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Chapter 1: Introduction

"When women are part of the negotiation and are part of decision-making, the outcomes are better. When we have our dinners with the women in the Senate -- the Democrats and Republicans -- we have so much common ground. We agree on so many basic principles and values. I think if there were more women at the decision-making table, we would get more things done." - Democratic Senator Kirsten Gillibrand

A 2010 Roper Survey on women and politics asked whether most men are better suited emotionally for politics than are most women.¹ The majority, 75 percent, disagreed with the statement, 21 percent agreed, and five percent did not know. The survey would suggest that women and men are viewed by most people as being equally competent in the arena of United States politics, however, are these feelings of equality between the sexes conditional or unconditional? Another opinion on women and politics comes from Democratic Senator Kirsten Gillibrand in the above quote. Gillibrand clearly agrees with the premise that women are as suitable as men in political roles as she is a politician herself, however, she goes further to assert that women and men legislate differently.

Although the majority of Americans agree that women are suited for politics that does not mean that women and men are viewed as having the same areas of expertise. “Depending on the issue domain at hand, voters attribute differential levels of expertise to men and women candidates and elected officials.”² Female politicians are stereotypically viewed as being more compassionate, compromising, and emotional than male politicians. Further, women politicians


are stereotyped as being most competent in areas of education, healthcare, welfare, and other domestic issues.³ Contrastingly, male politicians are seen by voters as more self-confident and assertive meaning they could better legislate the issues of foreign policy, military crises, the economy, and crime.⁴

If voters believe that politicians have gendered roles does that mean that voters vote differently based on their sex? Do women vote for women and men vote for men? The mainstream media attempts to depict women voters as one concise voting block, and distinguish between politicians by their party affiliation. Democrats and Republicans do generally support different issues, however, men and women legislate differently as well.⁵ Strong statistical evidence suggests that Republican women and Democratic women are more liberal than the male members of their parties.⁶ However, not all women politicians, Democrats or Republicans, support the same issues or oppose the same issues, and there is an overlap of common interests.

My research attempts to discuss and answer the following research questions: What is the relationship between gender and voting in the United States? Are gender stereotypes concerning politicians still relevant? Do male and female voters vote for the same political candidates? And do male and female politicians vote on legislation the same way? Further, do destabilizing events in the United States change the way politicians vote on key issues and affect who voters vote for? To understand the current status of women’s politics in the United States an analysis of the recent

⁴ Ibid.
⁵ Ibid.
⁶ Chapter 5 details this difference
history of women’s politics is essential, and so timeframe for this thesis is from 1992 to 2012.

The ‘Year of the Woman’ was the political name given to the year 1992 because of the great seat gains women made in the United States Senate and United States House of Representatives. After 1992, and all through the 1990s, women were making incredible seat gains and setting many ‘firsts’ in American politics such as the first African American woman to serve in the United States Senate. Furthermore, during the 1990s more women than men voted in the midterm and Presidential elections. Moreover, the majority of women voters voted for President Clinton during the 1992 and 1996 elections, and for female candidates in congressional elections by a larger margin than ever before.

However, the noticeable seat gains women were making came to an abrupt halt after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. In the subsequent post-9/11 elections fewer women were elected into the House and Senate than any election between the ‘Year of the Woman’ and 9/11.

I believe that the political aftershocks of September 11, 2001 changed politics in the United States. The main election issues before September 11th were the economy and education but after 9/11 the main issues were national security and war, and in the elections directly following the attacks less women were elected, and women shifted their voting patterns. As what happened after September 11th shows, when national security and war are the top election issues, female politicians in federal elections are negatively affected (they are not elected) and male politicians are positively affected (they are elected possibly because they are judged as more effective leaders in times of crisis than women). Moreover, after 9/11 most of the congresswomen voted

more conservatively on certain legislation. Also, women voters shifted from voting for women to voting for men possibly because they felt that male politicians could protect the United States better than female politicians. Female politicians in federal elections were negatively affected (not elected) after 9/11 because the focus of United States politics shifted away from social issues like education and healthcare to domestic security.

After the terror attacks of September 11, 2001, the stereotypes concerning the strengths of female politicians which might have helped them during the 1990s when social issues and the economy were the top election issues likely correlates to the changes that happened after 9/11. Consequently, less female politicians were elected, and the female politicians that held onto their seats, voted more conservatively \(^8\), and the voting patterns of women changed from supporting women politicians’ pre-9/11 to male politicians post-9/11. This change in women’s politics post-9/11 was caused by the preconceived gender roles that were supposedly overcome by the prevalence of the previous successes of female politicians starting with the ‘Year of the Woman. This foreshadows that destabilizing events like 9/11 crumble the unstable façade of equality \(^9\) most voters believe exists between the sexes in the United States. Due to the evidence that voting patterns of both female politicians and female voters changed in the elections directly after September 11th, and the fact that less women were elected, it is likely that if another destabilizing catastrophe happens in the United States these same patterns will occur again.

This thesis explains implications for the future of women politicians as well as addressing the voting patterns of male and female voters. This thesis shows what happened after 9/11 to the

---

\(^8\) as measured by the Americans for Democratic Action research results on a liberal to conservative rating scale

\(^9\) Yamin, P., November 2012
female politician, and female voter, as well as implications for the future of politics in the United States on the federal level.

**Outline:**

In order to fully understand and support the implications made in this introduction, the information will be organized chronologically:

**Chapter two** will detail the electoral success of women candidates during the 1990s as well as the representative make-up, and will also explain how women voters voted during the 1990s.

**Chapter three** will explain the changes that occurred surrounding September 11th, 2001 concerning the declining electoral success of female candidates as well as the shift in the voting patterns of female voters.

**Chapter four** details the success rate of congresswomen from the 2006 mid-term to the most recent Presidential election of 2012. This chapter also discusses what happened during the ‘War on Women’ and how during that time of political instability between the Democrats and the Republicans, voting habits similar to the ones that occurred after 9/11 reemerged. This chapter also discusses the current statues of women’s politics and implications for the future.

**Chapter five** will explain how women in the United States Senate are generally more liberal than the men of the Senate, but will also show how women changed their voting patterns to voting slightly more conservative after September 11th, 2001. This chapter will also show how by 2006 women in the Senate had transitioned back to their regular pre-9/11 voting habits. Chapter four will also show how voting records then became more conservative again during the Republican ‘War on Women’ in 2010.
Chapter six shows an in-depth case study of the voting records of six Senators, three Democrats and three Republicans in attempt to see who best represents the interests of the majority of the women voters in the United States. As well as a case study concerning Alaskan Senators Frank Murkowski and Ted Stevens and then the change between Frank Murkowski’s voting records and his daughter Lisa Murkowski’s voting records when she took his seat.

Chapter seven brings together my conclusions and answers the proposed research questions: What is the relationship between gender and voting in the United States? Do male and female voters vote for the same political candidates? And do male and female politicians vote on legislation the same way? Further, do destabilizing events in the United States change the way politicians vote on key issues and affect who voters vote for? The conclusion also discusses the outcome of my proposed thesis.
Chapter 2-

The Year of the Woman:

A Closer Look at the Women of Congress and Women Voters of the 1990s.

Women in the United States Senate and House of the 1990s:

Just nine years before 9/11 was the ‘Year of the Woman.’ Nineteen-ninety-two was politically named the ‘Year of the Woman’ because more women were elected into politics in the United States than ever before. That year the number of women represented in the United States Senate doubled from two female Senators to four\(^{10}\). Furthermore, in 1992, a record setting twenty-four women gained spots in the House of Representatives\(^{11}\). The ‘Year of the Woman’ was the start of nine years of considerable gains for women’s politics in the United States.

In 1993, California became the first state to elect two women as their United States Senators: Senator Barbara Boxer, and Former Mayor of San Francisco, Senator Dianne Feinstein. By 1996, both California and Maine had women as their two Senators, which was the first time this had ever occurred. It was also the first time two Democratic women, Boxer and Feinstein, and two Republican women Snowe and Collins, had been elected to serve the same state. Later, in 1998, Tammy Baldwin a Democrat from Wisconsin became the first openly gay or lesbian member to be elected to Congress, and she was also Wisconsin’s first female in the United States House of Representatives. Increasingly more women were elected into office in the United States
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Senate, and the United States House of Representatives in the elections following the ‘Year of
the Woman.’

By 1998, women held 63 of the 535 seats in the 105th United States Congress, in other
words women made up 11.8 percent of the body. Nine of the 100 Senate seats belonged to
women: Democratic Senator from California Barbara Boxer, Democrat Dianne Feinstein from
California, Republican Kay Bailey Hutchinson from Texas, Democrat Mary Landrieu from
Louisiana, Democrat Barbara Mikulski from Maryland, Democrat Carol Moseley-Braun from
Illinois, Democrat Patty Murray from Washington, Republican Olympia Snowe from Maine, and
Republican Susan Collins from Maine.\textsuperscript{12}

In the House of Representatives, 54 of the 435 total seats, or 12.4 percent of the body was
composed of women. Women from 21 different states were elected into the House during the
1990s. Furthermore, the House had sixteen women of color—11 African American, one Asian
American/Pacific Islander, and four Latin American women during the 90’s.\textsuperscript{13} This was the first
time this many women and this many minority women had served in congress. By 1998 only
seven states had never had a women representative in Congress: Alaska, Delaware, Iowa,
Mississippi, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Wisconsin. Contrastingly, by the same year
California alone had 24 women in Congress.\textsuperscript{14}

The economy was stable and the United States was not at war during the 1990s under the
Clinton administration and the top issues for voters were the economy and social issues like


\textsuperscript{13} Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP) Fact Sheet. 1998. “Women in the U.S.
Congress 1998.” New Brunswick Center for American Women and Politics.

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
healthcare and education. The success of female candidates for federal office during the 1990s and the most important election issues conform to the gender stereotypes of female politicians. However, to further understand the relationship between gender and voting for members of the United States Congress during the 1990s, a closer look at the statistics is necessary.

**Electoral Success Breakdown of Women in Congress During the 1990s**

In 1992 there were eleven female nominees for the United States Senate, ten Democrats and one Republican. One Democratic woman, Senator Barbara Mikulski from Maryland was the only incumbent in her race. Seven other women, six Democrats and one Republican, were challenging incumbents, and three other Democratic women were running for open seats. Incumbent Senator Mikulski (D-MD) won her race and so did all three of the Democratic women running for open seats\(^\text{15}\). Only one out of seven female Democratic challengers beat the incumbent for a Senate seat, this is not surprising, however because of the incumbent advantage.

This was a 45.45 percent success rate for women in the Senate that year, as well as a 50 percent success rate for Democratic women and a zero percent success rate for the Republican woman who ran. This was an improvement from 1990 where women nominees for Senate seats had a 12.5 percent success rate overall, zero percent for Democratic and 16.67 percent for Republican women. The 90’s was also the first time a women of color served in the Senate. Carol Moseley Braun a Democrat from Illinois was the first African American woman and first woman

---

\(^{15}\) All data from the Center for American Women and Politics or CAWP. Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP) Fact Sheet. 2012. “Women Candidates for Congress 1974-2012.” New Brunswick Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP), Eagleton Institute of Politics Rutgers University.
of color to serve the senate when she was elected in 1992. Braun was also the first woman of
color to lose reelection in the Senate when she lost in 1998.

In the United States House of Representatives in 1992, there were 106 female nominees, 70 Democrats and 26 Republicans. Of those 106 candidates, 26 were incumbents. Seventeen of the incumbents were Democrats and nine were Republicans. Forty-one ran as challengers to incumbents. Twenty-seven of the challengers were Democrats and 14 were Republicans. Thirty-nine women ran for open seats, 26 were Democrats and 13 were Republicans. Forty-seven of the female nominees won their seats, 35 were Democrats and 12 were Republicans. Twenty-three of the 26 incumbent nominees won reelection, 14 Democrats and nine Republicans. Two out of 41 challengers beat the incumbents for seats and they were both Democrats. Twenty-two out of 39 women won open seats, 19 Democrats and three Republicans. The success rate for women running for House seats in 1992 was 44.33 percent. Democratic women had a 50 percent success rate and Republican women had a 33.33 percent success rate. This was an improvement from 1990 where women nominees for House seats had a 40.58 percent success rate overall, 48.72 percent for Democrats, and 30 percent for Republican women.

In 1994, nine women ran for Senate seats, four Democrats and five Republicans. Two were incumbents, one Democratic and the other Republican. Five were challengers to male incumbents, two Democrats and three Republicans, and there were two women: one Republican, and one Democrat who ran for open seats. Of the nine women who ran three won seats, one Democrat and two Republicans. Both incumbents held onto their seats, and one Republican
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woman won an open seat.\textsuperscript{17} The success rate for women running for Senate seats in 1994 was 33.33 percent overall, 25 percent for Democratic and 40 percent for Republican women. The success rate for female nominees for the senate in 1994 went down over ten points from 1992, however, the drop is not surprising due to the year being a midterm-election where not as many voters turnout and where incumbents have a distinct reelection advantage and five of the nine women ran against male incumbents.

For House seats in 1994, 112 female nominees ran, 72 Democrats and 40 Republicans. Forty-four were incumbents, 34 Democrats and 10 Republicans. Fifty-two were challengers to incumbent men, 28 Democrats and 24 Republicans. Finally, 16 women were nominees for open seats, 10 Democrats and 6 Republicans. Of the 112 women who ran, 47 won seats, 30 Democrats and 17 Republicans. Thirty-six or the 44 incumbent women were reelected, 26 Democrats and 10 Republicans. Three of the 52 challengers to incumbent men won, and they were all three Republicans. Last, eight of the 16 women running for open seats won, four Democrats and four Republicans\textsuperscript{18}. The success rate for women nominees for the House in 1994 was 41.96 percent overall, 41.67 percent for Democrats, and 42.5 percent for Republicans. The success rate for women of the house in 1994 only dropped approximately two points from 1992, and was another strong year for women of the House.

\textsuperscript{17} All data from the Center for American Women and Politics or CAWP. Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP) Fact Sheet. 2012. “Women Candidates for Congress 1974-2012.” New Brunswick Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP), Eagleton Institute of Politics Rutgers University.

\textsuperscript{18} All data from the Center for American Women and Politics or CAWP. Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP) Fact Sheet. 2012. “Women Candidates for Congress 1974-2012.” New Brunswick Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP), Eagleton Institute of Politics Rutgers University.
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In 1996, nine women ran for Senate seats, five Democrats and four Republicans. Three of the women were challenging incumbent men, one Democrat and two Republicans. Six women were running for open seats, four Democrats and two Republicans. Two out of these nine women won seats and they both ran for open seats one was a Democrat Senator Mary Landrieu from Louisiana, and the other was Republican Senator Susan Collins from Maine. Women running for Senate seats had a 22.22 percent success rate overall, 20 percent for Democratic, and 25 percent for Republican women. The success rate for women of the Senate dropped another ten points from 1994 to 1996, however there were no female incumbents up for reelection and so there were no women who were favored to win.

There were 120 female nominees for the House in 1996, 77 Democrats, 42 Republicans and one Independent. Forty-one of the nominees were incumbents, 27 Democrats and 14 Republicans. Sixty-five challenged male incumbents, 41 Democrats and 24 Republicans. Fourteen women ran for open seats, nine Democrats, four Republicans, and one Independent. Of the 120 nominees, 51 won, 35 Democrats, 15 Republicans, and the only Independent woman who ran won. Forty out of 41 of the incumbents held onto their seats, one Republicans woman lost her seat. Six out of 65 women upset male incumbents to win seats, five Democrats and one Republican. Five out of 14 women won open seats, three Democrats, one Republican, and the one Independent. The success rate for women nominees for the House that year was 42.5 percent overall, 45.45 percent for Democrats, 35.71 percent for Republicans, and 100 percent for

Independents. Women in the House had another favorable election year in 1996, and the success rate raised one point from the 1994 mid-term election.

There were ten women who ran for Senate seats in 1998, seven Democrats and three Republicans. Four of these women were Democratic incumbents, and four were challenging incumbent men, one Democrat and three Republicans. Whereas two Democratic women were nominees for open seats. Of these ten nominees, four Democrats won seats, three Democratic incumbents Senator Barbara Mikulski from Maryland, Patty Murray from Washington, and Barbara Boxer from California, and one Democrat running for an open seat, Senator Blanche Lincoln from Arkansas. Women running for Senate seats in 1998 had a 40 percent success rate overall, Democratic women 57.14 percent, and Republican women zero percent. The success rate for women in the Senate improved approximately seven points from the 1996 election. The rate was partially helped by the three incumbent women who won reelection. Yet, one incumbent, Democrat Carol Moseley Braun the first African American woman elected to serve in the Senate did not win reelection.

