptist University. This honor provided funding for me to visit Washington, D.C. in July of 2019, where I interviewed three incredible women currently serving in Congress in various capacities. I believed it was important that I heard the personal testimonies firsthand from women in order for my thesis to become much more personal. It is one thing to study facts, while it is another to get to know the women behind the office. My goal is to tell their stories in hopes of inspiring other women who have set their sights on public office.

I asked the following questions to women working in Congress:

1. Describe yourself in three words.
2. What sparked your desire to work in public service?
3. Have you ever worked on a campaign for a female candidate?
4. If you answered “yes” to question three, do you believe her gender posed challenges for her campaign when raising funds?

5. If you answered “yes” to question four, how did you overcome those challenges?
6. While working in Congress, what have you learned about being a woman in your role?
7. Do you have any advice for young women who dream of working in Congress or public service?

I asked the following questions to Congresswomen:

1. Describe yourself in three words.
2. What sparked your desire to serve in public office?
3. Do you believe your gender posed challenges for your campaign when raising funds?
4. If you answered “yes” to question two, how did you overcome those challenges?
5. While in office, what have you learned about being a woman in Congress?
6. Do you have any advice for young women who dream of serving in public office?

I first interviewed Madeline Bryant, the current Scheduler for Congressman Bruce Westerman (AR-04). Bryant interned for Senator John Boozman of Arkansas during the summer of 2017, and eventually moved to DC in the summer of 2018, where she first served as Staff Assistant for Congressman Westerman. She has aspirations of serving in a communications role. Bryant believes she is driven, a team-player, and a perfectionist. An internship with Senator Boozeman, her senior thesis, and love for government brought her to D.C. When asked about her electoral experience with female candidates, she shared her experience working on a small city council campaign for a female candidate who was running against another female. “I never really found there to be any gender challenging aspects there – I just showed up to work every day and did it.” I listened intently to her responses on her experience in Congress thus far, as she has held many positions that are commonly considered great ways to start a successful career in public

service. She shared, “What I think is interesting about it is that I'm fortunate to be in an office where my role as scheduler is very valued and I feel very valued. I've just never felt unvalued as a female in my work environment – ever. I am very fortunate to feel that way and I know that there are several women out there who may not feel that. But, I have always felt equally valued and as an equal part of the team as everyone else.” Bryant had advice that applies not only to women, but to anyone - stay open minded about what you do. More specifically to women interested in serving in public office, she says “go for it!”

Emily Mace, currently serving as Legislative Director for Congressman Morgan Griffith (VA-09), was the second woman in Congress with whom I spoke.. Her career in Congress started with an internship in the office of Bruce Westerman in the summer of 2017 after she finished law school. She progressed straight from intern to legislative assistant, where she worked on a variety of issues. She moved in the spring of 2019 to her current position with Congressman Griffith. Mace believes she can describe herself as caring, focused, and reflective. A desire to be happy in her career brought her to Congress. Mace has not had any female electoral experience. While working in Congress in various roles, Mace shared that she has learned that “it’s not just about being a woman, it’s about all the factors that come along with being a woman. It’s a lot of little things that, I believe, aren’t intentional but affect the overall perception of me as a woman, and sometimes negatively or inferior. I’ve learned that I need to make an extra effort to adopt some characteristics that don’t come naturally to me, personally.” Mace shared some wisdom that applies to all. “My advice is to, first of all, take advantage of every opportunity that you have. If you think it’s an opportunity for you, take it - from small to big things. Also, work hard at the thing you are doing at that moment instead of trying to climb a ladder. If you are working hard

where you're at, that's going to go a long way in demonstrating to others who you are and what you're about."

My highest profile interview was with Virginia Foxx, the Representative for the 5th district of North Carolina. She was incredibly insightful and kind with all she had to share. Representative Foxx believes she is hard-working, principled, and a perfectionist. Her experience on the local school board, and her continuing desire to serve the members of her community brought her to Congress. She believes her gender has posed immense challenges for her when raising campaign funds, among challenges in other areas. "Women don't know a lot of people who have a lot of money," Foxx claims. In an effort to overcome her challenges in raising money, she "works hard," as she claims women always do when faced with obstacles. I was incredibly eager to hear of her experience as a Congresswoman. She shared, "It's like any other profession where women are in the minority; you have to work harder to be recognized. Or, you have to have unique qualifications or characteristics. Until women are a critical mass in any group, they are not given the attention or privileges that come with being in the majority." Representative Foxx had advice for young males and females - "do your best to be financially independent and have a life before you run for office." She believes this allows you to be the best public servant you can be.

