

Counting Women's Ballots

How did the first female voters cast their ballots? For almost 100 years, answers to this question have eluded scholars. *Counting Women's Ballots* employs new data and novel methods to provide insights into whether, how, and with what consequences women voted in the elections after suffrage. The analysis covers a larger and more diverse set of places, over a longer period of time, than has previously been possible. J. Kevin Corder and Christina Wolbrecht find that the extent to which women voted and which parties they supported varied considerably across time and place, defying attempts to describe female voters in terms of simple generalizations. Many women adapted quickly to their new right; others did not. In some cases, women reinforced existing partisan advantages; in others, they contributed to dramatic political realignment. *Counting Women's Ballots* improves our understanding of the largest expansion of the American electorate during a transformative period of American history.

J. KEVIN CORDER is a professor of political science at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo. His research has appeared in the *American Political Science Review*, *The Journal of Politics*, and other outlets in political science and public administration. Much of his work focuses on economic policy, and he is the author of two books on the Federal Reserve System. In 2013, Dr. Corder received a Fulbright–Schuman European Affairs program grant to study the regulation of banks in Malta and the United Kingdom. He shared a National Science Foundation grant and the Carrie Chapman Catt prize with Christina Wolbrecht for the research design that inspired *Counting Women's Ballots*.

CHRISTINA WOLBRECHT is an associate professor of political science and director of the Rooney Center for the Study of American Democracy at the University of Notre Dame. She is the author of *The Politics of Women's Rights: Parties, Positions, and Change*, which received the Leon Epstein Outstanding Book Award from the Political Organizations and Parties Section of the American Political Science Association (APSA). She is coeditor of *Political Women and American Democracy* as well as other edited volumes, and the author or coauthor of articles appearing in *Perspectives on Politics*, *American Journal of Political Science*, *The Journal of Politics*, and other leading political science journals.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-14025-7 — Counting Women's Ballots
J. Kevin Corder, Christina Wolbrecht
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN GENDER AND POLITICS

Cambridge Studies in Gender and Politics (CSGP) publishes empirical and theoretical research on gender and politics. The Series advances work that addresses key theoretical, normative, and empirical puzzles concerning sex and gender, and their mutual impacts, constructions, and consequences regarding the political, comprehensively understood.

General Editors

Karen Beckwith Case Western Reserve University (Lead)
Lisa Baldez Dartmouth College
Christina Wolbrecht University of Notre Dame

Editorial Advisory Board

Nancy Burns, *University of Michigan*
Matthew Evangelista, *Cornell University*
Nancy Hirschmann, *University of Pennsylvania*
Sarah Song, *University of California at Berkeley*
Ann Towns, *University of Gothenburg*
Aili Mari Tripp, *University of Wisconsin at Madison*
Georgina Waylen, *University of Manchester*

Aili Mari Tripp, *Women and Power in Postconflict Africa*
Mala Htun, *Inclusion without Representation in Latin America: Gender Quotas and Ethnic Reservations*

Counting Women's Ballots
*Female Voters from Suffrage through
the New Deal*

J. KEVIN CORDER

Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo

CHRISTINA WOLBRECHT

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-14025-7 — Counting Women's Ballots
J. Kevin Corder, Christina Wolbrecht
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

One Liberty Plaza, New York NY 10006

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781316505878

© J. Kevin Corder and Christina Wolbrecht 2016

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2016

Printed in the United States of America by Sheridan Books, Inc

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-1-107-14025-7 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-316-50587-8 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

<i>List of Illustrations</i>	<i>page</i> vi
<i>List of Figures</i>	vii
<i>List of Tables</i>	x
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xi
1. Counting Women's Ballots	3
2. Before Suffrage	35
3. What We Already Know	67
4. Estimating Women's Turnout and Vote Choice	88
5. Female Voters and the Republican Landslide of 1920	127
6. Female Voters, Republican Majorities, and the Progressive Surge in 1924	159
7. Female Voters and the "Rum and Religion" Election of 1928	189
8. Female Voters and the Emerging Democratic Majority, 1932–1936	218
9. Female Voters from Suffrage through the New Deal and Beyond	253
<i>References</i>	285
<i>Index</i>	303

