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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the support for women’s issues and presidential support amongst members of the House of Representatives in the 115th Congress (2017-2019). Earlier literature has emphasized gender as a strong predictor of support for women’s issues. In this study, I hypothesized that party affiliation will be the strongest predictor of both support for women’s issues and presidential support. I used gender, party affiliation, and various demographic factors to determine what influences support for women’s issues and support for the president amongst House members. When examining support for women’s issues, party affiliation trumps gender as the strongest indicator of support. Party affiliation is also the strongest indicator of presidential support. Gender differences in voting within each party are small. This suggests, at least at this moment in time, that gender has far less influence on a member’s support for women’s issues than previously suggested in literature looking at earlier years. From my analysis, I concluded that party affiliation explains almost all of the variation in support for women’s issues and presidential support.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Women’s issues are understood in many different ways by many different people. Historically, women’s issues were defined as societal issues that disproportionately affect women. Therefore, it is unsurprising that matters pertaining to family affairs, health care, and reproductive rights have, in the past, been at the forefront of women’s issues. As the feminist movement and the idea of intersectional feminism occurred, the idea of what problems affected women expanded. Gun control, criminal justice reform, and domestic violence were now being discussed as issues that affect women, especially minority women (Smooth, 2011).

Traditionally male-only or male-dominated legislatures made policy on women. Once women began to be elected, Congressional women began to band together in support of their own greater good (Kennedy, 2014). As their numbers grew, their voices increased as well.

Of course, the gender of legislators is not the only predictor of opinions on women’s issues. Obviously, partisanship is very important in all issues. As partisanship increases, it raises the question if women are willing to cross the aisle in order to support issues that affect women. What does explain the support for women’s issues in Congress?

In the past 20 years, an increasing number of women have been elected to the United States Congress. The trend of increasing women started before in the 1970s but accelerated in the early 1990s with the 92nd Congress and the “Year of the Woman” (Center for American Women and Politics, 2020). Figure 1 illustrates this trend. Women made up 20 percent of the House in the 115th Congress (2017-2019), the highest percentage to date.
With the prospect of even more women being elected to Congress, it is important to understand how women potentially support, or do not support, women’s issues. This research is aimed at understanding the factors that influence a member of Congress’ support for women’s issues and for contentious issues more generally. In order to re-approach past literature, I will study both gender and party affiliation within the 115th Congress (2017-2019). First, I aim to study party affiliation in the context of support for women’s issues and for support of the president. Then, I consider gender within parties and more specifically, focus on understanding how women in both parties support women’s issues and support the president. These considerations address and build on previous literature. I will test several hypotheses using data from the 115th Congress.

I included presidential support as a variable in order to explore and highlight the difference in voting patterns between men and women aside from strictly women’s issues. The
inclusion of hypotheses about support for the president assesses raw political partisanship. In particular, due to the contemporary political polarization which has grown over the past twenty years, presidential support may be the key to studying differences within this highly polarized Congress.

Due to the increased polarization in Congress, I suspect that party affiliation will explain support for women’s issues and divisive issues more generally. Through my research, I expect to find that gender plays a smaller role currently in predicting support for women’s issues than suggested in previous literature looking at earlier years. After presenting my findings, I will conclude with a discussion of the final results and potential future research related to these findings.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

Women are not a homogenous group. They do not vote the same or support the same issues just because they are women. Past literature has highlighted many differences between men and women in Congress as well as differences among women themselves. How do women differ in support for women’s issues among themselves and with men?

Past research from the 1980s and 1990s suggested that women as legislators are more liberal than their male counterparts and are willing to cross party lines to vote with other women (Welch, 1985; Swers, 1998), particularly on women’s issues. However, while gender has been understood in the past to be a strong indicator of support for women’s issues, party affiliation may now have completely eclipsed all other considerations. Moreover, women are now a greater proportion of legislative bodies and that might affect the vote too.

Women’s Impact

In this section, I draw upon previous research that describes how women affect legislative bodies. Volden, Wiseman, and Wittmer (2010) highlighted the effectiveness of women in Congress. They studied the effectiveness of women in both the minority and majority parties and throughout the legislative process. They hypothesized the women in both parties are more effective and introduce more legislation than men. On women’s issues, they hypothesized that women will also introduce more legislation than men. They note that women may be more effective lawmakers due to their specialization in women’s issues. They defined this issue
specialization as women being more likely to vote for women’s issue bills and to sponsor such legislation (Volden et al., 2010). To test these hypotheses, they studied every bill proposed in the House from 1973 to 2008 and analyzed the success of each bill. To study legislator effectiveness, they constructed an effectiveness score based on the number of bills introduced, the passage of these bills, and enactment of the proposed bills into law.

Their findings suggested that House women in both parties are more effective than their male colleagues on all bills. Comparatively, they concluded the majority women are slightly less effective in their party when compared to men than minority women in their party.

On women’s issue bills, they suggested that women in both the minority and majority parties focus on introducing and supporting women’s issue bills. Women are, therefore, specializing in women’s issues, but this specialization does not equate to legislative success. Women’s issue bills sponsored by women are not as likely to be passed as those sponsored by men. Although women sponsor and support women’s issues at higher rates than men, there is little to no deference to women in this area.