For House seats, 121 women ran in 1998, 75 Democrats and 46 Republicans. Fifty of the women were incumbents, 34 Democrats and 16 Republicans. Fifty-six women ran against male incumbents, 30 Democrats and 26 Republicans, and 15 women ran for open seats, 11 Democrats and four Republicans. Of the 121 female nominees, 56 won seats, 39 Democrats and 17 Republicans. All fifty incumbents were reelected, zero of the 56 challengers attained seats and

six out of 15 women, five Democrats and one Republican won open seats. Women running for house seats in 1998 had a 46.28 percent success rate, Democrats had a 52 percent success rate, and Republicans had a 36.96 percent success rate. The success rate in 1998 for women of the House raised another point from 1996 making the 1990s quite a decade of successes for women of the House.

Overall, the success rate for women of the House raised six points from 1990 to 1998. Women of the Senate were not quite as successful as women of the House, but Senate seats are more competitive than House seats as there are over 75 percent more seats available in the House. However the success rate for women of the Senate improved drastically from 12.5 percent in 1990 to 40 percent in 1998.

The shifting dynamic in United States federal politics showed how women during the 1990s were finally able to run competitive races against men. Furthermore, the popular notions from the time of philosopher Alexis de Tocqueville’s ideas of men and women inhabiting separate and unequal spheres with women in the subservient role; to conservative activist Phyllis Schlafly who disputed the Equal Rights Amendment in the 1970s and 80’s claiming women and men were not equal and women belonged in the home—were no longer the most relevant perceptions of women. This seems to suggest that men and women were starting to be seen as equal players in the game of United States federal politics. However, this is not entirely true. Although more women were getting elected and deciding to run for office this did not mean that United States voters saw men and women politicians as the same types of politicians. Meaning

even though women were no longer seen as being unfit for politics the new popular discourse was that women and men in politics had different strengths, women were stereotyped by voters as being more emotional, and less aggressive than male candidates. Women were judged as caretakers who were more competent in the areas of education, healthcare, and other domestic issues whereas men were seen as better fit to take charge and make decisions regarding foreign policy and national security. For example, Senator Patty Murray was told by her opponent that she was “just a mom in tennis shoes” however, this negative comment was later used positively by her campaign as a platform for Murray running as a surrogate for women’s interests and she won her race. Fortunately for the women candidates, during the 1990s the top issues for voters concerned domestic issues such as healthcare and education, and so stereotypes of women as being more competent than men in these areas likely proved beneficial for women candidates.

Women Voters of the 1990s:

In the United States during the 1990’s the economy was relatively stable, our country was not at war, and the biggest issues for voters were combating crime, the economy, education, and welfare. Only 4 percent of voters in 1992 believed that foreign policy was the most important

---


issue facing the United States. The primary concern for voters overall were social, domestic, and economic. One of the primary research questions is whether men and women vote for the same political candidates, and the answer to this question is that during the 1990s there was a gender gap between who men and women voted for. A gender gap, defined by CAWP the “difference in the percentage of women and the percentage of men voting for a given candidate,” became a natural occurrence in Presidential and Congressional races during the 1990s. The gap was first identified in the 1980 Presidential election, 46 percent of women voted for Carter whereas only 38 percent of men did. This eight point difference did not win Carter the election, but it was the first time women voted noticeably different than men. The 1980 Presidential election between Carter and Reagan was the last Presidential election where more men than women voted. In each subsequent election women cast more ballots than men.

In the 1992 Presidential election, 53 percent of the total voters were women and 47 percent were men. With this six point difference women could have decided the outcome of the election if they voted as a block. Yet Clinton won the election by garnering almost equal support


26 Ibid
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from women and men with 45 percent and 41 percent respectively.\textsuperscript{30} In the 1996 Presidential
election, however, there was more of a decisive split between male and female voters. Women
composed 52 percent of the total vote and men had 48 percent. Moreover, male voters preferred
Dole to Clinton by one point. Whereas women, contrastingly, favored Clinton to Dole by 17
points. There was a gender gap present in Clinton’s total vote with 55 percent of women and only
44 percent of men voting for him. Women voters gave Clinton the edge to get reelected in 1996
and if women had continued to vote the same as men, as they had in the past, Clinton might not
have won reelection.

In the 1998 congressional elections, according to the Voter News Service (VNS), 75
percent of the 32 Senatorial races they researched had a gender gap where women voted
decisively different than men by four or more points.\textsuperscript{31} In an even more telling statistic, in 44 out
of 47 races, women voted more liberal and were more supportive of the Democratic candidate
than men.\textsuperscript{32} These statistics show the immense changes in women’s voting that occurred in the
1990’s. Before the 90s women voted the same, or not much differently than men, and the small
difference that did occur did not change the outcome of the elections because the majority of
men and women still favored the same candidate. However, in the 1996 Presidential election,
women secured the Clinton win, and according to the VNS five Democratic candidates in 1998
congressional elections owed their win to female voters.\textsuperscript{33} In two of the five races decided by

\textsuperscript{30} “Demographics of How Groups Voted in the 1992 Presidential Election.” Demographics of

\textsuperscript{31} Voter News Service (VNS), http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/studies/2780

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid
women, the gender gap was more than ten points and insured the win for Democratic North Carolina Senator John Edwards, and New York Democratic Senator Charles Schumer. This shows the changing relationship between gender and voting in the United States from women and men voting for the same candidates to a gender gap emerging.

In eight of the ten 1998 Senate races involving female candidates women and men voted decisively differently. This gender gap showed that women voters supported liberal or Democratic female candidates and helped four of the five Barbara Boxer from California, Barbara Mikulski of Maryland, Blanche Lincoln from Arkansas, and Patty Murray of Washington win their respective elections. However women voters were not as supportive of Republican congress nominees in 1998, and all three of the Republican women who ran for Senate lost. This was due in part to the fact that women voters were more supportive of the Democratic candidate than the Republican female.

Although the majority of women voted for the Democratic candidate for President and tended to favor female federal candidates women do not vote as one complete block. White women voted almost equally for President Clinton in the 1990’s as his Republican opponents whereas minority and working women voted overwhelmingly for President Clinton. This is likely because these women belong to different economic brackets, and like men, wealthier women often vote more conservatively. Furthermore, women with higher economic security do not tend to be as supportive on the issue of reproductive rights as working women. However, the majority

_________________________

34 Voter News Service (VNS), http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/studies/2780


36 Ibid

37 Ibid
of women were not wealthy during the 1990’s so this voting discrepancy did not change the overall outcome of the vote. On the specific issue of women voters not being as supportive of Republican female candidates as they are of Democratic candidates, this is likely because the majority of women support reproductive rights and Republican female candidates overall are less supportive of abortion than Democratic candidates.38

In conclusion, during the 1990s the relationship between gender and voting in the United States changed. By the 1990s a gender gap between men and women fully emerged. Women started to vote independently and more liberally than men. Furthermore for the first time an openly gay female Representative as well as the first minority woman was elected to the Senate. However, this is not to say that these progressive changes meant voters saw male and female candidates the same way. Gender stereotypes related to traditional sex roles still pervaded the American voter psyche. “Depending on the issue domain at hand, voters attribute differential levels of expertise to men and women candidates and elected officials.”39 The popular consensus was that because women were more compassionate, compromising, and emotional they were competent in areas of education, healthcare, welfare, and other domestic issues.40 Contrastingly, men were seen by voters as more self-confident and assertive meaning they could better legislate the issues of foreign policy, military crises, the economy, and crime.41 More succinctly, men were

38 Further discussion of candidate issues in chapter 4.


40 Ibid.

41 Ibid.
still seen by voters as more competent in the public sphere, and women with issues of the family, or the private domain.

However, these gender stereotypes did not negatively affect female politicians of the 1990’s because the economy was relatively stable, and the most important issues were domestic and not matters of foreign policy. Furthermore, some candidates, like Senator Patty Murray even ran on these stereotypes and benefitted from them. The United States was not at war and national security was not identified as an imminent threat so voters were not preoccupied with whether or not politicians had military experience or stereotypically male traits. These gender stereotypes show that women and men candidates of the 1990’s were perceived not as equal but as having distinctly different traits. Although perceptions evolved from believing women were unfit for politics, women were still associated with constricting gender assigned policy issues, and seen as less aggressive, more emotional, and less assertive than male candidates.

This case study of 1990’s female candidates for Congress, and 1990’s female voters, confirms part of my thesis. When the United States is relatively stable, and when social issues like healthcare, education, and women’s rights are the most important issues to voters, women politicians are able to compete competitively in federal elections. However, during times of war and threatened national security these same stereotypes that likely helped female congressional candidates during the 1990’s, hurt their chances of being elected after the destructive terrorist attacks on September 11th, 2001. Furthermore, women voters changed their voting habits after the attacks from voting decisively for women and helping insure women candidates a win, to leaning more conservative.
Chapter 3:

How September 11th, 2001 Changed Everything

The last chapter talked how the relationship between gender and voting in the United States changed during the 1990s and how a gender gap on candidate choice emerged between the sexes. Furthermore, how the stereotypes of women as politicians correlated to the popular election issues of the time and might have caused the increasing success of female candidates for congress during the decade. This chapter will discuss what happened in the elections directly following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Also, it will seek to answer whether destabilizing events, like a terrorist attack, affect who voters vote for, and if these changes conform to gender stereotypes.

Women voters in the first Presidential election of the new millennium voted very similarly to how they voted in 1996--they preferred the Democratic candidate. As in the past, more women than men voted in 2000, 52 to 48 percent accounting for a four point gender gap. Women and men did not support the same candidate for president and there was an eleven point gender gap. Women preferred Al Gore to George W. Bush 54 to 44 percent, and men preferred Bush to Gore 54 to 43 percent in this controversial and contested election where Bush barely edged out the win. However, not all women were voted as a block and white women were equally supportive of Gore and Bush. Yet working women and minority women preferred Gore

---


43 Ibid.

44 Ibid.
to Bush 58 to 39 percent.\(^{45}\) This shows how women from different backgrounds vote differently, and how while women support the Democratic candidate overall there are factions present within the ‘Women’s vote’ where white women tend to be more conservative and minority women often vote more liberally.

There were also gender gaps present in United States Senate races in 2000. In Democrat Hillary Clinton’s senate race, women votes insured Clinton’s win.\(^{46}\) Men did not decisively vote for Clinton over her opponent, however, women preferred Clinton 60 to 39 percent.\(^{47}\) In Democrats Debbie Stabenow and Maria Cantwell’s races there were also gender gaps present and women’s votes determined their wins.\(^{48}\) In both races a 54 percent majority of men voted for the opponents of the women candidates, whereas women voters preferred the female candidates by an equal margin of 54 percent.\(^{49}\) The two Republican incumbents who were reelected, Senator Olympia Snowe received equal votes from men and women, which is understandable considering a majority of women are and were during that time Democrats.\(^{50}\) Republican Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison, however, was the only women who had a higher percentage of men’s votes over women’s 68 to 63 percent, however, she is very conservative concerning social issues


\(^{47}\) Ibid.

\(^{48}\) Ibid.

\(^{49}\) Ibid.

\(^{50}\) Ibid.
and considering the fact the majority of women voters are liberal concerning social issues this statistic is not surprising.

Women politicians during the 1990s were making incredible seat gains in the United States Senate as the data in the previous chapter shows. Year 2000 was another record breaking year. There were six women who won for United States Senate seats, Democratic incumbent Dianne Feinstein from California, and two Republican incumbents Kay Bailey Hutchison of Texas and Olympia Snowe from Maine. There were also two Democratic challengers to male incumbents: Maria Cantwell from Washington and Debbie Stabenow from Maine, and Democrat Hillary Rodham Clinton ran for an open seat. All six women won seats, a 100 percent success rate, and the only time every woman who ran was successfully elected. Furthermore, Democrat Jean Carnahan from Missouri was appointed to fill the vacant spot her late husband left. This meant that there were a record breaking thirteen female Senators in office. Moreover, this was the first time that three states had only women in their two Senate seats, Republicans Susan Collins and Olympia Snowe from Maine, Democrats Barbara Boxer and Dianne Feinstein of California, and Democrats Maria Cantwell and Patty Murray from Washington.

Every federal election since 1992, there was a new record of women serving in Congress and Democratic women as well as Republican women were seeing a fair amount of electoral victory. With all of the successes in the United States Senate and United States House of Representatives it seemed to suggest that the metaphorical ‘glass ceiling’ for women had finally shattered. However, this is not to say that traditional sex roles were still not in play. Voters still

---

viewed men and women politicians as having different strengths, women, were stereotypically judged as more competent on issues of education, healthcare, and other social issues, and men were depicted by voters as more knowledgeable on issues of national security and foreign policy. Usually politicians try to avoid constricting, binary stereotypes, however, besides the Y2K technological conspiracy and the contested Presidential election between Al Gore and George W. Bush the United States was relatively stable. The United States was not involved in any war, and the most important issues to voters were improving education, healthcare, and other domestic issues. So these gender stereotypes concerning women were likely beneficial to their electoral success as the gender stereotypes for women as being more competent than men in the areas of education, healthcare, and other domestic complemented the most important issues for voters during that time.

Then at 8:45 am Eastern time, September 11th, 2001 everything changed. On 9/11 the United States was shaken to the core when it experienced the biggest terrorist attack to ever happen on its own soil. With September 11th came more American causalities from a non-wartime act of terror than ever before. Four hijacked airplanes attacked the seemingly impenetrable United States, thus shaking the Americans physically and psychologically. Whereas before 9/11, education, healthcare, and other domestic issues were most important to United States voters. After September 11th, patriotism, foreign policy, and domestic security were the top priorities of the United States. Men (Republican men in particular) are stereotypically viewed by voters as being stronger than women and Democrats concerning the issues of foreign

policy and national security, and so did these same stereotypes that likely helped female candidates get elected, hurt their election chances when the United States was recovering from Terrorist attacks, moreover, did women voters show less support for female candidates?

Statistical evidence suggests so. The incredible seat gains women made in the House of Representatives and Senate pre-9/11 came to an abrupt halt after the devastating terrorist attacks. In the 2002, mid-term election less women won than in previous elections. There were eleven female candidates for the United States Senate, eight Democrats, and three Republicans. Two Democrats and one Republican were incumbents, five Democrats and one Republican were challenging male incumbents, and one Democrat and one Republican were running for open seats.

Of the eleven who ran three were elected, Republican Senator Susan Collins from Maine and Democratic Senator Mary Landrieu of Louisiana were reelected, and Republican Elizabeth Dole won an open seat and incumbent Democratic Senator Jean Carnahan lost her race. Senator Dole was elected yet Senator Carnahan lost her race and the other two winners were incumbents so the number of women in the Senate did not change from the previous election number of thirteen. The success rate for women running for Senate was 27 percent this is a 73 percent drop from the 2000 election. Furthermore, women did not vote as strongly for the female candidates. For example in Democratic Senator Landrieu from Louisiana barely won her seat and although she had more support from women than from men 50 to 40 percent, approximately 50 percent of women also voted for her opponent. Republicans Collins and Dole had roughly equal support
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from male and female voters as well. This was a noticeable change from the 2000 election where women voters insured the election for some of the women Senators.

There were no new seat gains in the House or Senate that year which was the first time since the incredible seat gains that began during the ‘Year of the Woman.’ Women as politicians lost their political ground in the 2002 mid-term election when national security was the biggest issue for voters, as opposed to their great electoral success during the 1990s when stereotypical women’s issues were most important to voters.

Year 2004 was also not a very successful year for women in the United States Senate.
There were ten women who ran for Senate seats nine Democrats, and one Republican. Four of the women were Democratic incumbents and one was a Republican incumbent. Of the remaining Democrats, two were challenging male incumbents and three were running for open seats. Five women won seats four Democrats and the one Republican. This was a 50 percent success rate, however, the only women who won were incumbents and they were favored to win because of the incumbent advantage.\(^{54}\)

The top issues for voters in 2004 when making their decision on who they were voting for in Congressional elections were the economy, national defense and foreign affairs, and terrorism. This emphasis on foreign affairs is likely why women running for the United States Senate did not do is well in the 2002 and 2004 elections, because female candidates had a higher success rate during the 1990s when the most important issues for voters were social issues. Contrastingly to 2000, women voters in 2004 also did not have a clear candidate preference for president.
Whereas in 2000 women voted for Gore over President Bush 54 to 44 percent, a ten point

\(^{54}\) [http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/cgi-bin/SDA-ID/ICPSR/hsda?icpsr+04245-0001](http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/cgi-bin/SDA-ID/ICPSR/hsda?icpsr+04245-0001)
difference, in 2004 they voted for John Kerry 51 percent and Bush 48 percent only a three point difference. Women did have a strong voter turnout, however, and constituted 54 percent of the whole vote, and eight point gender gap.

