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Abstract

This thesis seeks to answer if female politicians raise as much money as male politicians. In order to answer this question, I collected data from the Harvard MIT Election Data Science Lab. It has every candidate that ran in the general election for the House of Representatives from 1976 through 2018, but, for the purpose of this project, only the Presidential election years from 1980 through 2016 are used in this data set. It also includes how much money they raised, what state they are from, and what party the candidate was affiliated with. This data set also accounts for inflation by using the constant dollar value of 2020, and using an inflation calculator so that all the money has the same value. My hypotheses had little support from the data; however, there were key takeaways. Southern female candidates raise as much money as other female and male candidates in other regions; Republican female candidates raise more money than Democratic female candidates; female candidates in the House out-fundraise male candidates; and there is a clear linear relationship between winning and money raised.

The creation of public campaign financing options, similar to the one New York implemented in 2020, and a complete remodel of the Federal Election Committee, could create a political environment that would put the power back into the hands of constituents rather than in the hands of the wealthy and dark money contributors. The relationship between money and winning is so distinct, that the United States elections could be on a dangerous path. If elections continue to follow the trends, it could soon become the most affluent candidate wins rather than the best candidate wins. This affects not only female and male political candidates, but it also affects the integrity of elections and United States sovereignty.
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Chapter 1

In 2018, many women ran and won seats in Congress; it was dubbed “Year of the Woman,” just as seen in 1992 when, twenty-four women won seats in the House of Representatives and three women won seats in the Senate (“Women on the Campaign Trial”). Much like in 2018, there were many events that could have encouraged women to run for Congress. In 1992, Clarence Thomas was replacing Thurgood Marshall on the Supreme Court, and Anita Hill testified that he sexually harassed her in the workplace (“Women on the Campaign Trial”). The all-male Judiciary Committee offered little sympathy and compassion while Hill gave her testimony, and this gave momentum to female candidates and increased female representation in Congress (“Women on the Campaign Trail”). They created long-term benefits such as: the availability of funding, politically experienced women, and expanded institutional support for female candidates.
(“Women on the Campaign Trail”). However, the United States Congress is far from gender parity despite electing 117 women to Congress in 2018. This led me to dig deeper into what type of women run, for instance, why do women run, why are women underrepresented in Congress, is running as a woman more difficult, and what makes for a good campaign, etc.

My Women in Politics class, taught by Dr. Gregory Love, looked at a Pew Research survey on how American’s view women in politics and in leadership roles, and I was intrigued by what was recorded. 59 percent of adults said that there were too few women in high political offices, and 49 percent of these adults said that gender discrimination is a major reason why there are not more women in office (Horowitz, Igielnik, and Parker 2017). It made me wonder, if American citizens were so conscious that women were under-represented in Congress, and that gender discrimination seemed to be a contributing factor, why was seemingly nothing being done about this problem? Twenty-seven percent of responders said that a major reason why there are not more women in office is because not as many women are interested in running for high political offices, and I disagreed (Horowitz, Igielnik, and Parker 2017). I then found the article “Women’s Underrepresentation in Politics: No, It’s Not Just an Ambition Gap,” by Molly Bangs (2017) who discusses issues in party recruitment and political establishments, wealth gaps and the high costs of a political career, and campaign funding. I became increasingly interested into looking at the amount of money women fundraise in comparison to men because money is an incredibly important part of running a successful campaign. If women are raising significantly lower amounts of money than
men, then that could possibly be a contributing factor as to why women are underrepresented in Congress.

Twenty-six and a half percent of the United States Congress are women; this is 126 women out of 535 members of Congress (“Current Numbers”). Twenty-five women (25%) sit in the Senate, and 101 women (23.2%) serve in the House of Representatives (“Current Numbers”). Only 359 women have served in Congress to this date, and the first woman was only elected into Congress in 1917 (“Current Numbers”), Women have been consistently underrepresented in Congress since the beginning of the United States government (Rothschild 2020). All of the United States Presidents have been male, and it took until 2016 for a major party to nominate a female candidate for President (Rothschild 2020) and only three have served as vice-presidential nominees (Geraldine Ferraro in 1984, Sarah Palin in 2008 and Kamala Harris in 2020). In 2020, 28.9 percent of statewide elected officials are women, and these are some of the highest levels of female representation in American history (Rothschild 2020). The pace of progress in this realm is far from expedient; female representation in Congress went from 13.6 percent to 26.5 percent between 2001 and 2020, representation in statewide elected office has only increased 1.3 percent during the same time (Rothschild 2020). At this rate, women would not reach full parity in Congress for another 30 years. The reason that this is an issue is because it goes against the very foundation of the United States as a representative democracy (Rothschild 2020). Descriptive representation is when the characteristics of a representative mirror that of the population (Arnesen and Peters 2017). In other words, when women or minorities look at their political representatives, they will be able to see someone who has a shared experience with them. Descriptive representation can be
extremely important when it comes to the following: adequate communication, innovative thinking, increasing legitimacy, and inclusion (Arnesen and Peters 2017). Arnesen and Peters (2017), also find that the inclusion of women, or of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBTQ) people in the legislature has an affect on the types of legislation that is produced. When there are more women in the legislature, legislation about women’s issues appear more frequently, and when there are more members of the LGBTQ in the legislature, it helps create policies that support the equal rights of these groups (Arnesen and Peters 2017). Descriptive representation helps create equal representation of all groups that could possibly be overlooked when it comes to policy creation.

Abraham Lincoln’s famous quote in the Gettysburg Address is “a government of the people, by the people and for the people,” and the intention was to create a government that was controlled by its’ citizens rather than being controlled by royalty or special groups (Rothschild 2020). To protect this ideal, all American’s have the right to vote in elections which enables them to elect a candidate who will represent their interests and community interests in policy formation in state and federal elections (Rothschild 2020). So, if women face barriers to enter the political realm, representative democracy is weakened because it would not be a government that properly reflects the interests, attitudes, and ideals of all “the people.”

Leading up to the passage of the 19th amendment, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony are credited with being the leaders of the women’s suffrage movement beginning in 1851 (Maruszewski 2021). Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott led the first women’s rights convention, Seneca Falls Convention, in New York
(Maruszewski 2021). There were sixty-eight women and thirty-two men who signed the Declaration of Sentiments which would lead to decades of activism and the fight for women’s suffrage (Maruszewski 2021). Newly entering states in the West, like Wyoming, gave women the right to vote far before the 19th amendment was passed. Wyoming became a state in 1890, but they gave women the right to vote when it was still a territory in 1870 (National Geographic Society 2012). So, when Wyoming entered the union, they then became the first state that allowed women’s suffrage (National Geographic Society 2012). Some historians credit Wyoming’s eagerness to give women the right to vote came from the new state being open to new ideals, or because for every 6,000 men there were only 1,000 women (National Geographic Society 2012). Colorado, Utah, and Idaho would allow women to vote soon after Wyoming in the 1890s, but many states would not allow women to vote until 1920, (National Geographic Society 2012). Though the women’s right to vote was secured by the passage of the 19th amendment, a black woman did not serve in Congress until New York elected Shirley Chisholm in 1968 (Michals 2015). After women were able to vote, female politicians began elevating to elected office and being appointed to important government positions (“Milestones for Women” 2019). However, women still only make up 26.5 percent of the United States Congress, and the first woman to be the Vice President of the United States happened in 2021 (“Current Numbers”).