This study is important because it highlights the impact of women on Congress. In the House, both minority and majority women are more effective lawmakers than men. This study emphasizes that women in both parties support women’s issues more than men.

Women in Congress are more likely to include women’s issues on their policy agenda (Swers, 2001). Elected women are more likely to see their female constituents as an integral part of their constituency when compared to elected men. By validating the needs of female constituents and viewing women’s issues as important policy points, female legislators are empowering women. This empowerment, Swers (2001) suggests, is allowing more gender-related concerns to be brought before Congress. Swers concluded that regardless of party,
electing women allows for an increase in legislation that affects and reflects the needs of women. Past literature does support the idea that female legislators introduce women’s issue bills at a higher rate than their male colleagues (Volden, Wiseman and Wittmer, 2016).

Although women introduce these bills at higher rates, they may not be passed. Few studies focus on these bills after sponsorship. Volden, Wiseman, and Wittmer (2016) examine how likely these bills are to become law. Women’s issue bills are less likely to become law than bills not focused on women’s issues. They studied 151,824 bills (H.R.s) introduced between 1973 to 2014. One study found a two percent difference; four percent of all bills became law and only two percent of women’s issue bills did (Volden et al., 2016). When sponsored by a woman, women’s issue bills fare worse. Only one percent of women’s issue bills sponsored by women become law.

This lack of success raises the question of the importance and impact of women in Congress. As seen through past literature, women are able and willing to introduce women’s issues to the legislature (Thomas, 1991).

The problem arises as the issues move through the legislative process. Implications from this study suggest that possibly more women’s issues could become law if more women were elected to Congress (Volden et al., 2016). An increased number of elected women would aid in passage not just introduction of bills focusing on women’s issues. This study speaks to the potential impact that women in Congress have on the future of women’s issues in federal law.

The implications suggested in Volden et al. (2016) were examined on a state level by Thomas (1991). Thomas observed that the number of women in a legislative body impacts the body’s policy priorities. She suggested that states with high percentages of women in their
legislatures will see more legislation focused on women’s issues. She tested her hypothesis using
data from a survey of state legislators from 12 states.

Just as previous literature has concluded about Congress, she found that in state
legislatures women prioritize women’s issues above other policy issues. She found that women
introduce more women’s issue bills in states that they find more support. This support is
expressed as the increased number of women in state legislatures as well as the existence of
women’s legislative caucuses. Women’s issue bills had the most success in states with a
relatively high percentage of women in their legislature or states with women’s legislative
caucuses (Thomas, 1991). On the other hand, the percentage of women in the legislature did not
always reflect the success rate of legislation concerning women’s issues. This finding should not
undermine the importance of a woman’s impact on legislative bodies. Women do make a
difference in state legislatures as they continue to introduce and support women’s issue bills at
higher rates than men (Thomas, 1991). This study affirms the importance and impact of women
in legislative bodies.

The Impact of Gender on Voting

Past research heavily emphasizes a member of Congress’ gender and ideology as
predictive of voting outcomes. Swers (1998) illustrated how gender affects the support of
congressional bills in the 103rd Congress (1993-1995). The central hypothesis was that regardless
of party affiliation, elected women would come together to support women’s issue bills. The
various congressional bills in question were sorted into categories of women’s health, abortion,
and children’s and family issues. Swers used the American Association for University Women’s
voter rating system to categorize bills as women’s issues. Using interest group ratings provides an external validation of the measures the researcher uses. Swers concluded that women are more likely to support women’s issues than their male colleagues.

This study echoes Welch (1985) who examined how women’s congressional voting differs from men during 1972 to 1980. She found that within each party, women were more liberal, and that the differences were larger among Republicans. Swers’ study does offer a variation on Welch as it compares women to each other rather than to men in the House. Welch observed that women in Congress became slightly more conservative as more women were elected to Congress in that era.

Bendix and Jeong (2020) studied the foreign policy differences between men and women in Congress. Their research focused on whether women in Congress were more dovish than men. Past research suggested that women are in fact more dovish when it comes to foreign policy and security issues compared to their male colleagues. For example, governments with more elected women saw fewer military conflicts (Clayton and Zetterberg, 2018; Koch and Fulton, 2011; Shea and Christian, 2017). The literature concluded that gender was the explanation for this dovish behavior observed in female legislators. Bendix and Jeong observed that only Swers (2007) had examined the impact of party affiliation and gender on foreign policy stances in Congress. These differences in the literature motivated Bendix and Jeong to determine if women were dovish because women are more pacifist or because women represent more dovish constituents.

They concluded that it is party affiliation and constituency conservatism that explain foreign policy differences between men and women. After controlling for these, there was little evidence that women were more dovish than men (Bendix and Jeong, 2020). Women represented more liberal constituents who supported more dovish foreign policies. Women are more likely to
be elected in so-called “women friendly” districts which are strongly Democratic, urban, more educated and wealthier (Palmer and Simon, 2008; Ondercin and Welch, 2009). Such districts are more likely to both elect women and be dovish.

Bendix and Jeong built on past literature by including party affiliation as a variable. My study will also include partisanship in my explanatory model.