Each woman had individual answers that were particularly intriguing, but as a whole, they all revolved around similar ideas. It was apparent that they all very strongly felt that their gender should not be viewed as a limiting factor. Emily acknowledged that it may not be her gender specifically, but some attributes that are commonly associated with her gender that may pose the actual challenges. Rep. Foxx noted that her gender itself is an obstacle, and must be

combated with hard work and commitment to reaching goals. In addition, each woman had very unique experiences thus far in Congress, and I believe the same could be said for all women. Madeline expressed that she has not experienced any animosity towards her on the basis of her gender, but acknowledged that not all women are that fortunate. Rep. Foxx is one of those women, who has fought daily for a seat at the table. From speaking with these women, I am happy to conclude that I believe there is a place for everyone in Congress. Although it is true that some have to fight harder than others, I rest easily knowing everyone is represented well and can serve if they so choose.

Statistical Research Design

Hypothesis

In an effort to collect statistical research, I found it imperative to test the third portion of my methodology, hypothesis regarding women and campaign finance. I formulated five hypotheses, based upon my findings in my literature review and previous knowledge of women in Congress. My hypotheses are as follows:

Hypothesis 1 - Women earn less campaign contributions than their male counterparts.

Hypothesis 2 - White women and non-white women earn less campaign contributions than their male counterparts.

Hypothesis 3 - Women running under the Democrat party label earn campaign contributions equal to their male counterparts, while women running under the Republican party label earn smaller campaign contributions than their male counterparts.

Hypothesis 4 - Women with more congressional experience earn campaign contributions equal to their male counterparts.

Hypothesis 5 - Gender does not play a role in the campaign contributions for candidates in elections with an incumbent and a challenger.

Research Design

In order to test these hypotheses, I began by compiling a complete list of the members of the 116th Congress in the House of Representatives as of June 1, 2020. I used the House of Representatives only in all of my statistical research, as all seats were up in the 2018 election. From that list, I created two samples. First, I created a sample of women currently serving in the U.S. House, which I referred to as sample 1, or S1, totaling 102 women. I divided the women into five groups according to the number of years they have served in Congress - group 1 was composed of members who had 20 + years of experience, group 2 members have served for 15-19 years, members who have 10-14 years of experience form group 3, group 4 includes members with 5-9 years of service in Congress, and members who have served in Congress for 4 or less years make up group 5. I chose every 5th member of each group, totaling 21 women. I proceeded to collect the following data for each woman (and their opponent in the 2018 general election): opponent in the 2018 general election, office status (did they win the seat?), election status (incumbent or challenger?), gender, party (Republican, Democrat, or other), race (White or Nonwhite), region, age, margin of victory or defeat put into a “seriousness” variable (did they win by more or less than 10% of the vote?), and their total contributions earned for their 2018 campaign. Once S1 had all the necessary data, I repeated the process almost entirely to create a random sample of the current members of the House, regardless of gender, entitled S2. All steps were the same, except every 19th person in each group was chosen. The same data was collected for S2 as S1.

Summary of Statistical Findings

Before running tests, I eliminated any individual who did not report their earnings to the FEC. I ran a variety of tests on my data, including means and Anova procedures. I used .05 as the threshold for statistical significance for my Anova procedure.

Before I began testing my hypotheses, I wanted to ensure the results of my test would not be impacted by my method of selecting my samples. I was worried that since S1 is composed of women who were successful in winning their office, it would be likely they raised more money than their opponent in an effort to be victorious. Since this would be the case for one-half of the women in S1, I ran a means procedure with an Anova test of significance to see if there was a statistically significant difference between the means of the two samples. Table 1, the results of the means procedures, and Table 2, the results of the Anova test of significance, eased my worries as it affirmed there is no statistically significant difference in the average amount of campaign funds raised by candidates in S1 and S2.