There is only one legislative body that has reached gender parity in the United States, and that is Nevada in 2018.
Western states have traditionally had more women in office than other geographic locations in the United States, but none have been able to reach gender parity in both houses of the legislature except for Nevada (Flanzraich 2019). Nevada is now the only state government to have over 50 percent of their legislature be women, and they significantly out-paced the federal government (Flanzraich 2019). Democrats control the House and Senate in Nevada, and this could be a contributing factor as to why Nevada reached gender parity because there are more Democratic female candidates than Republican female candidates. The trend on the graph above tells the story that place matters in politics; generally, with very few exceptions, the South’s state legislatures have a smaller share of women than the national average, while states in the West and Northeast tend to have higher shares (Koeze, Conroy, Thomson-DeVeaux 2020).
The green shows the states that are above the national average, and the purple shows states that are below the national average when it comes to female representation. These differences can be due to differing state cultures, political parties, gender biases, and campaign financing. Rice and Coates (1995), did a study on traditional gender roles in the South and if they differ from the other regions. They created an eight-question survey that asked questions about the employment of mothers, employed women in general, and women in politics. Their study found that Southerners are still significantly more
conservative than people in other regions, but they are most similar to people in the Midwest (Rice and Coates 1995). However, this study showed that Southerners have the most traditional viewpoints when it comes to women in politics, and, as a whole, this study found that conservative gender attitudes are more prominent in the South than any other region in the United States (Rice and Coates 1995). In this survey, nearly eleven percent of Southerners did not want to vote for a woman for President, but, the most interesting find in this study, is that southern white women hold more conservative attitudes about women running for office than white southern men (Rice and Coates 1995). Rice and Coates (1995), accredits this to the “southern lady” mentality, and this mentality discourages women from having a seat in politics. This study is twenty-six years old, but the people who were answering conservatively in this survey are more than likely still alive and voting today. Not only do some voters in the South hold gendered attitudes when it comes to women in politics, but, more importantly, women in the South also hold these gendered attitudes even more so than men. This culture and the mind-set of southerners obviously affects female representation in the South.

Women who serve in state legislatures are the pipeline that eventually leads to the United States Congress, so it is relevant to see where female candidates thrive and where they do not. This paper seeks to answer the question do female politicians raise as much money as men; since campaigns rely on fundraising, its important to see if female politicians are comparative to male politicians in this area. Women must combat voter biases, gendered media coverage, and party recruitment; so, do female politicians face yet another barrier when it comes to fundraising?
Chapter 2

In 1890, Wyoming entered the Union as the first state that gave women the same rights as men to vote in elections and hold office (Amar 2005). Other western states such as Colorado, Utah, and Idaho followed suit behind Wyoming and allowed women to vote and hold office (Amar 2005). Then, in the early 1910s, Montana, Washington, Oregon, and Nevada all began to embrace women’s suffrage (Amar 2005). This is how Jeannette Rankin was able to become the first woman elected to Congress a few years before the 19th amendment passed (“Jeannette Rankin” 2009). Jeannette was a Montana Republican that was elected to the House of Representatives in 1916, and she garnered support from men and women in Montana (“Jeannette Rankin” 2009). Rankin lost re-election in 1918 partially because of her vote against entering World War I; however, she won a seat in Congress when she ran again in 1940 (“Jeannette Rankin” 2009).
By the end of 1919, 29 states had adopted either full or partial suffrage for women, and Presidential candidates could no longer appear outright anti-suffragist (Amar 2005). President Woodrow Wilson pleaded before the Senate to pass an amendment that would allow women to vote because he said the amendment was a “vitaly necessary war effort” (Amar 2005). President Wilson believed the amendment would enhance America’s claim to global leadership, so Congress proposed the 19th Amendment (Amar 2005). The 19th amendment guarantees women’s equal right to vote in elections by prohibiting the state and federal government from denying the right to vote on the basis of sex, and reads: “The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex” (“19th Amendment” 2010). However, this did not always extend the right to vote to black women (Jones 2021). Black women still had to navigate a maze of state laws that kept African American’s from exercising their right to vote because of Jim Crow laws (Jones 2021). Southern states effectively disenfranchised people of color by instilling poll taxes, literacy tests, grandfather clauses, intimidation tactics, and lynching’s (Jones 2021). It was not until 1968 that the first black woman won a seat in Congress (Michals 2015). Shirley Chisholm was not just the first black woman elected to Congress; she also sought the Democratic Party presidential nomination in 1972 (Michals 2015). She had an underfinanced campaign, and she did not appear in the televised primary debates (Michals 2015). However, Chisholm was able to pave the path for the women who would come after her.

Geraldine Ferraro was one of the trailblazers who followed Shirley Chisholm. Ferraro became the first woman to appear on a major-party ticket; she ran on a ticket with
Walter Mondale to become his Vice President (Thulin 2020). This ticket focused on the fact that they were “campaigning for the future,” and Mondale firmly believed that having a woman on a major-party ticket would change American expectations for the better (Thulin 2020). After the televised debate between Ferraro and George H.W. Bush, she faced many sexist remarks and was scrutinized in the press (Thulin 2020). Bush’s Press Secretary said “she’s too bitchy”, and newspapers asked her if she would bake blueberry muffins or if she was capable of pushing the nuclear button (Thulin 2020). Even though the Mondale/Ferraro ticket suffered one of the worst electoral college losses, her candidacy sparked enthusiasm in women (Thulin 2020). This enthusiasm helped create EMILY’s List, and this PAC still helps Democratic women who support reproductive rights get elected today (Thulin 2020). EMILY’s List was created in 1985, to fund political campaigns of pro-choice Democratic female candidates. They are a PAC that bundles money and sends it to Democratic women, who are pro-choice, in competitive races. They fund(ed) nearly every well known Democratic woman such as: Nancy Pelosi, Kamala Harris, Hillary Clinton, Elizabeth Warren, and Dianne Feinstein just to name a few (“Women We Helped Elect”). EMILY’s List has helped elect over one hundred Democratic pro-choice women to the House, twenty-six to the Senate, sixteen to governors’ seats, and hundreds of women to state and local office (“Women We Helped Elect”). Ferraro said “my candidacy has said the days of discrimination are numbered. American women will never be second-class citizens again,” and she was correct (Thulin 2020).

Twenty-four years after Geraldine Ferraro appeared on a major-party ticket, Sarah Palin, as a part of the McCain presidential campaign, was selected to run as the Vice
President on the Republican ticket. Eight years later, Hillary Clinton became the first woman to be nominated to run for President of the United States by a major party. In 2020, Kamala Harris has become the first woman to reach the White House as Vice President. Women who run for legislative offices all must face one common issue: fundraising. This paper seeks to answer the question: do female candidates raise as much money as male candidates? If so, are there geographic or partisan explanations? This is an important question to answer because in order to run a successful campaign, it usually requires a large sum of money. In House elections, 90% of people who spent more than their competitor won from 2000 through 2016 (Koerth 2018). The Tea Party wave election of 2010 was the only exception (Koerth 2018). These politicians often spend their money on campaign advertisements and traveling, which provides name recognition and being able to reach out to more of their constituents. So, if women are receiving less campaign donations, this could be a factor as to why they only make up 23.7% of Congress (“Current Numbers”). Some research suggests that women raise the same amount of money as men, so I will look at money contributions throughout the last three Presidential elections beginning in 2012 and ending in 2020. I hypothesize that as the years go on, the gap will close between what men and women raise, but women will still receive less campaign contributions than male candidates.