**Partisanship**

Congressional partisanship has been increasing for the last 60 years and today there are unprecedented levels of partisanship in Congress (Andris et al., 2015). Andris et al. (2015) studied Democratic and Republican members in the House from 1949 to 2012. They concluded that non-cooperation and partisanship in the House have increased exponentially over the past 60 years. They found no signs of partisanship decreasing anytime soon and that its effects on the future of policy have yet to be seen. This study illustrates the broad picture of partisanship in Congress.

The role of party in Congress is voluminous but I will focus on research that examines women and partisanship. Lawless (2018) studied women and bipartisan cooperation in Congress. She found that constituents thought that women would be more willing to compromise with the opposite party. To test this, she collected data on member participation in the Congressional Secret Santa Gift Exchange and Seersucker Thursday. Women were more likely to participate in these social activities and were more collegial compared to their male counterparts. However, this participation did not equate to women being more bipartisan than men. In fact, there was no evidence to suggest that women are more likely than men to be bipartisan problem solvers.
Lawless (2018) concluded that it is difficult for any factor to trump party in the legislative process because of the intensive partisanship of the current environment. She suggests that constituents may be disappointed to find out that women are not more immune to partisanship than men but reiterates the importance of women in Congress given the impact they do make. Regardless of her findings, women still sponsor more legislation and prioritize women’s issues more than men (Anzia and Berry, 2011; Volden et al., 2010; Volden et al., 2016). This study is relevant given the desire to uncover a possible connection between women in Congress and partisan politics and because it goes beyond voting.

Past scholarship has suggested that women in Congress are more liberal than men overall and within each party (Welch, 1985). While the number of women in Congress has increased in both parties since the 1970s, the number of Republican women in Congress has increased at a much slower rate compared to Democratic women (Thomsen, 2015).

Figure 2: Number of Women in the House of Representatives by Party
The 1992 “Year of the Women” saw an increase of women elected to Congress, as Figure 1 illustrated. However, the increase was mostly among Democrats as Figure 2 shows. The increase in Democratic women has continued over the last 26 years while the number of Republican women has actually declined since 1995. This partisan gap was small in 1980 but now has become substantial (Thomsen, 2015).

One explanation for this pattern is the idea that Republican women may be more liberal than Republican men and thus have a hard time getting elected (Carroll, 2003; Carroll and Sanbonmatsu, 2013). An increase in partisan polarization may contribute to the lower number of elected Republican women because it discourages party moderates, disproportionately women, from pursuing a political career. Thomsen (2015) argued that women who are ideological moderates are less likely to run than those at the ideological poles. To test her hypothesis, she studied 560 state legislators who served between 2000 and 2010. She concluded that there are so few Republican women in Congress because moderate Republican women are less likely to run for Congress and there are few conservative women in the congressional pipeline, even though they are more willing to run.

Republican women make up a small percentage of the potential candidate pool which pulls from state legislative offices. Only 13 percent of women holding state legislative offices consider themselves conservative which is reflective of the 8 percent female representation within the Republican party (Thomsen, 2015).

Over the years, Republican men and women have become more similar ideologically than Democratic and Republican women have (Thomsen, 2015). As more Republican women become ideologically conservative, more will be elected to Congress, Thomsen predicts. She believes that the increase in conservative women will help close the gap between the number of
Republican and Democratic women elected to Congress. Thomsen (2015) argued that when Swers (2002) concluded that Republican women were still more likely to support women’s issues than Republican men that there were few conservative women in her sample. Due to the lack of conservative women, this study may not be accurate in depicting the voting behavior of Republican women today. She suggests that the rise of the conservative Republican woman will increase party homogeneity.

Frederick (2009) explored roll-call voting in House women from the 97th Congress to the 109th Congress (1981-2006) to test if women were still more liberal than men. He did expect gender to play a role when voting on women’s issues. He used the American Association of University Women’s (AAUW) annual scorecard to test support for women’s issues.

His findings suggest that in the 108th and 109th Congresses (2003-2007) the ideological divide between women is actually greater than that of men. Moderate Republican women who used to band together with Democratic women are a thing of the past as more conservative women are elected. These women are reflecting conservative party ideals just as Democratic women do on the other side of the aisle.

Frederick (2009) asserts that this new breed of Republican women does not feel as though they represent women unlike the moderate Republican women of the past. The Republican party has also changed, with so-called moderate Republicans of both sexes disappearing. So Republican women no longer vote for liberal policies in the name of women. He pinpoints this shift in Republican women’s support for women’s issues as occurring during the 104th Congress (1995-1997). This study also supports the larger picture that women are no longer as liberal in Congress as they were once thought to be. Increasing partisanship appears to be causing and reflecting the growing ideological differences between women.
Chapter 3

Theory: To Explain Voting on Women’s Issues

Many factors influence how and why members of Congress vote the way they do. These factors can be both internal and external and affect members of Congress differently depending on a variety of variables. In my research, I am focusing on factors affecting how members of Congress vote on bills pertaining to women’s issues and on presidential support.

Every year, the American Association of University Women (AAUW) releases a list of bills pertaining to women’s issues. The organization then assigns each individual member of Congress a score according to how the member voted on these designated bills. These scores, reflecting a member’s support for women’s issues, will serve as the dependent variable in my study. Higher scores indicate a member is more supportive of women’s issues while lower scores indicate less support.