Table 1 - Report for Total Contributions			
Sample Status	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
FEMALE ONLY Sample	1692650.066	39	2325868.817
RANDOM Sample	1252509.965	36	1164023.784
Total	1481382.818	75	1862202.622

Table 2 - ANOVA Table						
TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS * SAMPLE STATUS		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Between Groups	3626500329007.600	1	3626500329007.600	1.046	.310
	Within Groups	252990596544949.200	73	3465624610204.783		
	Total	256617096873956.780	74			

I tested my first hypothesis discussing the correlation between a candidate's gender and their total contributions. By running a means procedure, I am able to analyze the average amount of funds raised by female candidates to their male counterparts. The results from my means procedure are shown below in Table 3.

Table 3 - Report of Total Contributions			
Gender	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Female	2085572.680	35	2251768.313
Male	952716.688	40	1243086.884
Total	1481382.818	75	1862202.622

Women, on average, raised \$2,085,572.68 for their campaign, while their male counterparts raised only an average of \$952,716.69. There is a \$1,132,855.99 differential between the average campaign funds raised by the two groups. My hypothesis was not supported, as I anticipated women would raise significantly less than men. I am surprised by the results of this means procedure, as it contradicts not only my hypothesis, but a good amount of literature I read. When running a test of significance, it became clear that I might have gotten it all wrong. In Table 4 below, there is a statistically significant difference in the two genders' ability to raise campaign

funds. From here, I can draw the conclusion that successful women candidates may not be at any disadvantage.

TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS * GENDER		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Between Groups	23956103684735.234	1	23956103684735.234	7.516	.008
	Within Groups	232660993189221.620	73	3187136893003.036		
	Total	256617096873956.880	74			

My second hypothesis studies the relationship between gender, race, and total contributions. I anticipated women, regardless of their race, will have a harder time raising campaign funds. When analyzing white candidates via means and anova procedure, it is clear that my hypothesis was very incorrect. Table 5 confirms that white women raise more campaign funds, on average, by about \$1.6 million.

Gender	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Female	2793290.924	22	2561903.422
Male	1192146.645	28	1371694.076
Total	1896650.128	50	2119955.551

There is a statistically significant difference between white males and females, coming in at .007, as shown in Table 6. I did not anticipate, though, that it would fall in the women’s favor.

Table 6 - ANOVA Table						
TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS * GENDER		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Between Groups	31584328204465.617	1	315843328204465.617	8.037	.007
	Within Groups	188632037172447.300	48	3929834107759.319		
	Total	220216365376912.940	49			

Results for campaign contributions for nonwhite women did not support my hypothesis, as shown in Tables 7 and 8. It is clear that race and gender favor women for average funds raised by the results of the means procedure shown in Table 7. Non-white women raised almost twice as much, on average, as men.

Table 7 - Report of Total Contributions			
Gender	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Female	1061272.062	10	619526.644
Male	522598.461	9	663143.411
Total	806110.893	19	680966.586

Although the groups are significantly different, the differences are not statistically significant. Table 8 shows the Anova procedure results, confirming that for successful nonwhite candidates, gender does not help or harm.

Table 8 - ANOVA Table						
TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS * GENDER		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Between Groups	1374486015038.904	1	1374486015038.904	3.351	.085
	Within Groups	6972392837567.295	17	410140755151.017		
	Total	8346878852606.199	18			

An incredibly hot topic in our current political climate, hypothesis three discusses gender within political parties. I examined the difference in campaign contributions of women and men in the Democratic party and the difference in campaign contributions of women and men in the Republican party. Because of my knowledge of party platforms, I predicted women will be treated fairly in the Democratic party, while they might struggle if running as a Republican. As indicated by the results of my means and Anova procedures, that is false. First, women running as Democrats, on average, earned more money than men, as shown below in Table 9.

Table 9 - Report of Total Contributions			
Gender	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Female	2114272.877	27	2169207.479
Male	1206656.920	14	1125618.980
Total	1804451.819	41	1913165.689

Although women outraised men by almost \$1 million, the difference in the two genders for the Democratic party is not statistically significant via an Anova procedure. Table 10 shows my results.

Table 10 - ANOVA Table						
TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS * GENDER		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Between Groups	7594894715885.813	1	7594894715885.813	2.134	.152
	Within Groups	138813223460561.280	39	3559313422065.674		
	Total	146408118176447.100	40			

I very much anticipated to see a distinct and significant difference in contributions for women and men in the Republican party. To my surprise, women outraised men by \$1 million on average. See table 11, where the results of the means procedure are shown.

