

EVALUTING THE IMPACT OF STATE VARIATION  
ON GENDER AND RACE THROUGH  
CAMPAIGN FINANCE

by

LAURA MERRIFIELD SOJKA

RICHARD C. FORDING, COMMITTEE CHAIR  
STEPHEN BORRELLI  
CAROL CASSELL  
UTZ L. MCKNIGHT  
DANA J. PATTON

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
in the Department of Political Science  
in the Graduate School of  
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2014

Copyright Laura Merrifield Sojka 2014  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## ABSTRACT

In spite of the increasing campaign finance legislation aimed at equalizing barriers in political campaigns, a fundraising gap persists across gender and race lines. In the era of modern campaigning, with the expenses of advertising and polling, among others, ample funds are necessary but not universally accessible to all candidates. This dissertation addresses the relationship between the candidate's gender and race with campaign fundraising, and the possible mediating impact of three dimensions of the state political context – state legislative professionalism, state Republican party strength, and state culture (South vs. Non-south).

I evaluate fundraising totals across 15 states for over 3,000 candidates in the 2006 state legislative elections. Ultimately, the findings suggest that after controlling for other candidate characteristics, as well as district and state context, there is a slightly negative relationship between gender though not statistically significant and a substantially negative relationship between race, which is statistically significant. It demonstrates that, with other mitigating factors controlled, female candidates fundraise slightly less and non-white candidates fundraise much less than their counterparts. In addition, there appears to be notable variation in the effect of gender/race on legislative professionalization and the Southern states in relation to the fundraising gap. This study finds that candidates from underrepresented groups continue to fundraise less than their white, male counterparts and that state variation is important in understanding the gender/race gap in campaign finance.

## DEDICATION

To my family and friends for their loving support.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to a number of people whose suggestions and guidance helped shape this dissertation into its final form. My kind committee members, Dr. Utz McKnight, Dr. Carol Cassel, Dr. Dana Patton, and Dr. Steve Borrelli provided invaluable feedback and offered recommendations that greatly improved the project. I am very thankful for my patient advisor, Dr. Richard Fording, whose tireless energy and guidance make this dissertation better than I could have ever anticipated. Lastly, I appreciate the feedback from the graduate student reading groups and their help in this process.

## CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
a. Statement of the Problem.....	1
b. Basis for the Research.....	4
c. Purpose of the Study.....	7
d. Explanation of the Collection.....	10
e. References.....	12
2. ARTICLE I – Pink Money, Blue Money: The Impact of State Political Context on the Relationship between Gender and Campaign Finance.....	15
a. Introduction.....	16
b. Literature Review.....	18
c. Theory and Hypotheses .....	21
d. Date and Methodology .....	24
e. Findings and Discussion .....	29
f. Conclusion.....	37
g. References.....	39
h. Appendix.....	44
3. ARTICLE II – The Impact of State Political Context on the Relationship between Race/Ethnicity and Campaign Finance.....	48
a. Introduction.....	49

b. Literature Review .....	51
c. Theory and Research Question .....	57
d. Hypotheses .....	58
e. Data and Methodology.....	61
f. Findings and Discussion .....	67
g. Conclusion.....	74
h. References.....	77
i. Appendix.....	80
4. ARTICLE III – The Impact of State Political Context on the Relationship between Gender, Race, and Campaign Finance .....	86
a. Introduction.....	87
b. Literature Review.....	92
i. Gender Literature.....	92
ii. Race/Ethnicity Literature.....	93
ii. Intersectionality Literature.....	95
c. Theory.....	97
d. Hypotheses .....	98
e. Data and Methods.....	100
f. Findings and Discussion.....	107
g. Conclusion.....	118
h. References.....	121
i. Appendix.....	126
5. Conclusion.....	131

## LIST OF TABLES

1.1 Study Hypotheses.....	23
1.2 States Selected for Campaign Fundraising Comparison.....	25
1.3 Funds and Gender OLS Model .....	30
1.4 Gender and State Professionalization Interaction Model.....	33
1.5 Gender and State Partisanship Interaction Model.....	33
1.6 Gender and Southern State Interaction Model.....	34
2.1 Study Hypotheses .....	60
2.2 States Selected for Campaign Fundraising Comparison.....	61
2.3 Funds and Race OLS Model.....	66
2.4 Race and State Professionalization Interaction Model .....	68
2.5 Race and State Partisanship Interaction Model .....	69
2.6 Race and Southern State Interaction Model.....	70
3.1 Study Hypotheses.....	100
3.2 States Selected for Campaign Fundraising Comparison.....	101
3.3 Funds and Gender/Race OLS Model .....	107
3.4 Funds and Gender/Race Fixed Effects Model.....	109
3.5 Gender/Race and State Professionalization Interaction Model .....	111
3.6 Predicted Effect of White Female Candidate, State Partisanship.....	112
3.7 Gender/Race and State Partisanship Interaction Model.....	113
3.8 Predicted Effect of Candidate Race/Gender by Region.....	114
3.9 Gender/Race and Southern State Interaction Model.....	115



## 1. INTRODUCTION

### i. Statement of the Problem

As we continue in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the social movements and efforts for gender and racial equality that fueled generations worth of protest seem to have substantially waned. African-Americans endured a history of political oppression in the United States that was slowly but systematically dismantled with the passage of the 15<sup>th</sup> Amendment, the dissolution of Jim Crow segregation, and the promise of social inclusion (as separate was inherently unequal) through the Civil Rights movement. In 2008, Barack Obama was elected to the highest political office in the nation and again, in 2012, the first African-American president secured a second term. African-Americans are not along as racial/ethnic minorities with increasing political opportunities. Hispanic-Americans are the largest growing demographic in the country and their power at the polls has been attributed to a number of electoral victories (US Census Bureau, 2010). In a nation where suffrage was long dominated by a white population, now on the verge of eclipse, the racial and ethnic minorities have made substantial, albeit hard-fought, strides.

The political landscape for women's position has also exhibited notable changes just within the last century. Granted the right to vote through the 19<sup>th</sup> Amendment, women have become increasingly active in politics. No longer relegated to the solely local or small positions, women comprise a large segment of the electorate and when a candidate ignores or disregards the "woman's vote" or the "women's issues," such ignorance is reciprocated by female voters at the polls. Though we have yet to elect a female chief of state, the value of the female experience and perspective on the whole seems to finally be achieving equal

recognition after an enduring historical legacy of sex-based exclusion and political oppression.

Yet though these strides mark an impressive inclusion of minorities and women in terms of voting participation, the divergence between those casting ballots and those whose names appear on ballots marks a radical shift. The lack of diversity within public office in the US extends nearly every level and every branch of government and transcends the cultural and socio-political boundaries of the states. As no distinctively impeding barriers prohibit women or racial minorities from running, the gaping underrepresentation of these groups merits critical analysis.

In terms of race and ethnicity, the most recent 2010 Census reported that approximately 36% of the country's population was either Non-White or Hispanic. However, racial and ethnic minorities occupy far fewer political positions, both elected and appointed. At the federal level, only 43 members (9%) of Congress are African-Americans (and they are exclusively in the House of Representatives), while 31 members (7%) are Hispanic or Latino, 12 are Asian (2%), and one (>1%) is Native American (Manning and Brudnick, 2013). In the Supreme Court, only one of its nine members is African-American and one is Latino, which totals to just 22%. Though White officials exclusively dominated the presidency until 2008, other positions within the executive branch remain overwhelmingly White.

At the state level some regional variation exists in the level of minority representation, yet African-Americans and Hispanic remain underrepresented at all levels of state government. Only one governor presently out of the fifty is Non-White and an average of 9% of the state legislative bodies' seats are held by African-American

representatives (National Conference on State Legislatures, 2009). Interestingly, states in the South tend to have the most Black legislators (with Mississippi leading all states at 29% of its total state legislature, Alabama at 24%, and Georgia and South Carolina tied at 22%) but even here the percentage of Black representatives is not proportionate to the size of the African-American population in the state (National Conference on State Legislatures, 2009).

For women, the picture is equally bleak with regards to holding public office, in spite of the fact that they numerically represent a majority of the population. Though they comprise roughly 51% of the total citizenry, women remain underrepresented in all branches of both state and federal government. At the federal level, women in the Congress account for 94 of the seats (17%) which can be further broken down by the 77 in the House and 17 in the Senate (Manning and Brudnick, 2013). On the Supreme Court bench, women represent only 3 of the 9 seats (33%) though the present composition still represents a record for gender representation on the Court. As already noted, the presidency and vice presidency positions have always been dominated by men.

Women's involvement in elected office is more prevalent in state and local positions, however, even these arenas are far from equitable and encouraging. The average percentage of women in the state legislatures averages around 23% and none of these actually achieves a balance comparable to the constituency populations (Colorado being the closest with 46% of its state legislature female) (*Center for American Women and Politics*, 2013.) Governorships are likewise rarely occupied by women (only 5 of 50 states currently boast female chief executives) and other lower positions in the state executive branch follow suit. The low numbers of women in elected office, at all levels and branches

of government, is not only disappointing for representative democracy, but it is the reality of the political arena still in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

## II. Basis for Research

While this marked underrepresentation is unfortunate, numerous studies have dedicated normative theories and empirical support to understand both the gender gap and the racial/ethnic gap in representation. Because most studies focus exclusively on either gender differences or racial/ethnic differences, the subsequent explanations conjured to interpret the low numbers of women and racial/ethnic minorities in public office differ. Following this distinction is imperative, as it delves into the larger cultural differences of race/ethnicity in the US and those of gender.

Much of the literature on race/ethnicity and campaigning and elections demonstrates that race matters in a variety of ways with regards to election outcomes (Terkildsen, 1993; Lublin, 1997; Reeves, 1997; Lai et al., 2001; Griffin & Keane, 2006). The most prevalent theories regarding the impact of the candidate's racial/ethnic background center on socialized stereotypes, the application of these attitudes on policy differences and political desirability, and economic and social challenges that still exist today. Each aspect of this racial/gender gap plays a unique role in both the campaign and the election for members of this unrepresented group into office.

Grounded in a treacherous history plagued by racial tension and oppression, numerous studies have articulated how an individual's race plays into our broader social understandings of identity. Research in public opinion has revealed that overt racial attitudes, such as the blatant racism once ubiquitous in American culture, have decreased.

Covert racial attitudes, however, have not declined and though they carry a dissimilar message and significance, the underlying issue of race-based difference and hierarchy.

The role of identity and political agenda are also important, as individuals from special groups (such as African-Americans) are perceived of embracing a unique group-focused agenda that caters more to that unique community's needs and interests over others (Bratton & Haynie, 1999; Bratton, 2002; Miller, 2005). The irony that a similar white-centered agenda does not exist can be attributed to the association of white as the norm and other racial/ethnic groups to be the other. When running for election in a diverse district, non-white candidates must keep these in mind, regardless of their truth in application (Cameron et al., 1996; Epstein & O'Halloran, 1999; Barreto, 2004.)

Economic and social disparities still exist between white Americans and non-white Americans, in spite of the abolition of legal and social structures once instituted to preserve such a hierarchy (Brown & Misra, 2003; Huffman & Cohen, 2004). Some differences are grounded in the traditions of colonization, slavery, and segregation, and have historically contributed to the consistent undermining of non-white individuals. While most stereotypes of racial/ethnic inferiority are commonly disregarded as false and archaic, the historical legacy of these perspectives remain entrenched in numerous aspects of modern life. Institutions ranging from the criminal justice system, to entitlement programs, to education all embody various ways and examples of racism (Petersilia, 1983; Nelson, 2002; Farkas, 2003; Smedley & Smith, 2003.)

The socio-economic gap between white families and non-white families is likewise still prevalent. Even in the same positions with the same industries, non-whites tend to earn less than whites, which creates a larger net effect over time. These practices of

implicit racism can seem nominal taken singly, but the cumulative outcome results in racist perceptions and practices that can be incredibly influential in a campaign. A non-white candidate may have less individual funds to contribute to his/her own campaign and simultaneously must battle with the notions that his/her lived experience and value as a candidate fails to reflect the voting base's beliefs. Certainly, in areas in which the racial/ethnic minorities comprise a majority, these opinions may not be as impactful, but in larger areas, in which the districts span a wide geographic range and represent more heterogeneity, they can play a significant role.

As states vary in their legislative compositions with regards to race and gender, they also vary in important institutional differences that can in turn affect their composition. A series of institutional features: term in office, number of days in term, staff size, and annual salary, accompanied the transition of many states to more professionalized state legislatures. Since the 1950s, state legislatures have become more professionalized, which proponents argued offered more opportunities for diversity in participation, as the increase in service accompanied an increase in compensation and made serving as a legislator a profession rather than supplemental activity (Moncrief, 1988; Fiorina, 1994; Fiorina, 1997; Stonecash & Agathangelou, 1997; Fiorina, 1999; Berry et al., 2000; Meinke & Hasecke, 2003). The more professionalized state legislatures provided lucrative opportunities that would not relegate only individuals with supplemental time and money to take part (such as the less professionalized state legislatures) but enabled those to pursue the office as a full-time, if temporary, job. Because of the very nature of such institutional change, it is impervious to partisan realignments and typical political fluctuations.

As one author wryly commented, the increasing professionalization allowed for not only the real estate agent to serve in public office, but also provided a way in which the secretary at such an agency could participate (Fiorina, 1994). Given the propensity (both historically but still currently) of secretarial roles and administrative support staff to be filled overwhelmingly by women and the dominance of the business elite leaders to still be men, the impact professionalization could have on gender representation deserves real consideration. Addressing a slightly different angle, a socioeconomic divide still leaves most racial/ethnic minorities in the periphery of earning power; coupled with fewer opportunities, less educational attainment, and generally holding less prestigious positions on the job market, African-Americans and Latinos in particular have diminished earning potential compared to white Americans. Considering a less professionalized state legislature, then, the potential for someone who comes from that background to serve is significantly diminished.

### iii. Purpose of the Study

This dissertation examines the influence of state level features and the fundraising results of underrepresented groups in gender and race. In order to understand how states vary in the campaign finance and the candidate's gender and race, the first general study focuses on whether a gap generally, with all other state variation controlled. Do women tend to fundraise less than men across the states? Do racial/ethnic minorities fundraise less than white candidates? How do these identities impact fundraising when they are compounded, such as for non-white women?

Three hypotheses and separate models testing interactional effects concentrate on specific state-level features: legislative professionalization, state partisan preference, and the regional culture. The first approach, legislative professionalization, assesses how the level of professionalization of the legislature may influence the campaign fundraising outcomes between male and female candidates. Incorporating a large body of previous research that has yet to be connected, the purpose of this study is to determine if professionalization matters with regards to female candidate's fundraising outcomes. Because the original argument endorsing institutional professionalization claimed its ability to make public offices more accessible to all interested citizens in government, its simultaneous advantages in promoting more diverse representation with regards to gender and race seems natural (Fiorina, 1994 and 1999; Meinke & Hasecke, 2003). But has professionalization of state legislatures created this sort of impact in mitigating such gaps?

The second approach involves the state's partisan preference and incorporates literature that finds women and racial/ethnic minorities tend to align with the Democratic party. As these types of candidates run more often and have more success on the Democratic ticket, it would follow that they could be more successful in fundraising endeavors in states that vote more often for Democratic candidates. A blue Democratic state may be more likely to encourage women and minorities to run for political office and also more likely to fund these candidates. State partisanship is not an easy variable to determine but by averaging the popular vote total from the previous three presidential elections, we can summarize whether a state leans more Democrat or Republican.

Lastly, the third approach and final focus of this study addresses whether there is a unique cultural element occurring in state legislative elections in the South. The South has



long been identified for its unusual political culture that has separated it from the rest of the country and inspired many “South” dummy variables to control for such an effect. Understanding if that cultural distinction of the South has an effect on the relationship between fundraising and gender/race, here, however is important. Southern states rank among the lowest in women’s representation and, though they have a higher percentage of African-American officials, proportionately to the population, there is a clear race gap as well.

Though many studies have addressed the larger issues of gender and race disparities, none have applied them in a state-wide comparison in terms of campaign finance. The ways in which states are beneficial for such an analysis is two-fold. First, they serve as a wonderful method of natural experimentation from which we can assess the effects of gender and race/ethnicity, campaign finance, and institution professionalization. Second, they prove to be an arena in which the presence of both women and minority groups has successfully expanded, though far from uniformly, and the variation amongst the election of women merits further examination. As legislatures provide large and fairly similar groups from which we can establish broader comparisons, focusing on the variations across legislative bodies serves the key objectives underlying in this study.

The nature of this research proves timely, as well, given the recent landmark elections of 2008, 2010, and 2012 regarding the gender and race gaps. In 2008, Barack Obama became the first African-American president and the Republican party nominated Sarah Palin, the first female Republican candidate for vice-president. Just two years later, the 2010 elections marked the first that the number of women elected in state and federal level offices actually declined. Then in 2012, Barack Obama was reelected to a second term

in office and a record number of African-Americans were elected to the House of Representatives. The old opinions that politics is a white man's game seem to have dissolved, yet the reality of the electoral outcomes reveals that, relative to their proportion of the actual population, white men do still dominate public offices. Money is irrevocably tied to successful campaigns but identifying differences that may inhibit or assist candidates from underrepresented groups can lead the way into further understanding a gender and racial/ethnic gap that continues to persist.

Ultimately, this dissertation aims to explore how the candidate's gender and race/ethnicity is influential in his/her fundraising totals, how this varies across the states, and how three types of variation further impact that relationship.

The legislative professionalization, state partisanship, and Southern effect serve as interesting approaches to understanding this relationship. Additionally, they provide alternative explanations in determining why female and racial/ethnic minority candidates fundraise more in some states relative to others. With the increase in candidate-centered elections, the constant climbing costs of campaigning, and a greater interest in more diverse institutions, this study is both relevant and necessary.

#### iv. Explanation of the Collection

This dissertation consists of three independent articles involving a larger theme of the impact of state variation on underrepresented groups through campaign finance. The collaborative thread that ties the three together is the emphasis on particular groups that have been both historically excluded and are presently marginalized with regards to numeric representation. Naturally, any number of groups fitting this description could apply but the locus for this research lies within gender and race/ethnicity groups for a

number of reasons. First, these are arguably the most notable underrepresented groups and the rich breadth of literature for both women and racial and ethnic minorities provides a number of plausible understandings for the gap, which establishes a valid basis from which this study will expand. Secondly, both of these groups are large and identifiable (though certainly not homogenous within themselves).

The articles will examine the same trends of legislative professionalization, state partisanship, and Southern location, identifying how these state differences influence gender and race through campaign finance. They separately address these effects female and non-white candidates, enabling a more comprehensive understanding of how the fundraising gaps vary. The first article will concentrate on the effects on gender, the second article will focus on the effects on racial/ethnic minorities, and the third article will concentrate on the impact on intersectional effect incorporating gender and race.

## REFERENCES

- Barreto, M. A., Segura, G. M., & Woods, N. D.(2004).The mobilizing effect of majority-minority districts on Latino turnout. *American Political Science Review*, 98(1), 65-75.
- Berry, W.D., Berkman, M.B., & Schneiderman, S. (2000). Legislative professionalism and incumbent reelection: The development of institutional boundaries. *American Political Science Review*, 94 (4): 182-206
- Bratton, K.A., & Haynie, K.L.. Agenda setting and legislative success in state legislatures: The effects of gender and race. *Journal of Politics* 61: 658-679.
- Bratton, K. A. (2002). The effect of legislative diversity on agenda setting evidence from six state legislatures. *American Politics Research*, 30(2), 115-142.
- Browne, I., & Misra, J. (2003). The intersection of gender and race in the labor market. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 487-513.
- Cameron, C., Epstein, D., & O'Halloran, S (1996). Do majority-minority districts maximize substantive black representation in Congress? *American Political Science Review*, 794-812.
- Center for American Women and Politics*. (2013). Women in state legislatures: 2013 Fact sheet.
- Epstein, D., & O'Halloran, S. (1999). Measuring the electoral and policy impact of majority-minority voting districts. *American Journal of Political Science*, 367-395.
- Farkas, G.(2003).Racial disparities and discrimination in education: What do we know, how do we know it, and what do we need to know? *The Teachers College Record*, 105(6), 1119-1146.
- Fiorina, M. P. (1994). Divided government in the American states: A byproduct of legislative professionalism? *American Political Science Review*. 88:304-316.
- Fiorina, M. P. (1997). Professionalism, realignment, and representation. *American Political Science Review*. 91:156-162
- Fiorina, M. P. (1999). Further evidence of the partisan consequences of legislative professionalism. *American Journal of Political Science* 43(3): 974-77.
- Griffin, J. D., & Keane, M. (2006). Descriptive representation and the composition of African American turnout. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(4), 998-1012.

- Huffman, M. L., & Cohen, P. N. (2004). Racial wage inequality: Job segregation and devaluation across US Labor Markets. *American Journal of Sociology*, 109(4), 902-936.
- Lai, J. S., Cho, W. K. T., Kim, T. P., & Takeda, O. (2001). Asian Pacific-American campaigns, elections, and elected officials. *Political Science & Politics*, 34(3), 611-617.
- Lublin, D. (1997). The election of African Americans and Latinos to the US House of Representatives, 1972-1994. *American Politics Research*, 25(3), 269-286.
- Manning, J.E. & Brudnick, I.A. (2013). Women in the United States Congress. 1917-2013: Biographical and committee assignment information, and listings by state and Congress. *Congressional Research Service*, 7:5700, 1-107.
- Meinke S.R.; Hasecke E.B. (2003). Term limits, professionalization, and partisan control in U.S. state legislatures. *Journal of Politics*, 65 (3) 898-908.
- Miller, C. M. (2005). Agenda-setting by state legislative Black caucuses: Policy priorities and factors of success. *Review of Policy Research*, 9(2): 339-354.
- Moncrief, G. F.(1988). Dimensions of the concept of professionalism in state legislatures: A research note. *State & Local Government Review*, 128-132.
- Nelson, A.(2002).Unequal treatment: confronting racial and ethnic disparities in health care. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, 94(8): 666.
- Petersilia, J. (1983). *Racial disparities in the criminal justice system*, Santa Monica, Ca.: Rand Corporation.
- Reeves, K. (1997). *Voting hopes or fears?: White voters, Black candidates, and racial politics in America*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Schaffner, B. F. (2005). "Campaigning on women's issues in U.S. Senate elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 49(4): 803-817.
- Smedley, B. D., & Smith, A. Y. (2003). *Unequal treatment: Confronting racial and ethnic disparities in health care* (Vol. 1). National Academy Press.
- Stonecash, J. M. & Agathangelou, A.M. (1997). Trends in the partisan composition of state legislatures: A response to Fiorina. *American Political Science Review*. 91:148-155.
- Terkildsen, N. (1993). When white voters evaluate black candidates: The processing implications of candidate skin color, prejudice, and self-monitoring. *American Journal of Political Science*, 1032-1053.
- US Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2010 American Community Survey 1-

Year Estimates, Table GCT0101; generated using American FactFinder;  
<http://factfinder2.census.gov>

Welch, S.(1978). Recruitment of women to public office: A discriminate analysis. *Western Political Quarterly*, 31: 372-380.

## 2. ARTICLE I

### Pink Money, Blue Money: The Impact of State Political Context on the Relationship between Gender and Campaign Finance

#### Abstract

Over twenty years after “The Year of the Woman,” women still lag behind men in many aspects of politics, including fundraising. In the era of modern campaigning, with the expenses of advertising and polling, among others, ample funds are necessary but not universally accessible to all candidates. Women are already economically disadvantaged (earning 77 cents on average to every male dollar) and as they are traditionally underrepresented in politics, they may have a limited political network from which they can seek financial support. This study addresses the relationship between candidate gender and campaign fundraising, and the possible mediating impact of three dimensions of the state political context – state legislative professionalism, state Republican party strength, and state culture (South vs. Nonsouth). I evaluate fundraising totals across 15 states for over 3,000 candidates in the 2006 state legislative elections. Ultimately, the findings suggest that after controlling for other candidate characteristics, as well as district and state context, there is no statistically significant relationship between candidate gender and fundraising. In addition, there appears to be little variation in the effect of gender across the three dimensions of state political context. This study finds that while the relationship is weak, female candidates continue to fundraise less than their male counterparts, the difference was not statistically significant and state variation is important in understanding the gender gap in campaign finance.

#### I. Introduction

As we continue in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, women on the international stage have earned increasingly powerful roles in government. No longer relegated to solely local or less important political offices, women are now regularly elected to prominent positions, including important

legislative, executive, judicial, and administrative offices. A handful of nations have even elected a woman to lead them in the chief executive position, including Germany (Angela Merkel) and Great Britain (Margaret Thatcher). The value of the female experience and the need for diverse perspectives seems to finally be achieving equal recognition after a historical legacy of sex-based exclusion and oppression.

Yet in the United States, arguably one of the greatest modern democracies, women still hold only a fraction of the important political offices that guide the policy and politics of our country and states. The United States has witnessed an increase in women's participation, both in running for office and getting elected, but this trend still falls short of parity with the population proportion and remains well behind most other modernized nations. Nearly a century after securing suffrage and earning the right to vote, women remain underrepresented in all branches of both state and federal government. For example, women comprise only 16 percent of the U.S. Congress, one-third of the Supreme Court, and the presidency has always been occupied by men (Center for American Women and Politics, 2010).

Women's involvement in elected office is more prevalent in state and local positions, however, the levels of descriptive representation in these arenas are far from equitable. The percentage of women in state legislatures averages around 23 percent and no state legislature achieves a balance comparable to the constituency population (Colorado being the closest with 38 percent of its state legislature female) (Facts on Women in State Legislatures, 2012). Governorships are likewise run by few women (only 6 of 50 states boast female chief executives) and other lower positions in the state executive branch follow suit (Center for American Women and Politics, 2010). The low numbers of women in elected office, at all levels



and branches of government, is not only disappointing for representative democracy, but remains the reality of the political arena in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Numerous studies have sought to understand the gender gap in representation. Over the past thirty years, explanations underscoring the social and economic climate, institutional features, and political barriers have been offered to explain why fewer women are elected to government offices in comparison to men. Earlier theories rooted in societal norms that claimed women were viewed as being incapable or disinterested in politics have long since been debunked and a number of prominent and successful female politicians have demonstrated women's effectiveness both in the polls and on the assembly floor. Women are likewise becoming increasingly more educated and actually out-graduating their male peers (Goldin, Katz, & Kuziemko, 2006). Though they still earn less than men, women play a more active role in careers outside the home; a trend that economists believe will only continue (Kessler-Harris, 2003).

Given that women's roles in political engagement are now socially permissible and even encouraged, one of the most important barriers to the election of women lies in their ability to mount an effective campaign. Critical to such efforts is fundraising. In the era of the modern campaign, necessitating frequent advertising in expensive media markets, mass mailings, telephone communication to voters, and a team of professional consultants, ample financial support is instrumental to electoral success (Stratmann, 1991, Stratmann, 2006). Studies have addressed the challenges of campaign fundraising for female candidates (Burrell, 1985; Green, 2003; Hogan, 2007; Crespin & Deitz, 2010), including the recent proliferation of female-centered PACs (such as Emily's List or Wish List) aimed at mitigating the "early-money" gap that divides victorious campaigns from unsuccessful ones (Nelson, 1995; Francia, 2001). Much

of this research has concentrated on a particular state and a single presumed barrier. To date, there has been no recent multi-state study that examines the effects of a variety of explanatory variables, such as partisanship, cultural differences, and institutional professionalization on the gender gap in state campaign fundraising.