FiveThirtyEight recorded the percent in which a member voted in support of the president during the 115th Congress (2017-2019). The organization included bills that were publicly supported by President Trump. These percentages, which translate to presidential support, will serve as the second dependent variable in my study.

I expect to find that legislators will vote following party lines when supporting bills dealing with women’s issues, such as equal pay and family planning, and on which the president has taken a stand. Party affiliation will be the strongest indicator of a member’s support for both women’s issue bills and presidential support. In addition to partisan differences, I expect voting to be influenced by gender differences.
Hypothesis 1: Party Differences

During the 115th Congress, all House members were either Republican or Democratic. In both Congress and the American public, Republicans are more ideologically conservative while Democrats are more ideologically liberal. Research has shown that these differences are evident in congressional voting and public opinion (Levendusky, 2010; Pew Research Center, 2014). Conservative and liberal viewpoints roughly coincide with the Republican party and the Democratic party, respectively.

Ideological differences between Republicans and Democrats occur over many different issues. This rift is especially apparent over issues like climate change where ideological disagreement occurs both in Congress and the general public (Brewer, 2012; Riley, 2008). Ideological splits amongst the parties are also evident in women’s issues. On women’s reproductive rights like abortion, Republicans and Democrats staunchly disagree (Peters, 2019). This disagreement can also be observed in other issues affecting women. Some Republicans have supported a more religious approach to public education and have also asserted that gun-control will negatively affect women by limiting a woman’s ability to protect herself (Schreiber, 2012). In regard to women’s issues overall, Republicans are more likely to think that equality for women has been achieved when compared to their Democratic counterparts (Pew Research Center, 2017).

From a historical prospective, Republicans are seen as the party of small government. Considering the pro-women policy can expand the role of government in areas like education and welfare, I expect Republicans will be less likely than Democrats to support women’s issues.

*Republicans will be less likely to support women’s issue bills than Democrats.*
Hypothesis 2: Gender Differences

The previous hypothesis focuses on differences between the two prominent political parties in terms of support for women’s issues. This second hypothesis focuses on gender as another influence on support for women’s issues.

I will examine the role of gender within each political party to be able to disentangle the influence of gender from the influence of party. Past research suggested that when compared to their male counterparts, Congresswomen are more liberal (Welch, 1985), but more current research (Frederick, 2009) indicates that this may have changed. On the other hand, more recent research suggested women from both parties are more likely to sponsor women’s issue bills than men (Volden, et al., 2010; Volden, et al., 2016). For this reason, I expect to find that both Republican and Democratic women will be more likely to support bills that support women’s issues than Republican and Democratic men.

Republican women will be more likely to support women’s issue bills than Republican men.

Democratic women will be more likely to support women’s issue bills than Democratic men.

Hypothesis 3: Party and Presidential Support

Following a similar line of argument as in Hypothesis 1, I expect that Republicans will be much more likely to approve bills supported by the president. This is almost tautological, but I need to examine partisanship to see if there is an independent effect of gender.

Republicans will be more likely to support the president than Democrats.
Hypothesis 4: Gender and Presidential Support

Hypothesis 2 includes gender as a potential variable that affects support for women’s issues. Assuming that past research about women’s liberalism in Congress holds, I expect to find that men within both parties will be more supportive of the president (Welch, 1985). However, in more recent years, there has been evidence to suggest that women are no longer more liberal than men (Frederick, 2009). Since the Trump administration is Republican, I suspect that women in Congress will be less likely to support the president given that they are more liberal than men. Under a Democratic presidential administration, I would expect to conclude the opposite. My hypotheses concerning gender and presidential support are as follows:

*Men will be more likely to support the president than women.*

*Republican men will be more likely to support the president than Republican women.*

*Democratic men will be more likely to support the president than Democratic women.*
Chapter 4
Methodology and Data

In order to test my hypotheses, I focused on the House of Representatives of the 115th United States Congress, in session between January 3, 2017 and January 3, 2019. I focused on the House of Representatives because the House has more female members to study than the Senate. Also, the composition of the House is reflective of a state’s population which makes it a more representative body compared to the Senate. The House provided an accessible and generalizable view of how women behave in the legislature.

The entirety of this term was served under the Trump administration. In this study, there are 450 observed members of the House rather than 435 members due to a number of members not finishing their terms and other members replacing them. Cabinet appointments, other resignations, and deaths were three major reasons for midterm departures.

Following Swers (1998), I use the scores assigned to members of Congress by the American Association of University Women (AAUW) to create my measure of support for women’s issues. The AAUW score is a composite score assigned to members based on their support for six bills. These bills are selected by the AAUW due to their direct impact on women. Six bills selected for the 115th Congress that determine a member’s score of support include the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 1869) which provided new tools to help close the gender pay gap; DeLauro/Frankel/Scott Amendment to the FY19 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Bill (H.R.3354) which enforced protections against unlawful employment discrimination; American Health Care Act of 2017 (H.R. 1628) which rolled back health care coverage provided by the Affordable Care Act; Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (H.R. 1) which overhauled the tax code to benefit wealthy taxpayers; DREAM Act of 2017 (H.R. 3440) which provided a path to legal citizenship
for minors; Resolution on Compliance with Title X Family Planning Requirements (H.J. Res. 43) which rolled back Obama era rules and allowed states to bar providers like Planned Parenthood from providing services.