Table 11 - Report of Total Contributions			
Gender	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Female	1988709.514	8	2671446.108
Male	883274.846	24	1335020.468
Total	1159633.513	32	1780546.463

When testing for statistical significance, the relationship came up short. There is not a statistically significant difference, as shown in Table 12, for the amount of contributions to male and female candidates in the Republican party.

Table 12 - ANOVA Table						
TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS * GENDER		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Between Groups	7331914824665.011	1	7331914824665.011	2.418	.130
	Within Groups	90948802070659.190	30	3031626735688.640		
	Total	98280716895324.200	31			

My literature review revealed experience to be a key factor in the success or failure of a female candidate. Experience in Congress is the variable I used to evaluate that theory. I hypothesized that women who have more congressional experience will not see a significant difference in the amount of the campaign contributions in comparison to men with similar years of experience. When evaluating the average campaign contributions of those with 10+ years of experience, men raised slightly, about \$400,000, more than women. Table 13 shows the differential in the average of the two groups given by the means procedure.

Table 13 - Report of Total Contributions			
Gender	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Female	1162980.839	8	643084.251
Male	1518368.965	6	599095.727
Total	1315290.036	14	627725.501

Although there is a difference in the averages of these two groups, it does not reach the threshold for statistical significance. Even if a female candidate is very experienced, there is no real significant difference in the amount of contributions they will earn, as shown in Table 14.

Table 14 - ANOVA Table						
TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS * GENDER		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Between Groups	433031040958.238	1	433031040958.238	1.108	.313
	Within Groups	4689479929060.663	12	390789994088.389		
	Total	5122510970018.901	13			

I anticipated a significant difference in the amount of contributions raised by men and women for those with little congressional experience, pondering that men would be able to raise more. The results of the means procedure I ran contradicted my original hypothesis as shown in Table 15.

Table 15 - Report of Total Contributions			
Gender	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Female	2821092.928	18	2372851.447
Male	1419708.433	8	674557.530
Total	2389897.699	26	2095512.046

It is incredible that women out-raised men almost 2:1 in the group with 10 or less years of experience. The results of the Anova procedure, shown below in Table 16, were incredibly close to being statistically significant, but come up short. Although the average women had more campaign contributions than the average man in this category, the difference is not statistically significant.

Table 16 - ANOVA Table						
TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS * GENDER		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Between Groups	10876865547647.547	1	10876865547647.547	2.639	.117
	Within Groups	98902402824542.340	24	4120933451022.598		
	Total	109779268372189.890	25			

My last hypothesis tested the common perception that incumbents raise more than their challengers. I believed that electoral status - either incumbent or challenger - plays a stronger role than a candidate's gender. In terms of my anticipated results for the statistical tests, I

anticipated no statistical significance will be observed, but there will be some small differences in the average amounts raised for each gender. When testing challengers, I was very close to having my hypothesis overturned. As shown in Table 17, the average amount raised by female challengers is almost three times as much as males.

Table 17 - Report of Total Contributions			
Gender	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Female	595846.400	8	628874.196
Male	203612.938	18	440761.016
Total	324300.157	26	526233.793

The results of the Anova procedure were just hundredths away from proving statistical significance for the difference in gender favoring women. See Table 18.

Table 18 - ANOVA Table						
TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS * GENDER		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Between Groups	852076182190.245	1	852076182190.245	3.368	.079
	Within Groups	6070973931786.771	24	252957247157.783		
	Total	6923050113977.017	25			

When examining the relationship between, gender, incumbency, and total contributions, I did not anticipate much differentiation, and was proven correct. Per the means procedure and shown in Table 19, men and women raised almost the exact same amount of money for their campaign efforts.

Table 19 - Report of Total Contributions			
Gender	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Female	1353353.867	18	685201.410
Male	1474787.218	12	637817.201
Total	1401927.207	30	658174.245

Because of such a narrow margin for the average of the two groups, the results of the Anova procedure are nowhere near statistically significant, proving that gender is overshadowed by incumbency in the battle for election campaign contributions. Table 20 shows such results.