However, the relationship between voting and gender changed after 9/11 and women did not vote as independently and liberally as they did during the 1990s and in the 2000 election. This shows how September 11th destabilized American congressional politics, and how voting patterns shifted towards conservatism. Before 9/11 there was a distinct gender gap in candidate preference in presidential and congressional elections however this gap is missing in the 2002 midterm and 2004 presidential election. Women voted more conservatively in these elections when the major issues for voters were national security and war, two stereotypically male dominated issues, and as I hypothesized, women candidates for congress were not as competitive in the 2002 congressional elections. This leads to the assertion that although voters claim to support both male and female candidates for congress destabilizing events like 9/11 crumble the unstable façade of equality most voters believe exists between the sexes in the United States. But what happens when the United States stabilizes and the most important issues for voters returns to social issues and the economy?
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Chapter 4:  
The War on Women and the Future of Women in Politics:

After the 2004 election, the first post-September 11th Presidential election, where Republican President George W. Bush was re-elected over Democratic candidate John Kerry, female politicians had lost ground to make up. Female candidates had the worst success rate in the 2004 congressional elections since before the ‘Year of the Woman’ in 1992. The difference in the elections of 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998, and 2000 before 9/11, and the 2002 and 2004 elections that occurred shortly after 9/11, compared to the elections of 2006, 2008, 2010, and 2012 were the issues which were more important to voters. In this chapter I will illustrate the differences in the elections after 9/11 and the issues which were most important to voters during these elections, as well as the success rate of female politicians who were affected by which issues were deemed most important. I will discuss the relationship between gender and voting as well as the prevalence of gender stereotypes during the post-9/11 era. As previously hypothesized, when the issues of national security, terrorism, and foreign policy are most important to voters, female politicians are negatively affected, and male politicians are positively affected.

The 2006 Midterm Election Female Candidates and Winners:

In 2006, the midterm election of President George W. Bush’s second term, 82 women won seats and served in Congress. This meant that 15.3 percent of the 535 seats belonged to women.\footnote{Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP) Fact Sheet. 2006. “Women in the U.S. Congress 1922-2006.” New Brunswick Center for American Women and Politics.} This was an eight seat gain from the 74 women in the 108th congress from the 2004

\cite{Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP) Fact Sheet. 2006. “Women in the U.S. Congress 1922-2006.” New Brunswick Center for American Women and Politics.}
Presidential election. In the Senate, there were 12 female nominees, eight Democrats and four Republicans. Six were incumbents, four Democrats and two Republicans, and there was one Democrat running for an open seat. There were also five female challengers to incumbents, three Democrats and two Republicans. Of the 12 nominees, eight won seats. All six of the incumbents won, one Democratic challenger to a male incumbent won, and the Democrat running for an open seat won. The success rate for women running for Senate seats in 2006 was 66.66 percent overall, 75 percent for Democratic women, and 50 percent for Republican women.

In the House of Representatives, 136 women ran, 94 Democrats and 42 Republicans. Sixty-five were incumbents, 42 Democrats and 23 Republican, and 18 women were nominated for open seats, 12 Democrats and six Republicans. Fifty-three women were running against incumbent men, 40 Democrats and 13 Republicans. Of the 136 nominees 71 women won seats, 50 Democrats, and 21 Republicans. Sixty-one of the 65 incumbents were reelected, all 42 Democratic reelects and 19 of the 23 Republicans. Three of the 53 challengers to incumbents won and they were all three Democrats. Seven of the 18 nominees for open seats won, 5 Democrats and two Republicans. The success rate for women nominees in the House in 2006 was 52 percent overall, 53 percent for Democrats, and 50 percent for Republicans.
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The 2008 Presidential Election Female Candidates and Winners:

There were seven female nominees for Senate seats in 2008, four Democrats and three Republicans. Three of the nominees were incumbents, one Democrat and two Republicans, and four female nominees were challengers to male incumbents, three Democrats and one Republican. Four of the seven nominees won seats, three Democrats, and one Republican. Two of the three incumbents won, the one Democrat and one of the two Republicans, as well as two of the three Democratic challengers to incumbents. Overall female nominees for Senate seats had a 57 percent success rate, Democrats had a 75 percent success rate, and Republicans had a 33.3 percent success rate. This was a slight drop in the success rate from 2006 overall and for Republican women but it remained the same for Democratic women.

In the House, there were 132 female nominees, 95 Democrats and 27 Republicans. There were 67 incumbents, 50 Democrats and 17 Republicans. Eleven female nominees were running for open seats, nine Democrats and two Republicans, and 54 women were challenging male incumbents, 35 Democrats and 18 Republicans. Seventy-four of the 132 nominees won seats, 57 Democrats and 17 Republicans. Sixty-four of the 67 incumbents were reelected, 49 of the 50 Democrats and 15 of the 17 Republicans. Five of the 54 challengers to incumbents won, four Democrats and one Republican, as well as five of the 11 candidates for open seats won, four Democrats and one Republican. The success rate for women nominees for House seats in 2008 was 56 percent overall, 60 percent for Democratic and 46 percent for Republican women. Overall the success rate in 2008 improved by four points from the 2006 mid-term election.

Democratic women had a seven point increase in success rate and Republican women had a four point drop.

In result of the 2008 election, there were 88 women in the 110th Congress. This meant that 16.4 percent of the 535 seats belonged to women. There were 72 total women in the House out of 435 seats and 16 in the Senate out of 100 seats. In 2008 there was the first female Speaker of the House, the top House position and second in line to Presidential succession after Vice-President. The first female House speaker was Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi of California. Women in the House came from 30 different states, 20 were Republican and there were 52 Democratic women.60 There were 11 Democrats in the Senate, and 5 Republicans and they represented 14 different states.

**The 2010 Midterm Election Female Candidates and Winners:**

In the 2010 midterm election there were 14 female nominees for Senate seats, nine Democratic women and five Republican women. Five of the nominees were Democratic incumbent women, five ran for open seats, two Democrats and three Republicans. There were also four female challengers to incumbent men, two Democrats and two Republicans. Of the 14 nominees, five won seats, four Democrats and one Republican. Four of the five Democratic incumbent women were reelected, and a female Republican nominee won an open seat.61 Overall, women Senate nominees had a 35.7 percent success rate in the 2010 election,

---


Democratic women had a 44.44 percent success rate, and Republican women had a 20 percent success rate. This was a drop from the 2008 election.

In the House in 2010 there were 138 female nominees, 91 Democrats, and 47 Republicans. Sixty-nine of the nominees were incumbents, 54 Democrats and 15 Republicans. There were also 57 female challengers to male incumbents, 27 Democrats and 30 Republicans. Twelve women ran for open seats, ten Democrats and two Republicans. Of the 138 nominees, 72 won seats, 48 Democrats and 24 Republicans. Fifty-nine incumbents were reelected, 44 Democrats and 15 Republicans. Eight challengers to male incumbents won, one Democrat and seven Republicans, and five women won open seats, three Democrats and two Republicans. Overall women in the House had a 52 percent success rate. Democrats had a 53 percent success rate and Republicans had a 43 percent success rate. This was a four point drop in the success rate from the 2008 election overall, a seven point drop for Democratic women, and a three point drop for Republican women.

The 2012 Presidential Election Female Candidates and Winners:

In 2012 there were 18 female nominees for the Senate, 12 Democrats and six Republicans. Six of the 18 nominees were Democratic incumbents, four were challengers to incumbent men, two Democrats and two Republicans. Finally, eight women were running for open seats, four Democrats and four Republicans. Eleven of the 18 women won seats, ten Democrats and one Republican. All six Democratic incumbents were reelected, and one Democratic challenger beat a male Republican incumbent. Four of the eight candidates for open seats won, three Democrats and one Republican. The success rate for women nominees for the
Senate was 61 percent overall, 83 percent for Democratic women, and 16.6 percent for Republican women. This was overall an over 30 percent success rate increase from the 2010 Senate election for women. It was a 39 point increase for Democratic women and a three point drop for Republican women.

In the House, there were 163 female nominees in 2012, 116 Democrats, and 47 Republicans. There were 66 incumbents, 45 Democratic women, and 21 Republican women. Sixty-eight women challenged male incumbents, 52 Democrats and 16 Republicans. Twenty-nine women ran for open seats, 19 Democrats and 10 Republicans. Of the 163 female nominees 78 won seats, 58 Democrats and 20 Republicans. Fifty-nine of the 66 incumbents were reelected, 42 Democrats and 17 Republicans. Four Democratic challengers to Republican male incumbents won seats, and 15 of the 29 women who ran for open seats were successful, 12 Democrats and three Republicans. Overall, women in the House had a 48 percent success rate, Democratic women had a 50 percent success rate, and Republican women had a 42.6 percent success rate. This was a slight drop from the 2010 midterm elections.

Resulting from the 2012 election, women in the 113th Congress now hold 97 out of the 535 total seats, or 18.1 percent overall. Moreover, 29 of the total women are women of color, making women of color comprise 4.5 percent of the total members of congress. There are 13 African American women in the House and they are all Democrats. There are nine Latin American women in the House seven are Democrats and two are Republicans. Seven Asian Pacific Islander women are in congress, they are all Democrats and six of them are in the House, and there is one female Senator, Mazie Hirono from Hawaii. Only two minority women have

---

served in the Senate, one African American, Former Senator Carol Moseley Braun, and then current Senator Mazie Hirone.\textsuperscript{63} In the House 42 minority women have served to date, 39 Democrats and three Republicans.

Women in the United States House of Representatives comprise 77 of the 435, or 17.7 percent total seats\textsuperscript{64}. Furthermore in the House, incumbent Democratic Congresswoman from California Nancy Pelosi is the current minority leader. Previously Pelosi was the first woman speaker of the House. Moreover, of the 77 women in the House, 19 are Republicans, 56 are Democrats, and they come from 31 different states.

In the United States Senate, women make up 20 percent or 20 of the 100 total seats. Sixteen of the 20 women in the Senate are Democrats whereas four are Republicans. The Republicans are Kelly Ayotte from New Hampshire, Susan Collins of Maine, Deb Fischer from Nebraska, and Lisa Murkowski of Alaska. The Democrats are Tammy Baldwin of Wisconsin, Barbara Boxer and Dianne Feinstein of California, Maria Cantwell and Patty Murray from Washington, Kirsten Gillibrand of New York, Kay Hagan of North Carolina, Heidi Helskamp of North Dakota, Mazie Hirono from Hawaii, Amy Klobuchar from Minnesota, Mary Landrieu of Louisiana, Claire McCaskill of Missouri, Barbara Mikulski of Maryland, Jeanne Shaheen from New Hampshire, Debbie Stabenow from Michigan, and Elizabeth Warren from Massachusetts.

\textbf{How Women Voted in the 2008 and 2012 Presidential Elections:}


2008 Voters:

In the 2008 Presidential election between Presidential candidates John McCain and Barack Obama more women voted than men, 53 to 47 percent.\(^{65}\) There was not a strong gender gap because both women and men favored Obama. However women preferred Obama by a higher percentage than men. Forty-nine percent of men voted for Obama and 48 percent voted for McCain.\(^{66}\) Whereas, women voted for Obama 56 percent and McCain 43 percent, favoring Obama by a margin of 13 points.\(^{67}\)

Women voted for five points more for President Obama in 2008, 56 percent, than they voted for Presidential nominee John Kerry with 51 percent, in 2004, which was the first Presidential election to follow the attacks of 9/11.\(^{68}\) Women gave Obama a decisive victory in 2008, whereas in 2004 women only voted for Kerry over Bush by a three point margin, 51 to 48 percent. McCain did five points worse among women in 2008 than Bush did in 2004 with 43 and 48 percent respectively.\(^{69}\)

Broken down into race and sex categories, Obama did not win a majority among white voters.\(^{70}\) He won only 41 percent of the white male vote to 46 percent of the white female vote,


\(^{66}\) Ibid.

\(^{67}\) Ibid.

\(^{68}\) Ibid.

\(^{69}\) Ibid.

\(^{70}\) Ibid.
still creating a five point gender gap.\textsuperscript{71} Although still not a majority, Obama fared better with white female voters than Kerry did by two points or 46 to 44 percent. Obama did win the minority vote but there was still a gender gap present. Latin Americans voted for Obama 68 to 64 percent women to men, making a four point gap between the genders. Obama fared best with African American voters with 96 percent of the African American female vote and 95 percent of the African American male vote.\textsuperscript{72}

The most important issues for voters in the 2008 election were: the economy, war specifically the war in Iraq, the financial crisis and banking situation, unemployment, drop in retirement accounts, and the housing market.\textsuperscript{73} While war was still on the mind of voters the issues of terrorism and national security were not of top importance to voters as they had been in the 2004 Presidential election.

\textbf{2012 Voters:}

There was a gender gap present in the 2012 Presidential election. More women voted than men, 53 percent to 47 percent respectively.\textsuperscript{74} More men voted for Presidential candidate

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{72} Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP) Fact Sheet. 2008. “The Gender Gap Voting Choices in Presidential Elections.” New Brunswick Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP), Eagleton Institute of Politics Rutgers University. \\
\end{itemize}
Mitt Romney than for President reelect Barack Obama, 52 percent to 45 percent, or a seven point difference. A majority of women, on the other hand, voted for Obama over Romney, 55 percent to 44 percent or an 11 point gap. According to CAWP this gender gap is larger than any other presidential race since 1996. Obama did as well among female voters in the 2012 election as he did in the 2008 election, and Romney and McCain also had to same support among women in the two elections. However, Obama did not do as well in 2012 with male voters, and without the female vote, Romney would have been elected President.

The voting demographic differences are more stark when broken down into race and sex categories. Romney won the majority of the white vote for men and women, however there was a gender gap present between white voters. Only 35 percent of white men voted for Obama whereas 42 percent of white women did, and 56 percent of white women voted for Romney. Romney did not, however, win a majority of votes from any minorities, men or women. Ninety-six percent of African American women voted for Obama and 87 percent of


African American men voted for him. This still represents a gender gap, yet, the majority of both sexes voted for Obama with African American voters. The same gender gap happened with Latin American voters with 76 percent of Latin American women to 65 percent of Latin American men voting for Obama, but both groups still elected Obama by majority.\textsuperscript{80}

There were gender gaps present in not only the Presidential election, but also in Congressional elections.\textsuperscript{81} In United States House races there was a ten point gender gap in 2012.\textsuperscript{82} Overall women voters in national races voted more for Democratic candidates than Republican candidates, whereas Republican candidates were supported more by a majority of men. Thus resulting, because more women voted than men, in a slight advantage for Democratic candidates.\textsuperscript{83}

The top issues for voters in the 2012 Presidential election were in order of importance: unemployment, the economy, dissatisfaction with the government or politics, the deficit or government spending, and healthcare.\textsuperscript{84} Noticeably absent from this list yet present in the 2004 Presidential election are the issues of national security and foreign policy.

Women voters were so instrumental in the 2012 Senate races that Center for American Women and Politics Senior Scholar Susan J. Carroll noted, “The composition of the United


\textsuperscript{82} Ibid.
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States Senate in the 113th Congress would look very different if it were not for the votes of women in these races. It’s clear that in a significant number of U.S. Senate races, women and men preferred different candidates and women’s preferences prevailed.”

Women determined the outcome of many key 2012 Senate races, “in seven high-visibility races where exit polls were conducted, men voted for the losing Republican candidate, while a majority of women cast their ballots for the winning Democratic candidate.” Furthermore, this gender gap helped the Democrats retain control of the U.S. Senate.

Women voters gender gap made the difference which elected female Democratic Senate newcomers Tammy Baldwin of Wisconsin, Elizabeth Warren of Massachusetts, as well as Democratic Senate incumbents Amy Klobuchar from Minnesota, and Kirsten Gillibrand of New York. Klobuchar had a 13 point gender gap, Gillibrand 12 points, Warren 12 points, and Baldwin ten points.