The AAUW explains how each bill will affect women. The American Health Care Act of 2017, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, and the Resolution on Compliance with Title X Family Planning Requirements were all designated as negatively affecting women. Members who voted in favor of these bills did not get a point for a pro women’s issue vote. The three other bills were seen as positively affecting women and, therefore, a member’s score increased with a vote in support of these bills. The scores assigned are based on support for these bills and range from 0-100 and, because there are six, increase by increments of 17 for those who voted on all six bills. I included all members who voted on at least four of those six bills.

I recoded the scores into categories of low, medium, and high support for women’s issues to examine crosstabulations. Scores between 0-32 were coded as “low” support; scores between 33-50 were coded as “medium” support; scores between 51-100 were coded as “high” support for women’s issues.

My second dependent variable was presidential support, drawn from compilations of FiveThirtyEight (2020). They calculated the percent of the bills in which the member of Congress voted in support of the president during the 115th Congress (2017-2019). These votes were all ones in which the president vocalized his stance on the issues. For crosstabulation, I recoded the percentages into a threefold category: Percentages between 0-25 were coded as “low” support for the president; percentages between 26-84 were coded as “medium” support for the president; percentages between 85-100 were coded as “high” support for the president. Three members are missing because they resigned early in the congressional term and, therefore, did
not have a percent assigned to them. Other members that resigned are still included because they stayed long enough for their voting record to reflect a percentage of presidential support.

My independent variables are gender and party affiliation. Information regarding gender and party affiliation were compiled using demographic information from the History, Art and Archives of the U.S. House of Representatives (2020) and Center for American Women and Politics (2018). Men are coded as “1” and women are coded as “0.” Republicans are coded as “1” and Democrats are coded as “0.”

My control variables include member ethnicity and the member district characteristics of region, ethnic population, blue collar population, and college graduate population.

I created dummy variables for whether a representative is a Hispanic or African American. Whites and Asian Americans are the omitted category. These data were coded from History, Art and Archives of the U.S. House of Representatives (2020).

I used the United States Census Bureau’s Regions and Divisions of the United States to code region. I created a regional dummy variable for the South. The South includes the Confederate states plus Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Oklahoma and are coded as 1. All other states are coded as 0.

I also examined the percent of college graduates in each district’s population, the percent of blue-collar workers in each district’s population, and the percent ethnic population, or any race other than non-Hispanic white, in each district. This data was collected from ProximityOne (2019) and Esri (2018) and are coded as a percent on a 0 to 1 scale.

I first tested my hypotheses using bivariate correlations and crosstabulations. I then moved to a multivariate analysis using regression.
Chapter 5

Findings

To test my hypotheses, I will first examine bivariate analyses and then will use a regression model to compare the effect of several variables together with a regression model.

I first assess the bivariate correlation between the variables. Table 1 presents these findings.

Table 1: The Impact of Gender and Partisanship on Support for Women’s Issues and Presidential Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women’s Issues</th>
<th>Presidential Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All correlations are significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed test). Presidential support is measured on a 1-100 scale with 100 the most supportive; women’s issues is measured on a 1-100 scale with 100 the most supportive; N is 440 for women’s issues and 447 for presidential support.

As Table 1 illustrates, the correlation between gender and women’s issues is significant and negative. As expected, women are more supportive of women’s issues. The inverse is observed with gender and presidential support. Men are more supportive of President Trump.

There is a strong negative correlation between being Republican and supporting women’s issues. Democrats are more supportive of women’s issues than Republicans. Inversely, the correlation coefficient for party affiliation and presidential support is a nearly perfect positive correlation. Republicans vote according to presidential preference almost always.
Both gender and party affiliation are useful in explaining support for women’s issues, but party affiliation has the stronger correlation. The same is true for presidential support. While gender is a significantly correlated with presidential support, party affiliation is the stronger indicator having a nearly perfect association with presidential support. On women’s issues, Democrats and women are more supportive than Republicans and men. On the other hand, Republicans and men vote more often with the president.

Table 1 supports Hypothesis 1 that Republicans will be less likely to support women’s issues than Democrats. Similarly, Table 1 provides support for Hypothesis 2 indicating that Republicans are less likely to support women’s issues but that women are more supportive of women’s issues than men. Table 1 also confirms Hypotheses 3 and 4 that Republicans and men are more likely to support the president.

**Table 2: Support for Women’s Issues by Party**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in table are expressed as percentages. Support for women’s issues is measured on a 1-100 scale with scores between 0-32 coded as “low”; scores between 33-50 coded as “medium”; scores between 51-100 coded as “high”. N is 195 for Democrats and 245 for Republicans.

I will use crosstabulations in order to better understand these relationships. In Table 2 above, I test Hypothesis 1 concerning party differences. This table illustrates why the correlation between partisanship and my two dependent variables is so high. Nearly all Democrats voted in favor of women’s issues between 83 to 100 percent of the time. Almost the opposite occurred for Republicans. In their case, 95 percent of House Republicans supported women’s issues 20
percent of the time or less. Only a minute 5 percent of Republicans support women’s issues more than 20 percent of the time.