Bias in Politics

Women are often treated differently than men in politics, and fundraising is not just one instance of a bias towards men. Women are treated differently by the media, the parties, and even voters. I will analyze the literature about the mistreatment of women in
the media, in the political parties, and the biases that voters have against female politicians.

**Social Media**

“Women are substantially underrepresented in the media, in general, and in written press in particular;” (Shor, van de Rijt, Miltsov, Kulkarni, Skiena 2015). Gendered media coverage still remains a barrier to women politicians today (Ryan 2013). The media frames women within their stereotypical box, and they often cover female politicians’ marital status, personal appearance and other things about their personal lives that they do not discuss about their male counterparts (Ryan 2013). They also spend more time writing about “female issues” like healthcare and education which undermines their credibility in other areas of more “masculine policy,” (Ryan 2013). Media frames confine female politicians to stereotypical roles that women are supposed to fall under, and this can construe the coverage and the perception of that candidate (Ryan 2013). In 2008, Joseph Uscinski and Lily Goren analyzed how broadcasters discussed Hillary Clinton in comparison with Barack Obama (Ames 2020). They found that Hillary Clinton was mentioned by her first name four times more than Barack Obama, which is a way of addressing her less formally than her male counterpart (Ames 2020). She was also labeled as “emotional” after tearing up on the campaign trail, and the media consistently referenced her menstrual cycle, pantsuits, laugh, and her husband (Ames 2020). Her body was even insulted because of the “thickness of her ankles.” This is how the media, obviously or not, was able to divert the conversation away from her policy and experience and focus on rather trivial, sexist content. Storybench election coverage tracker has tracked election coverage in the Democratic Primary in 2020, and they have
found evidence of gendered media bias. They found that female candidates receive less attention within the media, and the coverage that they do receive tends to focus on their appearance and personal life rather than their professional experience (Bajak and Heckman 2019). Female candidates, who were running for President in 2020, also get the majority of the negative coverage (Bajak and Heckman 2019). This bias in the media is just one example of how women are treated differently in the political arena.

In this new technological age, print media and the news are no longer the only type of media consumers are ingesting because 1 in 5 American’s receive their news from social media (Mitchell, Jurkowitz 2020). Social media has become a new platform for politicians to utilize during their campaign; it is cheap, fast, and easy. However, this new frontier of social media is yet another outlet where female politicians can face even more sexism and scrutiny. In the book “I’m (Not) With Her,” Melissa Ames talks about how social media, specifically Twitter, affected Hillary Clinton’s campaign in 2016. In 2016, Hillary Clinton would face negative attention in the primaries and the general election because she was a woman. In one study, Rebekah Tromble and Dirk Hovy analyzed tweets during the New Hampshire primary (Ames 2020). They determined that words associated @HillaryClinton were more negative than words associated with @BernieSanders (Ames 2020). They noted that only nine words were negative and 40 were positive when writing about Bernie Sanders, but only eight words were positive when writing about Hillary Clinton but there were 53 negative words (Ames 2020). They analyzed these words for gender implications, and only twelve words associated with Bernie Sanders carried a gendered meaning (Ames 2020). However, those words carried no negative connotation. On the other hand, there were 29 words associated with Hillary
Clinton that had a gendered meaning, but 13 carried negative connotations (Ames 2020). These researchers also analyzed these tweets looking for when words like “bimbo” or “whore” appeared or other gendered slurs (Ames 2020). 52,181 tweets mention Hillary Clinton, and of those tweets 1.16% mentioned these insults (Ames 2020). They came from both Trump supporters and Bernie supporters.

During the first debate of the primary election, these researches scraped data from twitter for tweets using the hashtag #debatenight (Ames 2020). They also gathered more tweets when the debate was over by using the advanced search option on Twitter and the hashtag to garner up more tweets for the study (Ames 2020). They shuffled the tweets about Hillary Clinton into two broad categories: tweets that mentioned her personality and tweets that mentioned her appearance (Ames 2020). These tweets often mentioned her personality as fake, poised, robotic, shrill, bore, elitist, and “having a thirst for power” (Ames 2020). Her appearance was also talked about a great deal. Everything from her pantsuit, to hair, make-up, skin color, and more. Donald Trump also received negative comments on his appearance, but these comments do not fit into the stereotypical box of what people believe men should look and act like Hillary Clinton did (Ames 2020).

Hillary Clinton was often blamed or partially blamed for the affair of her husband Bill Clinton, but people often attempted to make rational excuses for Donald Trump’s outward misogynistic comments and sexual assault accusations. This shows the gender norm that not only are women are held to a higher standard when it comes to scandals, but also men are more excusable when it comes to sexual transgressions (Ames 2020). These studies are especially important to look at because social media will not only continue to become more popular, but it is also more widely used than ever before. It is
not just women like Hillary Clinton who face this scrutiny on social media, but it is nearly all women who run for Congress. Congresswomen like Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, Ms. Omar, Ms. Tlaib, and Ms. Presley often receive backlash on twitter, and some of these sexist tweets will come from the President himself. Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram have turned into localized friend groups to major media outlets. We cannot definitely claim Clinton’s loss on social media, or one particular factor; however, one can draw the conclusion that women are, without a doubt, treated differently in the media, held to a higher standard, and are more often compared to negative gendered stereotypes. It is important to be well aware of the biases that are in place.

Twitter, Instagram, and Facebook’s political influence are significant, and these social media platforms are gaining traction every day for example: the #MeToo movement relied on social media to spread the word. The #MeToo movement was started by the actor Alyssa Milano when, she tweeted “if you’ve been sexually harassed or assaulted write ‘me too’ as a reply to this tweet,” in the wake of the Harvey Weinstein sexual assault allegations (Thomson 2018). This helped build a sense of community world-wide for women who suffered from sexual violence (Thomson 2018). The #MeToo movement proved how pervasive, influential, and global social media can be. Some adults changed their stance on LGBTQ rights, immigration, and other social issues because of social media (Perrin 2020). Social media has the power to change the mindsets of adults, spread information, and connect people across the globe. Social media is extremely far reaching and influential in almost every aspect of someone’s life, and the #MeToo movement is an example of the scope and size of how the internet can play a role in influencing social and political movements.
Political Parties

Party recruitment plays an important role in women running for office, and these party elites tend to recruit men more than women (Butler and Preece 2016). Women are also less likely to consider running for office when there is a lack of recruitment, but recent research suggests that women are harder to recruit than men (Butler and Preece 2016). However, Daniel Butler and Jessica Robinson Preece did a study looking into why women are less likely to respond positively to recruitment strategies. The female respondents believed that they would be treated differently, and they thought that they would receive less help. These respondents often pointed out gendered bias in political networks that they had come across such as: newspapers, social media, and news/televised networks. So, it is not surprising that women are less enthusiastic about running for office because they believe there is bias within the party’s. Women are also underrepresented in the leadership of the political parties, and this can also lead to the lack of recruitment for women because men and women social networks, beliefs, and desired candidate characteristics differ (“Women Candidates”). However, the Democratic Party does provide more female representation in leadership roles than the Republican Party. In 2021, there are only four women who are in leadership roles for the Republican Party and the Republican National Convention; these women are the Chairwoman, Ronna McDaniel; the Secretary, Vicki Drummond; Senate Republican Conference vice chair, Joni Ernst; and House Republican Conference chairman, Liz Cheney (“Republican Party” 2021). The Democratic Party leadership roles are occupied by the following nine women: Nancy Pelosi, the Speaker of the U.S. of Representatives; Keisha Lance Bottoms, Vice chair for civic engagement and voter protection; Gretchen Whitmer, Vice chairwoman;
Tammy Duckworth, Vice chairwoman; Virginia McGregor, Treasurer; Andrea Stewart-Cousins, Democratic Legislative Campaign Committee chairwoman; Michelle Lujan Grisham, Governors association chairman; and Mary Beth Cahill, Chief Executive Officer (“Democratic Party” 2021). Some women feel discouraged by their party because in a survey of local government elected women said that party leaders “discouraged potential women candidates from running for office because of their gender,” (“Women Candidates”). In a six-state study, it was found that electoral gatekeepers are overwhelmingly male, and that this is a disadvantage to women running for state legislative seats; in the states where parties play a larger role in selecting candidates, fewer women hold state legislative office (Fox and Lawless 2010). Again, in a four-state study, it revealed that local female office holders believed that party leaders discouraged female candidates by belittling their political ambition, putting them in hopeless races, and placing them in low-profile roles (Fox and Lawless 2010). Surveys of the local party leaders, in the four-state study, corroborated the officeholders’ beliefs; male party leaders did prefer male candidates over female candidates (Fox and Lawless 2010). Since there is evidence of gender bias at a local level, it is not surprising that the recruitment process is at the state and national levels are biased towards men as well.