Illustrations

1.1	Prior to the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment, some states enfranchised women for a limited set of offices, necessitating separate voting procedures	<i>page 2</i>
3.1	In line to vote at Clarendon, Virginia, November 4, 1924	66
5.1	Suffrage leaders cast their votes for president in New York City	126
6.1	Senator Robert La Follette Sr. speaks to a group of women during his 1924 campaign for President as the Progressive Party candidate	158
7.1	League of Women Voters Get Out the Vote campaign, Anne Arundel County, Maryland, 1928	188
9.1	Sophia Horne and Elizabeth Hunnicut getting out the vote in Atlanta, Georgia, 1926	252

Figures

4.1	Logical bounds and observed values, Illinois, 1920	<i>page</i> 108
4.2	Ecological fallacy in Illinois, 1920	110
4.3	Observed and predicted Republican support, Illinois, 1920	113
4.4	Trace plots for four state-level parameters, Illinois, 1920	122
4.5	Observed and predicted Republican support, Boston wards, women, 1924	124
5.1	Turnout of women and men, 1920	137
5.2	Partisan context and the turnout of women and men, 1920	142
5.3	Legal context and the turnout of women and men, 1920	143
5.4	Republican vote share of women and men, 1920	145
5.5	Partisan context and the Republican vote share of women and men, 1920	146
5.6	Change in number of votes cast by women and men, 1916 to 1920	147
5.7	Change in number of Republican votes cast by women and men, 1916 to 1920	149
5.8	Change in number of Democratic votes cast by women and men, 1916 to 1920	149
5.9	Change in Republican margin of victory for women and men, 1916 to 1920	150
6.1	Turnout of women and men, 1924	166
6.2	Change in turnout of women and men, 1920 to 1924	167
6.3	Partisan context and the turnout of women and men, 1924	168
6.4	Legal context and the turnout of women and men, 1924	169
6.5	Republican vote share of women and men, 1924	170
6.6	Progressive vote share of women and men, 1924	171

viii	<i>Figures</i>	
6.7	Partisan context and the Republican vote share of women and men, 1924	173
6.8	Partisan context and the Progressive vote share of women and men, 1924	174
6.9	Change in number of votes cast by women and men, 1920 to 1924	177
6.10	Change in number of Republican votes cast by women and men, 1920 to 1924	178
6.11	Change in number of Democratic votes cast by women and men, 1920 to 1924	179
6.12	Change in number of Progressive votes cast by women and men, 1920 to 1924	179
7.1	Turnout of women and men, 1928	197
7.2	Change in turnout of women and men, 1924 to 1928	198
7.3	Partisan context and the turnout of women and men, 1928	199
7.4	Partisan context and the Republican margin of victory, 1920 to 1928	200
7.5	Legal context and the turnout of women and men, 1928	201
7.6	Republican vote share of women and men, 1928	202
7.7	Change in partisan vote share of women and men, 1924 to 1928	204
7.8	Partisan context and the Republican vote share of women and men, 1928	205
7.9	Change in number of votes cast by women and men, 1924 to 1928	206
7.10	Change in number of Republican votes cast by women and men, 1924 to 1928	208
7.11	Change in number of Democratic votes cast by women and men, 1924 to 1928	208
7.12	Change in number of Progressive votes cast by women and men, 1924 to 1928	209
7.13	Change in Republican margin of victory for women and men, 1924 to 1928	210
8.1	Turnout of women and men, 1932 and 1936	227
8.2	Change in turnout of women and men, 1928 to 1936	228
8.3	1934–1950 partisan context and the turnout of women and men, 1932 and 1936	231
8.4	Legal context and the turnout of women and men, 1932 and 1936	233
8.5	Democratic vote share of women and men, 1932 and 1936	235

