

Hallie Jones
April 29th 2006

Directed Research Project
Advised by Laurie Rhodebeck, PhD.

The Effects of Partisanship on Election Outcome in Open-Seat Congressional Races that
Feature Female versus Male Candidates.

The Effects of Partisanship on Election Outcome in Open-Seat Congressional Races that Feature Female versus Male Candidates.

Women's political representation in the United States has long been a subject of great interest to many academics concerned with representative democracy. The United States is currently facing an era of increasing partisan polarization. In the context of women's political representation, it is important to gain a clear understanding as to how partisanship affects women's chances of being elected to political office. This study looks at national-level open seat congressional races and the impact that partisanship exerts in races that feature women running against men, and women running against other women. The data reveals that gender is a consistent predictor of the winner in inter-gender races, and that campaign spending is a predictor of the candidate's margin of victory. In same-sex female races, campaign spending was found to be the predictor of who wins the race, while party determined the candidate vote margin. These findings suggest that the presence of a female pulls voters toward partisanship extremes when two females are competing and that sex cues are a determining factor when the sexes are battling for an open seat.

Literature Review

The body of literature on the topic of women's political representation is vast and multi-faceted largely because even though women have made substantial progress toward equal participation in society, there is still a massive void in women's political representation in all levels of government. As recently as 1998, women comprised 52% of state populations in the United States, 55% of all tertiary students, and held 46% of

the paid labor positions (Paxton and Kunovich 2003). Yet, despite the high percentages of women in the overall population, education, and labor, their political representation at the state level severely lagged at mere 23% (Paxton and Kunovich 2003). At the local level, both governorship and big-city mayoral positions are strikingly male dominated, yielding an imbalance of 88% in men's favor (Arceneaux 2001; Fox and Lawless 2004). Eighty-six percent of the members of the 108th Congress were male when it convened, which ranked the United States 59th worldwide for female representation in the national legislature (Fox and Lawless 2004). If equal representation is viewed as an indicator of the health and quality of a representative democracy, then the United States compares unfavorably to the rest of the world.

Descriptive representation, or the compositional similarity between representatives and the represented (based on Pitkin's 1967 work), is important in democratic societies because it enhances symbolic representation and policy responsiveness (Schwindt-Bayer and Mishler 2005). In other words, the more closely the number of women office holders parallels the total female population, the more healthy and democratic a society will be. Theoretically, the electorate will perceive the governing body to be more legitimate because it symbolically looks like the population. As well, policy responsiveness should increase in proportion to descriptive representation (i.e. the more women in office, the more policy will be shaped in favor of women's interests). Diverse memberships in state-level legislative bodies are where the elected begin developing experience, credentials, and contacts advantageous to

advancing their political careers, which builds the foundation for increasing diversity in the membership of the national legislature (Squire 1992).

Women have a higher propensity to be politically disengaged than men. Some research suggests that women are less politically knowledgeable than men, less interested in campaigns and politics, less likely to attempt to influence another person's vote choice, less likely to have an opinion on political issues, less likely to comment on the presidential candidates and parties, less likely to have contacted a government official, and less likely to discuss politics with family and friends – characteristics all of which have held relatively constant in survey research spanning decades of time (Atkeson 2003). Atkeson looks at contextual cue theory as a possible explanation for women's political disengagement, arguing that the absence of women and "a government of white men creates a psychological and systemic participation barrier" (Atkeson 2003).

According to Atkeson (2003), the lack of "like" candidates relegates females to the simplest form of political behavior, which is voting. Atkeson's (2003) findings confirm that when competitive female candidates are present, the female electorate becomes more politically engaged thus demonstrating the importance of contextual cues for increasing women's political participation and engagement. It follows that as the symbolic representation of women gains momentum (i.e. the more females run for office and win elections), the total number of female office holders will increase and public policy will be more responsive to women's issues. Even if female legislators do not specifically promote a women's agenda, their visibility and presence in the

legislative body alone will deepen women's confidence in the legislative process (Schwindt-Bayer and Mishler 2005).

Studies have revealed that women pursue a different legislative agenda than their male counterparts, specifically focusing more on policy that deals with family, welfare, and educational issues (Atkeson 2003; King 2002; Thomas 2002). Female legislators have been found to place a higher priority on constituent work (especially for female constituents) than their male counterparts, and female committee chairs have been found to facilitate open dialogue and communication among hearing participants as opposed to the male legislator who uses his position to control hearings (Thomas 2002). Society as a whole (not just women) would reap direct benefits from an increase in the numbers of female legislators, at national, state, and local levels of government because women in office have been found to outperform their male colleagues in the legislature. This might be due to societal perceptions that women are less capable than men, so female legislators are on a constant quest to prove that they are equally as capable to perform the job function (Thomas 1997).

Sue Thomas (1997) revealed in her case study analysis composed of 50 interviews with female state legislators from across six states that women representatives perceive themselves as more hardworking across the board than their male contemporaries. Her study finds that women representatives perceive themselves, regardless of state or partisanship, to be more patient, more attentive to detail, better prepared in their daily tasks, more able to deal with female constituent needs, more concerned with the long term ramifications of legislative initiatives and less

concerned with short-term political gains, and less driven by personal gain than the general good (Thomas 1997). Thomas (1997) makes note that in terms of female legislators' identity, they generally view themselves (women in the legislature) as a group of "collective outsiders".

Many scholars have dedicated substantial resources to identifying the determinants of the gender gap in political office-holding, looked for methods to increase the political representation of women, and suggested potential structural and institutional reforms to ameliorate the imbalance. Some research has looked at governmental structure or the party system in the United States. Other research has studied the social, psychological, and structural antecedents impacting womens' personal decisions to enter a political race. There are a few areas of inquiry in which scholars have managed to produce concrete and conclusive results.

Studies analyzing various dimensions of the structure of the electoral system are the most conclusive in their findings. Term limits were once believed to have the potential to serve as a catalyst for increasing access to political office for women and minorities by uprooting long standing incumbents and increasing the turn over rate in elected offices. However, today it is generally accepted that the enactment of term limits is detrimental to both women and minorities, and especially to minority women (Carroll and Jenkins 2005, Carroll and Jenkins 2001, Rule 1994).

Another heavily scrutinized dimension of the electoral system is the number of candidates that are elected. Is the district a multi-member district (elects more than one representative) or a single-member district (elects one single representative)?