There are 26 women in the United States Senate; 17 Democrats and 9 Republicans (“Current Numbers” 2020). There are 101 women in the United States House; 88 Democrats and 13 Republicans (“Current Numbers” 2020). One can easily see the disparity within the parties when comparing the numbers of Democratic and Republican women. So, women are not just treated differently when it comes to candidate recruitment, but also handled very differently amongst the parties. Republican
tend to face less support within their party and less funding than Democratic women. This could be because Republican women are seen as more moderate than their male counterparts, or that Republican voters and party officials are less likely than Democrat voters or party officials to see benefits resulting from having more women in office (“Women Candidates”). In an ever-growing partisan world, it is beneficial to Democratic women rather than Republican women. For the purpose of electing more women to Congress, it is good that female candidates are perceived as more liberal than men in the Democratic Party, but this is a hinderance to Republican female candidates especially in their primaries (“Women Candidates”). Democratic women are often seen as the champions of women’s issues such as: reproductive rights and equal pay (Thomsen and Swers 2017). However, Republican women are much less likely to be allies for women’s issues because women’s issues are not central to the agenda of the Republican Party, and, because of this, women’s issues will be a continued source of polarization for the parties (Thomsen and Swers 2017).

The gender gap in voting has been an on-going phenomenon for decades, but before the 1980’s it was called the “traditional gender gap” (Stachowski 2004). During the 1950s and 1960s, women voted for Republican candidates more than men. However, when the divorce rates started to increase, and Ronald Reagan made anti-abortion a part of the Republican Party platform, women began voting for Democratic candidates more than men (Stachowski 2004). The number of unmarried women is steadily increasing, and only 39 percent of unmarried women identify with the Republican Party while 56 percent of married women identify with the Republican Party (Stachowski 2004). Though more women identify with the Democratic Party, vote in Democratic primaries, and
support Democratic candidates in the general election, it is male voters who have essentially created this “gender gap” (Barnes and Cassese 2017). Between 1952 and 2004, there was a 5 percent decline in women who identify with the Republican Party, but there was a 16 percent decline in men who identify with the Democratic Party (Barnes and Cassese 2017). However, the gap increases as individual’s political sophistication increases; there is a six-point gender gap between men and women with low political engagement, and a twenty-point gender gap between men and women with high political engagement (Barnes and Cassese 2017). Among Republican voters, women tend to favor welfare programs, child care, education, healthcare, gun control, and the millionaire tax more so than Republican men; however, there is no difference in their stances on abortion or immigration (Barnes and Cassese 2017). Even though Republican women are slightly more moderate then their male counterparts, this new era of highly polarized politics has left little space for them, and now female Republican legislators are indistinguishable from Republican male legislators (Barnes and Cassese 2017).

The Democratic party and women’s groups all want to expand women’s representation in Congress (Thomsen and Swers 2017). Reforms adopted in the 1970s mandate the representation of women and minorities in Democratic party convention delegations; however, the Republican party encourages diversity at their conventions, but they do not reserve seats for female or minority representation (Thomsen and Swers 2017). The Republican party rejects the identity-based appeals for women in office, and they value doctrinal purity and conservative principles over group-oriented interests (Thomsen and Swers 2017). Thomsen and Swers (2017) found that 90 percent of Democrat activists said that they believed their party supported the interests of women;
on the other hand, less than 50 percent of Republican activists said the same about their party.

Pew Research also did a survey about women and leadership in 2018. 79% of Democrats/Leaning Democrats said that there are too few women in political office today, but only 33% of Republicans/Leaning Republicans felt this way (Horowitz, Igielnik, and Parker 2018). 64% of Democrats/Leaning Democrats said that gender discrimination is a major reason why there are not more women in office, but only 30% of Republicans/Leaning Republicans felt this way (Horowitz, Igielnik, and Parker 2018). These are important numbers to discuss because if Republican’s do not see an issue with the amount of female representation, they could be less inclined to go out and seek female candidates. They also believe that gender discrimination is not a major factor as to why women do not hold office, and this could, again, be a reason that Republicans have less female representation and candidates, historically. Political parties and their recruitment literature are complex, but one can gather that leadership within the party can influence the types of candidates that are recruited and female candidates do not always feel supported. There are major discrepancies within the parties and how they go about recruiting, supporting, and electing women. Overall, it is evident that female candidates are treated differently than their male counterparts when it comes to recruitment and parties.

Voter Biases

There are mixed conclusions about whether gender stereotypes can hurt female candidates. Female candidates are often at odds with the stereotypes associated with being female, such as: emotional, warm, compassionate, wife, and motherly to name a
few (Bauer 2013). Descriptive stereotypes refer to observable traits exhibited by women, and prescriptive stereotypes specify the behavioral expectations of women (Bauer 2013). Prescriptive stereotypes can actually be the most harmful to female candidates because these lead to the expectations of how women are supposed to act; if women do not conform to the stereotype expected by society, it could severely limit the success of female politicians (Bauer 2013). This is especially important to understand because it can help researchers understand how voters use stereotypes to help develop opinions and expectations of female candidates (Bauer 2013). Since prescriptive stereotypes define what is acceptable for a woman, female candidates who are tough, assertive, and aggressiveness counter the typical prescriptive stereotype of a woman. Thus, female candidates can suffer backlash, and they can be viewed negatively by voters for not acting how “women are supposed to act.”

Female candidates all face the same issue as being labeled either “too emotional” or “too cold.” So, women must walk a very fine line of balance, but female candidates are judged more harshly and are held to higher standards than their male counterparts (Brooks 2013). A study by Deborah Brooks looks closely at displays of emotion by female and male candidates to see if a double standard is evoked. Crying and obvious aggression or anger shown by female candidates can be dangerous emotions to display to voters (Brooks 2013). Anger is a descriptive stereotype that is allowed for men to show because that is an internal characteristic that aligns with men; however, anger is counter-narrative to the stereotypes associated with women (Brooks 2013). Deborah Brooks did a large study on the effects of public displays of crying and anger for female and male candidates. Respondents had to read newspaper articles on fictitious male and female
candidates about that candidates display of emotion, and they had to evaluate them. She concluded that she found no significant difference between the penalties that male and female candidates faced for showing displays of emotion, but she did find that women judged the female candidate more harshly for displays of emotion than men. Her conclusion also prompted that the way that the media may cover these “emotional display events” may curb the way people evaluate candidates. However, Huddy and Terkildsen (1993) found that stereotypes may affect how voters feel the candidate will handle certain policy issues. Their study concludes that stereotypes of women being warm, sensitive, and kind qualified female candidates at better handling issues that deal with healthcare, women’s issues, education, and problems of the poor and elderly. On the other hand, male candidate stereotypes were thought to make them better equipped to handle foreign diplomacy, military, and economic policy. These findings suggest that masculine traits are considered more central to politics than feminine traits when it comes to executive positions and national politics (Huddy and Terkildsen 1993). They conclude that these are not unsurmountable barriers for female candidates to overcome, but they will have to present their masculine qualities the correct way.

