

Literature Review and Theoretical Background: Representation and women's legislative behavior

- Women make up just less than 21% of the Oklahoma Le in Politics 2022).
- Two main types of representation have dominated the li 1967).
- I move past this dichotomy and choose to focus on gyro principals (voters) have direct power over the placemen but have little direct power over the agent's actions once
- Literature on whether women focus on "women's issues US Congress indicates that this is the case, but work on might not be the case (Cook 2012; Volden, Wiseman, ar
- Interestingly, work on the Brazilian Chamber of Depution with other women legislators as opposed to men, support women's issues are more likely to have women principa
- I do not distinguish feminist issues from non-feminist is conservative representative claims resulting from Oklah control of the legislature and government trifecta (Celis

Legislative success

- In state legislatures, a common race, gender, and ethnicity would cosponsor a bill (Bratton and Rouse 2011).
- More generally, literature finds that as the number of co chance of success (Browne 1985).

Hypotheses:

H1: Bills addressing women's interests will be disproporti H2: Successful bills addressing women's issues will have H2b: Compared to non-women's issue bills, the number of bills to pass are greater.

Methodology and Research Design

- Data available from Legiscan (<u>https://legiscan.com/OK</u> altered as needed. Used only data for the 2020 legislativ
- Primary dependent variables: Bill issue and success
- Primary independent variables: Gender of author and n
- Because both dependent variables are dichotomous, I p legislative success, I created two models, one including excluding women's issue bills.
- Women's issues defined as those that exclusively/dispre men (Gerrity, Osborn, and Mendez 2007).

References:

Bratton, Kathleen A., and Stella M. Rouse. 2011. "Networks in the Legislative Arena: How Group Dynamics Affect Cosponsorship." Legislative Studies Quarterly 36 (3). doi: 10.1111/j.1939-9162.2011.00021.x.

Browne, William P. 1985. "Multiple Sponsorship and Bill Success in U.S. State Legislatures." Legislative Studies Quarterly 10 (4):483-488. doi: 10.2307/440070.

Celis, Karen, and Sarah Childs. 2012. "The Substantive Representation of Women: What to Do with Conservative Claims." Political Studies 60 (1):213-225. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9248.2011.00904.x.

Center for American Women and Politics. 2022. "State Fact Sheet- Oklahoma." Accessed April 8, 2022. https://cawp.rutgers.edu/facts/state-state-information/oklahoma

Cook, James M. 2012. "Gender, Voting and Cosponsorship in the Maine State Legislature." New

England Journal of Political Science 6 (1):2-30. Gerrity, Jessica C., Tracy Osborn, and Jeanette Morehouse Mendez. 2007. "Women and

Representation: A Different View of the District?" Politics & Gender 3 (2):179-200. doi: 10.1017/S1743923X07000025.

Mansbridge, Jane. 2003. "Rethinking Representation." American Political Science Review 97 (4):515-528. doi: 10.1017/S0003055403000856.

Legislating from the Minority: An analysis of women's substantive representation in the Oklahoma Legislature

Pritzlaff¹, Riley & Herrick¹, Rebekah 1. Oklahoma State University – Main Campus, Dept. of Political Science, Stillwater, OK