In this paper, I examine the effect of gender on campaign fundraising in state legislative elections. Restricting the focus to state legislative campaigns provides a consistent mode of comparison and offers a significant number of observations to control for a host of district and state-level characteristics. Utilizing a sample that includes 15 states, 2,048 legislative seats, and a total of 3,087 candidates running for public office (683 of them female), I conduct a fixed-effects regression analysis of the effect of gender on state legislative candidate fundraising, as well as the mediating effects legislative professionalization, state partisanship, and state culture. After controlling for candidate, district and state-level factors, I find that there is no statistically significant effect of gender on campaign fundraising. In addition, there appears to be little variation in the effect of gender across the three dimensions of state political context.

## II. Literature Review

Barbara Burrell (1990) was among the first scholars to determine that although fewer women run for office compared to men, women who run actually fare well compared to their male opponents. Subsequent studies have found that, when all other factors are equal, this original assessment continues to hold true (Dolan, 2004; Fox, 2006; Hogan, 2001). Rather, success in campaign fundraising has been found to be related to partisanship, social values, institutional features, and the variety of campaign contributions.

First, the relationship between gender and campaign finance is influenced by the candidate's partisan affiliations. Matland and King (2002) found that for Democratic candidates, gender was for the most part irrelevant. For Republican candidates, a woman would generally incur a significant difficulty in obtaining their party's endorsement, but once running on the Republican ticket, they would gain support from moderate Democrats and independents, while retaining much of their Republican-base. Kathleen Dolan (2008) argued that partisanship is related to the public perception of female candidates and the individual voter's opinion of female candidates, both which also play a significant role in election results.

The implications of social values and how women are perceived is also important in understanding how much money they are able to raise as candidates, relative to their male counterparts. Earlier research focused on gender socialization, noting that politics was often considered a man's game and it was unacceptable for women to participate in politics or fundraising (Lee, 1977; King, 1977; Stoper, 1977; Welch, 1978; Flammang, 1997). While the old adage does not necessarily apply in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, social factors are still cited as impediments to women's involvement, particularly family and support structures that complicate the decision to run for a woman in comparison to a man (Lawless, Fox, & Freely, 2001; Carroll & Sanbonmatsu, 2009). Women and men initially exhibit similar levels of interests in running for office, but when women are ignored for candidacy in a particular position, they will pass on the opportunity without ample encouragement and support (Lawless and Fox, 2004). As early fundraising initiatives are critical, deciding not to run or waiting until late in the election cycle can have serious implications.

Next, other studies have noted institutional features, such as term limits and single-member districts, can exhibit inherent biases against women's decision to run campaigns

(Carroll, 1994; Carroll & Jenkins, 2001; Darcy, Welch, & Clark, 1994; Rule, 1981). When men face less socialized and economic obstacles towards conducting a successful bid for a position, women are more likely to struggle in single-member districts competing against men, rather than in multimember districts with more than two candidates. Term limits typically yield positive results in allowing more women to compete for public office, though these do not exist in all legislatures. Incumbency, a powerful variable in American politics on nearly any level, is even more pervasive, as men already obtain an overwhelming majority of the elected offices and the benefits of this minimize the chances of a female challenger winning in a race. The benefits of incumbency extend to fundraising, and give the current seat holder an edge in not only name recognition and experience, but financing a campaign to further remind voters of such.

Finally, another reason women may be less inclined to declare candidacy for public office is due to the processes of the election and positions themselves and how they require women to make challenging decisions less likely to be incurred by their male competitors (Rule, 1988; Lawless & Fox, 2004). Though women enjoy fundraising and personal campaigning working on self-promotion as much as their male counterparts, they also must do more of it in order to achieve the same level of recognition with the voters and the time necessary to establish this is time that is needed to cultivate other aspects of the campaign as well.

For female candidates who are more likely to come into the race at a disadvantage (by having worked in politics less than their male counterparts and encountering more social prejudices against her bid), partisanship and fundraising are essential. Individual and PAC contributions can make a significant difference in the ultimate success of a campaign. Given the prevailing importance of PAC endorsement, female candidates are in a particularly vulnerable state, where the support of a PAC, especially early in the campaign, can really make a needed

difference in the eventual outcome of the race (Connor Green, 2004). Partisanship plays a role in PAC support, as well, particularly given the saliency of certain gendered political issues (Day, Hadley, & Duffy Brown, 2001; Day & Hadley, 2002).

Donors, both as individuals and as heads of PACs, want to support candidates they believe have solid potential at being able to win. Funds are needed, of course, as a part of doing this, however PACs wait to review candidates carefully and precisely choose who will receive not only their hearty endorsement, but additionally their financial weight. It is a problematic cycle in one sense: as the more women who win, the more PACs will choose to support them, the more PACs contribute to women's races, the more women will win. Because of the recurring nature of this relationship, it is difficult for women running for office to secure PAC support and it is risky for PACs to contribute until they are confident in the potential of the candidacy. It is critical to note PACs that specifically focus on bundling campaign contributions towards female candidates, such as EMILY's List (for Democrats) and WISH List (for Republicans) devote their efforts to select states. This is likely to do with the perceived viability of the candidates and the fact that few women have established political careers, making the prospect of future expansion uncertain.

### III. Theory and Hypotheses

As the literature review suggests, gender and fundraising with more comprehensive data and coverage of the states is necessary. To better understand the differences among states, this study will test four primary hypotheses that concentrate on state-level variation in campaign fundraising within the context of state legislative elections. First, following the trajectory of the previous literature, I believe that, on the whole, male candidates will garner more in fundraising

compared to female candidates. This gap, however, will depend on the level of institutional professionalization, the strength of the Democratic party's presence, and the geographic location of the states.

The second hypothesis focuses on the impact of institutional professionalization on the gender gap in campaign funding. The more professionalized state legislatures appear more attractive to candidates, offering increased accessibility of resources (including salary and staff) and competition for such resources. A more professionalized state enables one to work solely as a legislator and, coinciding with the power and prestige, encourages competition for these desirable seats, weeding out less viable (and less well-funded) candidates early in the primaries to ensure a higher quality match for the general elections. A less professionalized state legislature offers a much lower salary commensurate with a citizen legislature and a smaller staff. This requires the legislator to maintain a full-time occupation that is both flexible and economically advantageous, one that women who already earn less and occupy fewer managerial roles are equally less likely to hold. I believe that states that are more professionalized will demonstrate fewer differences (if any) in gendered campaign fundraising effects. Following the imagery established by Blair (1988) and reemphasized by Fiorina (1994) that certain professions are more conducive to enabling individuals to run for office in these less professionalized states and adding that these positions are usually occupied by white men, it would follow that less professionalized legislatures draw fewer non-white women to compete.

The third hypothesis asserts that partisanship at the state level is influential in the gender gap in campaign finance. The presence and strength of the party is influential in fundraising and can explain the propensity of certain states to prefer candidates from a particular party. Coupled with the notion that female candidates remain most often Democratic (though the number of

Republican women has grown slightly), I believe that women running in Democratic-leaning states exhibit fewer fundraising disparities compared to men, with regards to a more substantial gap between women and men in more Republican-leaning states. As more women are likely to be Democrat, they are also more likely to get money from that party and a Democratic state signifies one that accepts the party’s platform, which is generally more progressive on women’s issues and issues of liberty and equality. Thus, I believe the gap will widen between men and women in Republican-leaning states compared to men and women in Democratic-leaning states.

The final hypothesis maintains that the unique political culture of the South is influential in the gender gap in fundraising, resulting in a greater disparity between male and female candidates. The South has been historically both very conservative with regards to gender equality and also one-party dominated (originally by the Democrats following Reconstruction and now, following a realignment, by the Republicans). This distinctive social and political climate is unique and suggests that a gender-based gap in fundraising would be exaggerated within the South, compared to the non-South states. Coupling the disadvantages of female composition (Southern states consistently rank among the lowest in women’s involvement), economic equality, and partisan strength, I hypothesize that the fundraising gap between male and female candidates will be greater outside the South, rather than within it.

Table 1. Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1	Male candidates will fundraise more money than female candidates in state legislative elections, when all other mitigating factors (quality, leadership, etc.) are held constant.
Hypothesis 2	The effect of gender (i.e. the difference in dollars raised between male candidates and female candidates) will diminish as the professionalism of a state’s legislature increases.
Hypothesis 3	The effect of gender (i.e. the difference in dollars raised between male candidates and female candidates) will diminish as the strength of the Democratic party in a state increases. *
Hypothesis 4	The effect of gender (i.e. the difference in dollars raised between male candidates and female candidates) will be larger in the South

than outside the South.
-------------------------

#### IV. Data and Methodology

In order to examine the relationship between gender and the amount of money raised for state legislative campaigns, I conducted a review of the public campaign finance record. I chose 2006 as the year of study for a number of reasons. Most importantly, it served as the off-year congressional elections between two presidential races, thus minimizing the effects of a national presidential race on state politics. Retrospective analyses noted that Democrats did slightly better (relating to President George W. Bush's declining popularity (Jacobsen, 2008) but this had a marginal effect on state legislative seats. Thus, there is good reason to think that the 2006 election cycle was not affected by unique historical circumstances, and the results are more likely to be generalizable to other periods.

This election cycle provides a nice time because the time was slightly more gender neutral given the diminished significance of hard policy arenas (economy and war) on which women are typically deemed worse to handle. If this stereotypical association were relevant to the salient issues, it could result in diminished support for female candidates. It is probable that promptly following the invasion or the economic recession, voters would have employed the stereotypical gendered associations and biased this experience. Finally, these elections occurred relatively recently enough to be relevant to the current political mood while they are still distant enough to enable us to consider the larger implications of their results.

Due to the labor-intensive nature of the data collection process, it was not feasible to collect data for all 50 states. Therefore, I collected data for a sample of 15 states that were carefully selected to ensure variation in their level of state legislative professionalization, regional location, and state partisanship. A full summary of the descriptive statistics within this



sample is included in the appendix (Appendix - Table 1). Among the most important variables, however, the average of the total dollar amount fundraised was \$129,050.50 and women comprised 22.81%, which is close to the national average of 24.5% (Facts on Women in State Legislatures, 2012). The table below (Table 2) lists the states used in this analysis, along with data for several relevant contextual variables.

Table 2. States Selected for Campaign Fundraising Comparison

State	Professional. of Legislature ∞	Campaign Finance Laws <sup>^</sup>	Geographic Region	State Partisanship <sup>δ</sup>	Gender Composition *
Alabama	Moderate	Open	South	R - 56.35%	Low (12.9%)
California	High	Moderate	West	D - 52.95%	Mod (27.5%)
Colorado	Moderate	Restrictive	West	R - 49.41%	High (38.0%)
Connecticut	Moderate	Restrictive	Northeast	D - 54.35%	High (32.1%)
Georgia	Slightly Low	Restrictive	South	R - 53.22%	Low (19.1%)
Illinois	Slightly High	Open	Midwest	D - 54.58%	Mod (28.2%)
Iowa	Moderate	Open	Midwest	D - 49.34%	Mod (23.2%)
Michigan	High	Moderate	Midwest	D - 51.40%	Mod (25.0%)
Mississippi	Slightly Low	Open	South	R - 55.42%	Low (14.4%)
Nevada	Slightly Low	High	West	R - 47.63%	High (31.7%)
New York	High	Restrictive	Northeast	D - 59.35%	Mod (24.1%)
North Dakota	Low	Open	Midwest	R - 56.82%	Low (17.0%)
South Carolina	Moderate	Moderate	South	R - 54.90%	Low (10.0%)
Wisconsin	Slightly High	High	Midwest	D - 48.78%	Mod (22.0%)
Wyoming	Low	Moderate	West	R - 62.14%	Low (16.7%)
<b>Average</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	24.5%
∞ as defined by the National Center of State Legislatures ©2012					
δ the average of state presidential votes for the three previous elections, from data available by the Federal Election Commission © 1996, 2000, & 2004					
* from data available by the Center for American Women in Politics ©2010					
<sup>^</sup> refer to Table 1. in the Appendices					

Data was collected from the authentic ballots secured by the Board of Elections (at the state level) and financial donor reports available through the databases of the Institute for Money in State Politics. Additional demographic information about individual candidates was gathered through individual research on independent candidates (via their campaign websites, party websites, and press releases). Every effort was made to confirm the accuracy of the data collected and the reputability of the source from which it is originally derived. This conservative approach to ensure the accuracy of the data occasionally led to some observations (candidates) being dropped from the set for incomplete available information. The dataset consisted of a total number of 3,003 Republican and Democratic general election candidates running in a total number of 2,105 legislative races, and who raised at least \$1,000. Third-party candidates were excluded due to the fact that these candidates rarely raise much money and, with rare exception, are not successful at the ballot box. Finally, the \$1,000 threshold for inclusion in the sample ensures that candidates who filed for the election but never truly conducted a campaign (and therefore were not serious or viable) were not a part of this analysis; this cut-off is very conservative to ensure no unnecessary eliminations were made (Vonnahme, 2012).

To test the hypotheses, an ordinary least squares regression was used, establishing the individual candidate as the primary unit of analysis and utilizing the total dollar amount raised as the dependent variable.

$$y(\text{total dollar amount}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{gender}) + \beta_2(\text{party}) + \beta_3(\text{assembly}) + \beta_4(\text{quality}) + \beta_5(\text{primary competition}) + \beta_6(\text{leadership}) + \beta_7(\text{incumbency}) + \beta_8(\text{open seat}) + \beta_9(\text{district economic affluence}) + \beta_{10}(\text{district education attainment}) + \beta_{11}(\text{moderately professionalized institution}) + \beta_{12}(\text{highly professionalized institution}) + \beta_{13}(\text{state partisanship}) + \beta_{14}(\text{geographic location}) + \varepsilon$$

The independent variables included in this analysis capture qualities at the individual candidate level, the individual election/district level, and the state level. A comprehensive

description of the coding explanations and procedures is included in the Appendix (Table 2) but a brief summary follows. The variables denoting difference at the individual candidate level include partisanship, incumbency, open seat, challenger, leadership position (within the assembly), and candidate quality. Partisanship can play a very substantial role in the involvement of racial and ethnic minorities, as the earlier literature review suggests, and can also be influential in fundraising. As noted earlier, candidates identifying as independent or not running under either the Democrat or Republican parties were rare and excluded for the purposes of the study.

Traditional variables noted for their relationship to fundraising were also incorporated. Incumbency and open seat status were used individually as dichotomous responses, as well as intra-assembly leadership because of their relationship to fundraising (Biersack, Herrnson, & Wilcox, 1993; Krasno, Green, & Cowden, 1994). If the individual previously held a high position within that particular house, such as Speaker of the House, then that was included as a control as well (Sorauf, 1992). A candidate running for reelection who is the current Speaker might garner more campaign funds for his/her higher position of power, but it is possible that by attaining such status, that legislator has a long political legacy, which would diminish the need for excessive fundraising. Finally, the perceived viability of the candidate was assessed to determine if the candidate was a quality candidate (Jacobson & Kernell, 1983; Bond, Covington, & Fleisher, 1985).

Additional variables included the presence of opposition in the primary election and specific district level data including the educational and poverty levels. Opposition in either the primary or general election was important to include in the data set. Whether an opponent existed (within one's own party in the primary competition or on the opposing party in the

general competition) could impact the total amount of money raised (Jacobson, 2004; Mutz, 1995). Though this analysis looks strictly at the total amount of funds raised (disregarding the points of time in the campaign in which they were secured), the influence competition would have on the overall total is worth consideration. Primary competition and general competition were parsed into two variables to account for races in which the type of competition varied (again, affecting fundraising).

Using data available from the 2000 Census reports provided variables for educational and poverty levels within the district. District educational attainment was measured as the percentage of adults over age 25 who held a high school diploma (US Census 2000). District poverty levels encompassed all adults over age 25 who were at or below the poverty level (US Census, 2000).

These variables captured two important district characteristics that are influential in the gender and fundraising relationship. The district-level economic affluence variable concerns how much money individuals within the district have, which would be influential in the amount they choose to give (as donors) and the amount needed to win (as candidates). A race in a poor, rural district would likely require a lower threshold of fundraising to conduct a competitive candidacy, whereas a race in an affluent, suburban or metropolitan area might require more. This measure can be indicative of participation and also relates to economic affluence (through the positive relationship between education and income).

Finally, to capture differences among the states in the analysis, variables denoting the state partisanship, level of professionalization, and regional location were noted. The partisanship of the state, that is, the way in which a state tends to lean, could be influential in fundraising outcomes; a state that leans heavily Democrat is likely to yield candidates who are

Democrat and may garner less in fundraising totals, as the cultural preference already favors that party. Alternately, in such a one-party slanted state, the propensity of Democratic voters likely corresponds to more generous donors, so those candidates may secure more funds. This measure was calculated as the average vote share for the Republican candidate from the three most recent presidential elections prior to 2006 (1996, 2000, and 2004).

The state professionalization variable depicted the level of institutional professionalization of the legislature, following the categorizations established by the National Conference of State Legislatures and included differences such as salary, staff size, and number of days in office per session. This measure was divided into three categories denoting whether the state was “more professionalized,” “moderately professionalized,” or “less professionalized.” Finally, the geographic location of the states were noted by the boundaries established by the US Census and were then accompanied by the dichotomous component, separating them into “South” and “Non-South” groups.

## V. Findings and Discussion

To estimate the effects of these variables on campaign funding, I utilized an ordinary least squares model, with standard errors adjusted for clustering at the state level. I first estimated an additive model, the results of which are displayed below in Table 3. (A fixed effects model that assessed differences across the specific states in this sample is included in the Appendix, Table 3). Because the dependent variable is measured as the log of total funds raised, the coefficients can be interpreted as the proportional change in the dependent variable given a one-unit increase in the independent variable.

Table 3. Funds and Gender OLS Model

	Estimate	Std. Error	T-Value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	11.454	1.634	7.01	0.000 ***
Gender	-0.037	0.073	-0.51	0.620
Assembly	0.809	0.096	8.42	0.000 ***
Quality	0.594	0.139	4.26	0.001 **
Primary Competition	0.411	0.117	3.52	0.003 **
Leadership	1.109	0.317	3.50	0.004 **
Incumbency	0.299	0.126	2.38	0.032 *
Open Seat	0.942	0.089	10.49	0.000 ***
Candidate Party	-0.066	0.113	-0.58	0.569
District Poverty	-0.937	0.523	-1.79	0.095
District Education	0.046	0.032	1.46	0.167
Moderate Professionalization	0.669	0.374	1.79	0.095
High Professionalization	1.552	0.579	2.68	0.018 *
Southern States	1.413	0.325	4.34	0.001 ***
State Partisanship	-0.062	0.029	-2.15	0.050 *
Significance	0.001 '***'	0.01 '***'	0.05 '*'	
Number of Observations: 2,760				
Multiple R-squared: 0.3824, Root MSE: 1.2098				
Std. Err. adjusted for 15 clusters in states				

The results revealed that the impact of the assembly of the race, the candidate's quality, and the candidate's leadership were all highly statistically significant. The assembly in which the candidacy was focused achieved a  $p > |t|$  (0.000) with a coefficient of 0.809, indicating that candidates running for the state senate raised an average of 81% more compared their counterparts running for the state house. The candidate's quality (having won a political election in the past) yielded a  $p > |t|$  (0.000) with a coefficient of 0.594, which follows that with more experience and better networks, quality candidates would out raise political novices. Likewise, the candidate's leadership (holding a high level position within the assembly) demonstrates a positive relationship to fundraising, generating a highly statistically significant  $p > |t|$  (0.001) with a coefficient of 1.109.

The measure encompassing the presence of competition in the primary race achieved statistical significance. Candidates faced with competition in the primaries generally raised 41.1% more than those without competition ( $p > |t|$  (0.003)). Candidates who ran as incumbents, not surprisingly, indicated slight statistical significance ( $p > |t|$  (0.032)), raising 29.8% more on the whole. Likewise, candidates who ran for open seats (where the incumbent was not seeking reelection) raised 94.2% more with a  $p > |t|$  (0.000). These findings correspond with expectations as established by previous literature and reaffirm their value as control variables in this assessment.

Considering the first hypothesis, the relationship between the total funds raised and the gender of the candidate proves to be negative as the hypothesis proposed, but is weak. The candidate's gender exhibits a small impact, with a coefficient of -0.037. This suggests that female candidates raise an average of 4% less compared to male candidates, when all other mitigating factors are controlled. Yet this relationship failed to attain statistical significance, generating a  $p > |t|$  (0.620). The hypothesis that women candidates fundraised less than men was thus not upheld.

The second hypothesis suggested the less professionalized state legislature would reveal greater gaps in the fundraising disparities between male and female candidates. The model revealed a strong pattern of increased disparity, as the moderately professionalized legislatures reported a coefficient of 0.669 and a  $p > |t|$  (0.095) compared to the highly professionalized legislatures' result of 1.522 and a  $p > |t|$  (0.018). Women running in moderately professionalized states, therefore, raise 67% more than those in the least professionalized states, and women in the most professionalized states raise 152% more than their counterparts in the least professionalized states. The statistically significant positive relationship between the funds raised and the highly

professionalized legislatures illustrates the impact of the increased competition and desirability of seats in those institutions.

The third hypothesis stated that partisanship would be influential in women's ability to fundraise and that states that tended to lean Democrat would exhibit less disparity in gender fundraising compared to those that tended to lean Republican. Summarizing the three previous presidential elections in the "state partisanship" measure, the findings noted a weak, but negative effect that follows the hypothesis. States that tended to align with the Republican party denoted a negative influence on the relationship of gender and fundraising by 6.2%. In addition to a relatively small margin, it did attain slight statistical significance, with a  $p > |t|$  (0.050).

The fourth and final hypothesis surmised that female candidates running in the South would depict a greater fundraising disparity with regards to male candidates than their counterparts in the rest of the country. A strong positive relationship, however, refutes the hypothesis. The findings from the model revealed a 1.413 coefficient with a  $p > |t|$  (0.001). The relationship is statistically significant, and suggests a positive influence on the relationship between gender and fundraising with a 141.3% increase in Southern states.

In addition to the general model, separate models (Tables 4-6) assessed interactional effects within the relationship of gender and fundraising. The first interactive model (noted below in Table 4) examined the impact of institutional professionalization, corresponding to the second hypothesis that the more professionalized legislatures would exhibit less of a disparity in fundraising. Neither relationship garnered statistical significance. The interaction between gender and moderately professionalized state legislatures resulted in a coefficient of 0.149, noting the between less professionalized state legislatures and moderately professionalized ones. The  $p(>|t|)$  value was 0.467. The interaction between gender and highly professionalized state



legislatures resulted in a smaller coefficient of -0.039, indicating the difference between the highly and the less professionalized state legislatures and gender. The relationship was slightly significant with a  $p(>|t|)$  of 0.050.

Table 4. Hypothesis #2: Funds and Gender Model with State Professionalization Interaction Effect

<b>Coefficients</b>				
	Estimate	Std. Error	T-Value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	11.433	1.634	7.00	0.000 ***
Gender * Mod. Professionalization	0.149	0.205	0.73	0.476
Gender * High Professionalization	-0.039	0.205	-0.19	0.050 *
Gender	-0.074	0.147	-0.50	0.624
Assembly	0.811	0.098	8.31	0.000 ***
Quality	0.592	0.139	4.25	0.001 ***
Primary Competition	0.411	0.117	3.51	0.003 **
Leadership	1.116	0.315	3.54	0.003 **
Incumbency	0.299	0.125	2.39	0.031 *
Open Seat	0.938	0.089	10.46	0.000 ***
Candidate Party	-0.065	0.111	-0.58	0.571
District Poverty	-0.920	0.519	-1.77	0.098
District Education	0.046	0.031	1.48	0.161
Moderate Professionalization	0.641	0.385	1.66	0.118
High Professionalization	1.575	0.584	2.70	0.017 *
Southern States	1.419	0.323	4.40	0.001 ***
State Partisanship	-0.062	0.029	-2.14	0.051
Significance	0.001 '***'	0.01 '**'	0.05 '*'	
Number of Observations: 2,760				
Multiple R-squared: 0.3830, Root MSE: 1.2097				
Std. Err. adjusted for 15 clusters in states				

The second model (noted below in Table 5), coordinating with the third hypothesis that state partisanship is influential, yielded no statistically significant relationship between the overall partisan affiliations of the states and the candidate's gender. The resulting coefficient of the interaction was very marginal (0.014) with a coordinating  $p(>|t|)$  of 0.247.

Table 5. Hypothesis #3: Funds and Gender with State Partisanship Interaction Effect

<b>Coefficients</b>
---------------------

	Estimate	Std. Error	T-Value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	11.604	1.641	7.07	0.000 ***
Gender * Party Interaction	0.014	0.012	1.21	0.247
Gender	-0.696	0.544	-1.28	0.222
Assembly	0.811	0.096	8.40	0.000 ***
Quality	0.597	0.138	4.33	0.001 ***
Primary Competition	0.410	0.117	3.52	0.003 **
Leadership	1.107	0.318	3.43	0.004 **
Incumbency	0.297	0.124	2.40	0.031 *
Open Seat	0.940	0.089	10.49	0.000 ***
Candidate Party	-0.068	0.113	-0.60	0.559
District Education	0.047	0.031	1.49	0.158
District Poverty	-0.939	0.526	-1.79	0.096
Moderate Professionalization	0.673	0.372	1.81	0.092
High Professionalization	1.555	0.578	2.69	0.018 *
Southern States	1.422	0.319	4.44	0.001 ***
State Partisanship	-0.656	0.029	-2.26	0.040 *
Significance	0.001 '***'	0.01 '**'	0.05 '*'	
Number of Observations: 2,760				
Multiple R-squared: 0.3832, Root MSE: 1.2092				
Std. Err. adjusted for 15 clusters in states				

The third model assessed the fourth hypothesis that states in the South would demonstrate greater campaign finance disparities between male and female candidates compared to non-Southern states. The results are shown in Table 6, below. The interactional effect between Southern states and gender resulted in a very small coefficient of -0.005, but was not statistically significant with  $p > |t|$  (0.981).

Table 6. Hypothesis #4: Funds and Gender Model with Southern State Interaction Effect

<b>Coefficients</b>				
	Estimate	Std. Error	T-Value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	11.453	1.634	7.01	0.000 ***
Gender * South Interaction	-0.031	0.219	-0.15	0.887
Gender	-0.029	0.079	-0.37	0.718
Assembly	0.809	0.096	8.43	0.000 ***
Quality	0.593	0.129	4.27	0.001 ***
Primary Competition	0.411	0.117	3.53	0.003 *
Leadership	1,109	0.317	3.50	0.004 *

Incumbency	0.299	0.126	2.38	0.032
Open Seat	0.942	0.089	10.50	0.000 ***
Candidate Party	-0.066	0.112	-0.59	0.567
District Education	0.046	0.032	1.44	0.173
District Poverty	-0.936	0.525	-1.78	0.097
Moderate Professionalization	0.668	0.374	1.79	0.095
High Professionalization	1.551	0.579	2.68	0.018 *
State Partisanship	-0.062	0.029	-2.15	0.050 *
Southern States	1.419	0.346	4.10	0.001 ***
Significance	0.001 '***'	0.01 '**'	0.05 '*'	
Number of Observations: 2,760				
Multiple R-squared: 0.3925, Root MSE: 1.21				
Std. Err. adjusted for 15 clusters in states				

In all of the interactive effect models, the percentage of women's earnings relative to men's (a proportional measure of average income) attained slight statistical significance with positive coefficients. These findings suggest that states where women are closer to parity in wage earnings relative to men also denote a minimized fundraising difference. For state partisanship, the difference was 1.4%, for Southern states, the difference increased to 3.1%, and for professionalization, the difference was 14.9% for moderately professionalized and 3.9% for highly professionalized legislatures.