Table 3: Support for Women’s Issues by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in table are expressed as percentages. N is 85 for women and 355 for men.

As I hypothesized and as we saw in Table 1, women are much more likely to vote in favor of women’s issues. To be exact, 72 percent of the female representatives supported women’s issues more than 83 percent of the time whereas only 38 percent of men support women’s issues at the same rate. On the other hand, nearly 60 percent of men vote in favor of women’s issues less than 20 of the time compared to only 27 percent of women with that low support. It is clear that women overall are much more supportive of women’s issues. Thirty-four percent more women representatives are in the high category of support than the men.

There does appear to be a little more variation among men than women in supporting women’s issues. There are a few more men than women in the middle category of support.

Given the clear relationship between gender and voting and partisanship and voting, how do those two variables fit together in explaining voting on women’s issues and support for the president? In order to further understand how women in the House support women’s issues, we need to look at gender differences within each party.

Table 3 and Table 4 both provide tests of Hypothesis 2 on the relationship between gender and partisanship. Table 3 indicated variation among both men and women in their support for women’s issues and Table 4 examines party and gender together.
Table 4: Support for Women’s Issues by Party and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in table are expressed as percentages. N is 61 for Democratic women, 134 for Democratic men, 24 for Republican women and 221 for Republican men.

The table offers more evidence that party affiliation outweighs gender on voting for women’s issues. All Democratic women in Congress voted for women’s issues more than 83 percent of the time. Conversely, 96 percent of Republican women voted for women’s issues less than 20 percent of the time. This same pattern applied to the men in each political party. In the Democratic party, 99 percent of men voted almost all the time in support of women’s issues while 95 percent of Republican men opposed these bills most of the time. The percentages align almost exactly with those in Table 2 which looked at party affiliation alone.

Another difference between the Republicans and Democrats is that approximately 5 percent of Republican men did vote in favor of some women’s issues. These men, although voting in favor of some women’s issues, are on the low end of the middle category. All except one Republican man in the middle category voted in favor of women’s issues 33 percent of the time, the other 50 percent. Even so, they did vote against their partisan position some of the time.

I now turn to my hypotheses relating to presidential support. Tables 5, 6, and 7 illustrate crosstabulations that test Hypothesis 3 and 4 about gender and party predictors of presidential
support. Table 5 shows that nearly 57 percent of women in the House voted less than 25 percent of the time in favor of Trump proposals. Only 26 percent of men had such low support. Conversely, 56 percent of men but only 25 percent of women voted for Trump proposals more than 85 percent of the time. And, approximately 18 percent of both men and women voted for Trump proposals sometimes and against sometimes. Hypothesis 4, that women are less supportive, is confirmed by this bivariate analysis.

Table 5: Presidential Support by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in table are expressed as percentages. N is 88 for women and 359 for men.

These findings that women are more likely to oppose the president reflects the reality that there are many more Democratic women in Congress than Republican, and this has been true for some time (Edlund, 2002).

Table 6: Presidential Support by Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in table are expressed as percentages. N is 200 for Democrats and 247 for Republicans.

Table 6 examines the relationship between party and presidential support. We learned from Table 1 that the relationship between party and presidential support is nearly perfect. Table 6 shows how perfect it is.
Seventy-one percent of House Democrats but no Republicans voted less than 25 percent of the time in favor of Trump proposals. Ninety percent of Republicans voted in support of Trump proposals more than 85 percent of the time compared to only one percent of Democrats who did. Only ten percent of Republicans deviated from the presidential policies at least 15 percent of the time, while 29 percent of Democrats voted with him occasionally. Hypothesis 4, that Republicans are more supportive of the president, is strongly confirmed by this bivariate analysis.

In order to accurately understand support for the president, both party and gender must be included. The test of the second part of Hypothesis 4 examines the impact of gender within each party (see Table 7). Are women still more liberal than men within each party, as measured by opposition to Trump, as past literature suggests?

Table 7: Presidential Support by Party and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in table are expressed as percentages. N is 64 for Democratic women, 136 for Democratic men, 24 for Republican women and 223 for Republican men.

Democratic women do oppose Trump’s legislation more than do Democratic men. More than 78 percent of Democratic women hardly ever vote in favor of Trump’s proposed legislation compared to 68 percent of Democratic men. This roughly 11 percent difference between men
and women suggests that men in the Democratic party are somewhat more likely to support the president than women but yet both men and women vote against him most of the time.

Conversely, there is only a 2 percent difference between Republican men and women in presidential support. Ninety-two percent of Republican women voted for Trump most of the time and 90 percent of Republican men did the same. Only a handful of men and a handful of women voted against Trump a significant amount of time between 26 and 84 percent. Women are a tiny bit more likely to vote in favor of Trump’s legislation, but it is a negligible difference. Party again trumps other factors.

Table 7 illustrated that Democratic women are more liberal than Democratic men as measured by lack of presidential support. Democratic women are more liberal within their party than Republican women are. Obviously, party loyalty for the Republican administration is at play. It will be interesting to observe gender differences in a Democratic administration.