| | Results | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------|--|--|
| | • I found strong supp | ort for H1 | • | VARIA | BLES | |
| Legislature (Center for American Women | Women's issue bills | are more | likely | Chambe | er of origin | |
| | to have a woman au | thor (Odd | ls ratio | Num. oz | f coauthors | |
| literature: mandate and trustee (Pitkin | = 2.63). | | | Proporti | ion of | |
| • • • • • • | Women's issue bills | | | _ | coauthors | |
| roscopic representation in which the | likely to have wome | | ors | Author | lead | |
| ent of the agent (legislator in this case) | (Odds ratio = 4.07). | | | Coautho | ors lead | |
| ce in office (Mansbridge 2003). | • I found no support f | | | Success | | |
| es" shows mixed evidence: work on the | is likely that H2 had no significant | | | Author | Author gender | |
| n the Maine legislature indicates that this and Wittmer 2018). | results due to the sa | | | Author | | |
| ties found that women form strategic ties | women's issues bein | C | 11. | | Purty | |
| orting my theory that bills addressing | Interestingly, the number of coauthors had no significant impact | | | | ion of men | |
| bal authors (Wojcik and Mullenax 2017). | on success for women's issue bills, | | | | rs | |
| issues in this study in order to address | but it did for non-w | | ~ | Constan | ıt | |
| ahoma's Republican supermajority | bills. | | 540 | Observa | ations | |
| is and Childs 2012). | For non-women's issues, successful | | | | Sta | |
| | bills had more male | <i>,</i> | | | † This regre | |
| city often predicted whether a legislator | ratio $= 0.71$), but a s | Ň | | | This regre | |
| | of the coauthors we | | | | | |
| cosponsors on a bill increases, so does its | ratio = 0.38). | × · | | | | |
| tionately introduced by women. e a larger proportion of men authors. of coauthors needed for women's issues | <u>Descriptive statistics</u> This tables gives the summary statistics for all variables included in the model. The most interesting summary statiate are number of coauthors, proportion of women coauthors, | | | | | |
| | proportion of men coa | uthors. | | | | |
| | Descriptive Statistics Variable Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max | |
| K/legislation/2020) bill tracker and | Chamber of origin 1834 Bill issue (women's vs. non- 1832 women's issues) | .495 .038 | .5 .19 | 0 | 1 | |
| tive session. | Number of coauthors 1833 Proportion of women 1834 | 2.938 .104 | 11.203 .259 | 0 0 | 147 1 | |
| | coauthors Does author hold 1828 | .136 | .343 | 0 | 1 | |
| number of coauthors | leadership? (Yes/No) Do coauthors lead? 1834 | .039 | .193 | 0 | 1 | |
| performed logistic regression. For | (Yes/No) Did bill succeed (Yes/No) 1834 | .426 | .495 | 0 | 1 | |
| ng only women's issue bills, and one | Gender of authors1796Party of authors1827Proportion of men1493 | .336 1.848 .945 | .543 .409 .142 | 0 | 2 2 1 | |
| ronartionataly affact warmon and NOT | coauthors | .,,,, | .1 12 | - <u>-</u> - | | |
| proportionately affect women and NOT | Discussion: | 4 1 • 11 1 • | 1 • | ۰. | | |
| | • While it appears the | | e | | | |
| | have more women a dataset to include ad | ŕ | | • | ▲ | |
| | While it appears that | | C | | | |
| | predict success for v | | | | | |
| | encompassing more | | · | e | - | |
| | results. | -Sistati v | | | riables ry stations ry station | |
| | • It appears that for n | on-wome | n's issues | the numb | per of n | |
| | | 1 | | | | |

- male authors is more predictive of success.
- With more legislative sessions included, I can incorporate Poisson regression to determine whether specific legislators introduce women's issue bills at a disproportionate rate.

| | (1) | (2)† | (3)†† |
|-------------------|----------------|---------------|-----------|
| VARIABLES | Bill issue | Success | success |
| | | | |
| Chamber of origin | -0.0926 | 0.239 | 0.188 |
| | (0.272) | (0.746) | (0.119) |
| Num. of coauthors | 0.00200 | 0.0887 | 0.0713*** |
| | (0.0118) | (0.0562) | (0.0152) |
| Proportion of | 1.404*** | | |
| women coauthors | | | |
| | (0.344) | | |
| Author lead | 0.399 | 0.898 | 0.195 |
| | (0.359) | (0.951) | (0.169) |
| Coauthors lead | 0.941 | -2.104 | -0.252 |
| | (0.602) | (1.536) | (0.423) |
| Success | 0.405 | | |
| | (0.276) | | |
| Author gender | 0.966*** | -0.155 | -0.340*** |
| | (0.201) | (0.563) | (0.124) |
| Author party | -0.823*** | 0.161 | 0.208 |
| | (0.223) | (0.644) | (0.181) |
| Proportion of men | | 0.0997 | -0.980** |
| coauthors | | | |
| | | (1.982) | (0.435) |
| Constant | -2.897*** | -1.408 | -0.387 |
| | (0.465) | (2.079) | (0.547) |
| Observations | 1,786 | 43 | 1,404 |
| Stan | dard errors in | parentheses | |
| *** 1 | o≪0.01, ** p≪0 | 0.05, * p<0.1 | |

gression excluded women's issue bills

es that I tistics , and

tend to and this

e size hese

ression included women's issue bills

Pitkin, Hannah. 1967. The Concept of Representation. Berkeley: University of California Press. Volden, Craig, Alan E. Wiseman, and Dana E. Wittmer. 2018. "Women's Issues and their Fates in the US Congress." Political Science Research and Methods 6 (4):679-696. doi: 10.1017/psrm.2016.32. Wojcik, Stefan, and Shawnna Mullenax. 2017. "Men Idle, Women Network: How Networks Help Female Legislators Succeed." Legislative Studies Quarterly 42 (4):579-610. doi: 10.1111/lsq.12169.