The literature of voter’s bias is complex, and it is hard for many researchers to capture whether it has a significant impact or not. However, in 2020, female candidates often face the “likability” question which is inherently biased. Men are never asked if they are “likable” enough to be elected because it is obvious that they are not judged as harshly as female candidates. Research shows that voters will support a male candidate they dislike, but they are unlikely to support an unlikable female candidate (Thomson 2019). Though being sexist is not socially acceptable anymore, 13% of Americans still
believe men are better suited for politics (Thomson 2019). Overall, female candidates must walk on a tight-rope and balance their feminine and masculine qualities to seem suited for office. Voters are more reluctant and less forgiving of female candidates. This does not make it impossible for female candidates to be voted into office, but it does make it more difficult than a male candidate seeking office because female candidates are judged to a different standard.

Fundraising

In 2020, women ran and donated in record numbers (“In 2020 Women Ran”). Contributions greater than $200 from women rose from twenty-eight percent in 2016 to thirty-three percent in 2020, and the gain can mostly be credited to the increased number of Democratic women running (“In 2020 Women Ran”). In 2012, women donations to Democrat congressional and presidential candidates were $237,371,991, and women donations to Republican congressional and presidential candidates were $222,830,474 (“In 2020 Women Ran”). In 2016, women donations to Democrat congressional and presidential candidates were $286,146,652, and women donations to Republican congressional and presidential candidates were $179,042,431 (“In 2020 Women Ran”). In 2020, women donations to Democrat congressional and presidential candidates were $580,495,362, and women donations to Republican congressional and presidential candidates were $250,810,399 (“In 2020 Women Ran”). From these trends in the past three election cycles, one can see that women are becoming increasingly involved in the fundraising aspect of the electoral process. In 2020 races, women accounted for 33 percent of donations to congressional candidates and 31 percent of donations to state-level candidates, both record highs (“In 2020 Women Ran”). Women donors gave nearly
half, 46 percent, of their contributions to women candidates while men donors gave 24 percent, compared to 13 percent in 2012 (“In 2020 Women Ran”).

Individual donors make up a little more than half of all campaign dollars in congressional elections, and, because of this, donors can have a significant impact on a candidate’s campaigns and elections (Crespin and Deitz 2010). Women donor networks and small donors tend to lean more liberal, and this favors liberal Democratic women (Crespin and Deitz 2010). Female donor lists like EMILY’s List, WISH List, NOW, and Susan B. Anthony List funnel individual contributions to female candidates; however, these donor networks create a substantial advantage for Democrat women more than Republican women to raise money through individual donors (Crespin and Deitz 2010). Women House members consistently raise the largest share of their campaign funds from small, individual donors that contribute less than $200 (Crespin and Deitz 2010). This could be viewed as a positive or negative aspect; the positive is that women have a broader base of financial support than men, but the negative is that women tend to have to work harder in order to receive those funds (Crespin and Deitz 2010).

American elections are unique in the fact that a congressional candidate must raise a significant amount of money in order to be competitive in their race (Thomsen and Swers 2017). In the 2012 election, the average house candidate spent over $1.5 million dollars on their campaign (Thomsen and Swers 2017). In order for these candidates to prove their viability in the primaries, they have to build their own donor networks; a strong network of donors helps convince the party and other interested groups to throw their connections behind that candidate (Thomsen and Swers 2017). Women candidates, specifically Democratic women, benefit from female donor networks; however, the
majority of donors are men (Thomsen and Swers 2017). With this being said, it is important to understand the types of candidates who can build donor networks and the type of people who donate (Thomsen and Swers 2017). Ideology is one of the main reasons that people donate; donors generally only receive purposive benefits rather than social or material benefits (Thomsen and Swers 2017). So, these contributors care deeply about the candidate’s policy stances, and candidates that are more extreme raise a higher amount of funds from individual donations (Thomsen and Swers 2017). Individual donors also take into consideration strategic partisan concerns, and they will seek to donate to competitive races that will increase the number of seats for their party (Thomsen and Swers 2017). Male donors give twice as much money to incumbent Democrat candidates and three times the amount of money to incumbent Republican candidates than female donors do (Thomsen and Swers 2017). Female candidates raise more money from female donors than male candidates do, and Democratic women receive more of this money than their Republican counterparts (Thomsen and Swers 2017). Republican women receive less money from female donors than Republican men do, and this is because Republican women are often the challengers in an election and not the incumbent (Thomsen and Swers 2017). Thomsen and Swers (2017) found that Democratic men and women candidates have vastly different donor networks, and more women donate to female candidates and more men donate to male candidates. Thomsen and Swers (2017) attribute this difference to the different social and business connections among female and male Democratic candidates. On the other hand, male and female Republican candidates have very similar donor networks, and Thomsen and Swers (2017) found no statistically significant evidence that shows differences in donors’ support for
female and male Republican candidates. This can make it more difficult for Republican women to fundraise money because they must raise money from the same donors that men receive donations from (Thomsen and Swers 2017). This can become an obstacle for Republican women because they are more often the challenger and not the incumbent with an extensive network of donors.

Candidates who receive higher amounts of donations from individual donors are more ideologically extreme than candidates who receive money from the parties and PACs (Thomsen and Swers 2017). Democratic female donors favor more liberal candidates, female donors prefer female candidates, and these donors also support egalitarian gender roles (Thomsen and Swers 2017). Republican female donors also favor the more ideologically extreme candidate; a one unit increase in conservatism garners 43 percent more donations from female Republican donors (Thomsen and Swers 2017). Neither Republican women nor men prioritize the election of female candidates, and Republican donors’ favor more traditional gender roles (Thomsen and Swers 2017).
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The data that was collected will be able to explain many different situations when it comes to female candidates fundraising. The data was collected from the Harvard MIT Election Data Science Lab. It has every U.S. House of Representatives candidate that ran in the general election for the House of Representatives from 1976 through 2018, but, for the purpose of this project, only the Presidential election years from 1980 through 2016 are used in this data set. It also includes how much money candidates raised, what state they are from, and what party the candidate was affiliated with. This data set also accounts for inflation by using the constant dollar value of 2020, and using an inflation calculator so that all the money has the same value. By using this data, one will be able to answer the following hypotheses:

1. Women who run for congressional offices in southern states raise less money than women who run for congressional office in other states.
2. When it is a woman v woman race, outspending the opponent matters less.

3. Democratic women raise more money on average than Republican women.

4. The gap will shrink between what men and women raise, but women will still receive less campaign contributions than male candidates.