Overall, the results are mixed. The impact of legislative professionalization affirmed the hypothesis that the more professionalized the state, the less disparity between male and female candidates fundraising totals. Similarly, state partisanship proved to be influential (though weak), wherein more Democratic states denoted less difference in fundraising compared to states that were more Republican. Additionally, the findings testing the Southern hypothesis demonstrated a positive, but very weak relationship.

These findings were unexpected but provoke discussion about the relationship between gender and fundraising as well as the way that professionalization, partisanship, and region are

influential. A gendered disparity in fundraising was not upheld, as the difference was marginal, with women fundraising just under 4% relative to men, and it was not statistically significant. This suggests that while a larger gender gap in representation remains, campaign finance, at least with regards to the total amount raised, is likely not the source of women's underrepresentation.

The professionalization of the institution had little impact on the women's fundraising, though the highly professionalized state legislatures did denote a small (3.9%) gap between male and female candidates that was statistically significant. Because the more professionalized institutions are more attractive to potential office holders (accompanied with larger salary, staff, and tenure power), these races are also more competitive and likely whittle away competition so only the most competitive candidates remain in the general election.

The state partisanship and Southern states failed to achieve statistical significance, and the lack of relationship in both of these models was surprising. The partisanship hypothesis predicted that because women tend to run on and support the Democratic party ticket, that states leaning more Democrat would exhibit less of a gender disparity in terms of funds. Yet the results found no such relationship. This could be attributed to an imperfect measure of state partisanship (summarizing the total percentage of the popular vote in three presidential elections) or the lack of gender difference within the political parties.

Perhaps most unanticipated, women running in Southern states did not exhibit greater disparities than women running elsewhere. While fewer women do run and win in Southern state legislatures, they could also garner larger percentages of PAC and individual donations that specifically seek out female candidates, as there are fewer in elections and they would therefore take a larger share relative to races where more women run. This relationship is still unclear but what this study does show is that a gender gap in fundraising is not larger in Southern states.

## VI. Conclusion

The impact of state-level variations proves to be insightful into the relationship between gender and campaign finance. Given that the economic, social, political, and institutional diversity varies widely across states, it follows that the gender gap in fundraising for similar institutions will likewise be different. In spite of the fact that each state utilizes a legislature in a similar way to create policy, the elections employed to distribute those seats are not as comparable, nor is the composition of seat holders ultimately selected to participate in the legislature. The gender gap with regards to campaign fundraising is far from uniform, and addressing the state-level features, including professionalization, partisanship, and regionalization, provides a new alternative approach to understanding why greater gender disparities in funding exist in some states compared to others.

For the progression and development of the discipline, addressing this gap is critical: particularly as money becomes more influential in campaigns, state governments get more responsibility, and women and racial/ethnic minorities continually increase in their election races and victories. In understanding the impact of candidate identity in elections, then, the research questions raised in this study merit consideration. On the larger scale, the value of this examination contributes to our more general understanding about our democratic system. As political scientists have long since determined, political participation in a democracy is not free. It embodies costs, both physical and otherwise, and innately discourages or altogether excludes certain groups of people from becoming fully engaged. The costly charge of participation through voting is easily multiplied repeatedly in campaigning and, just as with voting, not simply in a strict literal sense.

The reality that even today, the elected officials who represent their constituencies fail to resemble those constituencies leads to the notion that restrictive barriers to campaigning still exist. State variation embodies differences that enable an assessment of where women and racial/ethnic minorities are able to raise comparable amounts of money which allows us to consider what factors can be helpful or harmful to encouraging participation. The combined influence of these trends demonstrates a need for a better understanding of why the costs of campaigning are so high and how the relationship between campaign finance and gender and race/ethnicity may offer insight into this discrepancy. Without knowing what the data and hypotheses will yield, it would be premature to overestimate the contribution, but regardless of the individual findings, the gap in current research necessitates the value in addressing this issue.

## References

- Berry, W.D., Berkman, M.B., & Schneiderman, S. (2000). Legislative professionalism and incumbent reelection: The development of institutional boundaries. *American Political Science Review*, 94:4, 182-206.
- Biersack, R., Herrnson, P.S., & Wilcox, C. (1993). Seeds for success: Early money in Congressional elections. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 18:535-551.
- Bond, J.R., Covington, C., & Fleisher, R. (1985). Explaining challenger quality in Congressional elections. *Journal of Politics*, 47:510-529.
- Burrell, B. C. (1985). Women's and men's campaigns for The US House of Representatives, 1972-1982 A Finance Gap? *American Politics Research*, 13(3), 251-272.
- Burrell, B. (1990). The presence of women candidates and the role of gender in campaigns for the state legislature in an urban setting: The case of Massachusetts. *Women in Politics*, 10:3, 85-102.
- Carroll, S. J. (1994). *Women as candidates in American politics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Carroll, S. J. & Jenkins, K. (2001). Do term limits help women get elected? *Social Science Quarterly*, 82:1, 199-201.
- Center for American women and politics. (2010). New Brunswick, NJ: Center for American Women and Politics. Retrieved from <http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/>
- Connor Green, J. (2004.) The times...Are they a-changing? An examination of the impact of the value of campaign resources for women and men candidates for the US House of Representatives. *Women & Politics*, 25:4.
- Crespin, M.H. & Deitz, J.L. (2010). If you can't join 'em, beat 'em: The gender gap in individual donations to congressional candidates. *Political Research Quarterly* (63:3), 581-593.
- Darcy, R.; Welch, S.; and Clark, J. (1994). *Women, elections, and representation*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Day, C. L. & Hadley, C. D. (2002). Who contributes? Similarities and differences between contributors to EMILY's List and WISH List. *Women & Politics*, 24:2.
- Day, C. L., Hadley, C. D., & Duffy Brown, M. (2002). Gender, feminism, and partisanship among Women's PAC contributors. *Social Science Quarterly*, 82:4, 687-700.

- Dolan, K. A. (2004). The impact of candidate sex on evaluations of candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85:1, 206-217.
- Dolan, K. A. (2008). Women as candidates in American politics: the continuing impact of sex and gender. Eds. C. Wolbrecht, K. Beckwith, & L. Baldez. *Political Women and American Democracy*, 110-127.
- Fiorina, M. P. (1994). Divided government in the American states: A byproduct of legislative professionalism? *American Political Science Review*. 88:304-316.
- Fiorina, M. P. (1997). Professionalism, realignment, and representation. *American Political Science Review*. 91:156-162
- Fiorina, M. P. (1999). Further evidence of the partisan consequences of legislative professionalism. *American Journal of Political Science* 43(3): 974-77.
- Flammang, J.A. (1997). *Women's political voice: How women are transforming the practice and study of politics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Fox, R. J. (2000). Gender and Congressional elections. Ed. S. Tolleson-Rinehart and J.J. Josephson. *Gender and American Politics: Women, men, and the political process*. M.E. Sharpe.
- Fox, R.L. (2006). Congressional elections: Where are we on the road to gender parity? Eds. S.J. Carroll & R.J. Fox. *Gender and elections: Shaping the future of American Politics*, 97-116.
- Fox, R.L., Lawless, J.L. & Freeley, C. (2001). Gender and the decision to run for office. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 26:411-35.
- Francia, P. L. (2001). Early fundraising by nonincumbent female Congressional candidates: The importance of women's PACs. Ed. Karen O'Connor. *Women and Congress: Running, winning, and ruling*. Haworth Press.
- Goldin, C. Katz, L.F., & Kuziemko, I. (2006). *The homecoming of American college women: The reversal of the college gender gap*. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Green, J. C. (2003). The Times... are they a-changing? An Examination of the impact of the value of campaign resources for women and men candidates for the US House of Representatives. *Women & Politics*, 25(4), 1-29.
- Hirano, S. & Snyder, J.M. (2009). Using multi-member districts to decompose the incumbency advantage. *American Journal of Political Science*, 53:2, 292-306.



- Hogan, R. E. (2001). Campaign spending by men and women candidates for the state legislature. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association.
- Hogan, R. E. (2007). The effects of candidate gender on campaign spending in state legislative elections. *Social Science Quarterly*, 88(5), 1092-1105.
- Jacobson, G.C. (2004). Money and votes reconsidered: Congressional elections. *Public Choice*, 47:7-62.
- Jacobson, G. C. (2008). *A Divider, not a uniter: George W. Bush and the American people-The 2006 election and beyond*. New York: Longman Press.
- Jacobson, G.C & Kernell, S. (1983). *Strategy and choice in Congressional elections*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Jenkins, S. (2007). A woman's work is never done? Fundraising perception and effort among female state legislative candidates. *Political Research Quarterly*, 60:2, 230-239.
- Kessler-Harris, A. (2003). *Out to work: A history of wage-earning women in the United States*. Oxford University Press.
- King, M. (1977). Cuba's attack on women's second shift, 1974-1976. *Latin American Perspectives*, 3: 106-119.
- Krasno, J.S. Green, D.P. & Cowden, J.A. (1994). The dynamics of campaign fundraising in house elections. *Journal of Politics*, 56:459-479.
- Lawless, J. L.; Fox R. L.; & Freely, C. (2001). Gender and the decision to run for office. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 26:3, 411-435.
- Lawless, J. L. & Fox R. L. (2004). Why don't women run for office? *Brown Policy Report*.
- Lee, M. M. (1977). Toward understanding why few women hold public office: Factors affecting the participation of women in local politics. In Marianne Githens and Jewel L. Prestage, eds. *A portrait of marginality, the political behavior of the American woman*. New York: David McKay.
- Manning, J.E. & Brudnick, I.A. (2013). Women in the United States Congress. 1917-2013: Biographical and committee assignment information, and listings by state and Congress. *Congressional Research Service*, 7:5700, 1-107.
- Matland, R. & King, D. (2002). Women as candidates in congressional elections. Cindy Simon Rosenthal, ed. *Women transforming Congress*. University of Oklahoma Press.

- Meinke S.R. & Hasecke E.B. (2003). Term limits, professionalization, and partisan control in U.S. state legislatures. *Journal of Politics*, 65:3, 898-908.
- Mutz, D.C. (1995). Effects of horse-race coverage on campaign coffers: Strategic contributing in presidential primaries. *Journal of Politics*, 57(4): 1015-1042.
- Nelson, C. J. (1994). Women's PACs in the year of the woman. *The year of the woman: Myths and realities*, 181-96.
- Rule, W. (1981). Why women don't run: The critical contextual factors in women's legislative recruitment. *The Western Political Quarterly*. 34:1, 60-77.
- Sanbonmatsu, K. & Carroll, S.J. (2009). Gender and the decision to run for the state legislature. Paper presented to the Midwestern Political Science Association Annual Conference.
- Sorauf, F.J. (1992). *Inside campaign finance: Myths and realities*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Stonecash, J. M. & Agathangelou, A.M. (1997). Trends in the partisan composition of state legislatures: A response to Fiorina. *American Political Science Review*. 91, 148-155.
- Stoper, E. S. (1977). Wife and politician: Role strain among women in public office. In M. Githens and J. Prestage, eds., *A portrait of marginality*, New York: Longman, 320-338.
- Stratmann, T. (1991). What do campaign contributions buy? Deciphering causal effects of money and votes. *Southern Economic Journal*, 606-620.
- Stratmann, T. (2006). Contribution limits and the effectiveness of campaign spending. *Public Choice*, 129(3-4), 461-474.
- US Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2010 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, Table GCT0101; generated using American FactFinder; <http://factfinder2.census.gov>
- Vonnahme, G. (2012). A preferential attachment model of campaign contributions in state legislative elections. *Public Choice*, 1-15.
- Welch, S. (1978). Recruitment of women to public office: a discriminate analysis. *Western Political Quarterly*, 31: 372-380.
- Women in state legislatures: Fact sheet. (2011). New Brunswick, NJ: Center for American Women and Politics. Retrieved from <http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/>
- Wright, G.C. & Schaffner, B.F. (2002). The influence of party: Evidence from the state legislatures. *American Political Science Review*, 96: 367.

Appendix

Appendix Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Variables

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
<b>CANDIDATE LEVEL</b>				
Funds	129,050.50	275,002.30	1000	5,889,792
Gender	0.2281	0.4197	0	1
Race	0.1649	0.3712	0	1
Quality	0.7132	0.4524	0	1
Primary Competition	0.2279	0.4474	0	1
Leadership	0.0492	0.2163	0	1
Incumbency	0.5626	0.4962	0	1
Open Seat	0.1680	0.3739	0	1
<b>DISTRICT LEVEL</b>				
Poverty	0.1228	0.0838	0.01	0.9
No Education	0.2284	0.7805	0.02	0.55
<b>STATE LEVEL</b>				
Women's Earnings to \$	76.3348	3.9631	65.5	82.7
Low Professionalization	0.2741	0.4461	0	1
Moderate Professionalization	0.3464	0.4759	0	1
High Professionalization	0.3795	0.4853	0	1
State Republican Vote Total	47.0868	7.4685	35.3067	62.1433
Southern Location	0.3143	0.4643	0	.01

Appendix Table 2. Explanation of Variable Coding

<b>VARIABLE NAME</b>	<b>VARIABLE CODING</b>
DEPENDENT Variable	
Fund	Total Dollar Amount (i.e. \$346,560)
INDEPENDENT Variables	
Candidate Gender	Male = 0, Female = 1
Candidate Party	Republican = 0, Democrat = 1
Won	Lost = 0, Won = 1
Candidate Quality	No Elected Political Position = 0, Previously Held Elected Political Position = 1
Primary Competition	No Primary Competition = 0, Primary Competition = 1
Candidate Race	White = 0, Non-White = 1
Candidate Leadership	No High Leadership Position Held = 0, Held High Leadership Position = 1
Candidate Incumbency	Not Incumbent = 0, Incumbent = 1
Candidate Open Seat	Not Open Seat = 0, Open Seat = 1
Race Assembly	House = 0, Senate = 1
State Partisanship	Average % of State voted for the Republican candidate for the 1996, 2000, & 2004 elections (i.e. 49%)
District Economic Affluence/Poverty	Percentage of Individuals within the district at or below the poverty level (i.e. 25%)
District Minority	Percentage of Individuals within the district who reported on the 2000 US Census to be any race or ethnicity other than Non-Hispanic White (i.e. 10%)
District Education Attainment	Percentage of Individuals over 25 years old within the district who reported on the 2000 US Census to have earned a HS Diploma or completed the GED equivalent (i.e. 22%)
State Partisanship	Average % of State voted Republican for the Republican candidate for the 1996, 2000, & 2004 elections (i.e. 51%)
Women's Per Capita Earnings	Average Percentage of Women's per capita earnings relative to Men's in the State for 2009 (i.e. 87%)
Institutional Professionalization	Least professionalized state legislature = 1, Slightly less professionalized state legislature = 2, Moderately professionalized state legislature = 3, Slightly highly professionalized state legislature = 4, Most professionalized state

	legislature = 5,
Geographic Location	Located outside of the South = 0, Located in the South 1

Appendix Table 3. Funds and Gender Fixed Effects Model

<b>Coefficients</b>				
	Estimate	Std. Error	T-Value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	10.656	0.098	109.03	0.000
Gender	-0.094	0.050	-1.88	0.061
Assembly	0.858	0.048	17.91	0.000 ***
Quality	0.563	0.076	7.39	0.000 ***
Primary Competition	0.422	0.051	8.28	0.000 ***
Leadership	0.675	0.108	6.24	0.000 ***
Incumbency	0.427	0.081	5.30	0.000 ***
Open Seat	0.759	0.071	10.65	0.000 ***
Candidate Party	-0.074	0.043	-1.72	0.086
District Education	0.011	0.279	0.36	0.720
District Poverty	-1.357	0.279	-4.86	0.000 ***
Alabama	---	---	---	---
California	0.754	0.118	6.35	0.000 ***
Colorado	-1.071	0.121	-8.83	0.000 ***
Connecticut	-1.541	0.107	-14.39	0.000 ***
Georgia	-0.909	0.102	-8.96	0.000 ***
Illinois	0.465	0.111	4.19	0.000 ***
Iowa	-0.699	0.114	-6.16	0.000 ***
Michigan	-0.695	0.109	-6.35	0.000 ***
Mississippi	-1.375	0.108	-12.78	0.000 ***
Nevada	-0.635	0.171	-3.72	0.000 **
New York	-0.051	0.102	-0.50	0.619
North Dakota	-3.537	0.137	-25.75	0.000 ***
South Carolina	-1.086	0.109	-9.98	0.000 ***
Wisconsin	-1.096	0.115	-9.55	0.000 ***
Wyoming	-3.019	0.138	-21.81	0.000 ***
Significance	0.001 '***'	0.01 '**'	0.05 '*'	
Number of Observations: 2,760				
Multiple R-squared: 0.5059, Root MSE: 1.0794				
Std. Err. adjusted for 15 clusters in states				

Appendix Table 4. Economic and Educational Gender Differences

State	Average Annual Earnings #			Average College Education *		
	Men	Women	% Wage Gap	Men	Women	% Edu. Gap

Alabama	\$45,485	\$35,549	78.2%	21%	20%	-1%
California	\$48,389	\$40,019	82.7%	32%	29%	-3%
Colorado	\$47,983	\$38,058	79.3%	38%	35%	-3%
Connecticut	\$59,387	\$43,900	73.9%	37%	36%	-1%
Georgia	\$42,667	\$33,665	78.9%	29%	28%	-1%
Illinois	\$49,336	\$37,841	76.7%	32%	29%	-3%
Iowa	\$42,634	\$31,431	73.7%	25%	24%	-1%
Michigan	\$48,066	\$34,542	71.9%	26%	24%	-2%
Mississippi	\$37,528	\$28,506	76.0%	21%	22%	+1%
Nevada	\$43,425	\$35,691	82.2%	24%	21%	-3%
New York	\$49,174	\$40,584	82.5%	32%	31%	-1%
North Dakota	\$40,693	\$29,742	73.1%	28%	28%	+/- 0%
South Carolina	\$39,648	\$31,010	78.2%	23%	24%	+1%
Wisconsin	\$44,812	\$33,611	75.0%	26%	24%	-2%
Wyoming	\$47,828	\$31,308	65.5%	21%	20%	-1%
US	\$45,485	\$35,549	78.2%	29%	27%	-2%
# From data available by the U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, © 2009						
* From data available by the American Association of University Women, Foundation Analysis, conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau						

Appendix Table 5. Average Amounts Raised by General Election Legislative Candidates (2005-2006)

State	\$ Amount Per Voter	Voters	Total Contributions	House Average	Senate Average
Alabama	\$29.03	1,250,401	\$36,294,226	\$99,431	\$365,186
California	\$10.71	8,899,059	\$95,316,305	\$385,132	\$495,671
Colorado	\$4.69	1,586,105	\$7,444,881	\$41,004	\$70,953
Connecticut	\$7.14	1,123,412	\$8,025,083	\$14,204	\$54,673
Georgia	\$10.81	2,122,185	\$22,947,002	\$58,331	\$120,695
Illinois	\$17.47	3,587,676	\$62,667,885	\$205,823	\$391,296
Iowa	\$15.41	1,071,509	\$16,508,298	\$65,702	\$128,807
Michigan	\$7.01	3,852,008	\$27,020,311	\$58,488	\$130,978
Mississippi	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nevada	\$20.70	586,274	\$12,140,565	\$92,241	\$213,554
New York	\$11.86	4,697,867	\$55,714,627	\$78,327	\$295,808
North Dakota	\$2.42	220,479	\$432,726	\$3,448	\$4,985
South Carolina	\$5.78	1,117,311	\$6,458,262	\$40,364	No Races
Wisconsin	\$4.51	2,183,155	\$9,835,392	\$35,495	\$121,006
Wyoming	\$3.88	196,217	\$761,264	\$6,031	\$11,335

* Data from the National Institute on Money in State Politics, March 2008					

Appendix Table 6. State Campaign Finance Laws

State	Individual	State Party	PAC	Corporate	Union	Total
Alabama	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	\$500/c/e	Unlimited	Open
California	\$3,900	Unlimited	\$3,900 $\psi$	\$3,900	\$3,900	Med.
Colorado*	\$550	\$113,905 <sup>^</sup>	\$550 $\xi$	Prohibited	Prohibited	High
Connecticut*	\$1,000 & \$250 $\phi$	\$10,000 & \$5,000 $\phi$	\$1,500 & \$750 $\phi$	Prohibited	\$1,000 & \$250 $\phi$	High
Georgia	\$6,300 $\infty$	\$6,300	\$6,300	\$6,300	\$6,300	High
Illinois	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	Open
Iowa	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	Prohibited	Unlimited	Open
Michigan*	\$3,400	\$68,000	\$34,000	Prohibited	Prohibited	Med.
Mississippi	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	\$1,000	Unlimited	Open
Nevada	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	High
New York	\$16,800 & \$8,200 $\phi$ $\pm$	Prohibited in primary Unlimited in general	\$16,800 & \$8,200 $\phi$ $\pm$	\$5,000	\$16,800 & \$8,200 $\phi$ $\pm$	High
North Dakota	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	Prohibited	Prohibited	Open
South Carolina*	\$1,000	\$50,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	Med.
Wisconsin	\$1,000 & \$500 $\phi$	\$22,425 & \$11,213 $\phi$	\$1,000 & \$500 $\phi$	Prohibited	Prohibited	High
Wyoming	\$1,000	Unlimited	Unlimited	Prohibited	Prohibited	Med.

\* Limits listed are specifically for statewide candidates  
<sup>^</sup> Includes candidate contributions to his/her own campaign  
 $\xi$  For “small donor” committees, maximum of \$5,675 donation accepted  
 $\infty$  Per election (primary and general separate); additional \$3,700 per run-off  
 $\pm$  For both primary and general elections (separate amounts for each totaled here)  
 $\psi$  For “small contributor” committees, \$7,800 limit  
 $\phi$  First number is for Senate candidates, second number is for House candidates  
 $\infty$  information derived from *State Limits on Contributions of Candidates* by the National Center of State Legislatures ©2012

### 3. ARTICLE II

#### The Impact of State Political Context on the Relationship between Race/Ethnicity and Campaign Finance

##### Abstract

In spite of the increasing campaign finance legislation aimed at equalizing barriers in political campaigns, a fundraising gap persists across racial/ethnic lines. In the era of modern campaigning, with the expenses of advertising and polling, among others, ample funds are necessary but not universally accessible to all candidates. This study addresses the relationship between candidate race/ethnicity and campaign fundraising, and the possible moderating impact of three dimensions of the state political context – state legislative professionalism, state Republican party strength, and state culture (South vs. Nonsouth). I evaluate fundraising totals across 15 states for over 3,000 candidates in the 2006 state legislative elections. Ultimately, the findings suggest that after controlling for other candidate characteristics, as well as district and state context, there is a negative, statistically significant relationship between candidate race/ethnicity and fundraising. In addition, the effect of race/ethnicity is moderated by two features of the state context - legislative professionalization and the state culture. This study finds that non-white candidates continue to fundraise less than their white counterparts and state context is important in understanding the race/ethnicity gap in campaign finance.



## I. Introduction

The role of money in politics has long been an issue of debate for scholars and candidates alike, and as the fundraising thresholds climb with each subsequent election, its impact continues to merit conversation. In the 2008 Presidential campaign, Democratic nominee Barack Obama outraised Republican hopeful John McCain nearly two-fold through cultivating small donations online. Almost two years to the day after Obama's inauguration, the Supreme Court announced its landmark decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* (2010). The controversial decision resulted in a partial strike-down of the McCain-Feingold Act (2002), allowing corporations and labor unions to fund independent communications (Liptak, 2010; Dionne, 2012). With every election year continually escalating the total funds raised, the significance of money in campaigns will likely continue to grow as well (Box-Steffensmeier & Schier, 2013).

Given the significance of fundraising, the difficulty of raising enough money to conduct a competitive campaign and be a viable candidate is not experienced in the same way by all candidates. Social groups that have historically been oppressed and continue to be economically marginalized can witness more challenges in their pursuit of elected office. This effect can be most debilitating for underrepresented racial and ethnic groups, who generally are less educated, make less money, and hold lower occupational positions (occupying service roles more than managerial posts) than the white majority.

Racial and ethnic minorities have made great strides in seeking and winning elected offices in the United States. The first African-American President, Barack Obama, was elected in 2008. Sonia Sotomayor became the first Hispanic-American Supreme Court justice in 2009.

The National Black Caucus of State Legislators' membership has increased from only 18 members in 1977 to over 600 by 2008 (King-Meadows & Schaller, 2007). On the whole, government is more diverse in the US at every level than ever before.

Yet, though these numbers represent improvement over recent decades, they still lag in proportion to the overall population. African-Americans are most prevalent in political positions in the South, which is also where they are more highly concentrated, but the percentage of African-American officials falls short in comparison to their share of the citizenry. Mississippi, for example, has an African-American population of 40% but only 21% of the seats in the state legislature are occupied by African-American officials (U.S. Census, 2010; "Legislator Demographics: State by State," 2010).

Arguably the most underrepresented demographic in American politics, Hispanic-Americans have recently become the largest minority group in the nation but hold few elected offices. Concentrated in the Southwest, they exhibit even larger disparities in representation, such as in California where they hold 19% of seats though they are 38.2% of the total population (U.S. Census, 2010; "Legislator Demographics: State by State," 2010). On the whole, Hispanic-Americans occupy a national average of just 3% of state legislative seats in spite of comprising 16.9% of the overall population (U.S. Census, 2010; "Legislator Demographics: State by State," 2010).

A number of barriers exist in mounting a modern campaign: visibility, mobilization, name recognition, to name a few. Each of these necessitates substantial funds to surge into advertising and outreach and while each component of a campaign warrants acknowledgement, without enough money to fund these endeavors, the outcome would be bleak. Previous research (Gierzynski and Breaux, 1991; Breaux and Gierzynski, 1991; Sorauf, 1992; Abbe and Herrnson,

2003; Overton, 2004) has determined repeatedly that most of the time, the candidate who raises the most money will garner the most voters. The financial challenges of running for office are compounded by the well-known incumbency advantage. Given the fact that fewer racial and ethnic minorities currently hold elected office and therefore cannot enjoy the benefits of incumbency, their need for fundraising is all the more imperative.

As inequities that manifest socially are replicated and even magnified within the realm of campaigning, examining the role of race and ethnicity in fundraising is critical to furthering our understanding of the race/ethnic gap in elected office. In this article, I evaluate the relationship between race and campaign fundraising at the legislative level across a sample of 15 states. First, I will review the current literature in the field. As I detail below, there has been very little research on the role of candidate race on fundraising, particularly at the state legislative level. I then detail the hypotheses that fuel the study, which are rooted in a large literature that suggests that Black and Latino candidates may face significant obstacles to successful fundraising. Additional hypotheses consider the role of partisanship, institutional professionalization, and region in mitigating or perpetuating the gap. Next, the data and methodology employed is explained, culminating with a discussion of the results yielded in the statistical models. Finally, I summarize the overall findings about the relationship between race and campaign finance and suggest additional approaches for future research.