**Multivariate Analysis**

Now that we have examined the impact of party and gender on presidential support in the crosstabs, we turn to a regression analysis where we can examine the impact of party and gender, taking into account other factors. I will regress support for women’s issues and then for presidential support on party and gender while controlling member and district characteristics. I hope to examine member ethnicity and district characteristics of region, age, ethnic population, blue collar population, and college graduate population.

Before I can enter all the variables I planned into the equation, I first need to examine their interrelationship. I correlated my independent variables to examine if multicollinearity
existed among them. Multicollinearity occurs when independent variables are highly correlated with one another which makes it difficult to evaluate the relationship between an individual independent variable and the dependent variable. In a regression, put simply, independent variables should be independent of each other. It is difficult to evaluate the impact of each independent variable separately if it is highly correlated with others. Table 8 illustrates the correlations among my independent variables.

Table 8: Intercorrelation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Repub.</th>
<th>% college grad.</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>% ethnic pop.</th>
<th>% blue collar</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African Amer.</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% college graduate</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% ethnic pop.</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% blue collar</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Amer.</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Men is coded 1=men, 0=women. Party is coded 1=Republican, 0=Democrats. Age is coded percent of district population over 18. South is a dummy variable coded 1=South, 0=other. All member ethnicity variables are dummy variables coded 1=white, 0=other; 1=African American, 0=other; 1=Hispanic, 0=other.
Several correlations exceed .5, including percent ethnic population and being a white House member. This makes sense as we expect districts with a high ethnic population to be more likely to elect racially diverse members than districts with low ethnic populations. The variables percent blue collar and percent college graduate are also negatively correlated. As the percent of college graduates increases in a district, we expect to see less blue-collar workers in this district. Percent blue collar is also correlated with party as districts with more blue-collar workers are more likely to elect Republicans than districts with fewer blue-collar workers. Being a Republican and percent ethnic population were negatively correlated which means that districts with high ethnic populations are more likely to elect Democrats than districts with low ethnic populations.

To combat multicollinearity from these variables, I removed percent blue-collar workers and percent ethnic population from my regression due to their high correlation with other independent variables.

After examining the interrelationship of the independent variables, I included men, party affiliation, African American, Hispanic, South, and percent college graduates in the regression equation. I used the dummy variables African American and Hispanic to control for member characteristics and the variables South and percent college graduate to control for district characteristics. I then ran regressions to analyze the impact of these factors on the dependent variables of support for women’s issues and presidential support.
Table 9: Support for Women’s Issues Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>52.367</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>-.943</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-105.508</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% college graduates</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>2.991</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-2.589</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>2.027</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>2.745</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Support for women’s issues
b. N=440, R²=.975

Table 9 illustrates support for women’s issues regressed on the included independent variables. The very high R-squared of .975 shows that the variables in the model explain almost all of the variability in the data. All variables except men are statistically significant at a .05 level. Although the percentage of college graduates in the district, being a southern district, and the members’ status as African American and Hispanic are all significant, they do not explain much in the model.

Party affiliation of the member is by far the most significant variable. This variable has an unstandardized regression coefficient of -.943 which means that the difference between Republican and Democrats is .943 on the scale of 0-1, controlling for other factors. In other
words, even with other variables in the equation, party is the key predictor of support for women’s issues. This confirms Hypothesis 1 about party differences. The relationship between party affiliation and support for women’s issues shows Republicans are less supportive of women’s issues.

One of the key independent variables in my study, gender, is not statistically significant. There is no statistical difference between men and women and their support for women’s issues, once party is taken into account. This helps us explore Hypothesis 2 on gender differences. There is no evidence to suggest that women in Congress are more likely to support women’s issues than their men colleagues taking into account party. Overall, party affiliation dominates gender in support for women’s issues.

The table also illustrates that African Americans and Hispanics have a modestly higher support for women’s issues, other things being controlled, than do whites and Asians. African Americans are .028 higher on a 1-point scale in support for women’s issues when compared to whites, Asians, and Hispanics. On the same 1-point scale, Hispanics have .04 more support for women’s issues than the other ethnicities. Representatives from southern districts have .02 less support than those from other districts. The .118 coefficient for college graduates suggests that a hypothetical district with no college graduates would score .118 less on the women’s support scale than one from a hypothetical district where everyone is a college graduate.
Table 10: Presidential Support Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>14.152</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.230</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>58.331</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% college graduates</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-3.459</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-4.561</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-3.027</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Presidential support
b. N=446, R²=.925

Table 10 represents the dependent variable presidential support regressed on the same independent variables as in Table 9. Like in the previous table, the high R-squared suggests that the variables in the model explains almost all of the variability in the data, 92.5 percent. All variables except men and South are statistically significant at a .05 level. Like the regression for support for women’s issues, party affiliation is the most significant variable. Republicans on average are .665 higher on the 1-point scale for presidential support than Democrats, other things equal.

The table also shows that representatives who are African Americans or Hispanic are less supportive of the president. Taking into account party, African Americans have .08 less support
for the president on a 1-point scale than whites, Asians, and Hispanics. Similarly, Hispanics are .056 less supportive than the other ethnicities on a 1-point scale. Districts with higher percentages of college graduates are also less supportive of the president, controlling for party and race. The .175 coefficient for college graduates suggests that a hypothetical district with no college graduates would score .175 less on the women’s support scale than one from a hypothetical district where everyone is a college graduate. The statistical significance of these variables is not particularly surprising given that districts with higher populations of college graduates, African Americans, and Hispanics are going to be more Democratic and, therefore, less supportive of President Trump’s proposals. And yet, these members are even more anti-Trump than others in their party.