Research suggests that a higher percentage of women and minorities are elected to state legislative bodies from multi-member districts than from single-member districts (King 2002). However, since the 1970's, there has been a growing trend in state legislatures toward abolishing or reducing the number of multi-member districts and transitioning into using primarily a single-member district structure. King (2002) found that converting from a mixed structure (some single-member districts and some multi-member districts) to exclusively relying on single-member districts led to decreased female representation in Alaska, Indiana, and Wyoming, and the negative impact of single-member districts on female representation became stronger over time (King 2002). Rule (1994) found that when states change from multi-member districts to single-member districts, within a decade female representation declines below the national average. Other studies have shown that in addition to women being advantaged by multi-member districts, their odds of winning increase more when they are running in an urban multi-member district (Hogan 2001; Moncrief and Thompson 1992). Rule's (1990) also observed that women were nominated in larger proportions to viable seats by party elites in multi-member districts. The literature seems to be conclusive in pointing to urban multi-member districts as two arrangements most favorable to women's electoral chances.

Another series of determinants for female political representation that have been granted a good deal of scholarly attention include many aspects of state political culture. Elements of state political culture can include openness of the political system or the political opportunity structure, female political engagement, a tradition of female

political participation in the state and local elective office, and female candidates' political ambition. Political parties can be analyzed in the context of state political culture and also in a structural/institutional context. An example of party-roles in state political culture would include openness to women, women's presence as party elites, women candidates receiving party nominations, party dominance, district partisanship, and active party recruitment of female membership and candidates (Hill 1981; Hoffman, Palmer, and Gaddie 2001; Paxton and Kunovich 2003; Rule 1990; Sanbonmatsu 2002). State political culture can also include measures of moralistic culture, traditionalistic culture, and ideology (Arceneaux 2001; Atkeson 2003; Camobreco and Barnello 2003; Hoffman, Palmer, and Gaddie 2001; Hogan 2001; King 2002).

The social eligibility pool is the mechanism by which women become eligible political elites to run for office (Sanbonmatsu 2002). Several determinants can be classified under the social eligibility pool, including female participation in the labor force and wage equality, women's professional backgrounds, educational attainment, political ambition, qualifications and political experience, and their financial quality or ability to raise money (Fox and Lawless 2004; Hill 1981; Paxton and Kunovich 2003). Gender role attitudes exert a great deal of influence on women's political representation and can be analyzed in the context of state political culture as well as socially. Gender role attitudes (such as family responsibility, private-life commitments, the view that politics is a man's world) shape women's initial decision to run for office, and also determine whether or not they have the self-perception of being a viable candidate. Similarly, gender role attitudes can influence party recruitment and the slating of

women, as well as voter decisions at the polls (Arceneaux 2001; Fox and Lawless 2004; Hill 1981; Hogan 2001). Unfortunately, while a good deal of the literature points toward gender-role attitudes as a possible determinant of female political representation, a widely accepted and tested measure of gender-role attitudes has yet to be developed (Arceneaux 2001; Fox and Lawless 2004; Paxton 2003; Rule 1990; Sanbonmatsu 2002).

Electoral systems can be used as a means to exclude or include the participation of certain groups in society (Rule 1994), and because of that, several structural and institutional factors have been explored as potential determinants of female political representation. Considerable attention has been given to legislative professionalism, which refers to compensation, the size of the constituency, the amount of staff support, the specific chamber (lower or higher) and the length of the legislative session, all of which contribute to the overall attractiveness of the office (Arceneaux 2001; Hill 1981; Hogan 2001; Squire 1992). Empirical evidence concerning legislative professionalism is mixed. Some studies find that legislative professionalism has a negative impact on female representation (Squire 1992) and some studies find little empirical evidence to support the claim, especially in more recent years (Hill 1981; Hogan 2001; Rule 1990). Additional areas of structural and institutional scrutiny include rates of turnover in political positions, whether or not the district is single-member or multi-member as described above, term limits, the urban or rural character of the district, and nativity (what is more commonly described as the "good ol' boy system") (Camobreco and Barnello 2003; Carroll and Jenkins 2005; Moncrief and Thompson 1992, Thomas 2002).

This study will analyze the effects of partisanship on election outcomes in open-seat national congressional races. Specifically, this study will look at inter-gender races (females running against males) to determine if the presence of a female candidate increases partisanship when voters go to the polls. Past studies have revealed a negative correlation between female presence in state legislative bodies and states exhibiting higher degrees of traditionalism (Hill 1981; Hoffman 2001; Rule 1990). As well, states in which the Democratic Party has been historically dominant have been found to have a similar negative impact on female presence in state legislative bodies (Arceneaux 2001; Hoffman 2001; Rule 1990; Sanbonmatsu 2002). The Republican Party has a historic tradition of being more hospitable toward fostering women's political participation (Hoffman 2001; Rule 1990; Sanbonmatsu 2002). The evidence pointing to a negative impact stemming from Democratic Party dominance at the state level is, however, contested. Rule (1990) noted that in recent years, Democratic Party control is no longer an indicator of a potential barrier for women's entry into a political career. Yet, the dual character of southern states, being historically dominated by the Democratic Party and traditionalistic, lines up as an obstacle against women achieving political victories (Rule 1990).

Of late, the Democratic Party has become more associated with cultural liberalism, and the Republican Party more associated with cultural conservatism (Layman 1997). Hoffman (2001) found that Republican female candidates running for state legislative seats were more likely to attract the Democratic vote during general elections than male Republican candidates, but observed a negative trend in women

receiving the Republican Party nomination. Likewise, Hoffman observed Democratic women substantially increasing their nomination rates, while exhibiting difficulty in winning general elections because their likelihood of attracting Republican confidence at the polls was less than their Democratic male counterparts (Hoffman 2001). Layman (1997) found that voter party identification was the most consistent predictor of the presidential vote. Hoffman (2001) suggests that his findings imply female success is increasingly linked to partisan tides, and offers a possible explanation that sex as a cue pulls voters toward ideological extremes at the polls.