## II. Literature Review

The literature on the influence of a candidate's race and his/her ability to fundraise is surprisingly scant. Much of what has been studied centers on the effects of voter attitudes and candidate characteristics and how they interact to effect election outcomes. Early studies

focusing specifically on Black or female candidates yielded no evidence of significant voter bias (Eckstrand and Eckert 1981; Leeper 1991; Sigelman and Sigelman 1984; Terkildsen 1993)). However, more recent studies demonstrate that the race of a candidate plays into a voter's decision (and a donor's decision), much like daily stereotypes guide individual impressions.

Particularly in races where relatively little information is available, the larger demographic group to which the candidate belongs can be influential in garnering voters' support. Gender identity is often easier to assess through a candidate's name (as "Hillary" and "Nancy" are more likely female while "John" and "Harry" are more likely male); however, colloquial names and surnames can conjure a candidate's race (such as "Fredrica" or "Jose"). Even black candidates who have names that are considered racially distinctive can be subject to voter biases due to racial stereotypes (Fryer and Levitt, 2004). Ethnic surnames, particularly for Hispanic candidates, can provide an important cue. Matson and Fine (2006) determined that the name recognition enabled voters to make educated guesses about the candidate's gender and ethnicity and that these were enhanced with increased spending. Fundraising can be particularly important for Hispanic candidates in low-information elections as it can allow candidates to distinguish themselves and make their own name more recognizable (Lieske, 1989; Bullock, Gaddie, and Ferrington, 2002). The challenge of correctly ascribing race and gender is evident and underscores the problematic reliance of cues, but the use of such short cuts is nonetheless prevalent.

Easily accessible and identifiable traits of candidates can play a larger role in low information elections, as the less and even moderately-informed seek such criteria as a basis for their decision. McDermott's (1998) foundational study on the impact of race and gender suggested that candidate demographic cues, such as race and gender, also offer

cognitive short-cuts for voters through their presumed (and rather stereotypical) association with being more liberal than white, male candidates. The influence of race is not independent of partisanship, voting, and representation, but is rather intersectional, conglomerating into one major informational cue (Hutchings and Valentino, 2004). Donors consider far more than simply a candidate's race when deciding to give them contributions: partisanship denotes an imperative indicator for support, but policy platforms, voting records (for incumbents), candidacy viability (for challengers and open seat-seekers) merit consideration as well.

While race and gender can be utilized as cognitive short-cuts, in races where a particular candidate perceives his/her race or gender to be an electoral disadvantage among voters, campaign fundraising and strategic spending can help (Matson and Fine, 2006). Spending campaign funds to promote one's positions and educate voters beyond their limited information cues, so they are actually familiar (and hopefully, agree) with the candidate's platform can provide the ability to transcend potential race or gender stereotypes that could prove detrimental at the polls.

The impact of money in campaigns has been well-documented through a litany of research and its focal point within this study only further reiterates the importance of fundraising in campaigns. To be sure, seats cannot be bought and money has a finite influence that cannot rectify unpopular or unclear platforms, or repair a tarnished reputation or poor character. Yet, securing enough funds to conduct a formidable campaign is critical in the modern arena of politics. Amongst the classic literature, Gierzynski and Breaux (1991) argued that money can have a substantial impact in state legislative races, depending particularly on whether the candidate is an incumbent or a

challenger, as the former need not spend nearly as much as the challenger to gain the votes necessary for victory. The implications of incumbency advantage, challenger status, and open seats have been central in electing candidates from underrepresented groups to public office. Because incumbents can boast impressive benefits, having already served and courted constituencies, the advantage can serve as a barrier to prospective challengers; as the majority of state legislative seats are held by white men, there is a great likelihood that in most elections, that demographic will also dominate the incumbent positions.

The direct influence of race in statewide elections was originally evaluated through empirical studies over twenty years ago through a few seminal pieces that served as foundational work in the field. Arrington and Ingalls (1984) demonstrated that on the local level, Black candidates and campaign donors vary from their white counterparts. They noted that in their Charlotte, North Carolina study, Black citizens were every bit as likely to contribute to campaigns as white citizens, but they donate fewer dollars per capita and further, donations are “substantially aligned by race” (582-583). Given this observation, the study concluded that no obvious financial discrepancy existed between Black and white candidates, as the fewer Black donors corresponded proportionately to fewer Black candidates.

Applying these findings to the state level, Sonenshein (1990) analyzed support for Black candidates at state offices through a normative assessment. The impermeable aspect of race required Black candidates address this identity but the need to mount a majority of electoral support forces them to simultaneously expand their voting base. The study found that with the numerous challenges facing Black candidates, the quest for more Black

leaders (including president, which the Sonenshein singled out) would require a major shift within the political atmosphere and a less stigmatized perspective of the non-white candidate. This question was later revisited on the eve of the landmark 2008 presidential election and concluded that racial tensions had eased and acceptance of minorities in high political offices had increased considerably since the earliest days of Black candidates (White, 2008).

Less research has been solely dedicated to Hispanic fundraising outcomes, but the cultural differences in terms of language and community can play an important role in their political behavior. The prominence of the Spanish language in Hispanic culture was historically attributed to diminished political participation (MacManus and Cassel, 1982; Calvo and Rosenstone, 1989). Revisionist studies, however, have found that more recently, being bilingual can actually increase political participation (Johnson, Stein, and Wrinkle, 2003).

Hispanic contributors behave differently from white donors, in both the cultural context for what it means to donate funds and political expectations for contributions (Rivas-Vazquez, 1999). They prefer in-person contact and emphasize family and community influences as motivators for contributions. In addition to a potential language difference, members of different ethnic groups have historical experiences and cultural differences that may change their perspectives on campaigns (Leighley, 2001). The way in which a candidate approaches fundraising likely varies across ethnic lines and also with regards to how long one has resided in the country. A first-generation Hispanic immigrant's understanding and perspective of the political process, including fundraising, would likely be different from a third-generation immigrant.

While all of these studies offer potential implications, none conduct a systematic, candidate-level analysis to determine if there is a disparity exists between white and non-white candidates. Smith (2005) argued that Black candidates are hindered by their ability to pursue their own agenda (one which, presumably, would incorporate race-based politics) because they are dependent on “white money” (736). His analysis focused on the substantive representation of Black candidates and elected officials, however, and he failed to definitively illustrate whether the fundraising experience and outcomes of Black candidates were different, merely noting that employing an entirely Black fundraising base is difficult in its execution and ineffective in its outcome. Likewise, Rivas-Vazquez (1999) charged that the cultural framework for fundraising and donating “has different meaning and expression than it does in Anglo culture” (115-116). She did not apply this concept to state elections, and so its applicability for Hispanic candidates at that level remains unclear.

Together, racial and ethnic minorities face barriers that make running for public office and fundraising more challenging. Both Black and Hispanic Americans lag behind whites with regards to job opportunities mean wages, average household income, and educational attainment (Lichter, 1989; Glaser, 1994). The cost to participate in politics is high but it is not the same for everyone. This literature indicates that the experience in fundraising and resulting outcome may be different for candidates based on their racial and ethnic background and this study aims to identify if a gap exists and how political, institutional, and regional features affect it.

### III. Theory and Research Question



Underlying this study is the belief that voters and donors view non-white candidates differently from white candidates and, to an extent, make decisions about those candidates based on their perceived racial/ethnic identity. Voters want a candidate who represents their interests and though individuals from racial/ethnic minority groups are acclimated to representation by a white public official (as has historically been the norm), the opposite is not necessarily true. The “Black” or “Hispanic” agenda are often seen as distinctive ways in which non-white candidates utilize identity politics to press issues unique to their communities (Reingold, 2012).

Donors are slightly more sophisticated than voters, yet their approach in selecting a candidate could be more simplistic: they want to support a candidate who they believe will win. Naturally, donors are also invested (in a literal sense as well as figuratively) in the candidate’s agenda and want someone who will represent their interests. Campaign contributions derive from nearly every economic sector and reflect varying sums, but large corporate interests and niche interest groups dominate the donor population. As most of these are operated by a homogenous collection of elites, comprised primarily of highly affluent and educated white men (and some women), their interests are not likely to align with a perceived racial minority “agenda.” Coupled with the reality that non-white Americans suffer an economic disadvantage that would make it more difficult for one to mount an effective campaign or enjoy the expendable income to finance or contribute to another’s campaign, a clear racial/ethnic divide in campaign contributions is likely to emerge.

#### IV. Hypotheses

The literature review demonstrates a clear disadvantage for minority candidates in political campaigns and I believe the impact of fundraising may exacerbate this disparity. Yet,

three is good reason to suspect that the magnitude of racial disparities in campaign fundraising may vary significantly across different institutional and cultural settings. How does race and ethnicity (used here in a simple dichotomous white/non-white measure) influence campaign fundraising totals? How do certain state features, including institutional, partisan, and regional differences impact this relationship? The hypotheses elaborated below outline the objectives upon which this analysis will concentrate.

To better understand the racial/ethnic variation in fundraising, this study will test four primary hypotheses that will be tested using data on state legislative elections. First, following the trajectory of the previous literature, I believe that, on average and everything else equal, white candidates will garner more in fundraising compared to non-white candidates. Coupled with differences in education, wage earnings, political participation, and incumbency advantage that benefits the primarily white incumbency, it follows that non-white candidates will fail to fundraise as much as their white counterparts. This gap, however, is hypothesized to vary depending on the level of institutional professionalization, the strength of the Democratic party's presence, and the geographic location of the states. These additional hypotheses are explained below.

Merging the literature on race and campaign finance with the work on professionalization and candidate occupation, my second hypothesis is rooted in the assumption that candidates will be more attracted to a professionalized state legislature (compared to an amateur legislature), due to the increased accessibility of resources (Fiorina 1994). Following the imagery established by Blair (1988) and reemphasized by Fiorina (1994) that certain professions are more conducive to enabling individuals to run for office in these less professionalized states and adding that these positions are usually occupied by white men, it would follow that less professionalized

legislatures draw fewer racial/ethnic minority candidates to compete. A more professionalized legislature enables one to work solely as a legislator due to the (generally) higher salary and, with the power and prestige that accompanies such a position, encourages competition for these desirable seats. The effect of increased competition in turn is likely to weed out less viable (and poorly-funded) candidates early in the primaries to ensure a higher quality pair of candidates for the general elections, and overall more homogeneity in the size of campaign fundraising totals statewide. I believe that candidates in states more-professionalized legislatures will demonstrate fewer racial/ethnic candidate differences (if any) in campaign fundraising.

The presence and strength of the party is undoubtedly influential in election outcomes and can explain the propensity of certain states to prefer candidates from a particular party. Stemming from the notion that most racial and ethnic minority candidates vote for and run on the Democratic party ticket (though the Asian-American and Hispanic-American population diverges on this, pending the country of origin), I believe that non-white candidates running in Democratic-leaning states will exhibit fewer fundraising disparities compared to white candidates. Inversely, this suggests a more substantial gap between racial and ethnic minorities and whites in more Republican-leaning states. Especially with the increasing saliency of universal healthcare and immigration reform issues in the last decade that may be a focal point for a racial/ethnic minority candidate, and given the Democratic party's positions in support of such policies, it would hold that partisanship would be influential in the relationship between the candidate's race/ethnicity and his or her fundraising totals. Thus, the third hypothesis maintains that the gap will widen between white candidates and non-white candidates in Republican-leaning states compared to the same two groups in Democratic-leaning states.

The final hypothesis rests on the unique political culture of the South, which differs significantly from all other regions in the US, particularly regarding race. Through American history, the racist history of the South has been demonstrated through the practice of slavery, participation in the Civil War, the institution of Jim Crow, and mass opposition to the Civil Rights movement. While it can boast the greatest numbers of Black legislators respective to other areas of the country, those numbers are still far from proportionate to the population and the conflation of racial and economic oppression can impede quality non-white candidates from funding and winning a state-level political office. In addition, the party politics that recently exhibited a realignment, swinging from just over one-hundred years of Dixiecrat dominance to full Republican control in most Southern states reinforces the notion that distinguishes the South from the other areas in the US. This distinctive social and political climate signifies this separation from the other regions and seems indicative that a racial/ethnic-based gap in fundraising would be exaggerated within the South, compared to the non-South states. Given the historical context of racism, economic equality, and partisan strength, I hypothesize that the fundraising gap between white and non-white candidates will be greater within the South, rather than outside it.

Table 1. Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1	White candidates will fundraise more money than non-white candidates in state legislative elections, when all other mitigating factors (quality, leadership, etc.) are held constant.
Hypothesis 2	The effect of race and ethnicity (i.e. the difference in dollars raised between white candidates and non-white candidates) will diminish as the professionalism of a state's legislature increases.
Hypothesis 3	The effect of race and ethnicity (i.e. the difference in dollars raised between white candidates and non-white candidates) will diminish as the strength of the Democratic party in a state increases. *
Hypothesis 4	The effect of race and ethnicity (i.e. the difference in dollars raised between white candidates and non-white candidates) will be larger

	in the South than outside the South.
--	--------------------------------------

IV. Data and Methodology

In order to examine the relationship between the candidate’s race/ethnicity and amount of money raised for state legislative campaigns, I conducted a review of the public campaign finance records. I chose 2006 as the year of study for a number of reasons. Most importantly, it served as the off-year congressional elections between two presidential races, thus minimizing the effects of a national presidential race on state politics. Retrospective analyses noted that Democrats did slightly better (relating to President George W. Bush’s declining popularity (Jacobsen, 2008) but this had a marginal effect on state legislative seats. Thus, there is good reason to think that the 2006 election cycle was not affected by unique historical circumstances, and the results are more likely to be generalizable to other periods.

Due to the labor-intensive nature of the data collection, it was not feasible to collect data for all 50 states. Therefore, I collected data for a sample of 15 states that were carefully selected to ensure variation in their level of state legislative professionalization, regional location, state partisanship, and current racial/ethnic composition. A full summary of the descriptive statistics within this sample is included in the appendix (Appendix - Table 1). Among the most important variables, however, the average of the total dollar amount fundraised was \$129,050.50 and non-white candidates comprised 16.49%. Table 2 below lists the states used in this analysis, along with data for several relevant contextual variables.

Table 2. States Selected for Sample

State	Professionalization of Legislature <sup>∞</sup>	Campaign Finance Laws <sup>^</sup>	Region	State Partisanship (% Republican) <sup>δ</sup>	Race/ Ethnic Comp. in Leg. <sup>+</sup>	Race/ Ethnic Comp. in Population*
-------	---	------------------------------------	--------	--	---	-----------------------------------

Alabama	Moderate	Open	South	56%	23%	30%
California	High	Moderate	West	47%	33%	26%
Colorado	Moderate	Restrictive	West	49%	15%	12%
Connecticut	Moderate	Restrictive	Northeast	46%	13%	18%
Georgia	Slightly Low	Restrictive	South	53%	21%	37%
Illinois	Slightly High	Open	Midwest	45%	24%	22%
Iowa	Moderate	Open	Midwest	51%	3%	7%
Michigan	High	Moderate	Midwest	49%	17%	20%
Mississippi	Slightly Low	Open	South	55%	21%	40%
Nevada	Slightly Low	High	West	52%	19%	23%
New York	High	Restrictive	Northeast	41%	26%	29%
North Dakota	Low	Open	Midwest	57%	2%	10%
South Carolina	Moderate	Moderate	South	55%	17%	32%
Wisconsin	Slightly High	High	Midwest	51%	6%	12%
Wyoming	Low	Moderate	West	62%	3%	7%
<b>Average</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	24%	78%
∞ as defined by the National Center of State Legislatures ©2012						
δ the average of state presidential votes for the three previous elections, from data available by the Federal Election Commission © 1996, 2000, & 2004						
+ from data available by the National Center of State Legislatures ©2012						
* from data available from the U.S. Census Bureau: State and County Quick Facts.						
^ refer to Table 4 in the Appendices						

Data were collected from the authentic ballots secured by the board of elections (at the state level) and financial donor reports available through the databases of the Institute for Money in State Politics. Additional demographic information about individual candidates was gathered through individual research on independent candidates (via their campaign websites, party websites, and press releases). Every effort was made to confirm the accuracy of the data collected and the reputability of the source from which it is originally derived. In some cases, identifying the candidate's gender or race could not be verified and thus was not recorded. This

conservative approach to ensure the accuracy of the data occasionally led to some observations (candidates) being dropped from the set for incomplete available information. The final dataset consisted of a total number of 3,003 Republican and Democratic general election candidates running in 2,105 state legislative races, and who raised at least \$1000. Third-party candidates were excluded due to the fact that these candidates rarely raise much money and, with rare exception, are not successful at the ballot box. Finally, the \$1,000 threshold for inclusion in the sample ensures that candidates who filed for the election but never truly conducted a campaign (and therefore were not serious or viable) were not a part of this analysis; this cut-off is very conservative to ensure no unnecessary eliminations were made (Vonnahme, 2012).

To test the hypotheses, ordinary least squares regression was used, establishing the individual candidate as the primary unit of analysis and utilizing the natural log of the total dollar amount raised as the dependent variable.

$$\begin{aligned}
 y(\text{total dollar amount}) = & \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{race}) + \beta_2(\text{party}) + \beta_3(\text{quality}) + \beta_4(\text{leadership}) + \\
 & \beta_5(\text{incumbent}) + \beta_6(\text{open seat}) + \beta_7(\text{assembly}) + \beta_8(\text{district partisanship}) + \beta_9(\text{primary} \\
 & \text{competition}) + + \\
 & \beta_{10}(\text{district per capita income}) + \beta_{11}(\text{assembly}) + \beta_{12}(\text{minority population}) + \beta_{13}(\text{district} \\
 & \text{education attainment}) + \beta_{14}(\text{state partisanship}) + \beta_{15}(\text{professionalization}) + \\
 & \beta_{16}(\text{geographic location}) + \epsilon
 \end{aligned}$$

The independent variables included in this analysis capture qualities at the individual candidate level, the individual election/district level, and the state level. A comprehensive description of the coding explanations and procedures is included in the Appendix (Table 2) but a brief summary follows. The variables denoting difference at the individual candidate level include partisanship, incumbency, open seat, challenger, leadership position (within the assembly), and candidate quality. Partisanship can play a very substantial role in the involvement of racial and ethnic minorities, as the earlier literature review suggests (Hutchings

and Valentino, 2004), and can also be influential in fundraising (Smith, 2001). As noted earlier, candidates identifying as independent or not running under either the Democrat or Republican parties were rare and excluded for the purposes of the study.

Traditional variables noted for their relationship to fundraising were also incorporated. Incumbency and open seat status were used individually as dichotomous responses, as well as intra-assembly leadership because of their relationship to fundraising (Biersack, Herrnson, & Wilcox, 1993; Krasno, Green, & Cowden, 1994). If the individual previously held a high position within that particular house, such as Speaker of the House, then that was included as a control as well (Sorauf, 1992). A candidate running for reelection who is the current Speaker might garner more campaign funds for his/her higher position of power, but it is possible that by attaining such status, that legislator has a long political legacy, which would diminish the need for excessive fundraising. Finally, the perceived viability of the candidate was assessed to determine if the candidate was a quality candidate (Jacobson & Kernell, 1983; Bond, Covington, & Fleisher, 1985).

Additional variables included the presence of opposition in either the primary election which was important to include in the data set. Whether an opponent existed (within one's own party in the primary competition or on the opposing party in the general competition) could impact the total amount of money raised (Jacobson, 2004; Mutz, 1995). Though this analysis looks strictly at the total amount of funds raised (disregarding the points of time in the campaign in which they were secured), the influence competition would have on the overall total is worth consideration. Primary competition accounts for races in which the type of competition varied (again, affecting fundraising).



Using data available from the 2000 Census reports provided variables for education, poverty levels, and minorities within the district. District educational attainment was measured as the percentage of adults over age 25 who held a high school diploma (US Census 2000). District poverty levels encompassed all adults over age 25 who were at or below the poverty level (US Census, 2000). The minority variable incorporated the percentage of citizens within the district that self-identifying as non-white citizens.

The economic affluence and educational attainment average captured two important district characteristics that are influential in the race/ethnicity and fundraising relationship. The district-level economic affluence variable concerns how much money individuals within the district have, which would be influential in the amount they choose to give (as donors) and the amount needed to win (as candidates). A race in a poor, rural district would likely require a lower threshold of fundraising to conduct a competitive candidacy, whereas a race in an affluent, suburban or metropolitan area might require more. Likewise, the district-level educational attainment variable signifies the percentage of the population over the age of 25 who have earned their high school diploma or GED equivalent. This measure can be indicative of participation and also relates to economic affluence (through the positive relationship between education and income).

Finally, to capture differences among the states in the analysis, variables denoting state partisanship, the level of professionalization, and regional location were noted. The partisanship of the state, that is, the way in which a state tends to lean, could be influential in fundraising outcomes; a state that leans heavily Democrat is likely to yield candidates who are Democrat and may garner less in fundraising totals, as the cultural preference already favors that party. Alternately, in such a one-party slanted state, the propensity of Democratic voters likely

corresponds to more generous donors, so those candidates may secure more funds. This measure was calculated as the average vote share for the Republican candidate from the three most recent presidential elections prior to 2006 (1996, 2000, and 2004).

The state professionalization variable depicted the level of institutional professionalization of the legislature, following the categorizations established by the National Conference of State Legislatures and included differences such as salary, staff size, and number of days in office per session. This measure was divided into three categories denoting whether the state was “more professionalized,” “moderately professionalized,” or “less professionalized.” Finally, the geographic location of the states were noted by the boundaries established by the US Census and were then accompanied by the dichotomous component, separating them into “South” and “Non-South” groups.

V. Findings and Discussion

To estimate the effects of these variables on campaign funding, I utilized an ordinary least squares model, with standard errors adjusted for clustering at the state level. I first estimated an additive model, the results of which are displayed below in Table 3. (A fixed effects model that assessed differences across the specific states in this sample is included in the Appendix, Table 3). Because the dependent variable is measured as the log of total funds raised, the coefficients can be interpreted as the proportional change in the dependent variable given a one-unit increase in the independent variable.

Table 3. Funds and Race/Ethnicity OLS Model

<b>Coefficients</b>				
	Estimate	Std. Error	T-Value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	11.366	1.686	6.74	0.000 ***
Race	-0.469	0.109	-4.28	0.001 ***
Gender	-0.018	0.073	-0.24	0.814
Assembly	0.812	0.092	8.80	0.000 ***

Quality	0.546	0.136	4.01	0.001 ***
Primary Competition	0.413	0.106	3.90	0.002 **
Leadership	1.135	0.328	3.46	0.004 **
Incumbency	0.268	0.129	2.08	0.056
Open Seat	0.959	0.105	9.14	0.000 ***
Candidate Party	-0.040	0.109	-0.37	0.719
District Education	0.045	0.031	1.43	0.176
District Poverty	-0.781	0.617	-1.27	0.226
District Minorities	0.411	0.252	1.63	0.125
Moderate Professionalization	0.695	0.412	1.69	0.114
High Professionalization	1.562	0.603	2.59	0.021 *
Southern States	1.410	0.339	4.16	0.001 ***
State Partisanship	-0.061	0.029	-2.07	0.057
Significance	0.001 '***'	0.01 '**'	0.05 '*'	
Number of Observations: 2,611				
Multiple R-squared: 0.3893, Root MSE: 1.1977				
Std. Err. adjusted for 15 clusters in states				

The results in Table 3 revealed that the assembly of the race and the candidate's quality both had statistically significant effects on fundraising. The assembly in which the candidacy was focused achieved a  $p > |t|$  (0.000) with a coefficient of 0.812. Due to the fact that the dependent variable is measured as the log of the fundraising total, this coefficient indicates that candidates running for the state senate raised an average of 81% more compared their counterparts running for the state house. The candidate's quality (having won a political election in the past) yielded a  $p > |t|$  (0.001) with a coefficient of 0.546, which follows that with more experience and better networks, quality candidates would out-raise political novices.

The measures encompassing the presence of competition in the general race, candidate's leadership, and candidate's challenger status achieved statistical significance as well. Candidates faced with competition in the primary election generally raised 41% more than those without competition ( $p > |t|$  (0.002)). Those already holding leadership positions within the legislature also raised 114% more than those who did not ( $p > |t|$  (0.004)). Candidates who ran for open seats,

not surprisingly, raised 96% on the whole ( $p > |t|$  (0.000)). These findings correspond with expectations as established by previous literature (Moncrief, 1992; Thompson et al., 1994; Hogan, 2000) and reaffirm their value as control variables in this analysis.

I now move to the test of Hypothesis 1, which examines the relationship between the total funds raised and the race/ethnicity of the candidate. Consistent with the hypothesis, the candidate's race/ethnicity exhibits a statistically significant impact, with a coefficient of -0.469 (shown in Table 3). This suggests that non-white candidates raise an average of 47% less compared to white candidates, when all other mitigating factors are controlled. This relationship achieved statistical significance generating a  $p > |t|$  (0.001). The hypothesis that non-white candidates fundraised less than white candidates is thus supported.

Additionally, interactional models were conducted to assess the impact of the individual hypotheses (Tables 4-6). The interactional effects for the state's partisanship and the institutional professionalization were marginal, while those for the state's region were notable.

Table 4. Hypothesis #2: Funds and Race Model With Professionalization Interaction Effect

<b>Coefficients</b>				
	Estimate	Std. Error	T-Value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	11.867	1.575	7.53	0.000 ***
Race * Moderate Professionalization	-0.182	0.337	-0.54	0.598
Race * High Professionalization	0.249	0.370	0.67	0.512
Race	-0.519	0.319	-1.63	0.126
Gender	-0.233	0.069	-0.34	0.742
Assembly	0.809	0.093	8.71	0.000 ***
Quality	0.546	0.132	4.14	0.001 ***
Primary Competition	0.417	0.109	3.83	0.002 **
Leadership	1.146	0.328	3.50	0.004 **
Incumbency	0.270	0.128	2.12	0.052
Open Seat	0.957	0.104	9.24	0.000 ***
Candidate Party	-0.031	0.103	-0.30	0.772
District Education	0.044	0.031	1.39	0.186
District Poverty	-0.781	0.588	-1.33	0.206
District Minority	0.385	0.244	1.58	0.137
Moderate Professionalization	0.721	0.412	1.75	0.102

High Professionalization	1.528	0.597	2.57	0.022 *
State Partisanship	-0.060	0.029	-2.07	0.057
Southern States	1.431	0.340	4.21	0.001 ***
Significance	0.001 '***'	0.01 '**'	0.05 '*'	
Number of Observations: 2,611				
Multiple R-squared: 0.3911, Root MSE: 1.1964				
Std. Err. adjusted for 15 clusters in states				

The second hypothesis concentrated on the impact of legislative professionalization on the relationship between race/ethnicity and fundraising, asserting that a larger gap in fundraising would be found in states with the least professionalized state legislatures, while the smallest difference (if any) would be seen in states with the most professionalized state legislatures. These results are reported above in Table 4. Moderately professionalized state legislatures achieved a -0.182 coefficient with a  $p > |t|$  (0.598) while highly professionalized state legislatures attained a 0.249 coefficient with a  $p > |t|$  (0.512). Relative to the least professionalized states, non-white candidates in moderately professionalized states raised roughly 18% less but those in highly professionalized state raised 25% on average more. This relationship was weak and failed to achieve statistical significance.