Women elected women but also ensured victories for Democratic men of the Senate in certain races. Women also elected Jon Tester from Montana, Joe Dennelly of Indiana, Tim Kaine in Virginia, Sherrod Brown of Ohio, and Bob Casey of Pennsylvania. More interestingly,

---
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women voters in Connecticut elected Democrat Chris Murphy over female Republican candidate Linda McMahon.\textsuperscript{89} “In Connecticut, men split their votes evenly between Democrat Chris Murphy and Republican Linda McMahon, while women showed a clear and decisive preference for Murphy.”\textsuperscript{90}

The ‘War on Women,’ which was the political catchphrase in the United States politics that became popular in the 2010 congressional elections, was the phrase used to describe the Republican Party initiatives limiting women’s rights, most commonly reproductive rights. The ‘War on Women’ became an important issue for voters, especially Democratic female voters, in the 2010 and 2012 elections. The issues of birth control, abortion rights, and gay marriage were important for female voters whether they supported a women’s right to choose or not. The Republican party’s platform stated a ban on gay marriage as well as abortion for any reason. Two male Republican candidates Richard Mourdock from Indiana and Todd Akin of Missouri made shocking comments about their stances on abortion rights. Mourdock when asked his stance on abortion commented that he had struggled with whether abortion should be allowed in instances of rape and said, "I came to realize that life is that gift from God. And, I think, even when life begins in that horrible situation of rape, that it is something that God intended to happen."\textsuperscript{91} This statement most likely did not make Mourdock popular among women because a majority voted

\begin{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{90} Edison Research exit polls conducted by the Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP), a unit of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.

\end{flushleft}
for Democrat Joe Donnelly, however the majority of men still voted for Mourdock. However, women’s votes elected Donnelly even though before this decisive comment, Mourdock lead in the polls.

Before Mourdock commented on abortion, Senate nominee Todd Akin made a similar statement that shocked many women and most likely cost him the election to Democrat Claire McCaskill. Akin, when asked if abortion should be allowed in instances of rape replied, “First of all, from what I understand from doctors, that’s really rare. If it’s a legitimate rape, the female body has ways to try to shut that whole thing down. But let’s assume that maybe that didn’t work or something. I think there should be some punishment, but the punishment ought to be on the rapist and not attacking the child.” Before this pseudoscientific comment was made by Akin, he was favored in the polls to win the race, however, he lost the election and Democrat Claire McCaskill was reelected. Unlike in the Mourdock race, however, both men and women voters favored McCaskill. However a gender gap still persisted, and women voted for McCaskill seven points more than men. In all but one of the Senate races in 2012 there were gender gaps in voting between men in women these differences ranged from five to thirteen points. Women were more likely to vote for Democratic candidates over Republican candidates than men.

The 2006 midterm elections, 2008 Presidential elections, 2010 midterm elections, and the recent 2012 Presidential elections were successful elections for female politicians. Women
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candidates overcame the losses they incurred in the elections directly following 9/11 and made more seat gains than ever before. Moreover, in these recent elections women voters showed a strong preference for Democratic candidates over Republican candidates and most specifically they supported Democratic female candidates. The most important issues in these elections were education, the economy, healthcare, and women’s rights issues. As I hypothesized, women politicians did well in these elections as the issues of national security, foreign policy, and terrorism were not the most important issues to voters as they had been in 2002 and 2004.

The last three chapters have focused on the change in the relationship between gender and voting among voters and how this affected the success rate of female politicians running for congress. The data showed how voters changed their voting patterns after 9/11 from expressing a gender gap in candidate preference with more women than men supporting the more liberal candidate and often female candidates in the 1990s and in 2000. Then after 9/11 men and women supported the same candidates in the 2002 and 2004 elections and women voted more conservatively in these elections. Then the data showed how women returned to their pre-9/11 voting habits and voted more liberally when the most important election issues were not national security and the war but instead social issues and the economy. But what about congresswomen? Did congresswomen change the way they voted on legislation after September 11th?

Chapter 5:

Senate Voting Patterns:
The three previous chapters focused on the relationship between gender and voting as expressed through voters patterns and preferences. This chapter focuses on women of the United States Senate and how they vote on legislation compared to male Senators. It will discuss how the women of the Senate voted on certain legislation between 1992 and 2010 to find out if male and female Senators vote on legislation the same way. Furthermore, whether the Senate women vote the same way on certain issues and conform closer to gender stereotypes or party stereotypes.

**Women of the Senate Top Issues:**

As previously mentioned, stereotypes of female politicians have claimed that they favor domestic issues over international issues, and that Democrats are stronger on domestic issues and Republicans are stronger on international issues. However, after September 11th, politicians of both parties had to prove that they were competent on issues of national security and foreign policy if they wanted to remain in office. So if stereotypically, women do not favor international issues, but instead favor domestic policy, yet Republicans favor international policy than where does this leave female Republicans? Also, are female Democrats truly opposed to foreign policy?

In this chapter, using Americans for Democratic Action data, I will show how the female politicians of both parties are more liberal than the male politicians of the House and Senate. This section will show that women vote differently than men of their party and that women and men as politicians differ on key policy issues even within the same party. The data gathered from Americans for Democratic Action is relevant because the group has been in consistent existence

---

since 1947. From its inception they have compiled yearly voting records of congresswomen and congressmen on the top 20 votes they find most important and took a stance on each issue. The group is a liberal group and so the stance they take they consider the liberal stance and they score each congressperson from 0-100, 0 being most conservative and 100 being the most liberal. Each vote is equated to five points so the 20 votes add up to an even 100. These annual voting records are considered a standard measure of political liberalism. The ADA data is consistent and helpful for finding trends in voting because the issues they pick out to use are social, economic, domestic, and international. The ADA scores the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives and is organized alphabetically by state. For my purpose, I separated the data by men and women and then organized the data by the year the person was elected. Next, I then compared male congressmen to other congressmen and then female congresswomen to other congresswomen. Finally, I compared the sexes to each other. Appended to the end of this thesis are relevant graphs with the complete Senate and House data for both sexes.

United States Senate 1992:
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There were two female United States Senators in 1992: Republican Senator Nancy Kassebaum of Kansas and Democratic Senator Barbara Mikulski of Maryland. Kassebaum was elected into the Senate in 1978 and Mikulski was elected in 1987. As the two Senators represented different parties, it was not surprising that they did not agree on all the same issues. However, the issues they did agree on were interesting and provide insight into how women legislate. Mikulski scored a liberal quotient of 100 and Kassebaum received a 25. One vote concerned abortion and if passed would have banned U.S. military personnel and their families from obtaining abortions at U.S. military bases overseas at their own expense. Both Senators voted against the bill even though Kassebaum is a Republican, and the bill did not pass.

Another similar issue was the Family Planning Veto Override. This vote was to override President Bush’s veto of a bill to reauthorize abortion counseling at federally funded family planning clinics. Bush did not want abortion counseling to be allowed at federally funded family planning clinics. Both Mikulski and Kassebaum voted to overturn Bush’s veto and the override was passed. This was another surprising position for a Republican Senator to hold but perhaps in this case being a woman and supporting other women was more important to Kassebaum than party alliance. Vote 15 was a similar issue, it concerned lifting a ban on research using tissue obtained from induced abortions. Mikulski and Kassebaum both voted in favor of ending the ban and the motion was agreed. These votes are examples of the congresswomen conforming to the stereotype that women support women’s issues.

Vote number 20 was another issue Kassebaum and Mikulski agreed on but was not another family or stereotypically women’s issue. It was a Nuclear Testing Moratorium in which Republican Senator Hatfield from Oregon proposed an amendment to impose a nine-month
moratorium on nuclear testing, and limited testing there on after. The vote was passed an
adopted. This vote shows insight how women legislate concerning national and international
security, as they both supported the moratorium.

Although the two Senators agreed on some of the same issues, for example they both
supported the stereotypical women’s issue of abortion rights, overall they both voted on party
lines. Mikulski took the liberal position 20 out of 20 of the votes or a liberal quotient of 100
percent and Kassebaum voted liberally only 5 out of the 20 times or 25 percent liberal quotient.
Compared to their respective parties the Republican men of the Senate had an average liberal
quotient of 16.8 percent meaning that Kassebaum voted slightly more liberally (approximately 8
percent). The Democratic men of the Senate had a 83.6 percent liberal quotient average (16.4
percent less liberal than Mikulski) and so Mikulski like Kassebaum also voted more liberally
than her male party counterparts.

Although only two out of the 100 Senators were women in 1992 the way they voted on
legislation shows an example of how men and women legislate differently. Further, this is an
example of how female politicians of both parties vote the same on certain women’s issues but
vote along party lines on other issues. This is also an example of how women of both parties vote
more liberally than the men of both parties.

**United States Senate 1994[^10]:**

By 1994, there were five new female Senators bringing the total to seven. In addition to
Mikulski and Kassebaum were Republican Kay Bailey Hutchison from Texas, Democrats

[^10]: All voting information from: "ADA's 1994 Congressional Voting Record." ADA Today 50
Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer from California, Democrat Patty Murray from Washington, and Democrat Carol Moseley-Braun from Illinois. This tipped the Republican Democrat balance in the Senate from one to one to five Democrats to two Republicans.

Votes of note for this year included the vote about Abortion Clinic Access, which made it a federal crime to use force, the threat of force or physical obstruction to block access to abortion clinics. This vote passed and was adopted and all seven of the female senators supported this bill. This was a notable vote because most of the male Republicans voted against the bill meaning that the Republican women voted more liberally than the Republican men and is another example of female Senators conforming to gender stereotypes. Another notable bill was vote number eleven which concerned Elementary and Secondary Education Reauthorization and prohibited agencies receiving money under the bill from encouraging or supporting homosexuality as a positive lifestyle alternative. This legislation that as of year 2013 seems outdated and narrow-minded surprisingly passed 63-36. Moreover, Democrats had control of the Senate during the time which makes the passage even more bewildering. What is less surprising, however, is that the women of the Senate voted along party lines for this vote. The Republican women voted in support of the bill and the Democratic women all voted against it.

There were also five votes concerning the defense budget (3, 6, 7, 13, 16), of which four were rejected and one passed. For these votes, Republican Nancy Kassebaum and Democrat Dianne Feinstein did not vote on party lines and Kassebaum voted more liberally than Feinstein. Specifically, vote number 13, if passed would have cut $257 million that was allotted for 18 new Trident II sea-launched ballistic missiles from the budget. Republican Kassebaum voted for this
budget cut, yet Democrats Mikulski and Feinstein took the more stereotypically conservative stance and voted against the cut providing an example against sex and party stereotypes.

Overall in 1994 the female Senator liberal quotient average was 68.6 percent and the male liberal quotient average was 53.2 percent meaning that the women of the Senate were 15.4 percent more liberal than the men. Broken down into sex and party, Republican women scored an average of 27.5 percent liberal quotient and Republican men had a 17.6 percent liberal quotient. Meaning that in 1994, like 1992, Republican women of the senate were more liberal than Republican men by almost ten percent. For Democrats, the Democratic women had an average of 85 percent liberal quotient and Democratic men had an 81 percent liberal quotient. Meaning Democratic women were also slightly more liberal than Democratic men. However, although Democratic and Republican women were more liberal than the men of their parties, Democratic women were more liberal than Republican women by 57.5 percent.

**Senate 1996**

In the Senate in 1996 there were two more Republican female Senators elected, Republican Senator Shelia Frahm from Kansas and Republican Senator Olympia Snowe from Maine. This brought the ratio of female Democratic Senators to Republican Senators to five to four with a total of nine female Senators in office. Votes of interest in 1996 concerned a variety of issues from family planning and abortion, defense spending, health insurance, and sexual orientation nondiscrimination.

Vote two was the Fiscal 1996 International Family Planning amendment that was proposed by Republican Senator McConnell concerning limiting abortion. It was rejected and all

---

of the female Senators voted against it except for Republican Senator Hutchison (Frahm was not in office yet and did not vote on the matter). This meant that Hutchison voted the conservative and Republican position and Kassebaum and Snowe voted liberally and not along party lines. In this instance and on this issue it is not unusual for women to be supportive of the reproductive rights of women, yet it is not the typical Republican stance. Two of the three Republican women who voted on this issue voted in support of a woman’s right to choose and the other voted against the right to choose and along party lines. Whereas all of the Democratic women voted in support of a woman’s right to choose.

Another contentious issue, vote number four, concerned Mental Illness Coverage by Health Insurance. The vote concerned Republican female Senator Kassebaum attempting to kill a bill by another Republican, Senator Domenici, which stated that health plans could not impose limits or financial requirements limiting mental health care coverage. This bill is of interest for two reasons. First, stereotypically, Republicans are not in support of health care reform yet the bill was proposed by a male Republican. The other reason is because stereotypically, women tend to be more supportive of health care than men, however, female Republican Senator Kassebaum was attempting to kill the bill. Kassebaum, clearly did not have the liberal position concerning this vote, however, all of the other female Senators who voted on this issue did vote liberally or against tabling the bill. However, Kassebaum overall had a higher liberal quotient than fellow Republican female Senators Hutchison and Frahm.

Senator Kassebaum did hold the liberal position on the Fiscal 1997 Defense Authorization Missile Defense Cut, which would have cut $300 million from the defense budget. Kassebaum along with all five of the Senate female Democrats voted to cut defense spending
and the three other Republican women Senators voted not to cut spending. This vote is contentious because Republicans tend to be more supportive of Defense spending than Democrats and eight of the nine female Senators voted along party lines, with the exception of Kassebaum, however the vote was rejected.

Vote ten was another Defense Authorization which would have resulted in a $13 billion cut from the defense budget. This legislation was not supported by Senator Kassebaum or any of the other female Republicans, but it was supported by four of the five female Democrats; only Democratic Senator Feinstein voted against the budget cut on the Democratic side meaning that she voted across party lines. Stereotypically defense spending is supported by Republicans and men more than Democrats and women, however, in this vote the Republican women voted to preserve the defense budget and one of the four Democratic women did as well.

Vote 18 was the Sexual Orientation Nondiscrimination bill which would have prohibited job discrimination based on sexual orientation by extending the 1964 Civil Rights Act to include sexual orientation. This bill was narrowly rejected 49-50, and the female Senators voted on party lines with the Republican women Senators voting against the bill and the Democratic women voting in favor of the bill. One exception, however, is that Republican Senator Snowe voted for the bill taking the liberal position.

Vote 20 concerned Federal Health Plan Abortions which prohibited federal health insurance plans from covering abortions except in case of rape, incest, or to preserve the right of the woman. The Democratic women of the Senate not surprisingly all voted against this abortion limit as women and Democrats stereotypically tend to favor a woman’s right to choose. However, the Republican women were split on this contentious issue. Republican Senators
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Frahm and Hutchison took the more conservative stance on the issue voting for the abortion limit however, Republican Senators Snowe and Kassebaum took the liberal position and voted against the change. From the 1992, 1994, and 1996 ADA voting records as a trend are starting to emerge where female Senators will vote across party lines for certain issues including the defense budget and abortion rights. In the case of abortion rights, voting across party lines could be evidence of the Republican women Senators identifying with their sex over their party.

For the Senate as a whole, the Senate average liberal quotient score for women was 59.4 percent, a 9.2 percent drop from the 1994 average. The average score for men of the Senate was 44.3 percent an 8.9 percent decline in liberalness from the 1994 average. This meant that in 1996 women of the Senate were on average 15 points more liberal than the men Senators. For Republican women the average was 16.25 percent, a 11.25 point drop from 1994. For Republican men the average was ten percent which was a 7.6 percent decline from 1994. Republican women were 6.25 percent more liberal than the Republican men, however this gap is smaller than in 1994 where there was a ten percent gap. Democratic women of the Senate with an average score of 94 were nine points more liberal on average than in 1994. The women Democrats were more liberal than the men Democrats by over 12 points with their average score of 81.7, but the Democratic men were more liberal in 1996 than in 1994 by almost a point. Although the women of both parties were more liberal than their male counterparts they still had very different liberal quotient averages with the female Democrats voting 77.25 percent more liberally than the Senate female Republicans.

Senate 1998103:

In 1998 Republican female Senator Frahm was not reelected to serve the remaining time on the seat she was appointed to. Moreover, Democratic female Senator Mary Landrieu from Louisiana was elected tipping the close balance between Democratic and Republican female Senators from 5 to 4, to 6 to 3 Democrats to Republicans respectively. Votes of interest in 1998 included tobacco restrictions, abortion procedure ban, NATO expansion, higher education reform, and implementation of a national missile defense.

In votes one through three, Republican women Senators Snowe and Collins voted the liberal position on issues of campaign finance, highway and transit reauthorization, and a budget resolution. Vote six was a North Atlantic Treaty Organization Expansion treaty which admitted Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic into NATO when it passed. The ADA does not support NATO so voting to admit these countries into NATO counted as a conservative vote for the liberal quotient. All nine of the women Senators voted to admit the countries into NATO therefore receiving a conservative score for the vote.