Methods

This study will test the following hypothesis: *Inter-gender open-seat races for the U.S. House of Representatives induce a higher degree of partisanship amongst the electorate.* The aim of this research is to assess inter-gender congressional races to determine whether or not the presence of a female candidate increases partisanship amongst the electorate. Since the stakes are higher for national legislative seats because they exhibit the highest degree of legislative professionalism in the United States, the races should be more hotly contested than state legislative seats, therefore causing the hypothesized effect of increased partisanship amongst voters in the district. If the hypothesized effect is found to hold true, this study will be consistent with the previous findings that suggesting that women's success in politics is increasingly linked to partisan tides and implies that sex as a cue pulls voters toward ideological extremes at the polls (Hoffman 2001).

Within the subset of female political representation, much of the research in the body of literature focuses primarily on state-level data and elections as a unit of analysis to explain the barriers to entry for women's political careers, largely because state legislatures are a starting point in the career ladder for the majority of legislative careers. However, state level data are more difficult to find than national-level congressional election data. The data can also be less consistent in format and the chances are higher for the data to be unreliable, as there are 50 state legislatures compared to a single national legislature. Therefore, this project focuses on national legislative races because of their highly competitive nature and the availability of national-level data. In the context of an increasingly polarized partisan playing field, an analysis of national elections should more clearly reveal the effect of partisanship in female versus male races if the hypothesis is correct.

This study looks specifically at open-seat races for the House of Representatives. The House, being the lower chamber congress, has 435 total numbers, as opposed to the Senate's 100. Thus, the availability of cases in which female candidates ran for office is greater in total quantity. House districts are also geographically and demographically smaller, whereas Senators represent their home state at-large. Since House districts are smaller, they are also more homogenous in their overall characteristics that potentially impact voter selections at the poll. The level of competitiveness is lower in races featuring an incumbent because of the incumbent advantage (high retention rates). Therefore, this study controls for the incumbent

effect by analyzing only open-seat races, which are more competitive (theoretically, the playing field is leveled) and they afford women better odds of winning.

This study uses data from presidential election years and mid-term election years. Data were gathered for one presidential election in which the Democratic Party won the candidate vote, and for one year in which the Republican Party won the candidate vote. For mid-term elections, the same distribution was applied. Data were collected for a mid-term election under a Democratic president, and also for a mid-term election under a Republican president. The specific years the election data for the U.S. House of Representatives were initially going to be collected on were 1994, 1996, 2002, and 2004. The decision was made by starting with more recent years first, because of the accessibility of information on the internet and for the purpose of identifying open-seat races. Data collected from these years would have included the mid-term election during Democratic president Bill Clinton's first term in office (first elected in 1992) and from a mid-term election during Republican President George W. Bush's first term in office (first elected in 2000).

During the 1994 mid-term election, the Republican Party and Republican Party activist Newt Gingrich launched the Contract with America, which had the effect of significantly increasing the number of Republicans elected to Congress. To protect the internal validity of the data set, the decision was made to avoid including the extreme case of the 1994 mid-term election because of its potential to bias the results. A modified year selection was made in order to insure a more normal mid-term election, which led to data from the 1998 mid-term election being substituted in place of the

1994 Contract with America election. Modifying the year selection creates a model that is less symmetrical than initially intended, but the 1998 mid-term election still fell under a Democratic presidency, although it was not the first term of service.

The next consideration was which races to include. As previously mentioned, races featuring an incumbent were excluded to control for the incumbency advantage. This study includes open-seat House races from 1996, 1998, 2002, and 2004 as the units of analysis. The *America Votes* series for each respective year was mined to identify open-seat races by state and district. A nominal number of cases (fewer than 10), in which the open-seat was uncontested or featured an intra-party race, were omitted from the data set. Third-party, independent, and write-in candidates are not included in the study.


America Votes was the source for identifying candidate names and candidate partisanship. Additionally, *America Votes* provided the overall partisan victory margin as a percentage for both the winner and the loser (referred to as the "candidate vote"). The candidate vote margin serves as an indicator of partisanship levels present in the race.

The open-seat races for all four election periods were collected and organized by state, district, and candidates according to their partisanship affiliation. I used the *Almanac of American Politics* to verify the data. In addition to comparing the data gathered from the *America Votes* series to test for accuracy, the *Almanac of American Politics* identified candidate gender.

In response to the absence of a commonly used and readily available measure of district partisanship, the presidential vote data available in the *Almanac of American Politics* serve as a proxy measure of district partisanship. Layman (1997) found party identification to be the most consistent predictor of the presidential vote, so the presidential vote data should serve as a valid estimator of district partisanship.

Studies in recent years have found that the ability to raise campaign funds is no longer a barrier to women’s entry into politics. However, it has been shown that female candidates must substantially outspend their male challengers in order to win the seat (Fox and Lawless 2004; Paxton and Kunovich 2003). Therefore, data on campaign expenditures were also taken from the *Almanac of American Politics* and have been included in the data set as an additional independent variable that could potentially impact female success.

This study uses a quasi-experimental research design. The subjects of the quasi-experiment are the open-seat congressional races themselves. The model is quasi-experimental because subjects cannot be randomly assigned. Rather, the subjects must be matched according to the gender composition of the race as shown below.

Subject Group	X Independent Variables	Y Dependent Variables
Group 1 Male v. Male Races	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Party of Candidate • Candidate Gender • District Presidential Vote • Campaign Expenditure • Region (South) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winner • Candidate vote Margin
Group 2 Female v. Male Races		
Group 3 Female v. Female Races		
		

The intra-gender male races provide a baseline from which to compare the observations of both the inter-gender races. Specifically, this study will turn to the data set to ask the following series of questions:

1. In inter-gender races, who is winning according to gender?
2. Across all groups (inter-gender races and both intra-gender faces), how are the winners distributed according to party and gender?
3. What variables are predictors of who wins the race, across all groups?
4. What factors impact the candidate vote margin, across all groups?
5. What factors appear to influence intra-gender female races?

Intra-gender female races will be analyzed to determine whether or not they produce a higher degree of partisanship than intra-gender male races. If evidence is found in this direction, then it suggests that increased partisanship amongst voters at the polls is a direct response to the female candidate's presence. If the intra-gender female races exhibit a lesser degree of partisanship, the finding will suggest that the effect of increased partisanship is in response to the battle of the sexes for political seats, rather than a generalized reaction to the presence of a female candidate in. It is important to note that the internal validity of the intra-gender female group could be challenged, because it consists of only eight total cases. However, the fact that there are only a total of eight cases across four election years in which women have had the opportunity to compete against other women (compared to the 110 intra-gender male races) implies a great deal about women's progress toward equal participation in the political arena.