The first hypothesis is important to look at because there are many stereotypes that surround the culture in the South, and some literature, Rice and Coates (1995), found that people in the South hold conservative attitudes about women running for office. If this is true, then female candidates in the South would not receive adequate campaign financing in comparison to female candidates in other regions. The second hypothesis is to test if money does or does not matter in a race that involves two women running against one another. Hypothesis three will answer whether Democratic female candidates raise more money or if Republican female candidates raise more money. The Democratic party takes a strong, progressive stance on women’s reproductive health and other women’s issues, and the Republican party does not have a strong interest in women’s issues. Horowitz, Igielnik, and Parker (2018), did a Pew Research Survey that found that 79 percent of Democrats/Leaning Democrats said that there are too few women in political office today, but only 33% of Republicans/Leaning Republicans felt this way. Swers and Thomsen (2017), also found that 90 percent of Democrat activists said that they believed their party supported the interests of women; on the other hand, less than 50 percent of Republican activists said the same about their party. So, literature suggests that the Democratic Party is the party for women and the Republican Party is not, but which female candidates receive the most financial backing? Finally, the fourth hypothesis is based on the assumption that male candidates raise more money than female candidates,
and, if they do, that the gap between male and female candidates will shrink. Crespin and Deitz (2010), found that women who run for the House of Representatives receive the majority of their campaign contributions through small donors that donate less than two hundred dollars, and larger scale donors are more popular amongst men. So, this hypothesis really seeks to answer if female candidates are raising less than men, and if so, does this gap shrink over time.
Figure 3

Unlogged Receipt Data
Quadrennial Data: 1980-1996
The graphs above illustrate the comparison of the distribution of money raised before taking the natural log of money (Figure 3) and then after taking the natural log of money (Figure 4). In Figure 3 the data is skewed very, very positive, but, after taking the natural log, Figure 4, it follows the bell curve shape. The explanation is money follows a logarithmic function. So, to account for that, we needed to take the log of money raised across all observations. Money and population generally have to be logged because it can skew the data positively when that is not the actual results.
Hypotheses One - Women who run for congressional offices in southern states raise less money than women who run for congressional office in other states.

This hypothesis has little support from the data (Figure 5). This could be a combination of multiple different factors. This data set only focused on female and male candidates in general elections; these female candidates received the party nomination. So, a possible explanation could be that after female candidates make it out of the primary election and into the general election, gender tends to matter less and partisanship completely takes over. Elected officials in the South also tend to stay in office for a very long time, and it is common for incumbents to easily collect campaign contributions. This can connect to the third hypothesis as well because the South is a Republican party stronghold, and this data set shows that Republican women are out-fundraising Democratic women between 1980 and 2016. So, it is sensible to see that southern candidates, specifically female candidates, raise almost the same as female candidates from other regions. There are not substantive differences between fundraising in the South or Non-South regions. There are not significant differences between female or male candidates either.
Often, people have stereotypes of the South, and some literature suggest that the culture of the South can negatively affect female candidates and their ability to fundraise. However, this data set shows that there is not a significant difference in Southern and Non-Southern female candidates when it comes to fundraising. This shows that women, no matter their region, have a chance in running a successful campaign and fundraising an adequate amount of money. This shows that female candidates in the South, who make it to the general election for the House of Representatives, are financially backed to the same degree as female candidates in other regions as well as male candidates.
Hypotheses Two- When it is a woman v woman race, outspending the opponent matters less.

This hypothesis has little support from the data (Figure 6); in all aspects of campaigns, money matters even when it is two women running against one another. Money does indeed matter in races that involve only women, and this graph shows that it always matters.

Figure 6

Most importantly, this graph shows a perfect linear relationship; the more money you raise the more likely you are to win, and money does not see gender. This is the most
important takeaway of the study. Often, people underestimate the power of money in politics, but this data set shows that in every region, despite who is involved in the House race, money can significantly impact the results of an election. To further prove this point, if the project were to be redone, I would look at early fundraising in primary elections, and also who is running in a race that is independently wealthy. This is because in some races there was no challenger, or the challenger raised little to no money. This could be because the partisan make-up of a district leaves little room for success of the opposing party. Also, after a candidate receives the party nomination, it would become easier for that candidate to have access to more funds; however, it could be interesting to see if candidates who have a lot of early donations in the primaries go on to win the primary election and then the general election. This way, one could use campaign contributions as a marker of success later on.

*Hypotheses Three* - *Democratic women raise more money on average than Republican women.*

This hypothesis has little support from the data, and in this data set Republican raised more money than Democratic women. Republican women held a 3.17 percent advantage over Democratic women. There is a reason as to why this may be so. The Republican party is not the party that people think of when they think of women’s issues or inclusivity; however, the Republican party is made-up by some of the most affluent people in the United States. Republican candidates receive a significant number of votes from individuals with incomes over $50,000 per year, and the advantage increases along with the income level, to a height of 63 percent of individuals earning $200,000 or more a year supporting Republicans (Fay 2020). This level is the direct opposite of individuals
earning less than $15,000 a year, who support Democrats at 63 percent and Republicans at only 36 percent (Fay 2020). Individuals that identify as Republicans have more expendable income than individuals that identify with the Democratic party or Independents (Fay 2020). Since female candidates vying for House seats receive a majority of their campaign contributions

_Hypotheses four- The gap will shrink between what men and women raise, but women will still receive less campaign contributions than male candidates._

The data set was split in two in order to see whether a gap does or does not shrink over time. From 1980 through 2000 is the first half, and 2000 through 2016 is the second half of the data set. In the pre-2000 section, female candidates raised more than male candidates, and female candidates also raised more money than male candidate’s post-2000 as well. Both female and male candidates have increased the amount of money they received; male candidates increased their campaign contributions by 16 percent, and female candidates by 15 percent. The constraint of this dataset is that it only looks at House data in Presidential election years; if this study was to be done again, I would look at Senate and House candidates during Presidential election years and the midterm elections. This would give a more definitive answer to if female candidates raise more or less than male candidates and if a gap exists or does not exist.
Chapter 5

Overall, chapter four shows that female candidates in the South raise just as much as female candidates in other regions as well as male candidates. It also shows that female candidates in this data set raised more money than their male counterparts, and Republican female candidates raised more money than Democratic female candidates. Most importantly, this dataset showed just how strong the connection is between fundraising and winning; the graph has a near perfect linear relationship. Some of the literature suggests that money does not necessarily determine the outcome of elections, but that it is simply just a contributing factor to success. However, I would make the argument that the majority of candidates who raise the most money in an election typically win that race, and I would also make the argument that money is an extremely close second to partisanship when it comes winning an election. This dataset shows a clear relationship that when candidates campaign fundraising increases, so does their
chance of success. However, this could be a dangerous path that United States elections are taking because the use of “dark money” has increased over the years. Dark money can be funneled into Super PAC’s anonymously, and the majority of the time it is untraceable. This money could come from other countries trying to influence the result of an election, or it can come from unethical practices. It is essentially a way to cheat the system and use millions of dollars that should not be poured into United States elections. After seeing such a relationship between raising money and the success of a candidate, people should be more concerned about the use and power of money.

In 2010, the Supreme Court made a decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* that essentially allowed corporations and wealthy donors to have even more power when it comes to political campaign spending. They reversed campaign financing restrictions, and now corporations, outside groups, and wealthy donors can spend an unlimited amount of money supporting a candidate as long as they are not coordinating with the candidate. Lau (2019) found that after the 2010 ruling, there was an increase in political spending from outside groups as well as an increase in the use of dark money. Allowing Super PACs and PACs to control federal elections is not only immoral and a threat to United States sovereignty, but it also negatively impacts female candidates. The Brennan Center for Justice lays out an agenda that can help right this wrong without overturning the Supreme Court precedent.