Vote number seven was the National Missile Defense bill. If passed it would have made it United States policy to implement a national defense shield. This vote failed by only one vote and the women of the Senate all voted with their parties on this issue with the Democrats taking the liberal position and voting against it and the Republicans taking the more conservative position and voting for it.

Vote number nine was another case where Snowe and Collins voted the liberal position and across party lines. It concerned Tobacco Restrictions requiring the tobacco industry to pay $516 billion over 25 years for antismoking education and research programs as well as raising taxes on cigarettes. Moreover, it would have penalized the tobacco industry if levels of youth
smoking did not decrease by 60 percent over ten years. Although all of the female Democratic Senators voted for this bill as well as Republican Senators Snowe and Collins this bill was narrowly rejected. This bill is notable because it concerned healthcare and education which are both stereotypically Democratic and women’s issues. Moreover, the Democratic women conformed to this stereotype with their votes and two of the three Republican women voted across party lines and took the stereotypical position for women. Republican Senator Hutchison did not take the liberal position on this bill and voted against it and with the Republican party.

Vote twelve was the Higher Education Act Reauthorization--Welfare Education amendment which would have allowed states to count post-secondary or vocational education towards work requirements for welfare parents. It was narrowly adopted and all of the Senate women who voted, voted for the amendment. Republican Senator Hutchison did not vote on the issue, however, her fellow Republican women took the liberal position and voted across party lines. This is another instance of Republican women voting more liberally than their male Republican counterparts on the issues of education and welfare, or issues which are stereotypically women’s issues or Democratic issues.

In a last surprising vote for 1998, vote 18 was an Abortion Procedure Ban which was three votes from passing. It would have banned certain late-term abortions and anyone convicted of performing such an abortion would have been subject to two years in prison and a fine. Republican Senator Hutchison remained in her usual position of being anti-abortion and voted in favor of the bill and with her party on the vote. Republican Senators Snowe and Collins, however, also held onto their pro-choice position and voted against the ban and not in concert with the Republican party. Five of the six Democratic women voted against the ban, surprisingly
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however, one Democratic women Senator Landrieu voted in favor of the ban. This is the first instance in the ADA data of a Democratic women voting against abortion rights. Senator Landrieu broke from the stereotypical Democratic and female position with her controversial vote.

In the Senate overall in 1998 the Democrats, including men and women, had an 88 percent liberal quotient and the Republicans had a nine percent liberal quotient. Senate women had an average liberal quotient score of 68.3 percent an almost 9 percent raise from 1996, however, in 1996 there was one more Republican in the Senate. The men of the Senate had a liberal quotient average of 43.8 percent meaning that the women of the Senate had a 24.5 percent higher liberal quotient. Republican women of the Senate had a liberal quotient of 23.3 percent which was a seven point increase from 1996. Republican men had a liberal quotient of 6.7 percent, about a three point drop from the 1996 score. Republican women had a 16.6 percent higher liberal quotient score than the men. Democratic women had a 90.8 percent liberal quotient average which was about a three percent drop from 1996. Democratic men had an average of 85.4 percent or about a four percent increase from 1996. Democratic women and men had about a five point difference with the women being more liberal. Like in the previous years, the women of the Senate were more liberal than the men in 1998, however the Democratic women were 67.5 percent more liberal than the Republicans and both parties of women were closer to their corresponding parties liberal quotient scores than to each other.

Senate 2000\(^{104}\):

In 2000, Democratic Senator Carol Moseley-Braun was not reelected, but Democratic Senator Blanche Lincoln was elected that year; keeping the number of female Democrats to Republicans 6 to 3 respectively. Notable votes for 2000 included Abortions for Military Personnel, Children’s Health Coverage, Hate Crimes, Trade with China, and a Missile Defense System.

Vote ten concerned the Abortions for Military Personnel bill which would have allowed military women and dependents of military personnel to obtain self-funded abortions at overseas military hospitals. The vote was to kill the bill and was proposed by Senator Hutchinson. As she proposed the tabling of the bill she clearly did not have the liberal stance on the issue, however her fellow female Republican Senators Collins and Snowe voted against killing the bill and in favor of abortion rights, and so did all five of Democratic women. Republicans Collins and Snowe have voted across party lines on the issue of abortion consistently since they were elected which shows an example of a trend concerning the representation of Republican men and women and how their views differ on issues concerning women’s rights even though they belong to the same party.

Vote eleven was a Hate Crimes amendment to broaden the categories covered by hate crimes legislation to include crimes related to gender, sexual orientation, and disability. This would make it easier for the federal government to become involved in the investigation and prosecution of hate crimes. It would also allot financial assistance to states in prosecuting these crimes. Eight of the nine female Senators voted in favor of this legislation with the exception of Republican Senator Hutchison. This is another instance where Senators Collins and Snowe voted
the liberal position across party lines and held the stereotypically woman or Democratic position on the issue of equal rights regardless of a person’s gender, sexual orientation, and disability.

Vote 15 concerned implementing Missile Defense System testing, and was another example of Senators Collins and Snowe taking the liberal position and siding with the Democrats and all five Democratic women Senators against defense spending and testing. Senator Hutchison was the sole female Senator who voted in support of testing the missile defense system, and the motion passed.

Children’s Health Coverage was vote 18, it was a motion to allow states to expand coverage under Medicaid and the State Children’s Health Insurance Program to the parents of the children enrolled in the programs. The motion was rejected narrowly, however, eight of the nine female Senators supported the motion. Again, Hutchison was the only female Senator who did not vote with the other female Senators, and although she voted conservatively on party lines she did not conform to the stereotypes of female politicians. Moreover, Republicans Snowe and Collins again voted liberally instead of conservatively and took the stereotypically female position on health care by voting for the motion. Vote 19 concerned Trade with China and the ADA position was against trade with China as the liberal vote. However, eight of the nine female Senators voted in favor of trade with China with only Democratic Senator Mikulski taking the ADA liberal position and voting against trade with China.

Overall, the liberal quotients for all groups were lower in 2000 than in the previously discussed years. The average liberal quotient for Democrats was 79 in 2000, a nine point drop from 1998. The Republicans had an average of seven which was a two point drop from 1998. The average liberal quotient of women in the Senate was 60.6 percent whereas the average for
men was 41.4 percent, a 19.2 percent difference. Republican women had a liberal quotient of 18.3 percent whereas Republican men had an approximately 6 percent liberal quotient, meaning they had a 12 point difference in their voting. Democratic women and men had an identical liberal quotient average of approximately 82 percent meaning that in 2000 the Democratic women were not more liberal than the Democratic men in the Senate. However, Republican women were still more liberal than the Republican men, and Republican women were still 63.4 percent less liberal than Democratic women.

**Senate 2002**

In 2002, one year after the attacks of September 11th, 2001 there were 14 female Senators; Democratic Senator Maria Cantwell of Washington, Democrat Jean Carnahan of Missouri, Democrat Hillary Rodham Clinton of New York, Democrat Debbie Stabenow of Michigan, and Democrat Lisa Murkowski of Alaska joined the Senate making the Democrat to Republican divide 10 to 4 respectively. Votes of interest were on issues concerning voting rights, Andean Trade Bill, Hate Crimes, the war in Iraq, and Homeland Security.

Vote four was an amendment to provide voting rights for convicted felons who had fully served their prison sentence so they could vote in federal elections. The ADA liberal stance on this vote was in favor of the amendment. Female Senators, however, were divided on the issue and the amendment did not end up passing. The Republican female Senators were not in favor of granting voting rights to convicted felons and female Senate Democrats were divided on the issue. Six of the ten female Democrats (Lincoln, Cantwell, Murray, Boxer, Clinton, and

Mikulski) were in favor of granting voting rights, but four (Landrieu, Feinstein, Carnahan, and Stabenow) were not. Landrieu and Feinstein both voted conservatively and against female politician stereotypes on other key issues such as against abortion rights in the case of Landrieu and Feinstein for defense spending.

Vote ten was the Andean Trade Bill which would extend duty-free status to certain products from Bolivia, Columbia, Ecuador, and Peru, but would hurt jobs in the United States because of cheaper company relocation to those countries. The ADA stance was to vote no on the bill as the liberal stance. The women of the Senate were divided on this issue of international relations. The four Republican women voted in favor of the trade as well as five of the Democrats (Landrieu, Lincoln, Cantwell, Feinstein, and Murray). These five Democrats voted against the liberal position. The five other Democratic women (Boxer, Carnahan, Clinton, Stabenow, and Mikulski), contrastingly, voted against the trade bill and held the liberal Democratic stance. The vote passed 66-30.

Vote 12 concerned a Hate Crimes bill to broaden the definition of hate crimes to include acts committed because of the victim’s sex, sexual orientation or disability and let the federal government help states prosecute hate crimes even if no federally protected activity was involved. The motion to limit debate and therefore allowing it to pass was rejected in the vote 54-43. For this vote all of the Democratic women were in support of the Hate Crimes bill and so were Republicans Snowe and Collins. This conformed to the stereotypical view that women are more likely to support equal rights regardless of sexual orientation or sex as well as the same stereotype for Democrats. Snow and Collins did break the stereotype that Republicans tend to not support equal rights legislation based on sexual orientation or sex. Republican Senators
Murkowski and Hutchison who voted against the Hate Crimes bill, conformed to the Republican stereotype but not to the women politician stereotype.

The issue of access to Military Abortions came up again in 2002 as vote 14 in an amendment proposed by female Democratic Senator Murray that would give military women and dependents of military personnel stationed overseas access to abortion services. This same issue came up two other times in the ADA vote research from 1992 to 2002 and a ban on the access for military abortions was defended both times. However, this time the access to abortions for military personnel and their families was passed. Twelve of the 14 women Senators voted in favor of the access and rights to abortion, Republican Senator Hutchinson abstained from voting (which is interesting because she previously motioned to kill the bill), and Republican Senator Murkowski voted against military abortion rights. This was another instance where Republicans Snowe and Collins voted across party lines for stereotypically women’s issues and took the Democratic and liberal stance.

Vote 15 was the Nuclear Waste Storage bill that female Republican Senator Murkowski motioned to approve. The bill asked for Yucca Mountain, Nevada as a repository for the nation’s spent nuclear and high-level radioactive waste. This vote is notable because of how the female Senators voted on this issue. The female Senators were divided in half on this issue: seven voted in favor and seven voted against. The four Republican women Senators voted in favor of the Nuclear Waste Storage in Yucca Mountain as well as Democratic Senators Murray, Lincoln, and Landrieu, whereas the other seven Democratic women voted against it. This issue of nuclear waste came at a time of war in the Middle East and after the attacks of 9/11 and might have helped sway the female voters to vote for nuclear storage when they would not have previously.
Another controversial issue was the passage of the joint resolution to authorize the use of force, or in other words to start a war, against Iraq and require the Administration to report to Congress that diplomatic options had been exhausted before military operations commenced. This vote was very emotionally and politically charged after the terrorist attacks. Politicians were looked up to in order to protect the United States and prevent future terrorist attacks. Without this emotionally charged environment this vote most likely would not have been necessary or the vote would have turned out differently. However, because of the timing of this vote, ten of the 14 female Senators voted in favor of war in Iraq. All of the female Republican Senators and six of the ten Democratic female Senators (Landrieu, Lincoln, Cantwell, Feinstein, Carnahan, and Clinton) supported authorizing war in Iraq. Four female Democratic Senators (Murray, Boxer, Stabenow, and Mikulski), however, did not support the use of force in Iraq. This vote was very indicative of personal views on war as well as societal and political pressure. The vote overwhelmingly passed 77-23 but of the 23 who voted against the use of military force, 19 were male Democratic Senators and four were female Democratic Senators.

Vote 19 concerned amending Homeland Security to make it a cabinet-level Homeland Security Department in charge of protecting domestic security. Presidential appointments for the positions in the cabinet would have been subjected to Senate confirmation and as collective bargaining if not seen as a security risk would have been retained. However, this vote concerned killing this substitute amendment and the motion was narrowly agreed to. The ADA position was in favor of the proposed amendment as it would have allowed more transparency and collective bargaining rights of workers. The women of the Senate voted along party lines for this vote which is an interesting contrast from the Iraq war vote.
Overall for 2002 the liberal quotient average for the Senate Democrats was 85.5 percent and 11.1 for the Senate Republicans. The average for the women of the Senate was 66.4 percent and the average for the men of the Senate was 43.8 percent, a 24.5 percent gap. The average for Republican women of the Senate was 17.5 percent a one point drop from 2000, and the average for the Republican men was 10.5 percent, a seven point gap showing again the tendency for women to be more liberal than men of the Senate, however, this gap is smaller than in 2000 when Republican women were 12 points more liberal than Republican men. This discrepancy might be explained by female Republicans feeling the need to vote more conservatively after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. Democratic women of the Senate had an average of 86 percent and the Democratic men of the Senate had a liberal quotient average of 81.5 percent. The average for Democratic women of the Senate was approximately four points higher than 2000 however, on votes concerning national security and foreign policy the majority of the Democratic women voted conservatively and did not take the Democratic position. Women in both parties voted more liberally than the men of the parties however, the Democratic women on average 68.5 percent more liberally than the Senate female Republicans.

Senate 2004:

There were 14 female members of in the Senate in 2004 as there were in 2002, however Democratic Senator Jean Carnahan lost the election to finish the term of the seat she was appointed to and Republican Senator Elizabeth Dole joined the Senate. This made the Republican to Democrat balance of the women in the Senate 5 Republicans to 9 Democrats.

---

There were many notable votes in 2004, vote number one was the Protection of Lawful Commerce In Arms Act- Gun Liability- Gun Safety Devices. It was proposed by female Democratic Senator Boxer and set up more restrictions on the sale of handguns concerning safety. It was swiftly adopted 70-27, and 13 of the 14 female Senators supported the amendment with the sole exception of Republican Senator Dole. This was another example of female Republican Senators voting the liberal position and breaking Republican stereotypes while conforming to stereotypes of female politicians.

Vote number two was Jumpstart Our Business Strength Acting- Exporting which was an amendment prohibiting government contracting with firms that outsource United States jobs overseas. It exempted contracts with WTO and that involved national security. It was easily adopted 70-26 and all fourteen of the female Senators voted for this amendment. This vote was one of the only times where every female Senator agreed on the same issue, and where all five of the Republicans took the liberal position breaking party stereotypes.

Vote four was the Unborn Victims of Violence act which made it a criminal offense to injure or kill a fetus during the act of a violent crime. Criminal penalties for harming a fetus equalled penalties for harming the pregnant woman regardless of whether the perpetrator knew the woman was pregnant. This act grated legal status to an unborn child. It was a controversial vote especially for female Senators, because it could act as a precursor in limiting abortion (even though there was no mention in limiting abortion in the legislation), which female politician of both parties typically disagree with. However, on the other hand, limiting violence against women is, like abortion, another extremely important issue for women. Although for the most part the female Senators voted along party lines on this vote, the female Republicans voted for
the passage of the act (Murkowski, Dole, Hutchison, and Collins) and the female Democrats against it (Murray, Mikulski, Stabenow, Clinton, Cantwell, Boxer, Lincoln, and Feinstein). There were, however, two exceptions. Republican Senator Olympia Snowe voted against the act which is not surprising considering her voting record on the issue of abortion. However, because the legislation does not explicitly limit abortion it is notable that she voted across party lines for this particular act. In contrast, Republican Senator Sandra Collins, Snowe’s co-Senator for the state of Maine, voted for the act. Her vote is noteworthy because her past voting record shows that she supports protecting abortion, yet in this case she voted to give a fetus legal status which does not support abortion. Democratic Senator Mary Landrieu voted for the act, this is consistent with her voting record as she continually votes against abortion rights. This vote is another instance of Landrieu voting across party lines by not supporting abortion rights and the act was adopted 61-38.

Another important vote in 2004 was an amendment proposed by Republican Senator Olympia Snowe titled Personal Responsibility Work and Family Protection Act- Child Care Funding. This amendment increased funds for childcare by $6 billion over five years. This amendment was adopted 70-27 and all the female Senators voted for it. The issue of child care is often referred to as a women’s issue and a Democrats issue so female Republican support for it is indicative of how female and male Republicans differ on key issues.