Data Analysis

There are a total of 163 open-seat house races included in the data set. During the 1996 Presidential election, there were 49 open-seat House races. There were 35 open seat House races during the 1998 mid-term election. The 2002 mid-term election yielded another 46 open-seat House races, and lastly, the 2004 Presidential election produced 33 open-seat House races. The table below provides a cross tabular analysis of the number of cases for each subject group by election year based on gender composition of the race. Consistent with the historical tradition of men dominating the political arena, the highest quantity of cases fell into the mm subject group (intra-gender male races), producing a total of 110 cases in which Democratic men were battling Republican men for the open House seat in their district. Next, the fm subject group (inter-gender races with females competing against males) shows a total of 45 total cases assigned to it, making it the second largest subject group. Lastly, the remaining eight cases were assimilated into the ff subject group (intra-gender female races).

YEAR * GROUP * PARTY * GENDER Crosstabulation

Count

GENDER PARTY				GROUP			Total
				mm	fm	ff	
Man	Repub	YEAR	1996	38	6		44
			1998	22	8		30
			2002	31	7		38
			2004	19	6		25
			Total	110	27		137
	Dem	YEAR	1996	38	3		41
			1998	22	3		25
			2002	31	7		38
			2004	19	5		24
			Total	110	18		128
Woman	Repub	YEAR	1996		3	2	5
			1998		3	2	5
			2002		7	1	8
			2004		5	3	8
			Total		18	8	26
	Dem	YEAR	1996		6	2	8
			1998		8	2	10
			2002		7	1	8
			2004		6	3	9
			Total		27	8	35

Men are 13.75 times more likely than women to be engaged in an intra-gender open-seat House race. The occurrences of intra-gender male races are 2.44 times more likely than the occurrence of inter-gender races in which men face off against a female challenger. Additionally, the inter-gender races are 5.6 times more likely to occur than intra-gender female races. These numbers reveal that women have not come close to achieving equal participation in the political playing field. When women do actually have the opportunity to run for an open House seat, they can expect to be competing against a male because the chances of running against another woman are extremely narrow.

Females are substantially behind males in their ability to secure the party nomination. The cross tabular table below illustrates the total number of candidates nominated to compete by gender and party. The numbers show that there were a total of 265 male candidates receiving the nomination to run for the open-seat in their district, compared to the 61 female candidates who received the nomination. Open-seat races generally draw party activists with aspirations for political advancement out of the sidelines and into the forefront, leading to heavy intra-party competition for the nomination, as well as stiff inter-party competition during the general election. This finding is consistent with the previous literature that points out that women are less likely to be slated by party elites when there is an open-seat at stake, which implies that political parties view men as being more viable candidates than women.

GENDER * PARTY Crosstabulation

			PARTY		Total
			Repub	Dem	
GENDER	Man	Count	137	128	265
		% of Total	42.0%	39.3%	81.3%
	Woman	Count	26	35	61
		% of Total	8.0%	10.7%	18.7%
Total	Count		163	163	326
	% of Total		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%

When looking at the fm subject group to determine who is winning inter-gender competitions, the male candidates (as shown below) out-competed the female candidates 29-16. Of the 45 total races in the fm subject group, the men won 64.4% of the time, compared to the women winning 35.6% of the time.

GENDER * GROUP * WINNER Crosstabulation

WINNER				GROUP			Total
				mm	fm	ff	
loser	GENDER	Man	Count	110	16		126
			% within GROUP	100.0%	35.6%		77.3%
			% of Total	67.5%	9.8%		77.3%
	Woman	Count		29	8	37	
		% within GROUP		64.4%	100.0%	22.7%	
		% of Total		17.8%	4.9%	22.7%	
	Total	Count	110	45	8	163	
		% within GROUP	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
		% of Total	67.5%	27.6%	4.9%	100.0%	
winner	GENDER	Man	Count	110	29		139
			% within GROUP	100.0%	64.4%		85.3%
			% of Total	67.5%	17.8%		85.3%
	Woman	Count		16	8	24	
		% within GROUP		35.6%	100.0%	14.7%	
		% of Total		9.8%	4.9%	14.7%	
	Total	Count	110	45	8	163	
		% within GROUP	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
		% of Total	67.5%	27.6%	4.9%	100.0%	

To gain a clearer picture of which gender is winning during each election year period, the fm subject group (shown in the cross tabular table below) was broken down by year, winner, gender, and group. In 1996, six men (66.7%) won compared to three women (33.3%) out of nine total races. In 1998, six men (54.5%) won compared to five women (45.5%) out of 11 total races. During the 2002 election, ten men (71.4%) won, and four women were successful (28.6%) out of 14 races. Lastly, in 2004, seven men (63.6%) were winners, and four women (36.4%) were winners, out of 11 total races. The pattern of men beating women is consistent across the board. The only year in which women came close to the men was in 1998, but the men still won more races. Men consistently perform better than women when the sexes are battling for an open seat.

GENDER * GROUP * WINNER * YEAR Crosstabulation

YEAR	WINNER			GROUP	Total		
				fm			
1996	winner	Man	Count	6	44		
			% within GROUP	66.7%	89.8%		
			% of Total	12.2%	89.8%		
		Woman	Count	3	5		
			% within GROUP	33.3%	10.2%		
			% of Total	6.1%	10.2%		
					Count	9	49
					% within GROUP	100.0%	100.0%
					% of Total	18.4%	100.0%
1998	winner	Man	Count	6	28		
			% within GROUP	54.5%	80.0%		
			% of Total	17.1%	80.0%		
		Woman	Count	5	7		
			% within GROUP	45.5%	20.0%		
			% of Total	14.3%	20.0%		
					Count	11	35
					% within GROUP	100.0%	100.0%
					% of Total	31.4%	100.0%
2002	winner	Man	Count	10	41		
			% within GROUP	71.4%	89.1%		
			% of Total	21.7%	89.1%		
		Woman	Count	4	5		
			% within GROUP	28.6%	10.9%		
			% of Total	8.7%	10.9%		
					Count	14	46
					% within GROUP	100.0%	100.0%
					% of Total	30.4%	100.0%
2004	winner	Man	Count	7	26		
			% within GROUP	63.6%	78.8%		
			% of Total	21.2%	78.8%		
		Woman	Count	4	7		
			% within GROUP	36.4%	21.2%		
			% of Total	12.1%	21.2%		
					Count	11	33
					% within GROUP	100.0%	100.0%
					% of Total	33.3%	100.0%

Next, I performed a crosstabular analysis of the data to gain a clearer picture of how the winners were distributed according to partisanship and gender by group. The table below shows that overall, there were a total of 90 Republican victories, and the

Democrats affirmed 73 wins. The data were broken down by gender and party to provide a clearer understanding of which sex fared best. Not surprisingly, the men took the lead again, weighing in with a total of 139 wins, compared to the women's modest 24 total successes spanning all four election periods. Of the male winners, 79 were Republicans and 60 were Democrats.