The Federal Election Committee (FEC) has to enforce the campaign election laws and update their election rules. The FEC is composed of, typically, three Republicans and three Democrats that are appointed to these positions by their party leaders (Lau 2019). Since this agency is evenly split, it requires the votes of at least four of the six
commissioners (Lau 2019). Historically, they would broker deals and compromise to update campaign finance laws; however, the increasing polarization in American politics has made compromises within the FEC quite difficult (Lau 2019). The FEC is so divided by partisanship that they cannot agree on investigations, the creation of new rules, or even administrative tasks (Lau 2019). The Brennan Center for Justice suggests to fix the FEC, Congress should increase the number of commissioners to an odd number (including at least one independent), to avoid gridlock, appoint an actual chair, and implement term limits for the commissioners. These improvements could-make the Federal Election Committee effective at doing their job. In turn, this would inevitably create a better environment for female candidates to run. The FEC is a defense against corruption in campaign financing and policing organizations who violate the rules.

On January 1, 2020, New York became the second state in a century to create a public campaign financing system for state elections (Malbin and Glavin 2020). In order for everyone to participate in this democracy, empowering small donors and taking power away from Super PACs and the wealthy, is a plausible solution. New York is using a tiered matching system that allows individual donors and low-income districts to make a difference in their favored candidates campaign financing (Malbin and Glavin 2020). The tiers are as follows:

- The first $50 would be matched at a 12:1 rate.
- The next $100 ($51-$101) would be matched at a 9:1 rate.
- The next $100 ($151-$250) would be matched at an 8:1 rate.
For example, a $50 contribution would become $650, and a $250 contribution would become $2,550 (Malbin and Glavin 2020). A legislative candidate who raises 100 within-district contributions of $50 would see $5,000 in private funds become $65,000 in campaign money (Malbin and Glavin 2020). They are also not imposing mandatory spending limits for candidates who accept these public campaign funds, but they capped the amount for a statewide candidate at $7 million divided between the primaries and general elections (Malbin and Glavin 2020). The commission decided to only match the money that comes from within that district, but candidates may still receive campaign contributions from outside of the district (Malbin and Glavin 2020). This type of public campaign financing will not only diversify the pool of candidates, but it will also create spaces where women can raise a significant amount of money from small donors. This allows the constituents to get involved, and I think that it could be successful on a national scale.

The Federal Election Committee needs to undergo an update in rules as well as increasing the number of commissioners to avoid gridlock. These are positions where partisanship should not matter; only the interest of fair and free elections should matter. This overhaul, in conjunction with the creation of a public campaign financing option, would create a political environment where money is not the most important thing on a candidate’s agenda. With New York’s new tiered strategy, House candidates would be required to spend time getting to know their constituents, and this would ultimately make them more in-tuned with their districts, which is ultimately their job. Under our current system, candidates can receive campaign contributions and win races without even having to speak or listen to constituents because they can raise so much money through
the use of PAC’s, Super PAC’s, and other networks. It would be beneficial for the integrity of United States elections to move to a more individual based, community-based type of campaign fundraising.

Overall, if I were to redo this study over again, I would look into the Presidential election years and midterm election years as well as the primary elections. This would allow me to not only definitively prove or disprove my hypotheses, but it would also be able to answer new questions about if early fundraising can become an indication of winning an election. This dataset was able to disprove the notion the female candidates have a difficult time raising money for general elections, and that Republican female candidates are not as bad off as the literature suggests. It also disproved the notion that men in House elections out raise female candidates, and most importantly it proves just how important money is to the success of a candidate. The largest take-away here is that money matters, and if elections continue on this trend, will it become the richest person wins?
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Appendix

This is the code from R studio that was used to clean the dataset, analyze the data, and create figures 3, 4, 5, and 6. These are listed in the results chapters.

# Taylor Harris Thesis Main R File
# Authors: R. Buczkowski, C. Smith, and T. Harris
# Sally McDonnell Barksdale Honors College Thesis Code
# University of Mississippi
# Copyright Taylor Harris, April 2021

# Importing data from MIT Election Data Science Lab
# Citation: MIT Election Data and Science Lab, 2017,
# "U.S. House 1976â€“2018", https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/IG0UN2,
# Harvard Dataverse, V8, UNF:6:p05ggI ERZ/Fc5LP4RarxeA== [fileUNF]
# URL = https://dataverse.harvard.edu/file.xhtml?fileId=4202836&version=8.0
# Attaching packages
library(tidyverse)
l library(gender)
l library(genderdata)
l library(scales)
# genderdata is installed using: remotes::install_github("ropensci/genderdata")

#Loading Data
read_csv('election_results.csv') -> results_1976_to_2018

#Creating clean Democratic election results data by state, year, district, name
results_1976_to_2018 %>%
          party == 'DEMOCRAT',
          writein == FALSE,
          runoff == FALSE,
candidatevotes > 50,
stage == 'gen' %>%
drop_na() %>%
select(year, state, state_po, district, candidate, party, candidatevotes) %>%
rename(dem_candidate = candidate,
    dem_votes = candidatevotes,
    party_dem = party,
    state_po.y = state_po) %>%
mutate(name = word(dem_candidate, start=1L, sep = fixed(" ")))
%>-
dem
dem$name %>%
gender() %>%
select(name, gender) %>%
distinct(name, .keep_all = TRUE) %>%
left_join(dem) %>%
arrange(year, state, district) %>%
dem_joined

# Repeating for the Republican election results
results_1976_to_2018 %>%
    party == 'REPUBLICAN',
    writein == FALSE,
    runoff == FALSE,
    candidatevotes > 50,
    stage == 'gen' %>%
drop_na() %>%
select(year, state, state_po, district, candidate, party, candidatevotes) %>%
rename(rep_candidate = candidate,
    rep_votes = candidatevotes,
    party_rep = party,
    state_po.x = state_po) %>%
mutate(name = word(rep_candidate, start=1L, sep = fixed(" ")))
%>-
rep
rep$name %>%
gender() %>%
select(name, gender) %>%
distinct(name, .keep_all = TRUE) %>%
left_join(rep) %>%
arrange(year, state, district) -> rep_joined
elecdata <- inner_join(rep_joined, dem_joined,
by = c('year', 'state', 'district')) %>%
rename(gender_rep = gender.x,
gender_dem = gender.y,
name_rep   = name.x,
name_dem   = name.y)

#############################################################
####
# Importing FEC Data
# United States of American Federal Election Commission
# 1050 First Street, NE
# Washington, DC 20463
# URL: https://www.fec.gov/data/browse-data/?tab=candidates
#############################################################
import <- function(file){
  read_csv(file) %>%
  select(name, office, party, state, district, candidate_election_year, receipts)}
# Pulling file names
list.files() %>%
as_tibble() %>%
filter(str_detect(value, 'House') == TRUE) %>%
pull(value
) -> files
# Binding CSV files together
map_dfr(files, import) %>%
select(-name, -office) -> fec_data

fec_data %>%
rename(year = candidate_election_year) %>%
filter(receipts > 101,
  party == 'DEM') %>%
rename(receipts.y = receipts) %>%
mutate(district = parse_number(district)) %>%
group_by(state, district, year) %>%
summarize(receipts.y = max(receipts.y)) -> fec_dem

fec_data %>%
rename(year = candidate_election_year) %>%
filter(receipts > 101,
  party == 'REP') %>%
rename(receipts.x = receipts) %>%
mutate(district = parse_number(district)) %>%
group_by(state, district, year) %>%
summarize(receipts.x = max(receipts.x)) -> fec_rep