Table 5. Hypothesis #3: Funds and Race Model with Partisanship Interaction Effect

<b>Coefficients</b>				
	Estimate	Std. Error	T-Value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	11.278	1.661	6.79	0.000 ***
Race * Party Interaction	-0.185	0.015	-1.23	0.240
Race	0.406	0.695	0.58	0.569
Gender	-0.017	0.072	-0.23	0.820
Assembly	0.809	0.094	8.65	0.000 ***
Quality	0.543	0.134	4.06	0.001 ***
Primary Competition	0.416	0.107	3.88	0.002 **
Leadership	1.135	0.328	3.46	0.004 **
Incumbency	0.274	0.126	2.17	0.048 *
Open Seat	0.960	0.106	9.09	0.000 ***
Candidate Party	-0.028	0.104	-0.28	0.785
District Education	0.043	0.032	1.31	0.210

District Poverty	-0.809	0.602	-1.34	0.200
District Minority	0.389	0.247	1.58	0.137
Moderate Professionalization	0.689	0.411	1.70	0.111
High Professionalization	1.557	0.601	2.59	0.021 *
State Partisanship	-0.059	0.029	-2.04	0.061
Southern States	1.438	0.342	4.20	0.001 ***
Significance	0.001 '****'	0.01 '**'	0.05 '*'	
Number of Observations: 2,611				
Multiple R-squared: 0.3904, Root MSE: 1.1969				
Std. Err. adjusted for 15 clusters in states				

The third hypothesis stated that partisanship would be influential in non-white candidate's ability to fundraise and that states that tended to lean Democrat would exhibit less disparity in gender fundraising compared to those that tended to lean Republican. The results are above in Table 5. Summarizing the three previous presidential elections in the "state partisanship" measure, the findings noted a small, negative relationship with a coefficient of -0.185 and a  $p > |t|$  (0.240). States that tended to align with the Republican party denoted a negative influence but this relationship was not statistically significant.

Table 6. Hypothesis #4: Funds and Race Model with Southern Interaction Effect

<b>Coefficients</b>				
	Estimate	Std. Error	T-Value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	11.776	1.550	7.59	0.000 ***
Race * South Interaction	-0.638	0.179	-3.56	0.003 ***
Race	-0.211	0.116	-1.82	0.090 ***
Gender	-0.016	0.071	-0.23	0.820
Assembly	0.808	0.094	8.55	0.000 ***
Quality	0.538	0.131	4.12	0.001 ***
Primary Competition	0.415	0.109	3.81	0.002 **
Leadership	1.084	0.273	3.97	0.001 ***
Incumbency	-0.284	0.122	2.32	0.036
Open Seat	0.953	0.105	9.10	0.000 ***
Candidate Party	-0.015	0.104	-0.15	0.885
District Education	0.038	0.033	1.17	0.263
District Poverty	-0.792	0.569	-1.36	0.186
District Minority	0.391	0.252	1.55	0.143

Moderate Professionalization	0.697	0.407	1.71	0.109
High Professionalization	1.547	0.593	2.61	0.021 *
State Partisanship	-0.059	0.029	-2.07	0.057
Southern State	1.511	0.346	4.37	0.001 ***
Significance	0.001 '***'	0.01 '**'	0.05 '*'	
Number of Observations: 2,611				
Multiple R-squared: 0.3949, Root MSE: 1.1925				
Std. Err. adjusted for 15 clusters in states				

The results of this interaction are shown above in Table 6. The coefficient of -0.638 indicates that non-White candidates in the South raise on average nearly 64% less which is highly statistically significant with a  $p > |t|$  (0.003). This finding is substantial and corresponds to the legacy of racial discrimination (in the political and economic sectors) that would influence the overall fundraising efforts of racial/ethnic minority candidates in that region.

Overall, the results are mixed. The candidate's race/ethnicity overall does prove to have a substantial impact on the total dollar amount fundraised. The impact of legislative professionalization suggested that there was a positive relationship between the more professionalized the state and the less disparity between White and non-White candidates fundraising totals. However, it failed to achieve statistical significance. State partisanship demonstrated a slightly negative relationship, indicating that non-white candidates fundraise less in Republican-leaning states. Perhaps most notably, Southern states demonstrated a negative relationship with candidate's race/ethnicity with regards to fundraising, as it was highly statistically significant that non-white candidates fundraised substantially less in Southern states. Though the state-level influences varied in magnitude, the race/ethnicity gap in campaign fundraising was consistently negative, demonstrating that the candidate's racial/ethnic background is influential in his/her fundraising.

These findings demonstrate that a race/ethnicity gap in campaign finance does exist in state legislative elections, but the state-level differences varied. Overall, the first hypothesis that maintained that non-white candidates would fundraise less than their white counterparts was upheld and the large coefficient of nearly 47% difference between the two was statistically significant. This finding illustrates not only that a race/ethnicity gap exists, but that it is substantial. What is undetermined in the scope of this particular study, however, is how this influences the elections. Though racial/ethnic minorities fundraise less, their campaigns may not necessarily need as much money. The focus of this study does not identify how the money is spent, but differences in campaigning and the districts (reliance on grassroots initiatives, co-ethnic voting, majority-minority districts, etc.) could signify that while non-White candidates fundraise less, this does not necessarily correspond to their underrepresentation. Further studies identifying the relationships between fundraising and campaigning would certainly be beneficial.

The professionalization of the institutions had no statistically significant impact on the race/ethnicity gap in fundraising, suggesting that how professionalized a state legislature is has no real impact on whether non-White candidates fundraise more or less than their White counterparts. Partisanship likewise had no effect. Though the hypothesis predicted that states leaning Democrat would exhibit smaller gaps in fundraising for non-white candidates, primarily because most racial/ethnic minorities tend to run on and support the Democratic party ticket, this relationship was not upheld.

The regionalization theory, maintaining that non-White candidates running in the South would exhibit greater fundraising disparities, was both strong and sizable. Racial/ethnic minority candidates fundraised on average nearly 64% less than White candidates, denoting a substantial



gap that was exacerbated in the Southern state legislatures. While this result is disheartening, it is not entirely surprising.

The historical means for excluding racial/ethnic minorities from politics in the South and the rampant segregation were only legally dismantled within the last 60 years. The largest populations of African-American legislators are found in the Southern states but this is in part due to the population density as well as the federal oversight through the Voting Rights Act of 1965 that mandated federal control over elections (a direct response to the discriminatory practices synonymous with Southern culture) (Guinier, 1991). These findings suggest that non-White candidates fundraise far less than White candidates in a staggering gap that emphasizes that while a racial/ethnic gap exists more generally in fundraising, it is even more prominent below the Mason-Dixon line.

## VI. Conclusion

This study demonstrates the importance of race and ethnicity in campaign fundraising. As the only multistate analysis to examine this relationship, the findings show that in state legislative elections, the candidate's identity is still related to how much he/she raises in contributions. The effect is certainly not universal, and varies based on differences across the states. The specific variations tested here (state partisanship, institutional professionalization, and region) yielded interesting results that reaffirm the disparities within and across states with regards to race/ethnicity and campaign finance.

In spite of assumptions that a candidate's racial or ethnic background does not define his or her candidacy, the cost of fundraising and financing a campaign remains an inequitable burden. White candidates benefit from various economic and political advantages, and generally

are able to raise more funds than their non-white counterparts. The findings from study affirm that a fundraising gap clearly exists still across race/ethnic lines. Non-white candidates fundraise substantially less than white candidates and, in the era of the modern campaign that necessitates expensive media markets and expansive campaign staffs; this can translate in a disadvantage to an already underrepresented population. Even though the racial/ethnic minority candidates tend to be higher quality, they fail to raise the same amount of money, revealing a challenge not easy to overcome.

The impact of state variation likewise proves to be substantial, as the hypotheses involving institutional professionalization and state-level partisanship were upheld. Overall, the more professionalized the legislature, the less of a gap in fundraising between racial and ethnic minority candidates and white candidates. Democratic-leaning states also demonstrate a minimized disparity between race and ethnicity and fundraising. These results show that not only do state level variations matter in explaining and understanding this relationship, but professionalization and partisanship play a particularly important role.

What these results fail to suggest is a way to fully mitigate the fundraising gap. The election system in the United States is inherently unfair when it is obvious that, even with all other mitigating factors held constant, non-white candidates are unable to raise comparable amounts of money compared to white candidates. Fundraising is critical to pay for the advertising, staffing, and other necessities required in the era of the modern campaign. When the candidate with the most money wins most of the time, it is apparent that the playing field is far from level. As non-white candidates consistently raise less money in their campaigns, they are at a disadvantage for winning their race. Adding this to the economic and education gap, and it

seems dismally clear why so few racial and ethnic minorities and serve in political office relative to the abundance of white officeholders.

Considering how fundraising plays a role in the election of candidates from underrepresented groups is critical to further understanding the complicated roles of money and race in politics. This study demonstrates that a race gap in campaign finance exists within the state legislative elections. We should continue to identify other ways in which the race gap occurs in campaigns and how funding can be used to exacerbate or minimize disparities. Determining inequities within the political system itself can prove to be challenging, but it is necessary to order to address why our representative democracy is not particularly representative and decide what can be done about this.

## References

- Abbe, O.G. and Herrnson, P.S. (2003). Campaign professionalism in state legislative elections. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 3(3), 223-245.
- Arrington, T.S. & Ingalls, G.L. (1984). Race and campaign finance in Charlotte, N.C. *Western Political Quarterly* 37 (4): 578-83.
- Biersack, R., Herrnson, P.S., & Wilcox, C. (1993). Seeds for success: Early money in Congressional elections. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 18:535-551.
- Boatright, R.G. (2013). Campaign finance in the 2012 election. In Box-Steffensmeier, J.M. & Schier, S.E. (eds.) *The American elections of 2012*. New York: Routledge.
- Bond, J.R., Covington, C., & Fleisher, R. (1985). Explaining challenger quality in Congressional elections. *Journal of Politics*, 47:510-529.
- Breaux, D.A. and Gierzynski, A. (1991). "It's money that matters:" Campaign expenditures and state legislative primaries. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 16 (3): 429-443.
- Bullock, C.S. (1975.) The election of blacks in the South: Preconditions and consequences. *American Journal of Political Science* 19 (4): 727-739.
- Bullock, C.S., Gaddie, R.K., & Ferrington, A. (2002). System structure, campaign stimuli, and voter falloff in runoff primaries. *Journal of Politics* 64:1210-24.
- Calvo, M. A., & Rosenstone, S. J. (1989). *Hispanic political participation*. Southwest Voter Research Institute.
- Dionne, E.J. (2012). The Citizens United catastrophe. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved August 12, 2013.
- Eckstrand, L.E. & Eckert, W. (1981). The impact of candidate's sex on voter choice. *Western Political Quarterly* 34: 78-87.
- Fryer, R.G. & Levitt, S.D. (2004). The causes and consequences of distinctively black names. *The Quarterly Journal of Economic* 119 (3): 767-806.
- Gierzynski, A. & Breaux, D. (1991). Money and votes in state legislative elections. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 16 (2): 203-17.
- Glaser, J.M. (1994). Back to the black belt: Racial environment and white racial attitudes in the South. *The Journal of Politics* 56(1): 21-41.

- Guinier, L. (1991). The triumph of tokenism: the Voting Rights Act and the theory of black electoral success. *Michigan Law Review*, 1077-1154.
- Hogan, R.E. (2000). The costs of representation in state legislatures: explaining variations in campaign spending. *Social Science Quarterly*, 81: 941-956.
- Humes, K.R., Jones, N.A., & Rameriez, R.R. (2011). Overview of race and Hispanic origin: 2010. *U.S. Census Bureau*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-02.pdf>
- Hutchings, V.L. & Valentino, N.A. (2004). The centrality of race in American politics. *Annual Review of Political Science* 7: 383-408.
- Hutchings, V.L., Valentino, N.A., Philpot, T.S., White, I.K. (2006.) Racial cues in campaign news: The effects of candidate strategies on group activation and political attentiveness among African Americans. *Feeling Politics: Emotion in Political Information Processing*, ed. D.P. Redlawsk.
- Jacobson, G.C. (2004). Money and votes reconsidered: Congressional elections. *Public Choice*, 47:7-62.
- Jacobson, G. C. (2008). *A Divider, not a uniter: George W. Bush and the American people-The 2006 election and beyond*. New York: Longman Press.
- Jacobson, G.C & Kernell, S. (1983). *Strategy and choice in Congressional elections*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Johnson, M., Stein, R. M., & Wrinkle, R. (2003). Language Choice, Residential Stability, and Voting Among Latino Americans. *Social Science Quarterly*, 84(2), 412-424.
- King-Meadows, T. & Schaller, T.F. (2007). *Devolution of black state legislators: Challenges and choices in the twenty-first century*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Leeper, M.S. (1991). The impact of prejudice on female candidates: an experimental look at voter inference. *American Politics Quarterly* 19: 248-61.
- “Legislator demographics.” *National Conference of State Legislatures*, 2013. Retrieved from <http://www.ncsl.org/legislatures-elections.aspx?tabs=1116,113,782#1116>
- Leighley, J.E. (2001). *Strength in numbers? The political mobilization of racial and ethnic minorities*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Lichter, D.T. (1989). Race employment hardship, and inequality in the American nonmetropolitan South. *American Sociological Review*, 54 (3): 436-446.

- Lieske, J. (1989). The political dynamics of urban voting behavior. *American Journal of Political Science* 33:150-174.
- Liptak, A. (2010). Courts take on campaign finance decision. *The New York Times*. Retrieved on August 12, 2013.
- Matson, M. & Fine, T.S. (2006). Gender, ethnicity, and ballot information: Ballot cues in low-information elections. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 6 (1): 49-72.
- McDermott, M.L. (1998). Race and gender cues in low-information elections. *Political Research Quarterly*, 51 (4): 895-918.
- MacManus, S. A., & Cassel, C. A. (1982). Mexican-Americans in city politics: Participation, representation, and policy preferences. *Urban Interest* 4(1): 57-69.
- Moncrief, G.F. (1992). The increase in campaign expenditures in state legislative elections: a comparison of four northwestern states. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 45(2): 549-558.
- Mutz, D.C. (1995). Effects of horse-race coverage on campaign coffers: Strategic contributing in presidential primaries. *Journal of Politics*, 57(4): 1015-1042.
- National Institute on Money in State Politics*. (2007). Data on campaign finance returns, 1999-2012. Retrieved from <http://followthemoney.org/>
- Number of African-American legislators – 2009. (2012). *National Conference of State Legislatures*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncsl.org/legislatures-elections/legisdata/african-american-legislators-1992-to-2009.aspx>
- Overton, S. (2004). The Donor Class: Campaign Finance, Democracy, and Participation. *The University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 153 (1): 73-118.
- Reingold, B. (2012). The uneven presence of women and minorities in America's state legislatures—and why it matters. *Scholars strategy network*. Retrieved from <http://thesocietypages.org/ssn/2012/11/12/minority-representation/> on July 18, 2013.
- Rivas-Vazquez, A. G. (1999). New pools of Latino wealth: A case study of donors and potential donors in US Hispanic/Latino communities. *Nuevos Senderos: Reflections on Hispanics and Philanthropy*, 115.
- Sigelman, L. & Sigelman, C.K. (1984). Sexism, racism, and ageism in voting behavior: An experimental analysis. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 45: 263-69.
- Smith, T. (2001). Race and money in politics. *North Carolina Law Review* 79: 1469.
- Smith, T. (2005). White dollars, black candidates: Inequality and agency in

- campaign finance law. *South Carolina Law Review* 57: 735-48.
- Sonenshein, R.J. (1990). Can black candidates win statewide elections? *Political Science Quarterly* 105 (2): 219-41.
- Sorauf, F.J. (1992). *Inside campaign finance: Myths and realities*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Terkildsen, N. (1993). When white voters evaluate black candidates: The processing implications of candidate skin color, prejudice, and self-monitoring. *American Journal of Political Science*, 37: 1032-53.
- Thompson, J.A., Cassie, W., and Jewell, M.E. (1994). A sacred cow or just a lot of bull? Party and PAC money in state legislative elections. *Political Research Quarterly*, 47(1): 223-237.
- US Census Bureau: State and county quickfacts.” 2010. Retrieved from <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/index.html>
- US Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2010 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, Table GCT0101; generated using American FactFinder; <http://factfinder2.census.gov>
- Valentino, N.A., Hutchings, V.L., White, I.K. (2002.) Cues that matter: How political ads prime racial attitudes during campaigns. *American political science review* (96, 1): 75-90.
- Vonnahme, G. (2012). A preferential attachment model of campaign contributions in state legislative elections. *Public Choice*, 1-15.
- Wilson, D.C. (2008). Prospective black candidates: can they win? *Harvard Journal of African American Public Policy* 12: 9-27.

Appendix

Appendix Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Variables

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
<b>CANDIDATE LEVEL</b>				
Funds	129,050.50	275,002.30	1000	5,889,792
Race	0.1649	0.3712	0	1
Gender	0.2281	0.4197	0	1
Quality	0.7132	0.4524	0	1
Primary Competition	0.2279	0.4474	0	1
Leadership	0.0492	0.2163	0	1
Incumbency	0.5626	0.4962	0	1
Open Seat	0.1680	0.3739	0	1
<b>DISTRICT LEVEL</b>				
Poverty	0.1228	0.0838	0.01	0.9
Minority	0.2715	0.2646	0.01	0.97
No Education	0.2284	0.7805	0.02	0.55
<b>STATE LEVEL</b>				
Low Professionalization	0.2741	0.4461	0	1
Moderate Professionalization	0.3464	0.4759	0	1
High Professionalization	0.3795	0.4853	0	1
State Republican Vote Total	47.0868	7.4685	35.3067	62.1433
Southern Location	0.3143	0.4643	0	.01

Appendix Table 2. Explanation of Variable Coding

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE CODING
<b>DEPENDENT Variable</b>	
Fund	Total Dollar Amount (i.e. 346,560)
<b>INDEPENDENT Variables</b>	
Gender	Male = 0, Female = 1
Party	Republican = 0, Democrat = 1
Won	Lost = 0, Won = 1
Quality	No Elected Political Position = 0, Previously Held Elected Political Position = 1
Primary Competition	No Primary Competition = 0, Primary Competition = 1
General Competition	No General Competition = 0, General Competition = 1
Race	White = 0, Non-White = 1
Leadership	No High Leadership Position Held = 0, Held High Leadership Position = 1
Incumbency	Not Incumbent = 0, Incumbent = 1
Open Seat	Not Open Seat = 0, Open Seat = 1



Challenger	Not Challenger = 0, Challenger = 1
Assembly	House = 0, Senate = 1
State Partisanship	Average % of State voted for the Republican candidate for the 1996, 2000, & 2004 elections (i.e. 49%)
District Economic Affluence/Poverty	Percentage of Individuals within the district at or below the poverty level (i.e. 25%)
District Minority	Percentage of Individuals within the district who reported on the 2000 US Census to be any race or ethnicity other than Non-Hispanic White (i.e. 10%)
District Education Attainment	Percentage of Individuals over 25 years old within the district who reported on the 2000 US Census to have earned a HS Diploma or completed the GED equivalent
State Partisanship	Average % of State voted Republican for the Republican candidate for the 1996, 2000, & 2004 elections (i.e. 51%)
Institutional Professionalization	Least professionalized state legislature = 1, Slightly less professionalized state legislature = 2, Moderately professionalized state legislature = 3, Slightly highly professionalized state legislature = 4, Most professionalized state legislature = 5,
Geographic Location	Located outside of the South = 0, Located in the South 1

Appendix Table 3. Funds and Race/Ethnicity Fixed Effects Model

<b>Coefficients</b>				
	Estimate	Std. Error	T-Value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	10.846	0.179	60.58	0.000 ***
Race	-0.481	0.095	-5.07	0.000 ***
Gender	-0.073	0.068	-1.07	0.303
Assembly	0.881	0.087	10.18	0.000 ***
Quality	0.481	0.139	3.47	0.004 **
Primary Comp.	0.438	0.093	4.69	0.000 **
Leadership	0.672	0.173	3.88	0.002 **
Incumbency	0.392	0.124	3.15	0.007 *
Open Seat	0.731	0.095	7.72	0.000 ***
Candidate Party	-0.014	0.111	-0.12	0.903
District Poverty	-0.353	0.666	-0.53	0.604
District Minorities	-0.085	0.262	-0.32	0.751
District Education	0.006	0.029	0.21	0.838
Alabama	---	---	---	---

California	0.731	0.094	7.78	0.000 ***
Colorado	-1.023	0.047	-21.91	0.000 ***
Connecticut	-1.694	0.044	-38.12	0.000 ***
Georgia	-0.992	0.037	-26.84	0.000 ***
Illinois	0.324	0.041	7.84	0.000 ***
Iowa	-0.900	0.033	-27.20	0.000 ***
Michigan	-0.860	0.031	-27.80	0.000 ***
Mississippi	-1.573	0.025	-63.16	0.000 ***
Nevada	-0.715	0.154	-4.66	0.003 **
New York	-0.221	0.039	-5.72	0.000 ***
North Dakota	-3.794	0.043	-87.52	0.000 ***
Wisconsin	-1.305	0.023	-56.61	0.000 ***
Wyoming	-3.247	0.039	-84.30	0.000 ***
Significance	0.001 '***'	0.01 '**'	0.05 '*'	
Number of Observations: 2,611				
Multiple R-squared: 0.5335, Root MSE: 1.0489				
Std. Err. adjusted for 15 clusters in states				

Appendix Table 4. Funds and Race (Hispanic and Black) Fixed Effects Model

<b>Coefficients</b>				
	Estimate	Std. Error	T-Value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	10.704	0.172	62.18	0.000
Hispanic	-0.361	0.182	-1.98	0.067
Black	-0.445	0.099	-4.51	0.000 ***
Assembly	0.841	0.087	9.68	0.000 ***
Quality	0.518	0.139	3.72	0.002 **
Primary Comp.	0.373	0.126	2.95	0.011 *
General Comp.	0.419	0.154	2.72	0.017 *
Leadership	0.698	0.182	3.82	0.002 ***
Incumbency	0.284	0.152	1.87	0.083
Open Seat	0.571	0.163	3.51	0.003 **
Challenger	-0.235	0.177	-1.32	0.207
Gender	-0.079	0.068	-1.17	0.261
Candidate Party	-0.014	0.111	-0.13	0.899
Dist. Education	0.007	0.025	0.30	0.768
Dist. Poverty	-0.318	0.612	-0.52	0.612
Dist. Minority	-0.062	0.244	-0.25	0.804
Alabama	---	---	---	---
California	0.603	0.104	5.81	0.000 ***
Colorado	-1.129	0.054	-20.98	0.000 ***
Connecticut	-1.729	0.042	-40.79	0.000 ***
Georgia	-0.959	0.036	-26.49	0.000 ***
Illinois	0.308	0.039	8.00	0.000 ***

Iowa	-0.935	0.030	-31.11	0.000 ***
Michigan	-0.971	0.060	-16.05	0.000 ***
Mississippi	-2.980	0.033	-90.14	0.000 ***
Nevada	-0.596	0.147	-4.06	0.000 ***
New York	-0.326	0.046	-7.15	0.000 ***
North Dakota	-3.901	0.069	-56.01	0.000 ***
South Carolina	-1.145	0.028	-40.19	0.000 ***
Wisconsin	-1.356	0.019	-68.15	0.000 ***
Wyoming	-3.211	0.041	-78.81	0.000 ***
Significance	0.001 '***'	0.01 '**'	0.05 '*'	
Number of Observations: 2,588				
Multiple R-squared: 0.5513, Root MSE: 1.0301				
Std. Err. adjusted for 15 clusters in states				

Appendix Table 5. Funds and Race (Hispanic and Black) OLS Model

<b>Coefficients</b>				
	Estimate	Std. Error	T-Value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	11.904	1.576	7.55	0.000
Hispanic	-0.292	0.204	-1.43	0.175
Black	-0.453	0.109	-4.12	0.001 ***
Assembly	0.777	0.092	8.41	0.000 ***
Quality	0.609	0.145	4.18	0.001 **
Primary Comp.	0.368	0.132	2.79	0.015 *
General Comp.	0.343	0.148	2.33	0.035 *
Leadership	1.111	0.288	3.86	0.002 ***
Incumbency	-0.603	0.311	-1.94	0.073
Open Seat	0.075	0.287	0.26	0.798
Challenger	-0.982	0.291	-3.38	0.005
Gender	-0.048	0.078	-0.61	0.552
Candidate Party	-0.037	0.108	-0.34	0.738
Dist. Education	0.040	0.026	1.55	0.142
Dist. Poverty	-0.816	0.643	-1.27	0.225
Dist. Minority	0.419	0.236	1.78	0.097
Mod. Prof.	0.694	0.409	1.70	0.112
High Prof.	1.553	0.604	2.57	0.022
South	1.473	0.339	4.34	0.001 ***
State Party	-0.059	0.029	-2.03	0.062 *
Significance	0.001 '***'	0.01 '**'	0.05 '*'	
Number of Observations: 2,588				
Multiple R-squared: 0.4055, Root MSE: 1.1833				
Std. Err. adjusted for 15 clusters in states				

Appendix Table 6. Average Amounts Raised by General Election Legislative Candidates (2005-2006)

State	\$ Amount Per Voter	Voters	Total Contributions	House Average	Senate Average
Alabama	\$29.03	1,250,401	\$36,294,226	\$99,431	\$365,186
California	\$10.71	8,899,059	\$95,316,305	\$385,132	\$495,671
Colorado	\$4.69	1,586,105	\$7,444,881	\$41,004	\$70,953
Connecticut	\$7.14	1,123,412	\$8,025,083	\$14,204	\$54,673
Georgia	\$10.81	2,122,185	\$22,947,002	\$58,331	\$120,695
Illinois	\$17.47	3,587,676	\$62,667,885	\$205,823	\$391,296
Iowa	\$15.41	1,071,509	\$16,508,298	\$65,702	\$128,807
Michigan	\$7.01	3,852,008	\$27,020,311	\$58,488	\$130,978
Mississippi	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nevada	\$20.70	586,274	\$12,140,565	\$92,241	\$213,554
New York	\$11.86	4,697,867	\$55,714,627	\$78,327	\$295,808
North Dakota	\$2.42	220,479	\$432,726	\$3,448	\$4,985
South Carolina	\$5.78	1,117,311	\$6,458,262	\$40,364	No Races
Wisconsin	\$4.51	2,183,155	\$9,835,392	\$35,495	\$121,006
Wyoming	\$3.88	196,217	\$761,264	\$6,031	\$11,335

\* Data from the National Institute on Money in State Politics, March 2008

Appendix Table 7. State Campaign Finance Laws

State	Individual	State Party	PAC	Corporate	Union	Total
Alabama	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	\$500/c/e	Unlimited	Open
California	\$3,900	Unlimited	\$3,900 $\psi$	\$3,900	\$3,900	Med.
Colorado*	\$550	\$113,905 <sup>^</sup>	\$550 $\xi$	Prohibited	Prohibited	High
Connecticut*	\$1,000 & \$250 $\phi$	\$10,000 & \$5,000 $\phi$	\$1,500 & \$750 $\phi$	Prohibited	\$1,000 & \$250 $\phi$	High
Georgia	\$6,300 $\alpha$	\$6,300	\$6,300	\$6,300	\$6,300	High
Illinois	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	Open
Iowa	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	Prohibited	Unlimited	Open
Michigan*	\$3,400	\$68,000	\$34,000	Prohibited	Prohibited	Med.
Mississippi	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	\$1,000	Unlimited	Open
Nevada	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	High
New York	\$16,800 & \$8,200 $\phi$ $\pm$	Prohibited in primary Unlimited	\$16,800 & \$8,200 $\phi$	\$5,000	\$16,800 & \$8,200 $\phi$ $\pm$	High

		in general	±			
North Dakota	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	Prohibited	Prohibited	Open
South Carolina*	\$1,000	\$50,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	Med.
Wisconsin	\$1,000 & \$500 ϕ	\$22,425 & \$11,213 ϕ	\$1,000 & \$500 ϕ	Prohibited	Prohibited	High
Wyoming	\$1,000	Unlimited	Unlimited	Prohibited	Prohibited	Med.