Of the female winners, 11 were Republicans and 13 were Democrats. Overall, female Democrats were more successful than Republican women at gaining House seats during the past four elections, winning 13-11. However, of the Democratic women's total 35 nominations, they secured 13 seats yielding a 37% success rate for winning. Of the Republican women's 26 total nominations, they won 11 of the open-seat races, yielding a success rate of 42%. So, even though the Democratic women secured more nominations and also won more races, their rate of success was not as high as the Republican women. This 5% margin leaning toward the Republican woman's favor is consistent with Hoffman's (2001) suggestion that Democratic women, while increasing their nomination rates, still have a more difficult time winning the general election than Republican women.

GENDER * GROUP * WINNER * PARTY Crosstabulation

PARTY		WINNER		GROUP			Total		
				mm	fm	ff			
Repub	loser	GENDER	Man	Count	50	8		58	
				% within GROUP	100.0%	44.4%		79.5%	
				% of Total	68.5%	11.0%		79.5%	
			Woman	Count		10	5	15	
				% within GROUP		55.6%	100.0%	20.5%	
				% of Total		13.7%	6.8%	20.5%	
		Total	Count	50	18	5	73		
			% within GROUP	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
			% of Total	68.5%	24.7%	6.8%	100.0%		
		winner	GENDER	Man	Count	60	19		79
				% within GROUP	100.0%	70.4%		87.8%	
				% of Total	66.7%	21.1%		87.8%	
	Woman		Count		8	3	11		
			% within GROUP		29.6%	100.0%	12.2%		
			% of Total		8.9%	3.3%	12.2%		
	Total	Count	60	27	3	90			
		% within GROUP	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
		% of Total	66.7%	30.0%	3.3%	100.0%			
Dem	loser	GENDER	Man	Count	60	8		68	
				% within GROUP	100.0%	29.6%		75.6%	
				% of Total	66.7%	8.9%		75.6%	
			Woman	Count		19	3	22	
				% within GROUP		70.4%	100.0%	24.4%	
				% of Total		21.1%	3.3%	24.4%	
		Total	Count	60	27	3	90		
			% within GROUP	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
			% of Total	66.7%	30.0%	3.3%	100.0%		
		winner	GENDER	Man	Count	50	10		60
				% within GROUP	100.0%	55.6%		82.2%	
				% of Total	68.5%	13.7%		82.2%	
	Woman		Count		8	5	13		
			% within GROUP		44.4%	100.0%	17.8%		
			% of Total		11.0%	6.8%	17.8%		
	Total	Count	50	18	5	73			
		% within GROUP	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
		% of Total	68.5%	24.7%	6.8%	100.0%			

When looking at the subject groups individually, the intra-gender male races (group mm) yielded 60 Republican winners and 50 Democratic winners. The intra-gender female races (group ff) turned out five Republican winners and five Democratic winners. Amongst the group of males, Republicans were more successful. Amongst the

group of females, Democrats proved to be more successful. Within the inter-gender competitions (group fm), 19 Republican men (70.4%) and eight Republican women (29.6%) won. Amongst the Democrats in this group, ten men (55.6%) and eight women (44.4%) won. When comparing the women's performance, they are winning at equal rates irrespective of partisanship. However, the comparison within this group based on party reveals that Republican women are lagging substantially behind their male counterparts, while Democratic women are running within 6% of a tie to their male counterparts.

This suggests that amongst the Democratic Party, women are on their way toward achieving more equal participation. As we have seen, the frequency of their nominations has gone up and they are almost as competitive as the male candidates within their party. Additionally, Democratic women out compete Republican females in intra-gender races. However, the position for Republican women does not appear to be as promising. Republican women are being nominated less frequently, they have been found to be less competitive than their Republican male counterparts, and they are less likely to win against a female Democratic challenger. These facts suggest that Republican women have substantial barriers to overcome if they are to enter into the world of politics, and it also suggests that the success of women is tied to their partisan affiliations.

The initial analysis of the data reveals some contradictions to and some consistencies with the previous literature. First, the total number of female candidates shows that the Democratic Party slated more women than the Republican Party to run

for the highly competitive open House seats. This finding demonstrates a deviation from the Republican Party's historic tradition of fostering women's political participation (Hoffman 2001; Rule 1990; Sanbonmatsu 2002). Indeed, of the four election terms included in this study, the Democratic Party slated a total of 35 women candidates, compared to the Republican Party's 26 female nominations.

The increasing trend of Democratic women receiving party nominations was noted by Rule (1990), who found that Democratic Party control was no longer a barrier for women's entry into a political career. Likewise, Hoffman (2001) found that Republican female candidates at the state level were experiencing a negative trend in winning the Party nomination, while Democratic women were enjoying a substantial increase in their nomination success rates. Previous findings have shown the Democratic Party to be correlated with cultural liberalism, and the Republican Party to be correlated with cultural conservatism (Layman 1997). In recent years, the Republican Party has been winning votes in the formerly traditionalistic Democratic south. Perhaps the Republican Party's decline in female nominations is a product of its increasingly conservative ideology, which might help to explain the reversal of historic tradition. Overall, Democratic women were found to have a lower success rate (7.4%) in the general election than Republican women (11.3%). Hoffman (2001) argued that while Republican women were being nominated less frequently than Democratic women, they were more likely to perform better in the general election than Democratic women because they could attract the Democratic vote at the polls.

Two additional cross tabular analyses were run to determine if the region exerts any significance. The first table (below) shows how winners were distributed by region for the fm subject group. It appears that the region does not have an impact on women's chances for winning the open-seat in the general election. Women are winning 36.4% of the time in the non-south and 33.3% of the time in the South.