Vote thirteen in 2004 was a National Defense Authorization Act-Military Interrogations. Republican Senator Warner was attempting to kill the amendment Democratic Senator Dodd proposed prohibiting the U.S. military from using private contractors to conduct prisoner interrogations. Killing the bill meant that these privately contracted prisoner interrogations would
be allowed to continue, and the ADA was against this vote. The female Senators voted against killing the amendment with the exception of Republican Senators Dole and Hutchinson. However, even though the majority of the female Senators were against killing the amendment prohibiting private contractors from conducting prisoner interrogations, the amendment still passed. This is an example of how if there were more women in the United States Senate and they voted the same way as these female Senators, this amendment would not have been adopted. This is an example of how female Senators legislate differently than male Senators.

There are considerably more male Senators than female (86 to 14) yet the population is 51 percent female to 49 percent male and if the representation of gender in the Senate reflected the population then our laws would be different, as this case shows.

Vote fourteen was another National Defense Authorization Act but this one was concerning Nuclear Weapons. This amendment prohibited the use of $36.6 million for the research and study of nuclear weapons. The women Senators on this vote, unlike on the previous defense bill, all voted along party lines the Republicans voted for spending on nuclear weapon defense and the Democrats against it. The prohibition failed in the Senate 42-55.

Vote fifteen also concerned defense, it was the National Defense Authorization Act-Missile which was an amendment proposed by Democratic Senator Barbara Boxer which barred the deployment of a national missile defense until an operationally realistic testing of the system confirmed that it worked. Boxer does not support the Missile Defense and this act was an attempt to stop the system from being implemented. This act had mixed support from the female Senators Republicans, Republican Senators Murkowski, Dole, Hutchison, Collins and Democratic Senators Landrieu and Clinton were in support of the Missile System and did not
vote to stop it. Democratic Senators Feinstein, Lincoln, Cantwell, Stabenow, Mikulski, Murray, and obviously Boxer, all voted to bar the system, and so did Republican Senator Snowe. This vote is another interesting look into the how women legislate because stereotypes claim that women typically do not support defense but this vote does not support that claim. Democrats also stereotypically do not support defense but how the female Democrats voted on this at does not completely support this claim. This act was rejected 42-57.

A further defense vote was number sixteen the National Defense Authorization Ace-Iraq Reports. This act required the President to submit an unclassified report to Congress within 30 days on the strategy and status of the war in Iraq. The female Senators all voted along party lines for this vote and the amendment was rejected 48-50.

Vote number seventeen was the Nomination Confirmation of J. Leon Holmes to be a judge for the United States District Court in Arkansas. The ADA stance on this vote was against the nomination because Holmes has a history of not supporting reproductive rights, gay rights nor the separation of state. This vote is of merit because of the way the female Senators voted on this confirmation. The women did not merely vote along party lines, Republican Senator Hutchinson, Collins, and Snowe voted against the confirmation along with Democratic Senators Murray, Mikulski, Stabenow, Clinton, Cantwell, Boxer, and Feinstein. Whereas Republican Senator Dole, and Democratic Senators Landrieu, and Lincoln voted in favor of confirming Holmes. Republican Senator Murkowski abstained from voting on this confirmation. Holmes was confirmed 51-46, however the female Senators voted ten to three against the confirmation. This is another example of how if there were more female Senators and they voted the same way as the current female senators then this vote would have turned out differently.
Another notable vote was the Federal Marriage Constitutional Amendment-Cloture, number 18, which was a motion to limit debate on a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment defining marriage as only between a man and a woman. Furthermore it added that the Constitution of the United States nor state constitutions could be construed as permitting homosexual marriage. Republican Senators Murkowski, Dole, and Hutchison voted to keep marriage between a man and a women and Republican Senators Collins, and Snowe as well as all of the Democratic Senators voted for gay marriage rights. This is another example of how Republican Senators Collins and Snowe tend to vote across party lines for social issues like gay marriage and reproductive rights, and this vote was rejected 48-50.

The National Intelligence Reform Act-Foreign Subsidiaries was vote number 19. This vote was proposed by Republican Senator Susan Collins and it was a motion to kill an amendment barring foreign subsidiaries of United States companies from doing business with countries considered sponsors of terrorism. The female Senators voted mostly along party lines, with Republican Senators Murkowski, Dole, Hutchison, and Collins voting to kill the bill and all of the female Democratic Senators voting against killing the bill (with the exception of Senator Boxer who abstained from voting). Republican Senator Olympia Snowe also voted with the Democrats. This vote is interesting because terrorism is typically an issue which is stressed by the Republican party but in this instance the Democrats wanted to bar the United States from doing business with countries who are considered to sponsor terrorism. Furthermore, as this vote was after 9/11 and Democrats wanted to appear tougher on terrorism following the September 11th terrorist attacks. Whereas for Republicans the reason they voted for killing the bill is most likely because of the business and fiscal aspect. This vote was narrowly adopted 47-41.
Lastly, vote twenty, like vote nineteen, concerned the National Intelligence Reform Act. This bill reorganized the fifteen United States intelligence agencies and created a national intelligence director with the power to freely transfer money among the CIA, National Security Agency and other defense and civilian agencies. It also created a counterterrorism center with operational planning capabilities and a Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board to investigate use of intelligence powers and act as a watchdog for civil liberties concerns. The bill required the Homeland Security secretary to develop and implement a comprehensive national transportation security plan and exempt certain “joint military programs” from the authority of the new director. All of the female Senators of both parties voted for this reform act. This act passed 96-2 with two Senators abstaining and was important because it was after 9/11 and otherwise might not have had such an enthusiastic response.

The ADA score average for women of the Senate in 2004 was 75 which was higher than the 2002 score, however, a few of the ADA positions were most likely colored by the terrorist attacks of 9/11. The average for the men of the Senate was 49.9 for 2004 which was also higher than the 2002 score. The Republican men of the Senate had an average score of 17.3 the and Republican women’s average was 39. The Democratic women had an average score of 95 and the Democratic men of the Senate had an average of 86.2. This showed once again how the women of the Senate are more liberal than the men of the Senate but also on issues of foreign policy the women voted like the men.

**Senate 2006**

---

In 2006 there were no new female Senators and the 16 female Senators remained, five Republicans and nine Democrats. The first notable vote of 2006 was vote two, the Fiscal 2007 Budget Resolution/Education Funding. Which would have increased education spending by $6.3 billion. Female Republicans Murkowski, Dole, and Hutchison voted against the increased funding, however, the other two Republicans Collins and Snowe voted for the education spending, along with all of the female Democrats. Education is another issue that Collins and Snowe tend to vote for which is not a stereotypically Republican vote, however, it is a stereotypically female politician vote. Whereas Murkowski, Dole, and Hutchison all voted like the male Republicans, and the funding was rejected.

Another memorable vote was a Constitutional Amendment to Ban Same-Sex marriage. The motion was narrowly rejected 49-48. Republican women Murkowski, Hutchison, and Dole voted against same-sex marriage and all of the Democrats as well as Republican Senators Collins and Snowe voted for gay marriage rights. This is another example of Collins and Snowe although they are Republican women to vote on the Democratic side.

Vote number eleven was the Fiscal 2007 Defense Authorization/Iran Sanctions. The premise of this amendment assumed that Iran had weapons of mass destruction (something that as of 2013 has yet to be verified) and would have set sanctions against not only Iran but countries which invested millions in Iran’s energy sector. The amendment stipulated that the sanctions would remain in effect until the President had proof that Iran had dismantled its ‘weapons of mass destruction.’ Furthermore this amendment would authorize spending $100 million to promote Democracy in Iran. The spending would be offset by decreasing spending on the wars in
Iraq and Afghanistan. The female Senators voted along party lines for this vote with the Republicans supporting the sanctions and the Democrats not supporting them.

Vote thirteen was the Fiscal 2007 Defense Authorization or Withdrawal of U.S. Troops from Iraq. This amendment asked for the withdrawal of troops from Iraq. The Republican women voted against the withdrawal and all the Democrats voted for the troop withdrawal with the except for Landrieu. This is another example of Senator Landrieu not voting on Democratic lines. This vote was rejected 39-60.

Vote fifteen was the U.S.-Oman Free Trade Agreement. This bill implemented a trade agreement between the U.S. and Oman and passed 60-34. The ADA stance was against implementing trade between the United States and Oman. Republican Senators Murkowski, Hutchison, and Democratic Senators Landrieu, Stabenow, Cantwell, and Clinton. Whereas Republican Senators Dole, Collins, Snowe, and Democratic Senators Feinstein, Lincoln, and Mikulski voted against trade with Oman. Senators Boxer and Murray abstained from voting; This vote passed 60-34 opening up trade with Oman.

Vote sixteen was the Parental Notification bill which made it a federal crime for anyone other than a parent to take a minor across state lines to obtain an abortion, except in cases in which the life of the mother was in danger. Democratic female Senators Lincoln, Stabenow, Boxer, Cantwell, Clinton, Murray, and Mikulski as well as Republican Senators Collins and Snowe voted against the bill. Whereas female Republican Senators Murkowski, Hutchison, and Dole, and Democratic Senator Landrieu voted for the bill. Democratic Senator Feinstein abstained from voting. This vote passed 65-34. This bill is another example of how if there were more female Senators than this vote might have not passed as the majority of the female Senators
did not vote in favor of this bill. Moreover this is another example of Republican Senators Collins and Snowe voting across party lines for reproductive rights.

Vote seventeen was the Fiscal 2007 Defense Appropriations/Ballistic Missile Modification Program which was an amendment to redirect up to $77 million of naval research and development funds to modify the Trident ballistic missile program and this amendment was rejected 31-67. Republican female Senator Dole and Democratic Senator Landrieu voted in favor of this Defense amendment. Republican Senators Murkowski, Hutchison, Collins, and Snowe voted against this amendment as well as Democratic Senators Lincoln, Feinstein, Stabenow, Boxer, Cantwell, Clinton, Murray, and Mikulski. The voting division of the women Senators on this amendment was notable because this vote occurred after September 11th and the female Senators for the most part voted against the defense spending. However Democratic Senator Landrieu voted in favor of the defense spending.

Vote nineteen was the Port Security Overhaul/September 11th Commission Recommendations. The motion was proposed by female Democratic female Senator Murray and was a procedural motion that would have implemented the recommendations of the September 11th Commission, including the screening of all cargo and enabling first-responders to communicate on a common radio spectrum. The motion also called for a new direction in Iraq and authorized additional funds for intelligence activities. This motion was rejected 41-57 and the female Republicans all voted against the motion whereas all the female Democrats voted for the motion.

Vote twenty was the Military Tribunals/Habeas Corpus amendment to delete provisions in a bill which limited the rights of detainees to challenge their detention in United States courts.
This amendment was rejected 48-51. The female Republican Senators all voted against the bill with the exception of Snowe who abstained from voting. The female Democratic Senators all voted in favor of the bill. This bill was quite interesting because a male Republican Senator proposed it, yet the female Republicans voted against it and the female Democrats voted for it.

The ADA score average for the women of the Senate in 2006 was 65.7 percent whereas the men of the Senate had an average score of 43.7 percent. Both the women and the men had lower score averages in 2006 than in 2004. The Republican women had an average score of 21 percent and the Republican men 9.2 percent. The Democratic women had an average of 90.6 percent and the Democratic men had an average of 86.4 percent.

Senate 2008:

In 2008 there were two more female Senators, Democratic Senators McCaskill and Klobuchar. This brought the Republican to Democrat ratio five to eleven. In 2008, President Bush was no longer in office and Obama was the new President. There were many important votes in 2008 on issues including intelligence, wage discrimination, and the defense budget. Vote two was the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Revisions which was a bill to amend the 1978 Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act that authorized warrantless surveillance of foreign targets, even if they are communicating with someone in the United States. The amendment authorized the FISA court to approve several aspects of how such surveillance is conducted and grant retroactive legal immunity to telecommunications companies that participated in the national security agency’s warrantless surveillance program. The ADA stance was against the passage of

this bill. This vote passed 68-29 and the female Senators were divided on this issue. All five of
the Republican Senators voted for the bill, as well as Democratic Senators Landrieu, Lincoln,
McCaskill, and Mikulski. Whereas Democratic Senators Boxer, Murray, Cantwell, Feinstein,
Klobuchar, and Stabenow voted against the bill. Democratic Senator Clinton abstained from
voting on this bill.

Vote three was the Fiscal 2008 Intelligence Authorization which funded US intelligence
activities including the CIA as well as unclassified emergency supplemental funding of the wars
in Iraq and Afghanistan. It would also prohibit the use of any interrogations treatment not
authorized by the United States Army Field Manual on Human Intelligence Collection
Operations against any individual in the intelligence community’s custody. This vote was
adopted 51-45. The ADA stance on this vote was for the passage. The female Republicans
Hutchison, Murkowski, and Dole voted against the passage, as well as Democratic Senator
McCaskill. Republican female Senators Collins, and Snowe, as well as Democratic Senators
Landrieu, Lincoln, Mikulski, Boxer, Murray, Cantwell, Feinstein, Klobuchar, and Stabenow
voted for the passage, and Democratic Senator Clinton abstained.

Vote four was the Overhaul of the Consumer Product Safety Commission which
strengthened toy safety standards with increased funding and regulations and passed 79-13. All
the female Senators voted in favor of this bill except for Democratic Senator Clinton who
abstained from voting. Vote eight, the Fiscal 2009 Budget Resolution-SCHIP, was another vote
which the female Senators all supported. It was proposed by Democratic Senator Barbara Boxer
and was an amendment to permit legislation permitting pregnant women yo be eligible for
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coverage under the State Children’s Health Insurance Programs and was adopted 70-27. All the female Senators voted for this legislation except for Clinton who abstained.

Vote eleven was on Wage Discrimination and concerned limiting debate and bringing to vote a bill to amend the 1964 Civil Rights Act and allow employees to file charges of pay discrimination. The motion was narrowly rejected 56-42 as sixty votes were necessary to pass. Shockingly, this was not an unanimous vote by the female Senators, because Republican Senators Hutchison, Murkowski, and Dole vote against it. However, all the other female Senators voted to end pay discrimination. This is another example of how if there were more female Senators the result of a vote would have ended up differently and if the three Republican female Senators who voted against the bill had voted for it the vote would have needed only one more vote to pass.

Vote thirteen was the Fiscal 2009 Budget Resolution which included funding for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. The ADA stance was in favor of the resolution. Female Republican Senators Hutchison, Murkowski, and Dole voted against the budget resolution, and all the Democratic female Senators voted in favor of the resolution, with the exception of Democratic Senator Clinton who abstained from voting. Furthermore, Republican Senators Snowe, and Collins, like the Democrats, voted in favor of the budget. In total twelve female Senators voted for it and three against with one abstaining and the vote was narrowly adopted 48-45. Without Republican female Senators Collins and Snowe voting with the Democrats for the budget it would not have passed.

The last notable vote for 2008 was the Fiscal 2009 Defense Authorization--Missile Defense amendment which would have authorized $271 million for the Missile defense Agency
funding programs protecting against ballistic missile threats. The ADA stance was against the
Missile Defense and the vote was rejected 39-57. Republican Senators Hutchison, and Dole
voted in favor of the Missile Defense spending along with Democratic Senator Landrieu.
Whereas Republican Senators Murkowski, Collins, and Snowe voted against the defense
authorization as well as Democratic Senators Clinton, Lincoln, McCaskill, Mikulski, Boxer,
Murray, Cantwell Feinstein, Klobuchar, and Stabenow.

Year 2008 was the first instance that within the timeline of 1992-2010 of Americans for
Democratic Action votes in which there were Republican women with higher Liberal Quotient
scores than some of the Democratic women. For example both female Republican Senators from
Maine, Collins and Snowe, had higher Liberal Quotient scores than Democratic Senators Clinton
and Landrieu. However, Clinton’s score was skewed due to her abstaining from many votes most
likely due to fact that she was the United State’s Secretary of State at the same time. Yet,
Democratic Senator Landrieu did not abstain from any votes and voted on the Republican side
on three votes which Snowe voted the Democratic side on and two where Collins took the
Democratic side. Furthermore, Republican Olympia Snowe had a Liberal Quotient score of 80
tying her with Democratic Senators Lincoln and McCaskill. This year is a great example of how
female Senators do not necessarily vote along party lines and tend to vote more liberally than
their male party counterparts.

The ADA average score for women in 2008 was 75.9 percent and 51.6 percent for men.
Both the men and women’s liberal quotients were higher than in 2006. The Republican women
average was 48 percent and the Republican men’s was approximately 19 percent. The
Republican’s quotients were higher than in 2006 by approximately ten points for the men and a
drastic 27 points for the Republican women. The Democratic women had an average of 88.6 percent and the men had an average of 86.2 percent. The scores for 2008 was another example of how the women of the Senate are more liberal than the men which was especially evident with the Republicans where the women had a liberal quotient average approximately 29 points higher than the men.