\* Limits listed are specifically for statewide candidates  
^ Includes candidate contributions to his/her own campaign  
ξ For “small donor” committees, maximum of \$5,675 donation accepted  
∞ Per election (primary and general separate); additional \$3,700 per run-off  
± For both primary and general elections (separate amounts for each totaled here)  
ψ For “small contributor” committees, \$7,800 limit  
ϕ First number is for Senate candidates, second number is for House candidates  
∞ information derived from *State Limits on Contributions of Candidates* by the National Center of State Legislatures ©2012

#### 4. ARTICLE III

##### The Impact of State Political Context on the Relationship between Gender, Race, and Campaign Finance

#### Abstract

With the constantly increasing costs of campaigning, the, having ample funds is necessary, but not universally accessible, to all candidates. Political barriers that exist for women and racial/ethnic minorities influence fundraising outcomes as well as electoral outcomes (Arrington and Ingalls, 1984; Smith, 2005; Matson and Fine, 2006). This study addresses the relationship between candidate gender and race and campaign fundraising, and the possible mediating impact of three dimensions of the state political context – state legislative professionalism, state Republican party strength, and state culture (South vs. Non-south). I evaluate fundraising totals across 15 states for over 3,000 candidates in the 2006 state legislative elections. Ultimately, the findings suggest that after controlling for other candidate characteristics, as well as district and state context, there is a negative relationship between gender and race and campaign fundraising, which is statistically significant with regards to race. In addition, there appears to be notable variation in the effect of gender/race in the Southern states in relation to the fundraising gap. This study finds that female and non-White candidates continue to fundraise less than their white, male counterparts and state variation is important in understanding the gender/race gap in campaign finance.

## I. Introduction

At the close of the 20th century, the social movements for gender and racial equality that fueled generations of protest seemed successful. African-Americans endured a history of political oppression in the United States that was slowly but systematically dismantled with the passage of the 15<sup>th</sup> Amendment, the dissolution of Jim Crow segregation, and the promise of social inclusion (as separate was inherently unequal) through the Civil Rights movement. In 2008, Barack Obama was elected to the highest political office in the nation and again, in 2012, the first African-American president secured a second term. African-Americans are not alone as racial/ethnic minorities with increasing political opportunities. Hispanic-Americans are the largest growing ethnic group in the country and their power at the polls has contributed to a number of electoral victories. In a nation where suffrage was long dominated by a white population, racial and ethnic minorities have made substantial, albeit hard-fought, strides.

The political landscape for women's position has also exhibited notable changes within the last century. Granted the right to vote through the 19<sup>th</sup> Amendment, women have become increasingly active in politics. No longer relegated to solely local or small positions, women comprise a large segment of the electorate and when a candidate ignores or disregards the "woman's vote" or the "women's issues," such ignorance is reciprocated by female voters at the polls (Atkeson, 2003; Brians, 2005; Wolbrecht, 2010). Following President Obama's election and inauguration into office, one of his first appointments was former political adversary Hillary Clinton to the role of Secretary of State. Having since retired for the duration of Obama's second term, political analysts speculate Clinton has ambitions for a presidential administration of her own in the forthcoming elections. Though we have yet to elect a female chief of state, the

value of the female experience and perspective on the whole seems to finally be achieving equal recognition after an enduring historical legacy of sex-based exclusion and political oppression.

Though these strides mark an impressive inclusion of minorities and women in terms of voting participation, the divergence between those casting ballots and those whose names appear on ballots marks a radical shift. The lack of diversity within public office in the US extends nearly every level and every branch of government and transcends the cultural and socio-political boundaries of the states. As no explicit legal barriers prohibit women or racial minorities from running, the gaping underrepresentation of these groups merits critical analysis.

In terms of race and ethnicity, the most recent 2010 Census reported that approximately 36% of the country's population was either non-White or Hispanic. However, racial and ethnic minorities occupy far fewer political positions, both elected and appointed. At the federal level, only 43 members (9%) of Congress are African-Americans (and they are exclusively in the House of Representatives), while 31 members (7%) are Hispanic or Latino, 12 are Asian (2%), and one (>1%) is Native American (Manning, 2012). In the Supreme Court, only one of its nine members is African-American and one is Latino, which totals to just 22%. Though white officials exclusively dominated the presidency until 2008, other positions within the executive branch remain overwhelmingly White.

At the state level, some regional variation exists in the level of minority representation, yet African-Americans and Latinos remain underrepresented at all levels of state government (Grofman and Handley, 1989; Marotta and Garcia, 2003; Griffin and Newman, 2007). Only one governor out of the fifty is non-White and an average of 9% of the state legislative bodies' seats are held by African-American representatives (National Conference on State Legislatures, 2009). Interestingly, states in the South tend to have the most Black legislators (with Mississippi leading



all states at 29% of its total state legislature, Alabama at 24%, and Georgia and South Carolina tied at 22%) but even here the percentage of Black representatives is not proportionate to the size of the African-American population in the state (National Conference on State Legislatures, 2009).

For women, the picture is equally bleak with regards to holding public office, in spite of the fact that they numerically represent a majority of the population. Though they comprise roughly 51% of the total citizenry, women remain underrepresented in all branches of both state and federal government. At the federal level, women in Congress account for 94 of the seats (17%) which can be further broken down by the 77 in the House and 17 in the Senate (Manning, 2012). On the Supreme Court bench, women represent only 3 of the 9 seats (33%) though the present composition still represents a record for gender representation on the Court. As already noted, the presidency and vice presidency positions have always been dominated by men.

Women's involvement in elected office is more prevalent in state and local positions, however, even these arenas are far from equitable and encouraging. The average percentage of women in the state legislatures averages around 23% and none of these actually achieves a balance comparable to the constituency populations (Colorado being the closest with 46% of its state legislature female) (*Center for American Women and Politics*, 2013.) Governorships are likewise rarely occupied by women (only 5 of 50 states currently boast female chief executives) and other lower positions in the state executive branch follow suit. The low numbers of women in elected office, at all levels and branches of government, is not only disappointing for representative democracy, but it is the reality of the political arena in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

A large literature in political science has examined race and politics. In addition, an equally large literature has focused on gender and politics. Yet, despite the growth in these two

fields over the last three decades, scholars have only recently begun to study how race and gender interact to affect political outcomes. Research demonstrates the challenges of running and choosing to run for women and racial/ethnic minorities, but these studies still tend to focus on one candidate trait (gender or race) without examining the heterogeneity within that group (Arrington and Ingalls, 1984; Soneshein, 1990; Carroll, 1994; Fox, 2000). Certainly, within any societal group, various similarities that underscore the cohesion and classification of the group are emphasized while the characteristics that are less central and prevent pure uniformity of the group are minimized for the sake of examination and generalization. This phenomenon is paramount to American politics in particular, as we simplify partisan preferences or ideological allegiances to a 7- or sometimes even 3-point scale while only minimally controlling for other factors that might signify variations within these stratifications. Most research that focuses on women in politics assumes a false universality; at best, they operate under the caveat that the definitions of gender or race supersede other important variations within those traits, and that their approach embodies a uniform, if unrealistic, perspective of what happens *to* those groups as a whole.

What about *within* these groups, though? The experience of a Black woman and a Hispanic woman running for office is likely to differ from their white female counterparts, as well as Black and Hispanic men. Representing an intersection of both minority positions, in terms of gender and race, non-White women running campaigns endure a unique political climate, fueled by their social and economic positions, that makes assimilation of their identity into simply “female” or simply “racial/ethnic minority” inaccurate and misleading. How do non-White women position themselves when they run for political office? Do they run as women? Do they run as racial/ethnic minority candidates? Do they run as both? Does their posturing

depend on their own perceived identity, as well as the interests of the voters, party, and donors? All of these factors inevitably play a role in the non-White woman's campaigning process.

Given the increasing prominence of campaign finance, understanding the differences between both gender and race is imperative in identifying at least one of the ways in which non-White female candidates have unique experiences that mimic the distinct positions, politically, economically, and socially, that they occupy. This can be visually depicted in a quadrant representation, where gender and race intersect to create four different categories (i.e. "White male," "non-White female," etc.). Undoubtedly, candidate fundraising is only a small segment of the campaigning process, but it offers a valuable vantage point beneficial to this analysis. Though advertising can vary widely, depending on the campaign's approach, the candidate's preference, the district climate, and the media market, the process of raising and spending money is similar regardless of the race. Constructing and pushing for policy preferences can also take a number of different approaches through a handful of tactics and techniques, while interesting and worth examination, can be deeply complex.

Evaluating how much money a candidate is able to raise, considering additional mitigating factors known to influence campaign fundraising, offers a simple, yet powerful analysis of non-White female candidates and their fundraising outcomes. How do fundraising totals differ across race and gender? Is the variance marginal or substantial and which candidates seem to be consistently underfunded? By analyzing the differences in fundraising totals of the four basic group variations within the intersections of gender and race (White men, White women, non-White men, and non-White women), we can garner a better understanding of the differences among these groups in one of the most challenging, but necessary facets of the modern campaign—raising money.

## ii. Literature Review

### i. Gender Literature

The importance of fundraising has long been observed by political pundits and scholars alike. As the costs for mounting a viable political campaign (and hiring premier consultants, and paying for quality opinion testing, and affording expensive media markets...) rise, it should be unsurprising that this aspect of campaigning has captured more attention. Narrowing our focus onto candidate identity and fundraising efforts, obstacles, and outcomes yields two major sections of empirical work examining the role of candidate gender and the role of candidate race, respectively.

Much research has been done on the impact of gender on campaigning that allows an in-depth examination of how and why women are still underrepresented in public office. The social barrier theories that politics was “a man’s game,” and that women had nothing substantive to contribute, or they were not as “electable” as men, have now swiftly been disproven (Stroper, 1977; Welch, 1977; Hedlund, et al., 1979; Rule, 1988). Social differences as a whole, however, have not been negated entirely, and women who participate in a majority of the domestic chores (child-rearing, cooking and cleaning, etc.) still outweighs men in addition to their growing position in the workforce (Bianchi, 1999).

These couple with other factors that reveal challenges women still face when running for public office. Women have a tendency to underestimate their abilities (purposefully or subconsciously) and are likely to overestimate the cost of funding a winning campaign (Lawless, Fox, & Freely, 2001; Jenkins, 2007; Sanbonmatsu & Carroll, 2009). The critical media spotlight is also cited as a deterrent, which tends to focus more on personal attributes and physical

qualities with female candidates. One need only to remember as recently as the last presidential election, when Hillary Clinton and Sarah Palin campaigned for the two highest executive positions in the country and endured relentless media criticism for their physical appearance, their ability as mothers, and their position relative to gender norms (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009.)

Because of the strength of the two party system, partisanship is an important financial indicator, particularly in the general election, and cues partisan and ideologically-led PACs and IGs in their contribution decisions (Day, Hadley, & Duffy Brown, 2001; Day & Hadley, 2002). Though a number of powerful PACs geared towards female candidates cater to both parties, Democratic women still benefit the most. Term limits are influential in fundraising as well, given incumbency advantage, and typically benefit female candidates and other underrepresented groups, as they inhibit career politicians (which historically have been white men) and cultivate more opportunities for open seats (Carroll & Jenkins, 2001). Given the tremendous financial and electoral advantage incumbents have, open seats are consistently the most advantageous opportunities for new candidates (Crespin & Deitz, 2009).

## ii. Race/Ethnicity Literature

The impact of race and campaigning likewise has yielded some valuable insights, though most of these center on aspects of campaigning aside from fundraising. The effects of the candidate's race varies depending on the circumstances, but cognitive shortcuts that combine all of the candidate's traits (as well as his or her opponent(s) prove to be instrumental. Unlike gender cues, which are often easier to assess through a candidate's name, race and ethnicity are not always as evident. However, candidates that have names that are considered racially distinctive make their race and presumed political traits that accompany those stereotypes more

evident (Fryer and Levitt, 2004). McDermott's (1998) foundational study on the impact of race and gender suggested that candidate demographic cues, such as race and gender, also offer cognitive short-cuts for voters through their presumed association with being more liberal than white, male candidates. The influence of race coupled with partisanship, voting, and representation is not independent, but is rather intersectional, conglomerating into one major informational cue (Hutchings and Valentino, 2004). While race and gender can be utilized as cognitive short-cuts, in races where a particular candidate perceives his/her race or gender to be an electoral disadvantage among voters, campaign fundraising and strategic spending can help (Matson and Fine, 2006). Funneling funds into polling, advertising, and media events can alleviate voter reliance on stereotypes and offer a chance to reassess (hopefully positively) the candidate.

The variation in campaign contributions underscores a key difference, as Arrington and Ingalls (1984) demonstrated that on the local level, Black candidates and campaign donors vary from their White counterparts. They noted that in their Charlotte, North Carolina study, Black citizens were every bit as likely to contribute to campaigns as White citizens, but they donate fewer dollars per capita. In addition, they concluded that donations are "substantially aligned by race" (582-583). Given this observation, the study concluded that no obvious financial discrepancy existed between Black and White candidates, as the fewer Black donors corresponded proportionately to fewer Black candidates.

At the state level, Sonenshein (1990) found that Black candidates utilize their bond to gain Black support but are still pressed to seek electoral and financial support beyond that community. This represents a paradox, as Smith (2005) argued that black candidates are hindered by their ability to pursue their own agenda (one which, presumably, would incorporate

race-based politics) because they are dependent on “white money” (736). Though the classic studies found that the stigmatized perspective of the non-white candidates was perilous, more recent research has observed that racial tensions and acceptance of minorities in high political offices had eased considerably (White, 2008).

Less research has been solely dedicated to Hispanic fundraising outcomes, but the cultural differences in terms of language and community can play an important role in their political behavior. Hispanic contributors behave differently from white donors, in both the cultural context for what it means to donate funds and political expectations for contributions (Rivas-Vazquez, 1999). They prefer in-person contact and emphasize family and community influences as motivators for contributions. In addition to a potential language difference, members of different ethnic groups have historical experiences and cultural differences that may change their perspectives on campaigns (Leighley, 2001). The way in which a candidate approaches fundraising likely varies across ethnic lines and also with regards to how long one has resided in the country. A first-generation Hispanic immigrant’s understanding and perspective of the political process, including fundraising, would likely be different from a third-generation immigrant.

Both Black and Hispanic Americans lag behind whites with regards to job opportunities mean wages, average household income, and educational attainment (Lichter, 1989; Glaser, 1994). No recent study has examined whether a race-based discrepancy still exists in fundraising results, and none of the studies have examined the influence of gender differences within the non-White candidate pool.

### iii. Intersectionality Literature

The reality of intersectionality long preceded the theory, which became prominent in feminist literature during the late 1980s and early 1990s. Countering an essentialist argument that underscored the second wave of feminism, early proponents of examining intersectionality argued that through instilling universalistic claims, the individual experiences and heterogeneity embodied by feminist politics were ignored and all women were presumed identical, regardless of their racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, and ideological background. The life experiences of Black women were divergent compared to the overly simplistic monolith that held all women as uniformly similar on the basis of gender (Davis, 1983; Crenshaw, 1991; Lorde, 2003).

Much of the work addressing the concepts of intersectionality, particularly within the Women's Studies and African-American Studies disciplines, has utilized a qualitative methodology. The underlying notions of meaningful difference within subgroups benefit from quantitative approaches, though limitations exist there as well. Particularly with regards to this study, there are a multitude of categorizations and groups and subgroups that can be continuously divided until the sample size within each consists of a small handful and impedes quality research. Here, the intersections of gender and race are examined and both dichotomously for the sake of simplicity and robustness of the sample. Certainly, not all women who are nonwhite embody the same experience, as the perspectives and positions of Black women, Hispanic women, Asian women, and Native American all vary drastically amongst themselves, as they do from Caucasian women. Furthermore, important differences reflected in socioeconomic disparities, variation in educational attainment, occupational positions, and sexual orientation remain unexamined within this analysis. Each of these facets may result in a difference in campaign fundraising experience but in order to maintain a substantial sample size, these additional distinctions are not examined.



### III. Theory

As the aforementioned theories guiding the earlier studies suggest, gender and race are likely to play a prominent role in influencing how voters and donors view candidates. As a candidate's personal identity can signify important perceived (albeit not always accurate) qualities about his/her political stance, these traits can likewise impact contribution decisions. Donors give to campaigns for a myriad of reasons, but they are usually interested in supporting a candidate with whom they agree and feel their best interests would be most adequately represented and also a candidate who can win. Though we have some understanding of how gender and race individually influence these decisions, the effect of the interaction of both gender and race together is vastly unaddressed in the literature and poses a number of questions as to its larger role in representation.

A non-White woman represents two types of underrepresented groups in government and is more likely to be economically and socially disadvantaged. Historically, non-White women have endured so much oppression that the possibility of running, let alone serving, in public office, is challenging. Compared to her non-White male colleagues who still embody male privilege and her White female colleagues who enjoy white privilege, the non-White female candidate is unique. As the literature notes, non-White women experience sex-based and race based barriers that make their social position unique (Davis, 1983; Crenshaw, 1991; Lorde, 2003). As these extend into the economic and political spheres, it follows that non-White women would also have different campaigning experiences. In the analyses below, I explore the impact of this intersection of gender and race on campaign fundraising. While I expect that

nonwhite women face a unique disadvantage compared to male and White candidates, this question has yet to be explored empirically.

Non-White women are less likely to be involved in party politics in the traditional sense (helping on campaigns, serving a specific political party) in part because of their disadvantaged economic position, which minimizes their ability to do so. This would indicate that states with more professionalized state legislatures or states that institute strict campaign finance restrictions would be more likely to elect such candidates, as it would control for some (though certainly not all) of the economic barriers that make the decision to run and the capability to conduct a competitive campaign difficult. While gender is equitably dispersed throughout the country, the same is not true for racial and ethnic minorities and an interesting twist in this study notes that some of the states exhibiting the most racial/ethnic diversity within the current composition of the state legislature simultaneously denote the lowest proportion of gender diversity.

#### IV. Hypotheses

Generally, I hypothesize that non-White women do not raise as much funds as either White women or non-White men running for political office. In spite of the fact that both women and racial/ethnic minorities incur their own challenges in campaign fundraising, I believe these disadvantages will be compounded for non-white women and will result in a hierarchy in which they raise less on the whole compared to any other group within this study, even when incumbency, candidate quality, and partisanship are considered.

In addition to this general hypothesis concerning the intersectional effects of gender and race, it is likely that this effect might be conditional on the state cultural and political environment. Specifically, I hypothesize that the fundraising disadvantage faced by non-White

women will vary as a function of the level of professionalization of the state legislature, state partisanship, and state culture (South or non-South). The table below (Table 1) summarizes the four hypotheses guiding this research.

First, I hypothesize the level of state legislative professionalization will impact the intersectional fundraising effect. Incorporating term length, salary, and staff size into the professionalization variable (utilizing the 3-point categorization from the National Conference of State Legislatures), I believe that the intersectional effect of gender and race will be greater in states with less-professionalized state legislatures. This conjecture is based on the premise that the less-professionalized state legislatures necessitate, through low salary and small staffs, that the legislator maintain an occupation that is both flexible and pays well, due to the fact that the salary in less-professionalized states is so low. As research has shown, these features of less-professionalized legislatures can affect legislators differently, depending on their social class (Blair, 1998; Fiorina 1994). Since non-White women are most likely to need to supplement their legislative salary with income from another profession, and since the less-professionalized legislature provides fewer staff members to rely on to help with the legislative workload, nonwhite candidates may be much less likely to be able to devote as much time to fundraising, compared to other candidates. Thus, it is plausible that non-White women may be uniquely disadvantaged with respect to campaign fundraising in less-professionalized states.

Next, I hypothesize that the intersectional effect of gender and race on fundraising will be conditional on the partisanship of the state. In particular, I hypothesize that the intersectional effect will be smaller in states that tend to support the Democratic party. Women and racial/ethnic minorities have historically supported the Democratic party and are also more likely to run on the Democratic ticket. In addition, Democratic voters are more likely to support non-

White female candidates (Philpot and Hanes, Jr., 2007). Therefore, it would follow that states in which voters tend to support the Democratic party, we would expect to see greater support for female and non-White candidates in the form of campaign donations.

Lastly, I hypothesize that the intersectional effect of gender and race will be greater among candidates running in Southern states, compared to states outside the South. This is expected for several reasons. First, white voters in the South tend to display less support for female candidates at the polls (Miller and Shanks, 1996), and as a result, there are far fewer women state legislators in the South than outside the South (“Women in state legislatures: Fact Sheet,” 2011). Thus, women may face a similar disadvantage with respect to fundraising due as donors may underestimate their viability. This hypothesized gender effect in the South may be exacerbated by greater levels of racial conservatism among Whites in the South (Valentino and Sears, 2005), thus leaving nonwhite female candidates especially disadvantaged in raising campaign funds.

Table 1. Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1	White male candidates will fundraise more money than non-White, non-male candidates in state legislative elections, when all other mitigating factors (quality, leadership, etc.) are constant.
Hypothesis 2	The effect of gender and race (i.e. the difference in dollars raised between White candidates/non-White candidates and male/female candidates) will diminish as the professionalism of a state’s legislature increases.
Hypothesis 3	The effect of gender and race (i.e. the difference in dollars raised between White candidates/non-White candidates and male/female candidates) will diminish as the strength of the Democratic party in a state increases. *
Hypothesis 4	The effect of gender and race (i.e. the difference in dollars raised between White candidates/non-White candidates and male/female candidates) will be larger in the South than outside the South.

V. Data and Methods

In order to examine the relationship between gender, race/ethnicity, and amount of money raised for state legislative campaigns, a review of the public records determining how much each candidate raised was conducted. Considering a number of elections years on which we have sufficient data, the 2006 election year was selected for a number of reasons. First, it served as the off-year congressional elections between two relatively salient presidential races. Though the political actors and the public in 2006 could not have predicted the magnitude of the 2008 presidential race, the political climate was already changing. Retrospective analyses noted that Democrats did slightly better (relating to President George W. Bush’s declining popularity (Jacobsen, 2008) but this had a marginal effect on state legislative seats.

For the practical purposes of investigating the research question within time and resource limitations, I collected data for a sample of 15 states. The specific states chosen for inclusion were selected to ensure variation on their level of professionalization, regional location, and partisanship. A full summary of the descriptive statistics within this sample is included in the appendix (Appendix - Table 1). Among the most important variables, however, the average of the total dollar amount fundraised was \$129,050.50 and White men comprised 65.87% of the sample, White women 17.94%, non-White men 11.18%, and non-White Women 5.08%. The table below (Table 2) provides descriptive information for the states used in this analysis.

Table 2 States Selected for Campaign Fundraising Comparison

State	Profession. of Legislature ∞	Geographic Region	State Partisan. δ	Gender Comp. in Leg. #	Race/ Ethnic Comp. in Leg. +	Race/ Ethnic Comp. in Population*
Alabama	Moderate	South	R – 56%	12.9%	23%	30%
California	High	West	D – 53%	27.5%	33%	26.3
Colorado	Moderate	West	R – 49%	38.0%	15%	11.9%
Connecticut	Moderate	Northeast	D – 54%	32.1%	13%	18%
Georgia	Slightly	South	R - 53%	19.1%	21%	37.2%

	Low					
Illinois	Slightly High	Midwest	D – 55%	28.2%	24%	22.1%
Iowa	Moderate	Midwest	D – 49%	23.2%	3%	7.2%
Michigan	High	Midwest	D – 51%	25.0%	17%	19.9%
Mississippi	Slightly Low	South	R – 55%	14.4%	21%	40.1%
Nevada	Slightly Low	West	R – 48%	31.7%	19%	22.9%
New York	High	Northeast	D – 59%	24.1%	26%	28.8%
North Dakota	Low	Midwest	R – 57%	17.0%	2%	9.9%
South Carolina	Moderate	South	R – 55%	10.0%	17%	31.6%
Wisconsin	Slightly High	Midwest	D – 49%	22.0%	6%	11.8%
Wyoming	Low	West	R – 62%	16.7%	3%	6.9%
<b>Average</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	24.5%	24%	77.9%
∞ as defined by the National Center of State Legislatures ©2012						
δ the average of state presidential votes for the three previous elections, from data available by the Federal Election Commission © 1996, 2000, & 2004						
+ and # from data available by the National Center of State Legislatures ©2012						
* from data available from the U.S. Census Bureau: State and County Quick Facts.						
^ refer to Chart ?. in the Appendices						

Data for candidate-level variables were collected from election results reported by the respective state divisions of elections and financial donor reports available through the databases of the National Institute for Money in State Politics. Additional demographic information about individual candidates was gathered through individual internet searches of each candidate. Every effort was made to confirm the accuracy of the data collected and the reputability of the source from which it was originally derived. This conservative approach to ensure the accuracy of the data occasionally led to some observations (candidates) being dropped from the dataset for incomplete available information. The final dataset included 3,003 candidates who ran in 2,105 legislative races across 15 states.

For the purposes of the analyses below, the sample was restricted to general election candidates who identified as either Democrat or Republican and raised at least a \$1,000 in campaign contributions. The sample incorporated only those who made it to the general election (though the presence of primary competition, influential in fundraising efforts, was noted). Consistent with previous studies, third party candidates were excluded. Generally, these candidates do not raise a lot of money and, with rare exception, are not successful at the ballot box. Finally, the \$1,000 threshold ensures that candidates who filed for the election but never truly conducted a campaign (and therefore were not serious or viable) were not included in this analysis. To test the hypotheses, a fixed effects regression was used, establishing the individual candidate as the primary unit of analysis and utilizing the natural log of the total dollar amount raised as the dependent variable.

$$\begin{aligned}
 y(\text{total dollar amount}) = & \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{White Male}) + \beta_2(\text{White Female}) + \beta_3(\text{Non-White Male}) \\
 & + \beta_4(\text{Non-White Female}) + \beta_5(\text{party}) + \beta_6(\text{quality}) + \beta_7(\text{leadership}) + \beta_8(\text{incumbent}) + \\
 & \beta_9(\text{open seat}) + \beta_{10}(\text{district partisanship}) + \\
 & \beta_{11}(\text{primary competition}) + \beta_{12}(\text{district affluence}) + \\
 & \beta_{13}(\text{assembly}) + \beta_{14}(\text{minority population}) + \\
 & \beta_{15}(\text{district education attainment}) + \beta_{16}(\text{state partisanship}) + \beta_{17}(\text{professionalization}) + \\
 & \beta_{18}(\text{geographic location}) + \epsilon
 \end{aligned}$$

The independent variables included in this analysis capture qualities at the individual candidate level, the individual election/district level, and the state level. A comprehensive description of the coding explanations and procedures is included in the Appendix (Table 2) but a brief summary follows. The variables denoting difference at the individual candidate level include: (1) candidate partisanship (0=Republican, 1=Democrat), (2) incumbency status, (3) open seat election, (4) leadership position (within the assembly), and (5) candidate quality. Partisanship can play a very substantial role in the involvement of racial and ethnic minorities, as

the earlier literature review suggests, and can also be influential in fundraising (Ansolabehere and Snyder, 2000).