GENDER * GROUP * WINNER * REGION Crosstabulation

REGION	WINNER				GROUP	
					fm	Total
no	winner	GENDER	Man	Count	21	88
				% within GROUP	63.6%	83.8%
				% of Total	20.0%	83.8%
			Woman	Count	12	17
				% within GROUP	36.4%	16.2%
				% of Total	11.4%	16.2%
		Total	Count	33	105	
			% within GROUP	100.0%	100.0%	
			% of Total	31.4%	100.0%	
south	winner	GENDER	Man	Count	8	51
				% within GROUP	66.7%	87.9%
				% of Total	13.8%	87.9%
			Woman	Count	4	7
				% within GROUP	33.3%	12.1%
				% of Total	6.9%	12.1%
		Total	Count	12	58	
			% within GROUP	100.0%	100.0%	
			% of Total	20.7%	100.0%	

The next table (below) shows the total number of candidates by gender and party, and identifies whether or not they emerged from the South. Of the Republicans, 89 males (84.8%) and 16 females (15.2%) received the party nomination in non-south states. In the Southern states, 48 males (82.8%) and ten women (17.2%) received the party nomination. This suggests that Republican women are actually being nominated at a higher rate in the South than in non-southern states. As for the Democratic Party,

78 men (74.3%) and 27 women (25.7%) were nominated in non-southern states.

There were eight Democratic women (13.8%) nominated in South, as compared to 50 men (86.2%). This finding reveals that Democratic women actually suffer in the South in terms of the slating process, and Republican women fare a little bit better. However, women in both parties are receiving low nomination rates across the board. The category yielding the most female nominations is Democratic women in non-southern states, at 25.7%. The discrepancy between the south (13.8%) and the non-south (25.7%) nomination rates amongst Democratic women is the largest gap.

REGION * GENDER * PARTY Crosstabulation

PARTY				GENDER		Total
				Man	Woman	
Repub	REGION	no	Count	89	16	105
			% within REGION	84.8%	15.2%	100.0%
			% within GENDER	65.0%	61.5%	64.4%
			% of Total	54.6%	9.8%	64.4%
	south	Count	48	10	58	
		% within REGION	82.8%	17.2%	100.0%	
		% within GENDER	35.0%	38.5%	35.6%	
		% of Total	29.4%	6.1%	35.6%	
	Total	Count	137	26	163	
		% within REGION	84.0%	16.0%	100.0%	
		% within GENDER	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
		% of Total	84.0%	16.0%	100.0%	
Dem	REGION	no	Count	78	27	105
			% within REGION	74.3%	25.7%	100.0%
			% within GENDER	60.9%	77.1%	64.4%
			% of Total	47.9%	16.6%	64.4%
	south	Count	50	8	58	
		% within REGION	86.2%	13.8%	100.0%	
		% within GENDER	39.1%	22.9%	35.6%	
		% of Total	30.7%	4.9%	35.6%	
	Total	Count	128	35	163	
		% within REGION	78.5%	21.5%	100.0%	
		% within GENDER	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
		% of Total	78.5%	21.5%	100.0%	

These findings illustrate that there is no clear evidence to support the assumption that the Republican Party's success in the South is correlated with the

decline in female nominations as a function of appealing to its conservative ideology and traditionalistic culture. Overall, women in the Republican Party are being nominated at a low rate, irrespective of the region. This implies that the broad shift toward conservatism in general may be the overarching impetus for the decline in women's participation within the Republican Party, and is a possible explanation for its break from the historical tradition of fostering women's political participation (Hoffman 2001; Rule 1990; Sanbonmatsu 2002). This information points to the need for future research in this area, to specifically determine the cause of women's declining number of nominations within the Republican Party. As well, consistent with Rule's (1990) observation, the Democratic Party is being shown to no longer serve as a barrier for women's entry into a political career.

To test the hypothesis that inter-gender open-seat races for the U.S. House of Representatives induce a higher degree of partisanship amongst the electorate, two linear regression models were employed to test the effects of the independent variables on the two dependent variables; winner outcome and the victory margin. In both models, each subject group is tested independently to test for variation and consistency in the outcome in terms of what independent variables are exerting a significant effect according to the gender composition of the subject group. Specifically, what independent factors affect winner outcome and the victory margin in each of the three classes of subject groups; intra-gender male races, intra-gender female races, and inter-gender 'battle of the sexes' races.

The first model seeks to answer the question of what variables are predictors of who wins the race, across all groups, and how or if those differ according to the gender composition of the race. Amongst the fm group (inter-gender races), the independent variables consisted of candidate gender, party, presidential vote, and campaign spending. The table below shows that gender was the only variable that exerted a significant effect (.019) with a t-score of 2.386, after controlling for all other variables. Campaign spending was the next closest variable, coming in with a t-score of 1.623 and a significance of (.108). Although campaign spending does not register as being a significant predictor of the winner outcome in inter-gender races, it does show to be more closely related than all other independent variables. Gender is shown to be the most significant predictor of who will win in inter-gender open-seat House races.

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.584	.138		4.232	.000
	GENDER	-.248	.104	-.248	-2.386	.019
	PARTY	-.152	.104	-.152	-1.466	.147
	PRESVOTE	7.739E-03	.114	.008	.068	.946
	SPENDING	1.065E-07	.000	.169	1.623	.108
	REGION	4.476E-02	.131	.040	.341	.734

a. Dependent Variable: WINNER

b. Selecting only cases for which GROUP = fm

Next, the intra-gender subject groups were tested to determine which independent variables are predictors of the winner outcome. Since each of the intra-gender groups are same-sex races, the gender variable is irrelevant and was therefore excluded from the list of independent variables. In each of the intra-gender groups, the significant variable was campaign spending. The table below shows the results for the

ff group, in which campaign spending shows a significance of .088 and a t-score value of 1.873.

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	8.610E-02	.350		.246	.810
	PARTY	.221	.255	.221	.868	.404
	PRESVOTE	4.146E-02	.298	.036	.139	.892
	SPENDING	2.046E-07	.000	.484	1.873	.088
	REGION	7.974E-02	.269	.077	.297	.772

a. Dependent Variable: WINNER

b. Selecting only cases for which GROUP = ff

The results for the mm group are shown in the next table. Again, campaign spending shows an extremely high significance of .000 and a t-score value of 3.744.