# Joining FEC and Election data
left_join(fec_dem, fec_rep, by = c('state', 'district', 'year')) %>%
  ungroup() %>%
  rename(state_po.x = state) %>%
  right_join(elecd ata) %>%
  drop_na() -> data_full

data_full %>%
  rename(receipts_rep = receipts.x,
         receipts_dem = receipts.y,
         state_abb = state_po.x) %>%
  mutate(constant_dollars_dem = case_when(year == 1980 ~ receipts_dem * 3.14,
year == 1984 ~ receipts_dem * 2.49,
year == 1988 ~ receipts_dem * 2.19,
year == 1992 ~ receipts_dem * 1.84,
year == 1996 ~ receipts_dem * 1.65,
year == 2000 ~ receipts_dem * 1.5,
year == 2004 ~ receipts_dem * 1.37,
year == 2008 ~ receipts_dem * 1.2,
year == 2012 ~ receipts_dem * 1.13,
year == 2016 ~ receipts_dem * 1.08),
constant_dollars_rep = case_when(year == 1980 ~ receipts_rep * 3.14,
year == 1984 ~ receipts_rep * 2.49,
year == 1988 ~ receipts_rep * 2.19,
year == 1992 ~ receipts_rep * 1.84,
year == 1996 ~ receipts_rep * 1.65,
year == 2000 ~ receipts_rep * 1.5,
year == 2004 ~ receipts_rep * 1.37,
year == 2008 ~ receipts_rep * 1.2,
year == 2012 ~ receipts_rep * 1.13,
year == 2016 ~ receipts_rep * 1.08)) -> clean_data

# Hypothesis 1: Women who run in the south will raise less money than women elsewhere
clean_data %>%
  inner_join(tibble(state_name = state.name,
                     state_abb = state.abb,
                     state_region = state.region)) %>%
  mutate(state_region = case_when(state_abb == 'MD' ~ 'Northeast',
                                   state_abb == 'DE' ~ 'Northeast',
                                   TRUE ~ as.character(state_region)),
         south = if_else(state_region == 'South', 1, 0)
) -> clean_data2
clean_data2 %>% select(gender = gender_dem, south, receipts = receipts_dem) %>%
  bind_rows(clean_data2 %>%
    select(gender = gender_rep, south, receipts = receipts_rep)) -> gender_receipts

reg1 <- lm(log(receipts) ~ gender + south,
  data = gender_receipts)
summary(reg1)

reg2 <- lm(log(receipts) ~ south,
  data = gender_receipts %>%
    filter(gender == 'female'))
summary(reg2)

reg3 <- lm(log(receipts) ~ south,
  data = gender_receipts %>%
    filter(gender == 'male'))
summary(reg3)

hist(log(gender_receipts$receipts))
options(scipen = 999)
library(esquisse)
library(ggplot2)
ggplot(gender_receipts) +
aes(x = receipts) +
geom_histogram(bins = 30L, fill = "#0c4c8a") +
labs(x = "Fundraising Totals", title = "Unlogged Receipt Data", subtitle = "Quadrennial Data: 1980-1996") +
theme_minimal() +
ylab("Number of Candidates")
ggplot(gender_receipts) +
aes(x = log(receipts)) +
geom_histogram(bins = 30L, fill = "#0c4c8a") +
labs(x = "Fundraising Totals", title = "Logged Receipt Data", subtitle = "Quadrennial Data: 1980-1996") +
```r
theme_minimal() +
ylab("Number of Candidates")
gender_receipts %>%
group_by(gender, south) %>%
count()

# Plotting
gender_receipts %>%
mutate(south2 = if_else(south == 1, 'South', 'Not South')) %>%
ggplot(aes(x = gender, y = receipts)) +
geom_boxplot(aes(fill = gender)) +
facet_wrap(~south2) +
theme_minimal() +
scale_fill_brewer(name = 'Gender', palette = 'Spectral') +
scale_y_continuous(labels = dollar, trans = 'log') +
labs(x = '',
     y = 'Natural Log of Funds Raised',
     title = 'Distributions of Funding Across Gender and Region',
     caption = 'Visualization created using ggplot2 in RStudio
Creator: Taylor Harris - University of Mississippi - Political Science Department') +
theme(
    axis.text.x = element_blank(),
    axis.text.y = element_text(face = 'bold.italic'),
    axis.title = element_text(face = 'bold',
                              size = 14),
    legend.position = 'bottom',
    legend.background = element_rect(color = 'black',
                                       size = 1),
    legend.text = element_text(face = 'bold.italic'),
    legend.title = element_text(face = 'bold'),
    plot.caption = element_text(hjust = 0,
                                size = 10))
```
# Hypothesis 2:
```
clean_data2 %>%
  mutate(dem_adv       = ((dem_votes - rep_votes) / (dem_votes + rep_votes)) * 100,
         dem_money_adv = ((receipts_dem - receipts_rep) / (receipts_dem + receipts_rep)) * 100) -> clean_data3
```

```
summary(lm(dem_adv ~ dem_money_adv,
            data = clean_data3))
```

# Visualizing
```
clean_data3 %>%
  ggpplot(aes(x = dem_money_adv, y = dem_adv)) +
  geom_point(aes(color = state_region)) +
  geom_smooth(method = 'lm', se = FALSE, color = 'black', size = 1.5) +
  theme_minimal() +
  facet_wrap(~state_region) +
  scale_color_brewer(name = 'State Region',
                     palette = 'Set1') +
  labs(x = 'Democrat Funding Advantage',
       y = 'Democrat Vote Advantage',
       title = 'Relationship Between Funding and Voting',
       subtitle = 'From Perspective of Democratic Vote',
       caption = 'Visualization created using ggplot2 in RStudio
Creator: Taylor Harris - University of Mississippi - Political Science Department') +
  theme(axis.text.x       = element_blank(),
        axis.text.y       = element_text(face = 'bold.italic'),
        axis.title        = element_text(face = 'bold',
                                          size = 12))
```
clean_data3 %>%
  filter(gender_rep == 'female',
         gender_dem == 'female') -> female_v_female
summary(lm(dem_adv ~ dem_money_adv,
           data = female_v_female))

female_v_female %>%
  ggplot(aes(x = dem_money_adv, y = dem_adv)) +
  geom_point() +
  geom_smooth(method = 'lm')

# Hypothesis 3 -- Democratic women raise more than Republican Women

clean_data3 %>%
  group_by(gender_dem) %>%
  summarize(median(constant_dollars_dem))

clean_data3 %>%
  group_by(gender_rep) %>%
  summarize(median(constant_dollars_rep))
pctdiff_hyp3 <- ((708852)- (755310))/((708852)+ (755310))*100
# Hypothesis 4 -- Gap Shrinks over time

clean_data3 %>%
  mutate(post_2000 = if_else(year >= 2000, 1, 0)) -> clean_data4

clean_data4 %>%
  group_by(post_2000, gender_rep) %>%
  summarize(median(constant_dollars_rep))

clean_data4 %>%
  group_by(post_2000, gender_dem) %>%
  summarize(median(constant_dollars_dem))

pctdiff_hyp4_w <- ((632115) - (860454))/((632115) + (860454)) * 100

pctdiff_hyp4_w

pctdiff_hyp3_m <- ((582097) - (802178))/((582097) + (802178)) * 100

pctdiff_hyp3_m