As in Table 9, the key independent variable of gender is not significant. There is no evidence to suggest that a member’s gender had a significant effect on their support for the president beyond party identification. Thus, my fourth hypothesis, that men are more supportive of the president than women, is not supported taking into account party.

Party affiliation best predicts a member’s support for President Trump. As seen in Table 10, the likelihood that a member is Republican dramatically increases presidential support. This confirms Hypothesis 3 that Republicans are more supportive of the president than Democrats. These results show that party affiliation dominates gender when predicting presidential support.
Chapter 6
Conclusion

My study explored the factors affecting how members of the House of Representatives vote on bills pertaining to women’s issues and on presidential support. Using both bivariate and multivariate analyses, I tested four different explanations to explain support for women’s issues and President Trump. My research serves as an addition to the literature about gender and partisanship on support for women’s issues.

When testing the relationship between support for women’s issues and each independent variable, it is clear that party affiliation is the dominant variable. In terms of party, Republicans are less likely to support women’s issue bills than Democrats. This is shown by the strong negative correlation between Republican and support for women’s issues in Table 1. Therefore, my first hypothesis concerning party differences is confirmed.

When gender was considered alongside party affiliation, party still trumped gender. There was no evidence to suggest that Republican women were more likely to support women’s issues than Republican men. In fact, 96 percent of Republicans women and 95 percent of Republican men voted for women’s issues less than 20 percent of the time. The rate of low support of women’s issues does not vary by gender in the Republican party. While Democrats are substantially more supportive of women’s issues than Republicans, Democratic women do not vary in support for these issues when compared to Democratic men. I reject Hypothesis 2 on gender differences in support for women’s issues because gender is not a significant indicator of support for these issues.

I tested the relationship between presidential support and each independent variable in order to explore how women vote outside of women’s issues. I hypothesized about the impact of
party and gender on presidential support separately, then together. When testing the relationship between party affiliation and presidential support, Republicans were more likely to support the president than Democrats. This conclusion is unsurprising since the Trump administration is Republican. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 about party and presidential support is confirmed.

I then turned to the effects of gender on presidential support. I hypothesized that men would be more supportive of the president than women even when party was a factor. And that is true without considering party. The crosstabulation findings indicate that more women oppose the president than support him. But as my further analyses show in Table 7 and Table 10, this is because there are many more Democratic women in Congress than Republican; it is party, not gender, producing the differences. In my regression analysis (Table 10), gender is not significant, therefore, I reject the hypothesis that men will be more likely to support the president than women once party is controlled.

The final hypothesis posited that within each party men were more likely to support the president. This is not confirmed. Amongst Republicans, women were actually a tiny bit more likely to vote in favor of Trump’s legislation than men. There is some variation amongst Democrats with 78 percent of women hardly ever voting in favor of Trump’s proposed legislation compared to 68 percent of men. This variation is still not enough for gender to be a significant variable. Gender is not a statistically significant indicator for presidential support. Party affiliation, again, dominates gender.

As expected, there are limitations to this research. Considering the dominance of party affiliation on the two dependent variables, I would not expect these limitations to greatly affect the results of this study, but corrections to these limitations could potentially help improve future studies.
A problem that plagues the literature is how to appropriately label a “women’s issue.” There is disagreement amongst the literature as some studies categorize topics like women’s health and family planning as women’s issues while others consider issues like gun control to apply. The fact that the main dependent variable in this study is still widely disputed in the literature caused me to consider this a limitation. I attempted to counteract this by using the AAUW and their women’s issues categorization. The understanding of a women’s issue is something that I am sure will continue to be addressed by the literature.

Another inevitable limitation when studying women in Congress is the lack of women in Congress. Women make up roughly 20 percent of Congress and, therefore, it can be difficult to study their affect with such few numbers. This problem is exponentially worse when it comes to Republican women. It is difficult to understand how Republican women behave in Congress due to the low numbers of elected Republican women.

As seen in Figure 2, there are more Democratic women in Congress than Republican. Women are not a politically homogenous group, nor do they randomly join a party. One consideration is that women may decide to run as Democrats disproportionately because they favor women’s issues and oppose Trump’s policies. Since women are increasingly choosing to be Democrats, party and gender are not independent of each other. The interconnectedness of party and gender makes it difficult to evaluate their impact separately.

The overall findings from this research shows that party affiliation is by far the biggest predictor of support for women’s issues and President Trump’s proposals. As partisanship increases, women are no longer as willing to cross the aisle in order to support issues that affect women. Instead, they may be choosing their party on the basis of their thoughts about women’s issues. While gender may not be a significant indicator of support for women’s issues, this does
not mean that women are not making a difference in Congress. As suggested in past research, women are still more likely to introduce and prioritize women’s issues in Congress. These results show that party affiliation is a strong predictor of a member’s support, but these findings should not diminish the impact women have in Congress. If anything, these results should highlight the importance of electing women to the United States Congress now and in the future.
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