**Senate 2010:**

In 2010 there were seventeen women in the Senate which was one more woman than in 2008, however, there were some losses and additions to the group. Republican Senator Elizabeth Dole was not reelected, and Democratic Senator Hillary Clinton resigned to fulfill her duties as Secretary of State and Democratic newcomer Kristen Gillibrand filled her vacant seat. Also, Democratic Senators Jeanne Shaheen, and Kay Hagan were elected, making the Republican to Democrat balance of the women Senators four to thirteen. Prominent issues in 2010 varied from position confirmations, healthcare, jobs, education, the paycheck fairness act, the DREAM act, an arms treaty, to finally the repeal of Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell.

Vote number one was the Confirmation of Paul Becker as a member of the National Labor Relations Board. The ADA stance was in favor of confirmation because of Becker’s history of working for and supporting unions. Republican female Senators Murkowski, Collins, and Snowe voted against the confirmation, and so did Democratic Senator Lincoln. Republican Senator Hutchison and Democratic Senator Landrieu abstained from voting on the matter. Whereas Democratic Senators Hagan, Cantwell, Feinstein, Klobuchar, McCaskill, Mikulski,  

---

Shaheen, Stabenow, Boxer, Murray, and Gillibrand voted in favor of the confirmation. Although eleven female Senators voted for the confirmation the vote was rejected 33-52. However, this means that Democratic female Senators composed one-third of the total vote in favor of the confirmation even though they only make up a third of the party, which shows that with more female Senators this vote might have gone the other way.

Number five was a controversial amendment which was proposed by Democratic Representative Feingold, and was the Disaster Relief and Summer Jobs Act of 2010 which was a confusing title for an amendment that required the President to present a withdrawal timetable of American troops from Afghanistan. This amendment called for an imminent end to the war in Afghanistan and the ADA supported this amendment. The female Republican Senators all voted against this amendment along with Democratic Senators Lincoln, Landrieu, Hagan, Feinstein, Klobuchar, McCaskill, Mikulski, Shaheen, and Stabenow. Whereas Democratic female senators Boxer, Murray, Gillibrand, and Cantwell all voted in support of the swift troop withdrawal. This vote was rejected 18-80 but is notable because it shows how in some instances the majority of the Senate women vote the conservative position, especially after September 11th when the vote concerns the wars September 11th resulted in.

The Medicaid, Jobs, and Education Assistance Act, vote number ten, was legislation to provide $26 billion to the states of which $16 billion would go to Medicaid and $10 billion for education funding to forestall teacher layoffs. All of the female Democratic Senators voted in favor of the legislation as well as Republican female Senators Collins and Snowe, and Republican Senators Hutchison and Murkowski voted against the funding. Education and
healthcare are examples of issues which Collins and Snowe continually vote on the Democratic side for.

The confirmation of Elena Kagan as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court was vote number eleven. Kagan was appointed by President Obama to replace John Paul Stevens and the ADA was supportive of her nomination. Republican female Senators Hutchison and Murkowski voted against the confirmation, however all of the Democratic women voted in favor of Kagan, as well as Republican Senators Collins and Snowe and Kagan was confirmed by a vote of 63-38.

The Paycheck Fairness Act, or vote thirteen, was a vote to amend the existing Lily Ledbetter Fair Pay Act by requiring employers to allow their employees to share salary information with each other for purposes of rooting out gender discrimination and the ADA supported this amendment. This vote was important because all of the female Senators voted with their party, the Democrats for the amendment and the Republicans against it. However, this amendment regarded women and the Equal Pay Act, which Republican female Senators Snowe and Collins voted in favor of, yet they voted against this amendment. Furthermore this vote only failed by two votes, 58-41 out of the necessary 60 votes necessary for cloture, so if Snow and Collins had voted for it, and for equality for women, it would have passed.

The James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act of 2010, vote fifteen, was legislation to provide aid to the surviving responders who suffered long-term health effects from exposure to the 9/11 terrorist attack sites. The female Senators voted along party lines for this legislation, the Republicans against it and the Democrats for it and this vote was narrowly rejected 57-42. However, this bill later passed on an unrecorded voice vote.
The Development, Relief and Education for Alien Minors or DREAM Act of 2010 was vote seventeen which was legislation to provide a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants brought to the United States as minors, who did not have a criminal record, graduated from high school, and attended college or served in the military. Republican female Senators Hutchison, Collins, and Snowe voted against the Dream Act as well as female Democratic Senator Hagan. Whereas, Democratic female Senators Lincoln, Landrieu, Cantwell, Feinstein, Klobuchar, McCaskill, Mikulski, Shaheen, Stabenow, Boxer, Murray, and Gillibrand along with Republican female Senator Murkowski voted for the Dream Act. Republican Senator Murkowski voting in favor of the DREAM act was surprising because she generally always votes on the Republican side of issues.

Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell Repeal Act of 2010, was vote eighteen, a vote to allow members of the United States military to serve openly regardless of their sexual orientation, and the ADA favored the repeal. All of the female Senators with the exception of Republican Senator Hutchison voted in favor of repealing Don’t Ask, Don’t and the vote passed 63-33. This was an interesting vote for sixteen out of the seventeen female Senators to agree on because Republican Senators such as Murkowski, are not for gay marriage, however, allowing soldiers to serve openly is not quite the same thing as promoting same-sex marriage, but it is a step in the progressive direction.

The last vote for 2010, vote twenty, was the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty. This vote was a nuclear arms treaty with Russia that reduced the number of warheads in both the United States’ and Russia’s arsenals and reinstated mutual inspections, while allowing for modernization of nuclear stockpiles, and development of antiballistic defenses. The ADA was in support of this
arms reducing treaty. Like the last vote, every female Senator, with the exception of Republican Hutchison, voted in favor of the treaty, and it passed 71-26.

Year 2010 was a mid-term election year and halfway through President Obama’s first term. This was also the year which the ‘War on Women’ started becoming relevant and this return to conservatism showed in the ADA scores of the Republican Senators. The liberal quotient average of the women in the Senate was 73.5 percent and the men’s was approximately 50 percent. The average of the Democratic women was 88.5 percent and the Democratic men’s was approximately 87 percent. The Republican women’s average was 25 percent a twenty-three percent drop from 2008 and the Republican men’s average was approximately nine percent which was about a nine point drop from 2008.

As the evidence shows, women Senators vote more liberally than male Senators. This is especially the case for Republican Senate women who often vote across party lines for issues such as reproductive rights, healthcare, and sometimes education. However, this evidence also showed how after 9/11 both Democrats and Republicans voted more conservatively. Further, during the ‘War on Women’ Republicans who had supported legislation like equal pay and abortion did not support those issues because of the political instability. This data also showed how Democrats like Barbara Feinstein and Mary Landrieu often do not take the Democratic side of issues such as defense spending in the case of Feinstein and abortion restrictions for Landrieu. This data supports my thesis that during times of national and political instability women politicians vote more conservatively and conversely during times of relative stability women vote more liberally.
Chapter 6:

Case Studies

Who can best represent women voters?

The relationship between voting and gender has been discussed and evidence has shown that men and women voted for different candidates producing a gender gap before September 11th. Further, that women voted more liberally than men before 9/11, but then voted more conservatively and closed the gender gap during the unstable period after the terrorist attacks in
the 2002 and 2004 elections. Then the voting evidence showed how women went back to their pre-9/11 voting preferences during the 2006 and 2008 elections when war and national security were not the most important issues for voters. Furthermore, how Senate women of both parties voted more liberally on legislation than their male party counterparts before 9/11 but then became more conservative directly following 9/11. These patterns were evident in most female voters and female politicians alike. Now I ask, who can best represent female voters?

Not all female voters are the same race, sexual orientation, class, or from the same region, and with their differences come differences in importances of issues—which determine who they vote for. So who do female voters think can best represent them? There were more women who voted than men in the 2012 Presidential election 53 percent to 47 percent meaning there was a gender gap of six points. Also, women voted for the Democratic candidate President Barack Obama, 55 percent compared to the 44 percent of women who voted for the Republican candidate Mitt Romney, an eleven point difference. CAWP data states that as of February 2012, 38 percent of women identified as Democrats and only 25 percent of men identified as Democrats. Whereas 30 percent of women and 31 percent of men identified as Republicans. However, it is evident from the Presidential exit poll that an even greater amount of women are Democratic and Republican leaning and likely vote the same direction in other political races because there are rarely competitive third-party candidates.

Furthermore, according to the CAWP women are more likely than men to favor a more active government, they are more receptive to same-sex marriage, they are more supportive of

health care and social service programs, and they are more likely to favor legal abortion without restrictions.\footnote{Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP) Fact Sheet. 2012. “The Gender Gap: Attitudes on Public Policy Issues.” New Brunswick Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP), Eagleton Institute of Politics Rutgers University.} Moreover, women are more likely to favor non-discrimination and equality legislation concerning minorities, sexual orientation, and gender. Moreover, not only are they more supportive than men on these topics but a majority of women support the issues as well.

In order to test to see who supports the majority of the same issues women voters support a case study of six female Senators, three Democrats and three Republicans was developed, and so was another case study concerning two male Republican Senators and then one female Republican Senator. I chose to use United States Senators for my case studies because there are only two from each state theoretically meaning equal and autonomous decision making power and because they are not as closely tied to constituent opinions as United States Representatives are because they represent a larger population, and are not elected every two years but instead serve for six. This allows Senators more freedom to vote on issues the way they would like to rather than how they feel pressured to by their constituents.\footnote{Frederick, Brian. "Gender and Patterns of Roll Call Voting in the U.S. Senate." Congress & the Presidency 37.2 (2010): 103-24. Print.}

Issues of importance regard stereotypically ‘gendered’ or party specific issues. As mentioned earlier, stereotypically, women support domestic and women’s issues such as education, healthcare, abortion rights, gay rights, and welfare funding. Conversely, men stereotypically support increasing defense or national security spending, purchasing or manufacturing weapons, increasing military spending, international relations such as trade, and funding intelligence programs. Furthermore, other stereotypes claim that women are indifferent
or vote against these ‘manly issues’ whereas men do the same with the ‘womanly issues’. Yet other scholarship claims that it is actually Democrats who support these domestic and women’s or social issues and Republicans support the defense, national security, and international issues. I have shown in previous chapters that women and men tend to legislate differently, however, my case studies will show a more concrete picture of how men and women legislate in the United States Senate.

The data of the case studies supports the hypothesis that women tend to vote more liberally on social issues like equal pay and abortion and healthcare issues than men, with an even larger discrepancy between female and male Republicans on these social issues. However, these case studies will show something that these stereotypes do not consider. How during and following times of instability, Republican female Senators vote against social issues more often than they do in times of perceived stability. Furthermore, Democratic female Senators during and following times of instability vote in favor of defense and intelligence spending. For example, women politicians voted differently, as in they voted in favor of international and defense issues after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, whereas men remained the same. Vote data will also show how women tend to vote more liberally than their male party counterparts, however that they also vote along party lines during times such as the ‘War on Women.’ This is true for domestic and international issues where for example female Republican Senators who had previously supported an issue such as equal pay changed their stance during the ‘War on Women.’

For the first case study, I juxtapose Republican Alaskan Senators Ted Stevens, Frank Murkowski, and Lisa Murkowski. Lisa is the daughter of Frank Murkowski and he appointed her
to fill his seat when he became Governor of the state. This is a particularly informative case study because not only was Senator Stevens in office during almost the entire time Senator Frank Murkowski and Senator Lisa Murkowski were in office providing an excellent constant, but furthermore, Lisa was originally appointed, and not elected to fill the vacant seat her father left. This, as in Hutchison’s case, helps alleviate liberal bias. Moreover, as Lisa is, one, the daughter of former Senator Frank Murkowski and two, Frank was and Lisa is a Republican, it could be assumed that they would have the same stances on issues. However, Lisa, discounting times of threatened stability (following 9/11 and during the ‘War on Women’) is noticeably more liberal than her father was.

From the ADA data of the Senators votes on twenty issues I narrowed the number down to eight issues which stereotypically are gendered like abortion and the defense budget. The ADA stance on issues is supposedly the most liberal position on the vote, however in the United States we do not have a liberal or conservative party but instead a Democratic party which tends be liberal and a Republican party with tends to be conservative. However, the parties and the politicians within the parties do not always vote along what is considered the ‘liberal’ and Democratic or ‘conservative’ and Republican side but I will use these definitions and stereotypes as a reference. For further reference the ADA or liberal stance on issues is for education, healthcare, and welfare funding, for gay rights, for immigration rights, for women’s rights and equality including reproductive rights, and against defense spending including weapons purchases, against war, and against trade due to human rights standards. So when I note that a Senator took the liberal position it means in accordance with the ADA, and consequently, if a Senator voted against the ADA side that will be considered the conservative position.
Alaskan Senator Frank Murkowski served in the United States Senate from 1981 to 2002 when he was elected as Governor of Alaska. He then appointed his daughter, Lisa Murkowski, to fill his vacant Senate seat. Frank and Lisa both served with Senator Ted Stevens who was an Alaskan Senator from 1968 to 2008. For the purpose of this case study, Senate voting records from 1992 to 2001 for Frank Murkowski and Ted Stevens will be compared with Lisa Murkowski’s voting records from 2002 to 2011. The issues which were voted on are separated into the categories of social or domestic issues: education, healthcare, abortion, anti-discrimination (which includes equal pay, hate crimes, and military discrimination of gay members), and then national security and foreign policy which includes: trade agreements and international relations, intelligence, and defense. The Senators are all conservative Republicans, so instead of detailing every vote that the Senators took the conservative position on, the instances in which they vote the liberal position are discussed and compared.

Between 1992 and 2001 there were thirty-four domestic issues and thirty-two defense issues picked for the case study. There were fourteen votes on the social issue of abortion. Senator Frank Murkowski took the liberal position on only one of these votes. The bill he supported allowed abortion counseling at federally funded institutions however, did not expressly endorse abortion. Senator Stevens voted the liberal position and supported abortion rights in seven of the fourteen votes. Like Murkowski, Stevens supported abortion counseling, but he also voted in favor of allowing military members and their families self-funded abortion access at overseas bases. Stevens also supported federal health plans allowing abortion as well as voting to make it illegal to obstruct a person from getting into an abortion clinic. However, even
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though Stevens voted in favor of some abortion rights he only supported half of the legislation, but he was more progressive on the issue than Murkowski.

On the social issue of education, both Frank Murkowski and Stevens voted exceedingly conservative. Murkowski voted conservatively seven out of seven times and Stevens supported one education funding bill but voted conservatively six out of seven times. On the domestic issue of healthcare, the Senators again voted conservatively eight out of nine times but they both supported a bill in support of it being mandatory for insurance companies to include mental illness coverage. On the social issues of anti-discrimination and equal rights Murkowski voted conservatively four out of four times and Stevens voted liberally one out of four times. Stevens voted in favor of a hate crimes bill.

On the national security and foreign policy issue of intelligence, Stevens voted conservatively and Murkowski took the liberal position. On the foreign policy issue of trade and international relations, Murkowski voted conservatively eight out of eight times and Stevens voted liberally three out of eight times. Concerning trade, the ADA stance is against trade agreements with countries who have human rights violations or unfair agreements in general, and the ADA stance is considered the liberal position even though most Democrats vote in favor of trade. Stevens took the liberal stance voting against NAFTA, the liberal position for enhanced foreign policy and trade regulations, and for NAFTA revisions. On the national security issue of defense Murkowski and Stevens took the liberal position three out of twenty-three times. They both voted against increasing defense spending on Seawolf Submarines, for a nuclear testing moratorium and ban, moreover to ban chemical weapons.
For the domestic and social issues in total Murkowski voted liberally two out of thirty-four times or 6.25 percent and Stevens voted the liberal position ten out of thirty-four times or approximately 29 percent. For national security and foreign policy, Murkowski voted liberally four out of thirty-two times or 12.5 percent and Stevens took the liberal position six out of thirty-two times or 18.75 percent. In conclusion, Murkowski is slightly more liberal concerning foreign policy and national security than he is concerning domestic issues yet Stevens is slightly more liberal than Murkowski in both areas. This data shows how Stevens is a fairly moderate Republican and is moderately liberal concerning the issue of abortion.