	<i>Figures</i>	ix
8.6	Change in Democratic vote share of women and men, 1928 to 1936	236
8.7	Change in number of votes cast by women and men, 1928 to 1932	238
8.8	Change in number of Democratic votes cast by women and men, 1928 to 1932	239
8.9	Change in number of Republican votes cast by women and men, 1928 to 1932	241
8.10	Minimum number of Republican converts, 1928 to 1932	242
8.11	Percentage of new Democratic support due to conversion, 1928 to 1932	243
8.12	Minimum percentage of 1928 Republican ballots converted (defection rate), 1928 to 1932	245
8.13	Change in number of votes cast by women and men, 1932 to 1936	246
8.14	Change in number of Democratic votes cast by women and men, 1932 to 1936	247
8.15	Change in number of Republican votes cast by women and men, 1932 to 1936	248
9.1	National turnout in presidential elections, 1880–1948	255
9.2	Total turnout and turnout of women and men, sample states, 1880–1948	256
9.3	Difference between women's and men's turnout, sample states, 1920–1936	258
9.4	Difference between women's and men's support for Republican presidential candidates, sample states, 1920–1936	260
9.5	Effects of partisan context and voting restrictions on turnout of women and men, 1920–1936	263
9.6	Percentage change in turnout of women and men, 1920–1936	265
9.7	Average Republican vote share of women and men, sample states, 1920–1936	271
9.8	Turnout of women and men, American National Election Studies, 1948–2008	273
9.9	Democratic vote share of women and men, American National Election Studies, 1948–2008	274

Tables

4.1	Available Data Aggregation for Each Sample State, 1920	<i>page</i> 93
4.2	Political Context of Sample States	96
4.3	National and Sample Presidential Election Outcomes, 1916–1936 (Percentage of Total Vote)	102
4.4	Characteristics of the United States and Sample States, 1920	103
4.5	2 × 2 Table with Four Unknown Parameters	105
4.6	2 × 4 Table with Eight Unknown Parameters	107
4.7	Observed and Estimated Quantities of Interest in Illinois, 1916 and 1920	111
4.8	The 2 × 4 Problem Decomposed into Six 2 × 2 Tables	118
4.9	MCMC Diagnostics for Four State-level Parameters, Illinois, 1920	121
9.1	States with Higher Female Support for the Republican or Democratic Presidential Candidate, 1920–1936	261

Acknowledgments

This book would not have been written if it were not for John Sprague.

This is true in a general sense. John Sprague was a teacher, mentor, dissertation chair, and friend to both authors from the time we were graduate students at Washington University in St. Louis in the 1990s. John's wisdom and perspective have shaped both of us deeply as social scientists and inform every aspect of this book, from the concern for the role of context in shaping political behavior to attention to the effective visual display of information.

This is also true in a specific sense. When Gary King made his forthcoming book, *A Solution to the Ecological Inference Problem*, available to the academic community in the mid-1990s, it was John who alerted both of us to the potential of bringing these new methods to bear on important unanswered questions. His initial enthusiasm and insight sparked the two decades of collaboration that produced this book.

We also owe a great deal to Gary King. As we discuss in Chapter 4, the identification of the ecological inference problem by William Robinson more than sixty years ago (along with the emergence of high-quality survey instruments) led to a significant and regrettable turn away from aggregate election data collection and analysis in the second half of the twentieth century. Many interesting questions – regarding not only elections, but also a wealth of puzzles across multiple fields – went unanswered as a result. Gary's book helped reignite work on approaches to ecological inference, including the Bayesian approach proposed by Jon Wakefield that we employ in this research. Gary also has been a long-time supporter of this project in particular, inviting us to a 2002 conference on

ecological inference at Harvard and continuing to provide useful advice and feedback as the project progressed.

We are indebted to our friends Andrew Martin and Kevin Quinn as well. The estimates that form the key empirical basis for this research were produced using a modified version of MCMCpack, an R package for Markov Chain Monte Carlo estimation they developed with Jong Hee Park. Even more important has been their ongoing consultation on the considerable data and estimation challenges this research has confronted. For that, and for many fine meals, we are grateful.