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.384	.078		4.900	.000
	PARTY	-8.16E-02	.066	-.082	-1.239	.217
	PRESVOTE	1.819E-02	.067	.018	.272	.786
	REGION	-2.14E-02	.069	-.021	-.312	.755
	SPENDING	1.758E-07	.000	.248	3.744	.000

a. Dependent Variable: WINNER

b. Selecting only cases for which GROUP = mm

The second set of linear regression models show which independent factors impact the candidate vote margin across all groups. The table below shows the results for the fm group. Campaign spending is the significant predictor at .020, with a t-score of 2.371. Surprisingly, gender does not seem to be a determining influence on the candidate vote margin in inter-gender open-seat House races.

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	46.029	3.862		11.919	.000
	PARTY	-2.373	2.905	-.088	-.817	.416
	PRESVOTE	.317	3.185	.012	.099	.921
	REGION	1.831	3.672	.060	.499	.619
	SPENDING	4.355E-06	.000	.256	2.371	.020
	GENDER	.799	2.911	.030	.274	.784

a. Dependent Variable: CANDVOTE

b. Selecting only cases for which GROUP = fm

A second analysis was conducted to see if the omission of the campaign spending variable would show any additional predictors of the candidate vote margin. However, the below results showed no significance on any of the independent variables, which implies that the candidate vote margin is not predicted by gender and is driven exclusively by campaign spending.

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	50.933	3.349		15.210	.000
	PARTY	-2.211	2.983	-.082	-.741	.461
	PRESVOTE	.000	3.267	.000	.000	1.000
	REGION	.000	3.686	.000	.000	1.000
	GENDER	.344	2.983	.013	.115	.908

a. Dependent Variable: CANDVOTE

b. Selecting only cases for which GROUP = fm

Next, the same linear regression model was run on each of the intra-gender groups, again excluding the gender variable. In the mm group, the predictor of the candidate vote margin again in intra-gender male races was found to be campaign

spending. The table below shows campaign spending to exert a significance of .000 and a t-score value of 3.975.

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	44.568	2.086		21.364	.000
	PARTY	1.893	1.752	.071	1.080	.281
	PRESVOTE	.624	1.781	.023	.351	.726
	REGION	-.759	1.826	-.028	-.416	.678
	SPENDING	4.966E-06	.000	.263	3.975	.000

a. Dependent Variable: CANDVOTE

b. Selecting only cases for which GROUP = mm

The ff subject group's below results interestingly illustrate that party, with a significance of .054 and a t-score value of 2.157 is a predictor of the candidate vote margin in intra-gender women's races. Campaign spending exerts no significant effect. This finding reveals that the presence of women candidates does tend to pull voters toward partisan extremes in races which feature two competing women. When all other factors are controlled for, the candidate vote margin is determined purely by the party of the candidate.

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	37.478	9.341		4.012	.002
	PARTY	14.681	6.806	.518	2.157	.054
	PRESVOTE	.708	7.955	.022	.089	.931
	REGION	1.362	7.186	.047	.190	.853
	SPENDING	3.494E-06	.000	.291	1.197	.256

a. Dependent Variable: CANDVOTE

b. Selecting only cases for which GROUP = ff

Conclusion

The results of the analysis show that the predictors of winner and candidate vote margin vary according to the gender composition of the race for the open House seat in the district. For the all male races, the Republicans outperformed the Democrats. Both linear regression models revealed that campaign spending is the exclusive predictor of the dependent variables, winner and the candidate vote margin. Amongst the same-sex female races, Democratic women outperformed Republican women. Campaign spending was found to be the single predictor of the dependent winner variable in the first linear regression model. The second linear regression model showed that party exerted a significant influence on the candidate margin of victory. Amongst the mm group, Republican males won at a higher rate (54.5%) than Democratic males (45.5%) in the all-male races. Both linear regression models showed that campaign spending was the significant predictor of the winner and the candidate majority vote margin.

Amongst the inter-gender fm subject group, the Republican and Democratic women were found to be winning at the same rate, as each won eight of 16 total races claimed by the women. This suggests that irrespective of their party, women are competing against men at equal success rates. However, when comparing the winners based on party, the Republican women were shown to be substantially less competitive than the Republican males, yielding a 19-8 score in favor of the men. While this finding suggests that Republican women are less successful than Republican men at defeating their Democratic challengers, it could also be argued that the large disparity can be accounted for the small number of Republican women who were nominated to compete

for the open-seat. Republican women did outperform Democratic women in the general elections, as they received fewer nominations and won a higher percentage of races. However, Democratic women out competed Republican women at a higher rate when they ran against each other.

Democratic women were competing considerably close to their Democratic male counterparts, showing a score of 10-8 in the Democratic man's favor. Democratic women may have a more difficult time defeating a Republican male in the general election, but they are more competitive than a Democratic male challenging a Republican woman (who won 10-8, or had a success rate of 55.5% to 45.5%), as Democratic women beat Republican women 5-3, with a success rate of 62.5%. Republican men beat Democratic women 19-8, showing a victory margin of 70.3% to 29.6%. Republican males won at a higher rate (54.5%) than Democratic males (45.5%) in the all-male races. So, Democratic women are more competitive against a Republican woman than a Democratic male, but they are less competitive than the Republican woman in inter-gender races, and the Republican male substantially out-competes the Democratic woman.

Republican women appear to be successful at attracting Democratic support away from their Democratic male challengers at the polls. However, Democratic women are not nearly as successful as the Democratic male against the dominant Republican male. Democratic women do, however, have a higher success rate than the Democratic male when competing against the Republican woman. Overall, this is consistent with the finding in the first linear regression model that gender is the most

significant predictor of winner in inter-gender races. The men consistently outperformed the women when they competed. The second linear regression model revealed that the candidate vote margin was influenced by campaign spending. In other words, the amount a candidate won by was dependent upon how much that candidate spent on the campaign.

In summary, Republican males are the most successful candidates during the period under consideration, whether competing against a Democratic man or woman. Gender is a significant predictor of winner in inter-gender races, but otherwise, the only significant determinant of who wins and the outcome of the candidate vote margin is campaign spending. The Democratic male has a higher chance than the Democratic female at defeating the Republican male, especially if he outspends his opponent. The Democratic female has a higher chance than the Democratic male at defeating the Republican female, especially if she outspends her opponent. However, the candidate vote margin is exclusively affected by partisanship.