Senator Lisa Murkowski, however, is more liberal than both her father and Senator Stevens. Lisa on the topic of reproductive rights, voted for abortion rights five out of twelve times. Stevens voted liberally concerning abortion four out of eight times including reaffirming Roe v. Wade, abortion funding for international family planning, abortion rights for military families. L. Murkowski also voted in favor of the same legislation, with the exception of the military family legislation, but she also voted in favor of federal funding for Planned Parenthood. Lisa’s stance on abortion is considerably more liberal than her fathers and even more liberal than Stevens’.

On the domestic issue of healthcare, Lisa voted liberally seven out of thirteen times and Stevens voted liberally three out of eight times. Both Senators supported funding for children’s health insurance, and a medicare bill. However, Lisa also voted in favor of HIV and AIDs research funding, and Stevens did not. On the social issue of education, Stevens voted conservatively three out of three times but L. Murkowski voted in favor of increasing education funding twice. On the social issues of non-discrimination and equal rights Murkowski voted
liberally three out of eight times and Stevens conservatively four out of four times. Murkowski voted for repealing Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell, for a hate crimes bill, and for a wage equality bill. However, in 2010 during the ‘War on Women’ she voted against the Paycheck Fairness act most likely due to party pressures and reelection worries and she also voted against abortion legislation during that same time, which confirms my thesis that during times of instability women Senators vote more conservatively.

On the foreign policy and national security issue of intelligence L. Murkowski voted liberally two out of eight times and Stevens voted liberally one out of six times. Both Senators voted in favor of intelligence reform, however, L. Murkowski also voted against reauthorizing the Patriot Act in 2005. On the foreign policy issue of trade and international relations Stevens voted conservatively five out of five times, whereas Murkowski voted liberally one out of seven times. Murkowski voted in favor of a Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty with Russia, which was the liberal position. On the national security issue of defense Murkowski voted liberally four out of twenty-three times and Stevens voted liberally three out of twenty-one times. Both Senators voted in favor of limiting military interrogations, against ballistic missile use, and against missile defense. Murkowski also voted in favor of improving detainee standards overseas.

On social issues, Senator Lisa Murkowski with a score of seventeen out of thirty-eight or 44.7 percent is more liberal than both her father former Senator Frank Murkowski with a socially liberal score of two out of thirty-four times or 6.25 percent and Stevens voted the liberal position ten out of thirty-four times or approximately 29 percent from 1992 to 2001 and seven out of 23 or 30.4 percent from 2002 to 2008. On foreign policy issues L. Murkowski is also most liberal with a score of seven out of thirty-eight or 18.4 percent, compared to her father with a score of
four out of thirty-two times or 12.5 percent and Stevens took the liberal position six out of thirty-two times or 18.75 percent from 1992 to 2001 and four out of thirty-two or 12.5 percent from 2002 to 2008.

As the data shows, Lisa Murkowski is more liberal than her father on every issue, especially on the issues of abortion and anti-discrimination laws. However, she is also more supportive of healthcare and education funding than her father. Furthermore, during the relatively stable years between 2004 and 2008 Lisa is also noticeably more liberal on defense issues. L. Murkowski voted more liberally than both her father and Stevens however her voting is not consistent. For example, she first appointed into office right after September 11, 2001, and after this time of national insecurity she votes very conservatively, even on issues like abortion and healthcare which she supports later in her tenure. L. Murkowski progressively becomes more liberal with her voting from 2003 until around 2010, when the ‘War on Women’ was raged and then she again votes more conservatively and differently than she did between 2003 and 2009. For example, in 2009 she supports and votes for the wage equality bill but then in 2010, she votes against the equal pay act. Lisa Murkowski proves my thesis of how during times of perceived instability women vote more conservatively yet during times of stability women vote more liberally.

**Senators Boxer, Feinstein, Landrieu, Snowe, Collins, and Hutchison:**

I decided to use a diverse group of female Senators to illustrate the differences and similarities between the Senators more fully. Yet I also selected female Senators who have been in office for an extended amount of time so there was more data to analyze. Consequently, I
picked the most conservative (as defined by the ADA liberal to conservative scale) female Republican, Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison from Texas. Hutchison was appointed to fill a vacant seat. This helps to eliminate liberal bias that might be present in climates where a female Senator is elected. Meaning that if a state is liberal enough to vote a woman Senator into office it might explain why women Senators are statistically more liberal than male Senators. I also chose the most conservative female Democrat, Senator Mary Landrieu from Louisiana. I decided an in-depth analysis of the most liberal female Senators of each party would be informative as well. The most liberal Republican woman Senator is Olympia Snowe from Maine, closely followed by her co-Senator Republican Susan Collins and so I decided to include them both. Subsequently, I decided to compare the female Republican pair to another female Senate pair, Democrats Barbara Boxer and Dianne Feinstein from California; they are two of the most liberal female Democrats. The Senators chosen also represent a diverse group of states. Boxer and Feinstein are from the liberal Democratic voting West Coast State of California, whereas contrastingly, Hutchison is from the conservative Republican southwest state of Texas. Landrieu is from the Southern State of Louisiana which is majority Democratic because of its large African American population but as a Southern State is more moderate than states like California. Finally, Snowe and Collins are from the moderate and Republican leaning state of Maine.

In order to find out if these six female Senators support the same issues as the majority of women voters, a list of 56 United States Senate votes were compiled that pertain to domestic and social issues or of education, abortion, healthcare, and anti-discrimination for example gay rights and equality for women. There were also 52 more Senate votes included which pertained to 

\[ \text{from the ADA data between 1997-2011} \]
foreign policy and national security issues. These votes were on legislation concerning intelligence, trade and international relations, and defense. These 108 votes concern the issues most important to women voters in attempt to find out which female Senators best conform to the opinions of women voters. Or in other words, to find out whether party affiliation matters or if these six diverse female Senators have the same stance on issues as women voters do. The voting years included are from 1997 to 2011 because those are the years that all six of the female Senators were in office at the same time.

First, votes on domestic and social issues will be analyzed and then issues on foreign policy and national security. Out of the total of 108 votes the issue of reproductive rights was voted on nineteen times. Democratic Senator Barbara Boxer voted in support of a woman’s right to choose all nineteen or 100 percent of the time. Democratic Senator Dianne Feinstein voted in support of abortion rights seventeen out of eighteen times, and she did not vote against abortion one time but was instead absent from the vote. Democratic Senator Mary Landrieu voted for reproductive right’s twelve out of eighteen times approximately or 67 percent of the time. Landrieu, like 45 percent of women voters,\textsuperscript{114} believes that abortion under certain circumstances should be allowed but not without restrictions. Landrieu voted against late-term abortions even in cases of health risks for the mother and for criminally charging a doctor who performed such an abortion. Landrieu also supported mandatory parental notification laws and other legislation which limited a woman’s right to choose.

Surprisingly, both Senate Republicans Olympia Snowe and Susan Collins voted in support of abortion rights more often than Democrat Landrieu. Snowe voted in favor of the right to choose seventeen out of nineteen times or approximately 89 percent, and Collins voted for abortion rights sixteen out of eighteen times, or approximately 83 percent. As hypothesized in my thesis Snowe and Collins did not support abortion funding in 2010 during the ‘War on Women’ although they supported nearly all of the abortion legislation before that year. Other pro-choice legislation the two Senators did not support was a bill an international family planning abortion rights in 1999, and Collins also voted in 2004 for legislation that did not expressly deny abortion but gave a fetus legal rights therefore potentially undermining a woman’s right to choose. Republican Senator Hutchison contrastingly, supports severely limiting abortion rights. She voted for abortion rights only one out of eighteen times or approximately 5.5 percent. The only pro-choice legislation Hutchison supported was in 2003 when she voted to reaffirm the Supreme Court’s landmark Roe v. Wade decision.

With the exception of Republican Senator Hutchison, the five other female Senators in this case study are in support of a women’s right to choose. Landrieu is in favor of placing certain restrictions on abortion however, so are a majority of women voters. Although Hutchinson voted to limit abortion rights, she did most importantly vote to reaffirm the Supreme Court’s Roe v. Wade decision which legalized abortion in the United States which proves she is not completely opposed to the right to choose. As a majority of women voters support reproductive rights these female Senators (besides Hutchison for the most part) are substantively representing their interest as opposed to merely descriptively representing them on the issue of abortion rights.
On the social and domestic issue of health care there were nineteen corresponding votes. In addition to supporting abortion rights, a majority of women are in favor of federal healthcare programs. Democratic Senator Boxer supported the liberal stance on healthcare legislation nineteen out of nineteen times or 100 percent. Democratic Senator Feinstein also favored a liberal stance on healthcare legislation eighteen out of nineteen times or approximately 95 percent. The only issue Feinstein did not take the liberal position on was when she voted in favor of raising the age requirement for medicare. This is not a liberal stance because it disadvantages poor people. Democratic Senator Landrieu, like Feinstein, voted liberally on healthcare legislation eighteen out of nineteen times. The only time she did not take the liberal position was a vote concerning medicaid and subsidizing prescription drug costs.

Republican Senators Collins and Snowe only supported healthcare legislation eight and nine times out of nineteen or 42 and 45 percent, respectively. Collins and Snowe show voting patterns on this issue which support my thesis. Both voted for healthcare legislation before September 11, 2001, but then around 9/11 they stopped voting in favor of healthcare funding. Then again around 2005 they vote for healthcare funding once more, but during the ‘War on Women’ show less support and vote more conservatively on the issue. This supports my thesis that women politicians vote more conservatively during times of national instability, like September 11th and then the ‘War on Women.’ Republican Senator Hutchison also mirrors this trend but more drastically. She only took the liberal position in support of three out of nineteen or approximately 16 percent of the health care votes. Furthermore, she only supported healthcare funding in 2007 and 2008, when she voted twice in support of funding for healthcare insurance for Children and once in support of medicare funding. Around September 11th and during the
‘War on Women’ Hutchison does not support issues that a majority of women voters support, but she does when the United States is relatively stable.

Overall on the issue of healthcare Democrats Boxer, Feinstein, and Landrieu best substantively represent the views of the majority of women voters. However, Republicans Collins, Snowe, and Hutchison have a history of being more supportive of this women’s issue when the United States is stable and not during times like September 11th and the ‘War on Women’ and they do not have to vote conservatively to hold on to their seat.

Concerning the issue of education Democratic Senators Boxer, Feinstein, and Landrieu voted in support of education legislation nine out of nine times, or 100 percent. Republican Senators Collins and Snowe voted for increasing educational funding six and five out of nine times, respectively. As with healthcare the same trend is present in Collins and Snowe’s voting records on education. The Senators are less supportive of educational funding around September 11, 2001, and during the ‘War on Women’ and are more supportive of education between the two divisive periods when the United States was relatively stable. Republican Senator Hutchison only supported education legislation one time, in 2011 she voted to preserve Pell Grant funding, however she does not seem to have a voting pattern on this issue.

On the domestic and social issues of anti-discrimination and equality such as gay rights, women’s rights, minority and disability rights, Boxer, Feinstein, and Landrieu voted for these rights and against discrimination nine out of nine times or 100 percent. Snowe and Collins voted for these rights 7 and 6 out of nine times or approximately 78 and 67 percent, respectively. Again, the two Senators show a pattern of voting for equal rights legislation before September, 11th 2001 and then again before the ‘War on Women’ but not during. For example, both Senators

Densmore, 04/13, 96
did not support a hate crime bill in 2004 yet supported hate crime legislation in 2007 and 2009. Snow and Collins also voted for pay equality legislation 2008 and 2009 but not during the ‘War on Women’ in 2010. This is further support of my thesis of female Senators voting more conservatively during unstable times. Republican Senator Hutchison only supported one out of nine votes on anti-discrimination legislation or approximately 11 percent. The only anti-discrimination legislation Hutchinson voted for was the 2009 pay equality bill but she did not vote for it again in 2010. Overall on the issue of anti-discrimination Democrats Boxer, Feinstein, and Landrieu as well as Republicans Collins and Snowe are for the most part substantively representing the majority of women voters on this issue. The majority of women voters are supportive of gay rights, and equal right for women and the Democrats supported these rights every time, and Collins and Snowe supported these rights most of the time. Further, they all except for Hutchison, supported repealing Don’t Ask Don’t Tell allowing gay military members to serve openly.

On the national security and foreign policy issue of intelligence, international relations, and defense the six Senators all show patterns of voting more conservatively after 9/11 and all but Boxer also voted more conservatively during the ‘War on Women.’ Contrastingly Republicans Collins and Snowe voted more liberally 2004 through 2008, and Landrieu and Feinstein voted more liberally 2004 through 2009. Hutchison also voted more liberally in 2005 and 2006.

The majority of women voters do not support the war in Afghanistan, and although all three of the Democrats voted in 2005 to end the war in Iraq, only Boxer voted in 2010 during the ‘War on Women’ to end the war in Afghanistan. Overall concerning national security and foreign
policy it is difficult to know which Senators have the same opinions on the issues as women voters because it is hard to find specific polls concerning defense and foreign policy and women besides whether a women voter is supportive of war. However, the majority of women do not support wars, and are Democrats, and often there is a voting decision between funding education and funding defense. The only Senator out of the six who voted to end to wars, and to fund education over defense is Democratic Senator Boxer so for foreign policy and national security Boxer best substantively represents the majority of women voters.

Overall concerning domestic and social and foreign policy and national security issues Democratic Senator Barbara Boxer seems to be the best substantive representation for women voters. However, it is unclear how the majority of women feel about foreign policy issues because domestic and social issues are more favored and discussed in regards to women. Additionally, Democratic Senators Feinstein and Landrieu follow close behind Boxer and Snowe and Collins follow close behind them, yet they are more true to women voter’s opinions during times of national security and stability and not during or slightly after events like September 11, 2001, and the ‘War on Women.’ Republican Senator Hutchison on the other hand does not seem to be substantively representative of women voters especially during times of instability and she is only slightly more representative during times of stability.

In sum, socially liberal Democrats like Boxer and Feinstein and sometimes Landrieu, and socially liberal Republicans like Collins and Snowe, are the best substantive representation for the majority of women voters. This is especially the case during times of stability when Republicans and Democrats alike are more able to vote liberally. Socially conservative Democrats and Republicans like Hutchison do not seem to substantively represent the majority
of women voters and are more substantially representative of male voters. What does all of this information mean for the future of women’s politics in the United States?
Chapter 7:

Conclusion:

The Future of Women in Politics:

Understanding the current status of women’s politics is an important area of study for political science. The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, happened during the peak of women’s politics in the United States; a time where women were gaining more roles in politics than ever before and trends were showing that this increase was projected to reach greater heights in the new millennium. However, election results in the 2004 and 2006 elections show that when national security and war are the top election issues, gender stereotypes are prevalent and women politicians. My research discussed and answered the questions: What is the relationship between gender and voting in the United States? Are gender stereotypes concerning politicians still relevant? Do male and female voters vote for the same political candidates? And do male and female politicians vote on legislation the same way? Further, do destabilizing events in the United States change the way politicians vote on key issues and affect who voters vote for?

As evidence shown in this thesis suggests, during times of political and national instability, women candidates do not have as high of a success rate in running for United States Congress, women in the United States Senate, especially Republican women, vote more conservatively, and women voters do not prefer women candidates by large majority. A paragon of this phenomenon was exemplified during the Congressional and Presidential elections following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks in 2002, and 2004, as well as the voting records of the female United States Senators between 2002 and 2004.
A similar phenomenon occurred during the ‘War on Women’ in 2010 where Republican women Senators voted more conservatively, voting against the same legislation they previously supported. Moreover, the majority of women voters during the ‘War on Women’ overwhelmingly voted for Democratic candidates especially female Democratic candidates. However, the majority of women voters did not support the Republican female candidates who ran for congress during 2010. What does this implicate for the future of women in federal politics?

This foreshadows that destabilizing events like 9/11 and the ‘War on Women’ crumble the unstable façade of equality most voters believe exists between the sexes in the United States, and bring out the underpinning gender stereotypes that still describe women as inferior to men in instances of instability. Furthermore, if a similar event were to happen in the United States, women could lose the progress they finally gained back in the 2008 and 2012 elections. As of 2013 there are 20 female United States Senators, and 78 women in the House, a record amount of women in United States Congress. This is far from equal gender representation, and as the ADA issues section points out, if there were more women in offices we would likely have slightly different laws as Congresswomen tend to be more liberal than Congressmen. As Democratic Senator Kirsten Gillibrand stated, women Senators, Democrats and Republicans alike have many common interests and values, and as the voting records show, female Senators in times of national stability tend to agree on the issues of reproductive rights, healthcare, and equality legislation.
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