Traditional variables noted for their relationship to fundraising were also incorporated. Incumbency and open seat status were all measured in a dichotomous manner, as was a variable measuring intra-assembly leadership because of their relationship to fundraising (Biersack, Herrnson, & Wilcox, 1993; Krasno, Green, & Cowden, 1994). If the individual previously held a high position within that particular house, such as Speaker of the House, then that was included as a control as well (Sorauf, 1992). A candidate running for reelection who is the current Speaker might garner more campaign funds for his/her higher position of power, but it is possible that by attaining such status, that legislator has a long political legacy, which would diminish the need for excessive fundraising (Berkman and Eisenstein, 1999; Carey, Niemi, and Powell, 2000; Hogan, 2004).

Additionally, the perceived “viability” of the candidate was captured by the inclusion of a dichotomous variable measuring whether or not the individual was a quality candidate (Jacobson & Kernell, 1983; Bond, Covington, & Fleisher, 1985). This status could exert influence over how many other candidates enter the race, the ability to raise funds, and can be particularly important to control for to properly estimate the effect of race/ethnicity, due to the fact that nonwhite candidates might be more likely to have political experience (Berkman and Eisenstein, 1999). A quality candidate has the advantage of presumably knowing how to fundraise, as he/she has done it successfully at least once before. Quality was determined based on whether the candidate had previous success in a public election prior to this race. This was determined through internet-based biographical searches of all candidates.



The district-level variables included (1) the presence of opposition in the primary election, (2) the partisan leanings of the district, (3) the socioeconomic characteristics of the district, and (4) the racial composition of the district. Opposition in the primary election was important to include in the data set. An opponent within one's own party in the primary competition could impact the total amount of money raised. Though this analysis looks strictly at the total amount of funds raised (disregarding the points of time in the campaign in which they were secured), the influence competition would have on the overall total is worth consideration. Primary competition accounted for races in which the type of competition varied (again, affecting fundraising) (Jacobson, 2004; Mutz, 1995). The presence of competition would lead to a greater interest and need to fundraise more; alternately, a race where there is no competition in the primary election will likely have low fundraising totals (Stratmann and Aparicio-Castillo, 2006; Hamm and Hogan, 2008).

I control for district-level socioeconomic variables in order to capture differences across districts in the ability of voters to contribute to political campaigns. District affluence might also be related to differences in the cost of running a campaign. For example, a race in a poor, rural district would likely require a lower threshold of fundraising to conduct a competitive candidacy, whereas a race in an affluent, suburban or metropolitan area might require more (Stratmann, 1991; Ansolabehere, Gerber, and Snyder, 2002). Using data available from the 2000 Census reports provided variables for education, poverty levels, and minorities within the district. District educational attainment was measured as the percentage of adults over age 25 who held a high school diploma (US Census 2000). District poverty levels encompassed all adults over age 25 who were at or below the poverty level (US Census, 2000). The minority variable

incorporated the percentage of citizens within the district that self-identifying as non-white citizens.

Finally, to capture differences among the states in the analysis, variables denoting the state partisanship, level of professionalization, and regional location were noted. The partisanship of the state, could be influential in fundraising outcomes to the extent that Republican and conservative-oriented interest groups are more numerous and are more likely to contribute to political campaigns. Although conservative groups may target Republican candidates more often than Republicans, it is well-known that many donors contribute to candidates from both parties, and may be especially likely to contribute to a candidate of a different ideological orientation when that candidate is an incumbent. A measure of state partisanship was created by computing the average percentage of voters in a state who supported the Republican presidential nominee in the three previous presidential elections (1996, 2000, and 2004)

The state professionalization variable reflects the level of institutional professionalization of the legislature, following the categorizations established by the National Conference of State Legislatures. The NCSL index is based on three institutional characteristics: salary, staff size, and number of days in office per session. This measure is coded as a three-category ordinal variable, denoting whether the state was “more professionalized,” “moderately professionalized,” or “less professionalized.”

Finally, the states were categorized based on whether or not they were located in the South. Campaign finance laws are less restrictive in these states (see Appendix Table 2 – Campaign Finance Laws Summary) and candidates tend to raise more money in those races (see Appendix Table 3 – Average Fundraising Totals by State). A dichotomous variable measuring

the geographic location of the states (0=non-South, 1=South) was based on the regional classification established by the U.S. Census Bureau.

## VI. Findings and Discussion

To estimate the effects of these variables on campaign funding, I utilized an ordinary least squares model, with standard errors adjusted for clustering at the state level. I first estimated an additive model, the results of which are displayed below in Table 3. Because the dependent variable is measured as the log of total funds raised, the coefficients can be interpreted as the proportional change in the dependent variable given a one-unit increase in the independent variable.

Table 3 Funds and Gender/Race Model

<b>Coefficients</b>				
	Estimate	Std. Error	T-Value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	11.908	1.594	7.47	0.000***
White Female	-0.023	0.049	-0.47	0.648
Non-White Male	-0.436	0.125	-3.48	0.004 **
Non-White Female	-0.512	0.199	-2.56	0.023 *
Assembly	0.812	0.093	8.75	0.000***
Quality	0.542	0.137	3.95	0.001***
Primary Competition	0.413	0.106	3.89	0.002 **
Leadership	1.132	0.331	3.42	0.004 **
Incumbency	0.269	0.130	2.07	0.058
Open Seat	0.957	0.104	9.18	0.000***
Candidate Party	-0.042	0.109	-0.38	0.708
District Education	0.045	0.031	1.43	0.176
District Poverty	-0.816	0.618	-1.32	0.208
District Minorities	0.400	0.251	1.68	0.133
Moderate Professionalization	0.691	0.413	1.67	0.116
High Professionalization	1.561	0.603	2.59	0.021 *
Southern States	1.410	0.340	4.14	0.001***
State Partisanship	-0.061	0.029	-2.07	0.057
Significance	0.001 '***'	0.01 '**'	0.05 '*'	
Number of Observations: 2,610				

Multiple R-squared: 0.3889, Root MSE: 1.1987
Std. Err. adjusted for 15 clusters in states

The results from Table 3 demonstrate that the influence of the assembly of the race and the candidate’s quality were both highly statistically significant. The assembly in which the race occurred achieved a  $p > |t|$  (0.000) with a coefficient of 0.812. This suggests that candidates running for the state senate raised roughly 78% more compared their counterparts running for the state house. The candidate’s quality (indicated by a previous victory in a political election) yielded a  $p > |t|$  (0.001) with a coefficient of 0.542, which follows that with more experience and better networks, quality candidates would out raise political novices.

Other control variables that displayed statistical significance included the presence of primary competition, the candidate’s leadership, candidates as challengers, and the presence of general competition. Candidates facing competition in the primary elections raised 41.3% more on average (with a coefficient of 0.365 and a  $p > |t|$  of 0.002). Those vying for open seats raised around 95.7% more (with a coefficient of 0.957 and a  $p > |t|$  of 0.000). Finally, candidates with leadership positions within the legislature raised 110% more than those without such prestige (1.132 coefficient,  $p > |t|$  0.004). These results reaffirm the contributions already in the literature, that the presence of competition does increase fundraising and the position of the candidate, as a leader or challenger, is influential as well (Berkman and Eisenstein, 1999; Carey, Niemi, and Powell, 2000; Hogan, 2004).

Additionally, to demonstrate the cross-state variation, I ran a fixed effects model, shown below in Table 4. As with the previous model, the dependent variable is measured as the log of total funds raised, the coefficients can be interpreted as the proportional change in the dependent variable given a one-unit increase in the independent variable.

Table 4. Funds and Gender/Race Fixed Effects Model

<b>Coefficients</b>				
	Estimate	Std. Error	T-Value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	10.849	0.181	59.92	0.000 ***
White Female	-0.053	0.049	-1.10	0.291
Non-White Male	-0.424	0.116	-3.66	0.003 **
Non-White Female	-0.628	0.178	-3.53	0.003 **
Assembly	0.881	0.087	10.15	0.000 ***
Quality	0.477	0.140	3.40	0.004 **
Primary Competition	0.437	0.093	4.69	0.000 ***
Leadership	0.671	0.176	3.81	0.002 **
Incumbency	0.394	0.125	3.16	0.007 **
Open Seat	0.728	0.093	7.82	0.000 ***
Candidate Party	-0.018	0.111	-0.17	0.871
District Education	0.007	0.029	0.23	0.823
District Poverty	-0.391	0.669	-0.58	0.568
District Minorities	-0.093	0.266	-0.35	0.730
Alabama	---	---	---	---
California	0.736	0.093	7.88	0.000 ***
Colorado	-1.037	0.046	-22.31	0.000 ***
Connecticut	-1.695	0.043	-39.63	0.000 ***
Georgia	-0.987	0.037	-256.57	0.000 ***
Illinois	0.329	0.041	7.95	0.000 ***
Iowa	-0.899	0.033	-27.01	0.000 ***
Michigan	-0.861	0.030	-28.66	0.000 ***
Mississippi	-1.572	0.025	-62.92	0.000 ***
Nevada	-0.714	0.153	-4.65	0.000 ***
New York	-0.218	0.039	-5.57	0.000 ***
North Dakota	-3.793	0.043	-87.34	0.000 ***
South Carolina	-1.199	0.029	-41.37	0.000 ***
Wisconsin	-1.302	0.024	-54.59	0.000 ***
Wyoming	-3.246	0.039	-81.97	0.000 ***
Significance	0.001 '***'	0.01 '**'	0.05 '*'	
Number of Observations: 2,610				
Multiple R-squared: 0.5334, Root MSE: 1.0494				
Std. Err. adjusted for 15 clusters in states				

From both regression models in Tables 3 and 4, it is evident that non-White male candidates and non-White female candidate raise significantly less than their White male counterparts. In the OLS model (Table 3) non-White male candidates registered a coefficient of

-0.436 with a  $p > |t|$  of 0.004, while non-White female candidates reported a coefficient of -0.512 with a  $p > |t|$  of 0.023. This suggests that non-White men fundraise 43.6% less and non-White women fundraise 51.2% less than White men on average.

When the state dummy variables are included in the fixed effects model (Table 4), the coefficients change slightly, with non-White male decreasing to -0.424 and non-White women increasing to -0.628. The  $p > |t|$  of 0.003 and 0.003, respectively, remain statistically significant. It is important to note that the coefficient for non-White females is larger in magnitude than for non-White males, though this is not statistically significant. Comparing the two models, we can determine that these conclusions do not change in the fixed effects model.

Regarding the primary hypotheses, the first hypothesis proposed that candidates who were underrepresented with regards to gender or race (White women, non-White men, and non-White women) would fundraise less than White men. The findings supported the hypothesis, yielding negative coefficients for each of the variables representing underrepresented groups. Based on the results noted in Table 3, White women generated a coefficient of -0.023 with a  $p > |t|$  of 0.648, showing that they raised an average of 2% less than White men, though this difference was not statistically significant. Non-White men resulted in a coefficient of -0.436 with a  $p > |t|$  of 0.004, which was highly statistically significant. This finding demonstrates that non-White men raise over 38% less than their White male counterparts. Lastly, non-White women exhibited the largest disparity, with a coefficient of -0.512 and a  $p > |t|$  of 0.0123. This suggests that non-White women fundraise over 51% less compared to White men. Given the similarity of the coefficients for non-White men and non-White women (and the fact that they are not statistically distinguishable), the intersectionality hypothesis is only weakly supported.

The second hypothesis maintained that the professionalization of the legislature would influence fundraising totals, in that the intersectionality effect would lie in races in the least professionalized state legislatures while the smallest differences (if any) would be within races in the most professionalized state legislatures. To test this hypothesis, I re-estimated the model after including interaction terms between the candidate race-gender indicators and the variables measuring legislative professionalism. These results are presented in Table 5, below. Like the results for the additive model, we find evidence that fundraising totals were higher in states with more professionalized legislatures. However, the coefficients for the interaction terms are all insignificant and therefore the second hypothesis is not supported. Overall, these results continue to show no interaction between professionalism and candidate gender and race.

Table 5. Funds and Gender/Race with Professionalization Interaction Model

<b>Coefficients</b>				
	Estimate	Std. Error	T-Value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	11.338	1.682	6.74	0.000***
White Female*Mod Professionalization	0.019	0.150	0.13	0.899
White Female*High Professionalization	-0.066	0.130	-0.51	0.621
Non-White Male*Mod Professionalization	-0.262	0.351	-0.75	0.469
Non-White Male*High Professionalization	0.357	0.342	1.04	0.314
Non-White Female*Mod Professionalization	0.258	0.448	0.58	0.574
Non-White Female*High Professionalization	0.091	0.582	0.16	0.878
White Female	-0.001	0.094	-0.00	1.000
Non-White Male	-0.494	0.320	-1.54	0.145
Non-White Female	-0.588	0.428	-1.37	0.191
Assembly	0.812	0.095	8.58	0.000***
Quality	0.546	0.132	4.13	0.001 ***
Primary Competition	0.416	0.109	3.82	0.002 **
Leadership	1.146	0.326	3.51	0.003 **
Incumbency	0.267	0.127	2.10	0.054
Open Seat	0.954	0.102	9.32	0.000 ***
Candidate Party	-0.032	0.105	-0.31	0.763
District Education	-0.044	0.031	1.40	0.18
District Poverty	-0.859	0.595	-1.45	0.170
District Minorities	0.381	0.240	1.59	0.135

Moderate Professionalization	0.709	0.419	1.70	0.112
High Professionalization	1.554	0.605	2.57	0.022 *
Southern States	1.441	0.339	4.24	0.001 ***
State Partisanship	-0.060	0.029	-2.07	0.058
Significance				
	0.001 '***'	0.01 '**'	0.05 '*'	
Number of Observations: 2,610				
Multiple R-squared: 0.3920, Root MSE: 1.1971				
Std. Err. adjusted for 15 clusters in states				

The third hypothesis held that state partisanship would interact with the race and gender of a candidate, such that states that tended to lean Democrat would have less of a disparity in fundraising compared to states that tended to lean Republican. This hypothesis was tested by including an interaction term for state partisanship and each of the race-gender indicators. These predicted effects are presented in Table 6 below and the coefficient estimates for this model are presented in Table 7.

Table 6. Predicted Effect of White Female Candidate by State Partisanship

State Partisanship Value	Predicted Effect of White Female Candidate
Sample minimum (35)	-0.14
One standard deviation below the mean (39.5)	-0.09
Sample Mean (47)	-0.01
One standard deviation below the mean (54.5)	0.08
Sample maximum (62)	0.17

Note: Coefficient estimates in the table are based on the results presented in Table 7 and reflect the predicted difference between the fundraising total for White males and White females.

\*p<.05; \*\*p<.01; \*\*\*p<.001

As can be seen in Table 7, only one of the three interaction terms – for White females - is statistically significant. This suggests that differences between White females and White males do in fact depend on the state political context. Fundraising differences between White males and Black males and females, on the other hand, are not statistically different across different values of state partisanship. To provide a clearer interpretation of these interaction results, I present



predicted coefficients for the variable for white females, at different levels of state partisanship. These predicted effects are presented in Table 7 below.

These results from Table 7 show that White females raise significantly less funds than White males in the Democratic-leaning states in the sample. For example, where the Republican vote averaged 39.5% (one standard deviation below the mean for this sample), White females are predicted to raise 1.1% less than White males. This difference is not only modest in magnitude, but becomes even smaller and statistically insignificant once the Republican vote share reaches the mean value for the sample. Although White females are predicted to raise more than White males in heavily-Republican states, the difference is not statistically significant.

Table 7. Funds and Gender/Race with State Partisanship Interaction Model

<b>Coefficients</b>				
	Estimate	Std. Error	T-Value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	11.396	1.668	6.83	0.000***
White Female*State Partisanship	0.011	0.005	2.19	0.046 *
Non-White Male*State Partisanship	-0.025	0.011	-2.29	0.038 *
Non-White Female*State Partisanship	0.008	0.038	0.20	0.844
White Female	-0.543	0.246	-2.20	0.045
Non-White Male	0.739	0.483	1.53	0.148
Non-White Female	-0.859	1.782	-0.48	0.637
Assembly	0.813	0.095	8.52	0.000***
Quality	0.544	0.134	4.05	0.001***
Primary Competition	0.414	0.107	3.88	0.002 **
Leadership	1.130	0.332	3.40	0.004 **
Incumbency	0.272	0.124	2.19	0.046 *
Open Seat	0.953	0.105	9.08	0.000 ***
Candidate Party	-0.034	0.105	-0.32	0.754
District Education	0.043	0.032	1.35	0.199
District Poverty	-0.855	0.608	-1.40	0.182
District Minorities	0.386	0.245	1.57	0.138
Moderate Professionalization	0.701	0.411	1.71	0.110
High Professionalization	1.564	0.601	2.60	0.021 *
Southern States	1.443	0.341	4.24	0.001 ***
State Partisanship	-0.062	0.029	-2.13	0.052

Significance	0.001 ‘***’	0.01 ‘**’	0.05 ‘*’	
Number of Observations: 2,610				
Multiple R-squared: 0.3911, Root MSE: 1.1972				
Std. Err. adjusted for 15 clusters in states				

The fourth hypothesis stated that the region of the election would moderate the effects of candidate race and gender, with the expectation that states in the South would display greater disparities relative to states elsewhere. This hypothesis was tested by including interaction terms for each of the three candidate race-gender variables and the dummy variable for the South. The predicted effects are presented below in Table 8 and the results are presented in Table 9.

Table 8. Predicted Effect of Candidate Race/Gender by Region

Candidate Group	Non-South	South
White Female	-0.01	-0.03
Non-White Male	-0.14	-0.82 ***
Non-White Female	-0.33	-0.82 **

Note: Coefficient estimates in the table are based on the results presented in Table 9 and reflect the predicted difference between the fundraising total for each candidate group and White males. \*p<.05; \*\*p<.01; \*\*\*p<.001

The results shown in Table 9 suggest that consistent with the hypothesis, the variation in fundraising totals increases as we move from states outside the South to the South. For ease of interpretation, the predicted effects of the race-gender indicators are presented below in Table 9. for the South. While white females continue to be predicted to raise a nearly identical amount as White men, non-White men raised an estimated 68.3% less and non-White women raised 50.3% less. The coefficient for non-White men was statistically significant, with a  $p>|t|$  of 0.000, while it was not for non-White women. In summary, the pattern of results suggests that although Black candidates are disadvantaged across both regions, fundraising disparities are larger in the South. The pattern of the coefficient estimates is consistent with the intersectionality hypothesis in both regions, but given the fact that the differences between the estimates for Black males and Black

females is not statistically significant, it would be premature to conclude that the intersectionality hypothesis is supported.

Table 9. Funds and Gender/Race with Southern Interaction Model

<b>Coefficients</b>				
	Estimate	Std. Error	T-Value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	11.285	1.655	6.82	0.000 ***
White Female*South	-0.023	0.103	-0.22	0.829
Non-White Male*South	-0.683	0.144	-4.76	0.000 ***
Non-White Female*South	-0.503	0.447	-1.12	0.280
Assembly	0.809	0.095	8.52	0.000 ***
White Female	-0.005	0.059	-0.09	0.930
Non-White Male	-0.141	0.116	-1.21	0.245
Non-White Female	-0.329	0.270	-1.22	0.243
Quality	0.531	0.132	4.04	0.001 ***
Primary Competition	0.413	0.108	3.83	0.002 **
Leadership	1.109	0.316	3.50	0.004 **
Incumbency	0.287	0.123	2.33	0.035 *
Open Seat	0.948	0.104	9.08	0.000 ***
Candidate Party	-0.020	0.104	-0.20	0.847
District Education	0.038	0.033	1.17	0.262
District Poverty	-0.837	0.573	-1.46	0.167
District Minority	0.385	0.249	1.54	0.146
Moderately Professionalization	0.695	0.409	1.70	0.112
High Professionalization	1.549	0.594	2.60	0.021 *
Southern States	1.509	0.359	4.21	0.001 ***
State Partisanship	-0.059	0.029	-2.06	0.058
Significance	0.001 '***'	0.01 '**'	0.05 '*'	
Number of Observations: 2,610				
Multiple R-squared: 0.3942, Root MSE: 1.1942				
Std. Err. adjusted for 15 clusters in states				

Overall, the results provide mixed support for the hypotheses concerning the effects of a candidate's gender and race on campaign fundraising. On the whole, the candidate's race proves to be more influential than gender. The impact of legislative professionalization affirmed the hypothesis that the more professionalized the state, the less disparity between minority and

majority candidates fundraising totals. State partisanship, likewise, demonstrated a slightly negative relationship, indicating that underrepresented candidates fundraise less in Republican-leaning states. The most substantial finding involved the influence of the South, where Southern states demonstrated a negative relationship with candidate's gender and race with regards to fundraising. Though the state-level influences varied in magnitude, the gender and race gap from underrepresented groups in campaign fundraising was consistently negative, demonstrating its impact.

These findings demonstrate the interesting relationship between gender, race, and campaign finance and uphold the notion of an intersectional gender/race gap in campaign fundraising. The first hypothesis proposed that non-white female candidates would fundraise the least amount relative to other groups. The findings confirmed this. Non-White women reported an average of 51% less in fundraising totals relative to White men and the difference was statistically significant. Non-White men also fundraised around 44% less (also statistically significant). The small coefficient and failure to achieve statistical significance for White women, however, suggests that while the intersectional effect has a negative impact for Non-White women, fundraising the least, the effect is related more to race than it is gender.

The professionalization of the legislature rendered no noticeable impact on the gender and race gaps in fundraising. Because the more professionalized institutions are more attractive to potential office holders (accompanied with larger salary, staff, and tenure power), these races are also more competitive and likely whittle away competition so only the most competitive candidates remain in the general election.

The partisanship of the state had an interesting effect on the gender/race and fundraising relationship. It proved to be statistically significant for both White women and Non-white men

but with only small coefficients. For the White female candidates, they actually fundraised more than White men in more Republican leaning states by a very small margin on 1%. Non-White men fundraised on average less in those same states by 2.5%. Non-White women exhibited no statistically significant effect. The partisanship theory was thus only upheld for Non-White men but raises more questions than it answers. For the purposes of this study, it is evident that it did not have a substantial impact on the gender/race fundraising gap, though future research disseminating this connection would be beneficial.

The final hypothesis regarding state legislatures in the South predicted that every group other than White men would fundraise less and while that trend proved to be true, it was only statistically significant with Non-White men. This finding was unexpected, particularly given the fact the fundraising gap between White men and Non-White women was not statistically significant. Non-White men registered 68% less in fundraising relative to White men, which was highly statistically significant.

The sizable difference between non-White men and non-White women was very surprising and is different to explain. It could be possible that more Non-White men run for the state legislature in the South than non-White women, and because donors (PACs and interest groups) seeking to give to non-White women would have fewer outlets, those women would not experience the same disparity non-White men do. It might also be possible that fewer non-White women run for state legislative seats but those who do are more competitive and qualified candidates, with regards to fundraising. Relative to non-White men or White women which have a larger pool in terms of quantity, those groups may have an overall devalued effect in quality. Though the reason is still unclear, these results were certainly interesting and merit additional research and discussion in future research.

## VII. Conclusion

The candidate's gender and race seems to be influential in his/her fundraising outcome, particularly when one considers the effect of races in the South. In terms of the total funds raised, one underrepresented group, White women, fared rather well in comparison to their counterparts. In comparison, race seemed to have a greater effect, as non-White men garnered less and non-White women, significantly so.

The intersectionality hypothesis, that non-White women would fundraise less than both White women and non-White men, seemed to be true. In the general OLS model, non-White women fundraised on average 51.2% less than White men, which was also a larger deficit than that denoted by White women (2.3%) and non-White men (43.6%). The fixed effects model produced a similar effect, with non-White women fundraising 62.8% less than White men, while White women and non-White men fundraised 5.3% and 42.4% less, respectively. It is important to note that while the statistical significance for non-White women was moderate in the fixed effects model (with a  $p > |t|$  of 0.003), it was only slightly statistically significant in the OLS model (with a  $p > |t|$  of 0.023). This suggests that while the coefficient estimates are not highly statistically significant, they do demonstrate a pattern of an intersectional fundraising gap.

With regards to the state variation hypotheses, the Southern effect proved to be most interesting. The hypothesis that gender and race differences would be magnified in campaigns in the Southern states was strongly upheld. The Southern effect was especially strong regarding candidate race, with non-White men fundraising 68.3% on average less and non-White women fundraising 50.3% less than their White male counterparts. The coefficient for non-White men was statistically significant and surprisingly larger than the coefficient for non-White women,

which failed to achieve statistical significance. This reaffirms the long-standing literature that asserts the political culture within the South is uniquely distinctive respective to the rest of the country.

Neither the professionalization nor the partisanship of the state hypotheses were upheld. The professionalization of the state legislature had little impact on the differences in fundraising outcomes. Likewise, the state's partisanship had little effect contrary to the hypothesis that the partisan culture of the state might be influential. Regardless of whether the state leans left or right, the fundraising gap demonstrated between gender and race groups exists the same.

The overall findings of this study illustrate that gender and race are influential in campaign fundraising outcomes, that an intersectional effect compounding two underrepresented groups in gender and race adds to this disparity, and that the state's location in the South may be influential in mitigating these effects. Yet the larger question remains: why do these differences exist? Including state dummies in the fixed effects models controls for some differences but this still fails to capture the unique variations within states that can attribute to the differences of candidate gender and race in fundraising. As we strive to make our institutions more representative of their constituents, identifying and understanding these differences are critical.

Future research in this area would benefit from further dissecting the race binary into categories more representative of the population (as the term "non-White" is inherently limiting and generalizing). Expanding the sample to include either a panel study would be beneficial to investigate how these trends have evolved through multiple elections. Alternately, incorporating the full population of all 50 states to view the impact nationwide could have valuable implications as well.

Since gender and race differences do exist and exhibit a more substantial negative effect to on such candidate, it is imperative to understand how campaign finance plays a role. Money is critical in constructing a successful campaign, and yet the economic distribution in the US is far from uniform across gender and race differences. This study demonstrates how various state-level differences impact the fundraising gap in gender and race and also emphasizes why further research in this field is important.