Overall, Republican females are more competitive against men of the opposing party than Democratic women, but they are nominated less frequently and their success rates are not nearly as high as the Republican male. The Republican woman seems to be at the greatest disadvantage, because Republican males are the most competitive candidate to challenge a Democratic male or a Democratic female. Amongst Democrats, the Democratic female is advantaged because she out-competes Republican females in same-sex races, especially if she outspends her opponent. Additionally, the Democratic female is receiving her party's nomination more frequently. However, the

Democratic male is still a much more competitive candidate against the Republican male, especially if he manages to outspend his opponent.

Future research is needed to determine by exactly how much women candidates must outspend their male competition in order to win the open House seat. Also, more research needs to look at cases in which women compete against other women, as the number of women entering politics increases. The small number of same-sex female races poses questions regarding the reliability of the findings. As well, it would be interesting to look at the discrepancy between the numbers of women getting nominated for races in which an incumbent is running compared to the number of women who are slated to compete for an open House seat with higher stakes.

Bibliography

Arceneaux, Kevin. 2001. "The "Gender Gap" in State Legislative Representation: New Data to Tackle an Old Question." *Political Research Quarterly*. 54 (1): 143 – 160.

Atkeson, L. R. (2003). Not all cues are created equal: The conditional impact of female candidates on political engagement. *The Journal of Politics*, 65(4), 1040-1061. Retrieved January 26, 2006, from Worldwide Political Science Abstracts database.

Camobreco, John F. and Barnello, Michelle A. 2003. "Post Materialism and Post Industrialism: Cultural Influences on Female Representation in State Legislatures." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly*. 3 (2): 117 – 138.

Carroll, Susan J. and Jenkins, Krista. 2005. "Increasing Diversity or More of the Same? Term Limits and the Representation of Women, Minorities, and Minority Women in State Legislatures." *National Political Science Review*. 10: 71 – 84.

Carroll, Susan J. and Jenkins, Krista. 2001. "Do Term Limits Help Women Get Elected?" *Social Science Quarterly*. 82 (1): 197 – 201.

Craig, Stephen C.; Martinez, Michael D.; Kane, James G. and Gainous, Jason. 2005. "Core Values, Value Conflict, and Citizens' Ambivalence about Gay Rights." *Political Research Quarterly*. 58 (1): 5 – 17.

Craig, Stephen C.; Kane, James G. and Martinez, Michael D.. 2002. "Sometimes You Feel Like a Nut, Sometimes You Don't: Citizens' Ambivalence About Abortion." *Political Psychology*. 23 (2): 285 – 301.

Fox, R. L., & Lawless, J. L. (2004). Entering the arena? gender and the decision to run for office. *American Journal of Political Science*, 48(2), 264-280. Retrieved January 26, 2006, from Worldwide Political Science Abstracts database.

Gainous, Jason and Radunovich, Bill. 2005. "Religion and Core Values: A Reformulation of the Funnel of Causality." *Politics and Policy*. 33 (1): 154 – 180.

Hill, David B. 1981. "Political Culture and Female Political Representation." *The Journal of Politics*. 43 (1): 159 – 168.

Hoffman, K. U., Palmer, C., & Gaddie, R. K. (2001). Candidate sex and congressional elections: Open seats before, during, and after the year of the woman. *Women & Politics*, 23(1-2), 37-58. Retrieved January 26, 2006, from Worldwide Political Science Abstracts database.

Hogan, Robert E. 2001. "The Influence of State and District Conditions on the Representation of Women in the U.S. State Legislatures." *American Politics Research*. 29 (1): 4 – 24.

Johnson, Stephen D. and Tamney, Joseph B.. 2001. "Social Traditionalism and Economic Conservatism: Two Conservative Political Ideologies in the United States." *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 141 (2): 233 – 243.

King, James D. 2002. "Single Member Districts and the Representation of Women in American State Legislatures: The Effects of Electoral System Change." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly*. 2 (2): 161 – 175.

Layman, Geoffrey C. and Carmines, Edward G.. 2001. "Cultural Conflict in American Politics: Religious Traditionalism, Post Materialism, and U.S. Political Behavior." *The Journal of Politics*. 59 (3): 751 – 777.

Miller, Arthur; Wynn, Tor; Ullrich, Phil and Marti, Mollie. 2001. "Concept and Measurement Artifact in Multiple Values and Value Conflict Models." *Political Research Quarterly*. 54 (2): 407 – 419.

Moncrief, Gary F. and Thompson, Joel A. 1992. "Electoral Structure and State Legislative Representation: A Research Note." *The Journal of Politics*. 54 (1): 246 – 256.

Paxton, P., & Kunovich, S. (2003). Women's political representation: The importance of ideology. *Social Forces*, 82(1), 87-114. Retrieved January 26, 2006, from Worldwide Political Science Abstracts database.

Rule, Wilma. 1994. "Women's Underrepresentation and Electoral Systems." *Political Science and Politics*. 27 (4): 689 – 692.

Rule, Wilma. 1990. "Why More Women Are State Legislators. A Research Note." *The Western Political Quarterly*. 43 (2): 437 – 448.

Sanbonmatsu, Kira. 2002. "Political Parties and the Recruitment of Women to State Legislatures." *The Journal of Politics*. 64 (3): 791 – 809.

Schwindt-Bayer, Leslie A. and Mishler, William. 2005. "An Integrated Model of Women's Representation." *The Journal of Politics*. 67 (2): 407 – 428.

Squire, Peveerill. 1992. "Legislative Professionalism and Membership Diversity in State Legislatures." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. 17 (1): 69 – 79.

Struening, Karen. 1996. "Privacy and Sexuality in a Society Divided Over Moral Culture." *Political Research Quarterly*. 49 (3): 505 – 523.

Thomas, Sue. 2002. "The Personal is the Political: Antecedents of Gendered Choices of Elected Representatives." *Sex Roles*. 47 (7/8): 343 – 353.

Thomas, Sue. 1997. "Why Gender Matters: The Perceptions of Women Office Holders." *Women & Politics*. 17 (1): 27 – 53.

Weldon, S. L. (2002). Beyond bodies: Institutional sources of representation for women in democratic policymaking. *Journal of Politics*, 64(4), 1153-1174. Retrieved January 26, 2006, from Worldwide Political Science Abstracts database.