Kristi Andersen's book *After Suffrage* provided essential guidance to this period and these issues when our project was in its infancy, and Kristi herself has been a valuable sounding board and supporter over the years. We also benefited from the advice and encouragement of other colleagues around the country, including Karen Beckwith, Lisa Baldez, Lee Ann Banaszak, Dianne Bystrom, Gerald Gamm, Dan Galvin, John Geer, Robert Huckfeldt, Holly McCammon, Ken Kollman, Rick Matland, Bruce Oppenheimer, and Rick Vallely. Some of the conversations were many and wide-ranging, some few and specific, but each person helped us to develop further the ideas and approach we articulate in this book. To those who have provided insight but whom we have inadvertently and regretfully failed to list here, please know you have our gratitude as well. The opportunity to present and receive feedback on our research from seminar participants at the University of Notre Dame, Western Michigan University, Loyola University Chicago, Northwestern University, Ohio State University at Marion, Swarthmore College, Vanderbilt University, Washington University in St. Louis, and the European Conference on Gender and Politics, as well as from discussants and audience members at multiple American Political Science Association (APSA) and Midwest Political Science Association (MPSA) meetings, has been invaluable. As the finish line neared, Dave Campbell read the entire manuscript, cover to cover; his insights and encouragement made the final push possible. All of these fine colleagues are of course blameless for any errors that remain.

A multitude of undergraduate and graduate students performed essential tasks as research assistants, including tracking down and verifying citations and sources; scouring newspaper microfilm; and above all, entering column upon column of electoral and census data, some of it written in pencil and then copied on to microfilm decades ago. We are grateful to Notre Dame graduate students Brian Krueger, Patrick Flavin, Catherine Borck, Jill Budny, Jay Johnson, Ana-Tereza Lemos-Nelson, Noman Sattar, Cheryl Schotten, Claire Smith, Yizhong Sun, Michele Waslin, Annabella

Acknowledgments

xiii

España-Najera, and Justin McDevitt; Notre Dame undergraduates Mary “Chrissy” Prina, Megan DiPerna, and Lauren Willoughby; and Western Michigan University graduate student Uisoon Kwon.

Financial support has been essential to this project. In particular, this research would not have been possible without National Science Foundation grants SES-9905843 and SES-9905307, which supported the original data collection and analysis. A research prize from the Carrie Chapman Catt Center for Women and Politics Research at the Iowa State University provided early support and encouragement. We also benefited from ongoing funding from our home institutions, particularly the Institute for Scholarship in the Liberal Arts (College of Arts & Letters), Faculty Research Program, and the Rooney Center for the Study of American Democracy at the University of Notre Dame, and the Research Development Award Program at Western Michigan University.

Tracking down historic election records is an adventure. In pursuit of the exceptional Illinois election records (recorded by sex in 1916 and 1920; see Chapter 3) we contacted all 102 Illinois counties (save Cook, where the data were already available in published form) via telephone. Though most election records below the level of the county were lost to history, we are grateful to the county clerks and staff who dug through their archives in search of the data we required. A few were able to copy and send us records; others opened their doors to Christina Wolbrecht and her husband during one memorable spring break so that we could enter the data directly off of the poll books that were too large for a standard copy machine. We also visited and/or called a number of state, university, and presidential archives and libraries across the United States in search of election records and other information and were repeatedly impressed by the professionalism and knowledge of the staff who answered our questions, and in more than a few cases, followed up with large packages of photocopied material that made this project possible.

Lew Bateman, senior editor at Cambridge University Press, has been an unflinching and patient supporter of this project for many years. It was a pleasure to work with him, and with the staff at CUP, to bring this book to press. We are grateful to the three anonymous readers, whose careful and thoughtful feedback sharpened and improved the final manuscript.

Our families and friends have been patient as well. J. Kevin Corder thanks his wife, Susan, for her good humor as she endured hundreds of claims about how close the “Christina book” was to actual completion. For unflagging optimism and encouragement, he also appreciates his Western colleagues, particularly Tom Bailey and Katherine Joslin.

Christina Wolbrecht likewise is grateful to her colleagues at Notre Dame, in particular Alexandra Guisinger and Karen Graubart, for advice and support of all kinds. She thanks her husband, Matt, for all the ways he makes her professional life possible and her personal life meaningful. And for only occasionally saying, Just finish it! Christina Wolbrecht also thanks her daughters, Ella and Jane, both of whom were born after this book project was initiated, for their love and joy. They were outraged to learn that women were once denied the right to vote; we hope this book is just one more piece of evidence for them of the myriad ways in which women should and do count in this world, in politics and beyond.