## REFERENCES

- Ansolahehere, S., Gerber, A., & Snyder, J. (2002). Equal votes, equal money: Court-ordered redistricting and public expenditures in the American states. *American Political Science Review*, 96 (4): 767-777.
- Ansolahehere, S., & Snyder Jr, J. M. (2000). Soft money, hard money, strong parties. *Columbia Law Review*, 100: 598-619.
- Arrington, T.S. & Ingalls, G.L. (1984). Race and campaign finance in Charlotte, N.C. *Western Political Quarterly* 37 (4): 578-83.
- Atkeson, L.R. (2003). Not all cures are created equal: The conditional impact of female candidates on political engagement. *Journal of Politics*, 65(4): 1040-1061.
- Berkman, M., & Eisenstein, J. (1999). State Legislators as Congressional Candidates: The Effects of Prior Experience on Legislative Recruitment and Fundraising. *Political Research Quarterly*, 52(3): 481-498.
- Bianchi, S. M. (1999). Women, work, and family in America. *Sociology of Families: Readings*, 170.
- Biersack, R., Herrnson, P.S., & Wilcox, C. (1993). Seeds for success: Early money in Congressional elections. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 18:535-551.
- Blair, D. (1988). *Arkansas Politics and Government*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Bond, J.R., Covington, C., & Fleisher, R. (1985). Explaining challenger quality in Congressional elections. *Journal of Politics*, 47:510-529.
- Brians, C.L. (2005). Women for women? Gender and party bias in voting for female candidates. *American Politics Research*, 33(3), 357-375.
- Carey, J. M., Niemi, R. G., & Powell, L. W. (2000). Incumbency and the probability of reelection in state legislative elections. *Journal of Politics*, 62(3), 671-700.
- Carlin, D.B. & Winfrey, K.L. (2009). Have you come a long way, baby? Hilary Clinton, Sarah Palin, and sexism in 2008 campaign coverage. *Communication Studies*, 60(4), 326-343.
- Carroll, S. J. (1994). *Women as candidates in American politics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Carroll, S. J. & Jenkins, K. (2001). Do term limits help women get elected? *Social Science Quarterly*, 82:1, 199-201.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford law review*, 1241-1299.
- Crespin, M.H. & Deitz, J.L. (2010). If you can't join 'em, beat 'em: The gender gap in individual donations to congressional candidates. *Political Research Quarterly* (63:3), 581-593.
- Davis, A.Y. (1983). *Women, culture and politics*. New York City: Random House, Inc.
- Day, C. L. & Hadley, C. D. (2002). Who contributes? Similarities and differences between contributors to EMILY's List and WISH List. *Women & Politics*, 24:2.
- Day, C. L., Hadley, C. D., & Duffy Brown, M. (2002). Gender, feminism, and partisanship among women's PAC contributors. *Social Science Quarterly*, 82:4, 687-700.
- Fiorina, M.P. (1994). Divided Government in the American States: A Byproduct of Legislative Professionalism. *The American Political Science Review*. 88:2, 304-316.
- Fox, R. J. (2000). Gender and Congressional elections. Ed. S. Tolleson-Rinehart and J.J. Josephson. *Gender and American Politics: Women, men, and the political process*. M.E. Sharpe.
- Fryer, R.G. & Levitt, S.D. (2004). The causes and consequences of distinctively black names. *The Quarterly Journal of Economic* 119 (3): 767-806.
- Glaser, J.M. (1994). Back to the black belt: Racial environment and white racial attitudes in the South. *The Journal of Politics* 56(1): 21-41.
- Griffin, J.D. & Newman, B. (2007). The unequal representation of Latinos and whites. *Journal of Politics*, 69(4), 1032-1046.
- Grofman, B. & Handley, L. (1989). Black representation: Making sense of electoral geography at different levels of government. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 265-279.
- Hamm, K. E., & Hogan, R. E. (2008). Campaign finance laws and candidacy decisions in state legislative elections. *Political Research Quarterly*, 61(3), 458-467.
- Hedlund, R. D., Freeman, P. K., Hamm, K. E., & Stein, R. M. (1979). The electability of women candidates: The effects of sex role stereotypes. *The Journal of Politics*, 513-524.
- Hogan, R. E. (2004). Challenger emergence, incumbent success, and electoral

- accountability in state legislative elections. *Journal of Politics*, 66(4), 1283-1303.
- Hutchings, V.L. & Valention, N.A. (2004). The centrality of race in American politics. *Annual Review of Political Science* 7: 383-408.
- Jacobson, G.C. (2004). Money and votes reconsidered: Congressional elections. *Public Choice*, 47:7-62.
- Jacobson, G. C. (2008). *A Divider, not a uniter: George W. Bush and the American people-The 2006 election and beyond*. New York: Longman Press.
- Jacobson, G.C & Kernell, S. (1983). *Strategy and choice in Congressional elections*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Jenkins, S. (2007). A woman's work is never done? Fundraising perception and effort among female state legislative candidates. *Political Research Quarterly*, 60:2, 230-239.
- Krasno, J.S. Green, D.P. & Cowden, J.A. (1994). The dynamics of campaign fundraising in house elections. *Journal of Politics*, 56:459-479.
- Lawless, J. L.; Fox R. L.; & Freely, C. (2001). Gender and the decision to run for office. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 26:3 411-435.
- Leighley, J.E. (2001). *Strength in numbers? The political mobilization of racial and ethnic minorities*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Lichter, D.T. (1989). Race employment hardship, and inequality in the American nonmetropolitan South. *American Sociological Review*, 54 (3): 436-446.
- Lorde, A. (2003). The master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. *Feminist postcolonial theory: A reader*, 25-8.
- Matson, M. & Fine, T.S. (2006). Gender, ethnicity, and ballot information: Ballot cues in low-information elections. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 6 (1): 49-72.
- Marotta, S.A. & Garcia, J. G. (2003). Latinos in the United States in 2000. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 25(1), 13-34.
- McDermott, M.L. (1998). Race and gender cues in low-information elections. *Political Research Quarterly*, 51 (4): 895-918.
- Miller, W. E., & Shanks, J. M. (1996). *The new American voter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mutz, D.C. (1995). Effects of horse-race coverage on campaign coffers: Strategic

- contributing in presidential primaries. *Journal of Politics*, 57(4): 1015-1042.
- Rivas-Vazquez, A. G. (1999). New pools of Latino wealth: A case study of donors and potential donors in US Hispanic/Latino communities. *Nuevos Senderos: Reflections on Hispanics and Philanthropy*, 115.
- Rule, W. (1981). Why women don't run: The critical contextual factors in women's legislative recruitment. *The Western Political Quarterly* 34(1): 60-77.
- Sanbonmatsu, K. & Carroll, S.J. (2009). Gender and the decision to run for the state legislature. Paper presented to the Midwestern Political Science Association Annual Conference.
- Smith, T. (2005). White dollars, black candidates: Inequality and agency in campaign finance law. *South Carolina Law Review* 57: 735-48.
- Sonenshein, R.J. (1990). Can black candidates win statewide elections? *Political Science Quarterly* 105 (2): 219-41.
- Sorauf, F.J. (1992). *Inside campaign finance: Myths and realities*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Stratmann, T. (1991). What do campaign contributions buy? Deciphering causal effects of money and votes. *Southern Economic Journal*, 606-620.
- Stratmann, T., & Francisco, J. (2006). Competition policy for elections: Do campaign contribution limits matter?. *Public Choice*, 127: 1-2, 177-206.
- Stoper, E. S. (1977). Wife and politician: Role strain among women in public office. In M. Githens and J. Prestage, eds., *A Portrait of Marginality*, New York: Longman, 320-338.
- Welch, S. (1978). Recruitment of women to public office: A discriminate analysis. *Western Political Quarterly*, 31: 372-380.
- Wolbrecht, C. (2010). *The politics of women's rights: parties, positions, and change*. Princeton University Press.
- Women in state legislatures: Fact sheet. (2011). New Brunswick, NJ: Center for American Women and Politics. Retrieved from <http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/>
- Valentino, N.A. & Sears, D.O. (2005). Old times are not forgotten: Race and partisan realignment in the contemporary south. *American Journal of Political Science*, 49:3 672-688.
- US Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2010 American Community Survey 1-

Year Estimates, Table GCT0101; generated using American FactFinder;  
<http://factfinder2.census.gov>

Appendix

Appendix Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Variables

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
<b>CANDIDATE LEVEL</b>				
Funds	129,050.50	275,002.30	1000	5,889,792
White Male	0.6587	0.4742	0	1
White Female	0.1794	0.3837	0	1
Non-White Male	0.1118	0.3152	0	1
Non-White Female	0.0508	0.2196	0	1
Gender	0.2281	0.4197	0	1
Race	0.1649	0.3712	0	1
Quality	0.7132	0.4524	0	1
Primary Competition	0.2279	0.4474	0	1
Leadership	0.0492	0.2163	0	1
Incumbency	0.5626	0.4962	0	1
Open Seat	0.1680	0.3739	0	1
<b>DISTRICT LEVEL</b>				
Poverty	0.1228	0.0838	0.01	0.9
Minority	0.2715	0.2646	0.01	0.97
No Education	0.2284	0.7805	0.02	0.55
<b>STATE LEVEL</b>				
Women's Earnings to \$	76.3348	3.9631	65.5	82.7
Low Professionalization	0.2741	0.4461	0	1
Moderate Professionalization	0.3464	0.4759	0	1
High Professionalization	0.3795	0.4853	0	1
State Republican Vote Total	47.0868	7.4685	35.3067	62.1433
Southern Location	0.3143	0.4643	0	.01

Appendix Table 2. Explanation of Variable Coding

<b>VARIABLE NAME</b>	<b>VARIABLE CODING</b>
<b>DEPENDENT Variable</b>	
Fund	Total Dollar Amount (i.e. 346,560)
<b>INDEPENDENT Variables</b>	
Gender	Male = 0, Female = 1
Party	Republican = 0, Democrat = 1
Won	Lost = 0, Won = 1
Quality	No Elected Political Position = 0, Previously Held Elected Political Position = 1
Primary Competition	No Primary Competition = 0, Primary Competition = 1
Race	White = 0, Non-White = 1

Leadership	No High Leadership Position Held = 0, Held High Leadership Position = 1
Incumbency	Not Incumbent = 0, Incumbent = 1
Open Seat	Not Open Seat = 0, Open Seat = 1
Assembly	House = 0, Senate = 1
State Partisanship	Average % of State voted for the Republican candidate for the 1996, 2000, & 2004 elections (i.e. 49%)
District Economic Affluence/Poverty	Percentage of Individuals within the district at or below the poverty level (i.e. 25%)
District Minority	Percentage of Individuals within the district who reported on the 2000 US Census to be any race or ethnicity other than Non-Hispanic White (i.e. 10%)
District Education Attainment	Percentage of Individuals over 25 years old within the district who reported on the 2000 US Census to have earned a HS Diploma or completed the GED equivalent
State Partisanship	Average % of State voted Republican for the Republican candidate for the 1996, 2000, & 2004 elections (i.e. 51%)
Institutional Professionalization	Least professionalized state legislature = 1, Slightly less professionalized state legislature = 2, Moderately professionalized state legislature = 3, Slightly highly professionalized state legislature = 4, Most professionalized state legislature = 5,
Geographic Location	Located outside of the South = 0, Located in the South 1

Appendix Table 3. Average Amounts Raised by General Election Legislative Candidates (2005-2006)

State	\$ Amount Per Voter	Voters	Total Contributions	House Average	Senate Average
Alabama	\$29.03	1,250,401	\$36,294,226	\$99,431	\$365,186
California	\$10.71	8,899,059	\$95,316,305	\$385,132	\$495,671
Colorado	\$4.69	1,586,105	\$7,444,881	\$41,004	\$70,953
Connecticut	\$7.14	1,123,412	\$8,025,083	\$14,204	\$54,673
Georgia	\$10.81	2,122,185	\$22,947,002	\$58,331	\$120,695
Illinois	\$17.47	3,587,676	\$62,667,885	\$205,823	\$391,296
Iowa	\$15.41	1,071,509	\$16,508,298	\$65,702	\$128,807
Michigan	\$7.01	3,852,008	\$27,020,311	\$58,488	\$130,978
Mississippi	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nevada	\$20.70	586,274	\$12,140,565	\$92,241	\$213,554

New York	\$11.86	4,697,867	\$55,714,627	\$78,327	\$295,808
North Dakota	\$2.42	220,479	\$432,726	\$3,448	\$4,985
South Carolina	\$5.78	1,117,311	\$6,458,262	\$40,364	No Races
Wisconsin	\$4.51	2,183,155	\$9,835,392	\$35,495	\$121,006
Wyoming	\$3.88	196,217	\$761,264	\$6,031	\$11,335
* Data from the National Institute on Money in State Politics, March 2008					

Appendix Table 4. State Campaign Finance Laws

State	Individual	State Party	PAC	Corporate	Union	Total
Alabama	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	\$500/c/e	Unlimited	Open
California	\$3,900	Unlimited	\$3,900 $\psi$	\$3,900	\$3,900	Med.
Colorado*	\$550	\$113,905 <sup>^</sup>	\$550 $\xi$	Prohibited	Prohibited	High
Connecticut*	\$1,000 & \$250 $\phi$	\$10,000 & \$5,000 $\phi$	\$1,500 & \$750 $\phi$	Prohibited	\$1,000 & \$250 $\phi$	High
Georgia	\$6,300 $\alpha$	\$6,300	\$6,300	\$6,300	\$6,300	High
Illinois	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	Open
Iowa	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	Prohibited	Unlimited	Open
Michigan*	\$3,400	\$68,000	\$34,000	Prohibited	Prohibited	Med.
Mississippi	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	\$1,000	Unlimited	Open
Nevada	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	High
New York	\$16,800 & \$8,200 $\phi$ $\pm$	Prohibited in primary Unlimited in general	\$16,800 & \$8,200 $\phi$ $\pm$	\$5,000	\$16,800 & \$8,200 $\phi$ $\pm$	High
North Dakota	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	Prohibited	Prohibited	Open
South Carolina*	\$1,000	\$50,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	Med.
Wisconsin	\$1,000 & \$500 $\phi$	\$22,425 & \$11,213 $\phi$	\$1,000 & \$500 $\phi$	Prohibited	Prohibited	High
Wyoming	\$1,000	Unlimited	Unlimited	Prohibited	Prohibited	Med.

\* Limits listed are specifically for statewide candidates  
<sup>^</sup> Includes candidate contributions to his/her own campaign  
 $\xi$  For “small donor” committees, maximum of \$5,675 donation accepted  
 $\alpha$  Per election (primary and general separate); additional \$3,700 per run-off  
 $\pm$  For both primary and general elections (separate amounts for each totaled here)  
 $\psi$  For “small contributor” committees, \$7,800 limit  
 $\phi$  First number is for Senate candidates, second number is for House candidates  
 $\infty$  information derived from *State Limits on Contributions of Candidates* by the National Center of State Legislatures ©2012

Appendix Table 5. Funds and Race (Hispanic and Black) Fixed Effects Model



<b>Coefficients</b>				
	Estimate	Std. Error	T-Value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	10.704	0.172	62.18	0.000
Hispanic	-0.361	0.182	-1.98	0.067
Black	-0.445	0.099	-4.51	0.000 ***
Assembly	0.841	0.087	9.68	0.000 ***
Quality	0.518	0.139	3.72	0.002 **
Primary Competition	0.373	0.126	2.95	0.011 *
General Competition	0.419	0.154	2.72	0.017 *
Leadership	0.698	0.182	3.82	0.002 ***
Incumbency	0.284	0.152	1.87	0.083
Open Seat	0.571	0.163	3.51	0.003 **
Challenger	-0.235	0.177	-1.32	0.207
Gender	-0.079	0.068	-1.17	0.261
Candidate Party	-0.014	0.111	-0.13	0.899
District Education	0.007	0.025	0.30	0.768
District Poverty	-0.318	0.612	-0.52	0.612
District Minority	-0.062	0.244	-0.25	0.804
Alabama	---	---	---	---
California	0.603	0.104	5.81	0.000 ***
Colorado	-1.129	0.054	-20.98	0.000 ***
Connecticut	-1.729	0.042	-40.79	0.000 ***
Georgia	-0.959	0.036	-26.49	0.000 ***
Illinois	0.308	0.039	8.00	0.000 ***
Iowa	-0.935	0.030	-31.11	0.000 ***
Michigan	-0.971	0.060	-16.05	0.000 ***
Mississippi	-2.980	0.033	-90.14	0.000 ***
Nevada	-0.596	0.147	-4.06	0.000 ***
New York	-0.326	0.046	-7.15	0.000 ***
North Dakota	-3.901	0.069	-56.01	0.000 ***
South Carolina	-1.145	0.028	-40.19	0.000 ***
Wisconsin	-1.356	0.019	-68.15	0.000 ***
Wyoming	-3.211	0.041	-78.81	0.000 ***
Significance	0.001 '***'	0.01 '**'	0.05 '*'	
Number of Observations: 2,588				
Multiple R-squared: 0.5513, Root MSE: 1.0301				
Std. Err. Adjusted for 15 clusters in states				

Appendix Table 6. Funds and Race (Hispanic and Black) OLS Model

<b>Coefficients</b>
---------------------

	Estimate	Std. Error	T-Value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	11.904	1.576	7.55	0.000
Hispanic	-0.292	0.204	-1.43	0.175
Black	-0.453	0.109	-4.12	0.001 ***
Assembly	0.777	0.092	8.41	0.000 ***
Quality	0.609	0.145	4.18	0.001 **
Primary Comp.	0.368	0.132	2.79	0.015 *
General Comp.	0.343	0.148	2.33	0.035 *
Leadership	1.111	0.288	3.86	0.002 ***
Incumbency	-0.603	0.311	-1.94	0.073
Open Seat	0.075	0.287	0.26	0.798
Challenger	-0.982	0.291	-3.38	0.005
Gender	-0.048	0.078	-0.61	0.552
Candidate Party	-0.037	0.108	-0.34	0.738
Dist. Education	0.040	0.026	1.55	0.142
Dist. Poverty	-0.816	0.643	-1.27	0.225
Dist. Minority	0.419	0.236	1.78	0.097
Mod. Prof.	0.694	0.409	1.70	0.112
High Prof.	1.553	0.604	2.57	0.022
South	1.473	0.339	4.34	0.001 ***
State Party	-0.059	0.029	-2.03	0.062 *
Significance	0.001 '***'	0.01 '**'	0.05 '*'	
Number of Observations: 2,588				
Multiple R-squared: 0.4055,      Root MSE: 1.1833				
Std. Err. adjusted for 15 clusters in states				

## 5. CONCLUSION

The results of this collection demonstrate that fundraising gaps with regards to gender and race/ethnicity do exist, even when important variables such as incumbency and candidate quality are controlled. These disparities are not uniform across the states, but vary, depending on the institutional professionalization, partisan leanings of the state, and the location. More professionalized institutions led to higher fundraising totals and a slightly minimized fundraising gap, while Republican states related to higher fundraising totals but no relationship to the gender and racial/ethnic gap. States in the South notably exhibited a substantial difference in total funds raised for white candidates compared to non-white candidates and male candidates compared to female candidates.

Within the fundraising gap itself, the disadvantage in fundraising totals was more substantial for racial/ethnic minorities than for women. In the first study, though female candidates as a whole did raise slightly less than their male counterparts (an estimated 3.7%), the difference failed to achieve statistical significance. The results from the second study focused on racial/ethnic lines and found a noticeable gap between non-White and White candidates, an average of 46.9%. Considering the merge of both gender and race of the candidate, the final study evaluated the intersectional identities and determined that White women raised slightly less (2.3%) while non-White men raised much less (43.6%), and non-White women raised even less (51.2%).

The results are staggering: generalizing the campaign finance gap as an issue equally evident in all states or as a universal barrier among underrepresented groups fails to account for the dynamic variation across states and candidate identities. Much of the literature in state campaign finance does not assume homogeneity across the nation, an approach that this study

would reaffirm to be problematic. Our conceptualizations about gender and race, however, do seem to fall into this trap.

As scholars in the field of Women's Studies have long since noted (Crenshaw, Lorde, and Davis, among others), the categorizations of gender and race can falsely manifest in binaries wherein an interaction presumably does not exist. Presuming all women have the same essential shared experiences is not only inaccurate but unfair, in that this assumption minimizes the challenges that are greater for some groups of women compared to others. Addressing the intersection of a candidate's gender and race/ethnicity enables us to better understand the diversity not just across these groups but within them.

The third study demonstrates exactly why such an approach is necessary. Based on the first two studies, we could conclude that the racial differences exceed gender differences in fundraising, as the gap between white and non-white candidates well over quadrupled the gap between male and female candidates. The third study, however, employed the intersectional identities to explore the intra-group differences and showed that non-white women experience a fundraising deficit that exceeds both their white female and non-white male counterparts. Such a variation would have gone undetected if one were simply relying on gender or racial/ethnic binaries and assuming uniformity within those groups.

While we can notice the differences in fundraising and conclude that gender and race gaps are still prevalent in state elections, the larger question remains: what causes these disparities and what can be done to minimize or even eliminate them? To adequately address the first question, the impact of the economic and social structures, as well as the cultural expectations must be considered. The wage gap occurs across both gender and race/ethnic lines

and disadvantages groups that are already disproportionately unrepresented in public government.

When women continue to earn significantly less than men, even in identical positions within the workforce, the financial disparity likely has broader implications. Women have less money to spend on daily necessities (including childcare, a burden which still tends to fall on women in a two-parent household) and would have to work more to make as much as men, compensating for the wage gap. In a very practical level, they would have less money to self-finance a campaign; a vital component particularly at the beginning during the primaries.

A similar effect occurs with racial and ethnic minorities, but this can even be exacerbated with an educational gap. Black students graduate from high school, matriculate to college, and earn a college degree at a lower rate relative to white students. For Hispanic students, the educational disparities are even greater. While a college degree may be attractive to voters in the abstract sense, it has more practical implications that would prove helpful in politics: the exposure to diversity, the networking and community involvement, among other products of higher education provide candidates with a base of support and a skill set they might otherwise not have. When coupled with an economic disadvantage, it should not be surprising that non-white candidates struggle to fundraise as much as their white counterparts, when they average a lower income and less education on average.

Beyond the economic explanations, the way in which we socialize and project expectations on individuals, beginning even at birth, define a large part of one's identity. For women, the myths of politics as a man's game and of one being able to have "it all" have been dispelled by previous generations, but the expectations that one still cultivate an exciting and rigorous career, while raising a happy and healthy family, dutifully fulfilling community

commitments, and looking feminine, remain. For racial/ethnic minorities, the implicit racism is embedded in everyday social context that sets the standard. It is important to achieve a socially acceptable level of education, pursue a career that enables one to afford his/her own lifestyle (without relying on government assistance in anyway), and raise a family within a heteronormative, two-person household.

Social constructions that describe difference beyond the essential, biological distinctions create ideals that impact the way we view each others and the way we view ourselves. Where these constructions of group identity conflict with the expectations of a public official, the individual is forced to reconcile the difference between the two. Hilary Clinton's colorful closet of pantsuits represent this issue, as she straddles the line between being taken seriously as a leader who warrants respect (pant suits) but also as a woman with her own identity and preference in self-expression (lilac, magenta, chartreuse hues uncharacteristic in a man's wardrobe). Barack Obama likewise fields criticism that he is "too black" (showing his preference for Jay-Z and Beyonce's music) and yet simultaneously not "black" enough (failing to resolve issues of racial oppression). The complex dynamics of social values and expectations play an integral part in both the decision to run and the actual requirements of the office.

The political sphere represents a merge of both the social and the economic influences, and is naturally important in terms of this study. The rise of candidate centered campaigns has likely made it easier for candidates from underrepresented groups to actively engage in the election process. When political parties controlled decisions such as who would run and voters followed the cues to choose the party, not the individual, "paying dues" was valued and could legitimately keep out those who had not been around as long from participating. Now the candidates themselves take a greater responsibility in the process, but such responsibility can be

costly. The necessities required to mount a winning campaign rely on knowledge, experience, and funds. If racial/ethnic minorities and women are already disadvantaged economically (raising less in their occupations relative to white men) and are discouraged from becoming politically active (through social constructions and expectations), then it would follow that they might lag behind in political knowledge as well. The interrelatedness of the economic, social, and political factors cannot be ignored and culminate to forge a formidable challenge in increasing diversity of public officeholders.

If the barriers preventing inclusion are rooted deeper than simply the political system itself, as I argue they are, the question of how to minimize disparities and encourage more widespread participation becomes increasingly complicated. Campaign finance laws and restrictions approach the symptoms of the issue but not the cause of it and I am skeptical to believe it would have any positive effect with regards to gender or race/ethnicity. Limiting the dollar amount of individual contributors, for example, does not mean that the total fundraising results will be diminished; instead, it establishes yet another barrier that divides the politically savvy from those less so, as the former group will know how to coordinate with PACs, unions, and corporation to maximize those contributions and understand how to manipulate loopholes to their favor. A political novice, armed with ideals, not expertise (or the money to acquire it) is left at an incredible disadvantage. Though this is not to discount the other potential benefits incurred through such legislation, blithely assuming it would have a positive impact on the gender and racial/ethnic gaps would be premature.

Quotas have been used in political systems in other countries, as well as in the bureaucracy to varying degrees, as a way to ensure diverse representation. The general principle underlying a quota system seem to be inherently conflicted with the core values of American

democracy which, in theory, purportedly boast equality of opportunity and access. The actual mechanisms imbedded in elections (filing, qualifying, party primaries, etc.) lend to the resulting disparities that prove equality may be little more than a firmly grounded illusion. Incorporating quotas into the current system, however, would still only alleviate the symptoms or product resulting from the larger issues. Additionally, they would likely generate more animosity with regards to sexism and racism.

Equal wage policies that mandate employers compensate workers equally on the basis of the position and experience, leveling the economic differences across gender and racial/ethnic lines would be more preferable. Even then, the translation from increased pay wage to increased civic opportunities would take time and rely on social norms to change, reflecting a widespread desire for more diverse representation. I hesitate from endorsing any of these policies because the controversy that arises from them actually stems from the original issue questioning why certain groups are marginalized from the campaigning process to begin with. If we cannot agree as a society that sexism and racism is still rampant and pervades our politics as much as it does other facets of our culture, then how could we come to any agreeable conclusion for a way to resolve it?

While the findings of the studies in this collection demonstrate a gender and race/ethnic gap in campaign finance, it is clear that the implications of this issue are even more widespread. If women and racial/ethnic minorities fundraise less money than their white and male counterparts, they have less to spend on advertising, polling, canvassing, and campaigning in general. Funds are critical to modern campaigning and, especially when coupled with other influential factors like experience and quality, they can supplement deficits or enhance strengths. For candidates who already lack in fundraising, its impact can be detrimental.



Diversity with regards to gender and race/ethnicity is still greatly underrepresented in public office and spans across every branch of government and nearly every level. This indicates that the problem is not simply relegated to a particular type of public office or a location, but systemic of the larger social issues. Why do women and racial/ethnic minorities fundraise less than other candidates? Assuming it is not for a lack of ability nor a disregard for its importance, other factors make it more challenging for them to garner the necessary funds to afford a campaign.

Rather than just look at this problem on one-dimension, we should ask ourselves whether there is a contributor bias (i.e. donors are more likely to give to white men) and whether the current regulations and political environment inhibit inclusion of all people. Identifying all the factors that inevitably impact campaigns, elections, and the involvement of underrepresented groups in them cannot be reasonably exhausted by any single study. This collection demonstrates the importance of campaign finance which, though it may be only a small part of the larger framework, is nonetheless an important part of that process. Investigating the source of contributions, the influence of cultural expectations, and the way in which candidates seek out donors are all valuable topics for future research in this area. Additionally, unpacking the intersectional effects beyond just gender and race, and broadening these to SES and sexual orientation (among other possibilities) is imperative to understanding these relationships.

With the myriad of factors that contribute to elections in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, it is not surprising that the research originally set to uncover the role of gender and race in campaign fundraising continues long after its inception. The challenge in understanding how to make campaigns more equal and level the opportunities for political office remains a puzzle still today; yet it is a stimulating and exciting one.