Table 20 - ANOVA Table						
TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS * GENDER		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Between Groups	106171622601.202	1	106171622601.202	.239	.629
	Within Groups	12456435130025.970	28	444872683215.213		
	Total	12562606752627.172	29			

Conclusion

My study of women in Congress has yielded many remarkable and insightful thoughts.

Below is a quick summary of my findings:

Findings on Hypothesis 1 - Women earned more campaign contributions than their male counterparts.

Findings on Hypothesis 2 - White women and non-white women earned more campaign contributions than their male counterparts.

Findings on Hypothesis 3 - Women running under the Democrat party label earned equal campaign contributions as their male counterparts, while women running under the Republican party label earned equal campaign contributions as their male counterparts.

Findings on Hypothesis 4 - Women with more congressional experience earned equal campaign contributions as their male counterparts.

Findings on Hypothesis 5 - Gender did not play a role in the campaign contributions for candidates in elections with an incumbent and a challenger.

In conclusion, I can identify one common thread among all topics that I studied for all women that participate in the legislative process one way or another – fight. Women fight on the campaign trail to raise funds to put them on a level playing field with their opponent. Women fight to win their race against fierce challengers. Women fight to advance bills regarding women’s issues in both chambers of Congress. Women have fought for their equality in the legislative process for almost a century now, and I don’t believe they will be finished fighting any time soon. The question to be asked, I believe, is do they fight because they’re at a disadvantage, or because of the nature of politics? To that, I answer that the nature of politics causes women to have to fight. When reflecting upon my results, I don’t see women to be at a disadvantage when it comes to raising campaign funds. I will, however, note that I do see disadvantages at different places in the overall legislative process. Politics, by nature, is brutal. Women must fight to stay alive, just as everyone else. Their gender, though, does make a difference in regards to the amount they must fight for equality in the legislative process.

Bibliography

- “Women March onto the Ballot in 2018.” *OpenSecrets.org*, Mar. 2018,
www.opensecrets.org/news/reports/women-candidates
- Blank, Avery. “Can Female Candidates Win Big Without Big Money? How To Close The Funding Gap.” *Forbes*, Forbes Magazine, 4 Nov. 2018,
www.forbes.com/sites/averyblank/2018/11/04/can-female-candidates-win-big-without-big-money-how-to-close-the-funding-gap/#5d472e581603
- Manning, Jennifer E., et al. *Women in Congress: Historical Overview, Tables, and Discussion*. Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, 2015.
- Barnello, Michelle A., and Kathleen A. Bratton. “Bridging the Gender Gap In Bill Sponsorship.” *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 3, 2007, pp. 449–474.,
doi:10.3162/036298007781699645.
- Atkinson, Mary Layton, and Jason Harold Windett. “Gender Stereotypes and the Policy Priorities of Women in Congress.” *Political Behavior*, 2018,
doi:10.1007/s11109-018-9471-7.
- Crespin, Michael H., and Janna L. Deitz. “If You Can’t Join ’Em, Beat ’Em: The Gender Gap in Individual Donations to Congressional Candidates.” *Political Research Quarterly*, vol. 63, no. 3, 2009, pp. 581–593., doi:10.1177/1065912909333131.
- Smith, Eric R. A. N., and Richard L. Fox. “The Electoral Fortunes of Women Candidates for Congress.” *Political Research Quarterly*, vol. 54, no. 1, 2001, pp. 205–221.,
doi:10.1177/106591290105400111.
- Volden, Craig, et al. “Women’s Issues and Their Fates in the US Congress.” *Political Science Research and Methods*, vol. 6, no. 4, Aug. 2016, pp. 679–696.,
doi:10.1017/psrm.2016.32.
- BENZE, James G, and Eugene R DECLERCQ. “THE IMPORTANCE OF GENDER IN CONGRESSIONAL AND STATEWIDE ELECTIONS.” *Social Science Quarterly*, Vol. 66, No. 4, Dec. 1985, pp. 954–963., doi:<https://www.jstor.org/stable/42861997>.

“Ballotpedia.” Ballotpedia, ballotpedia.org/Main_Page.

“Campaign Finance Data.” *FEC.gov*, www.fec.gov/data/.

“Directory of Representatives.” *Directory of Representatives | House.gov*,
www.house.gov/representatives.