

# **Political Context and the Turnout of New Women Voters after Suffrage**

**J. Kevin Corder, Western Michigan University**

**Christina Wolbrecht, University of Notre Dame**

## **Web Appendix A**

### **State Data, Independent Variables, and State-level Estimates**

In the body of the paper we report the effects of urban place, electoral competition, previous pro-suffrage activity, electoral laws, and years since suffrage extension on male and female turnout in 1920 and 1924. Due to space constraints, we omitted extended discussion of the characteristics of the states in the sample and of the geographic units that make up the data set, as well as turnout estimates for each state. Each is reported below.

#### ***State Data***

Data for the paper was collected from state publications for five sample states, principally in the North Central and North Eastern regions of the United States. The sample states and the Electoral College vote share of each state is displayed in Table A-1. The states of Illinois and New York account for more than half of the voters in the sample.

*Table A-1 about here.*

Creation of the turnout data sets required combining census data and election returns collected at different points in time and published by different agencies and levels of government. Our objective was to merge election returns and census data at the level of the Minor Civil Division, the principal official unit of government below the level of the county. We were able to merge a large proportion of the published election returns with MCDs of the same name in the U.S. Census. The U.S. Census reports include detailed footnotes describing

how existing MCDs are incorporated or reorganized and how new MCDs are formed between census surveys. In cases where incorporation or reorganization made it impossible to determine how MCD election returns (reported every four years) should be matched with MCD census data (reported every ten years), we created a new observation composed of several MCDs and called an MCD-grouping. In extreme cases where MCD reorganization was extensive or data were unavailable, we employed county-level data. In other cases where MCDs were disaggregated into wards and ward election returns were published, we relied on wards. The distribution of geographic units in the data is displayed as Table A-2, below.

*Table A-2 about here.*

### ***Independent Variables***

Three of the variables included in the model of turnout reported in the article are measured at the state level: electoral laws, years since suffrage, and level of outside pro-suffrage activity (see Table A-3). Using information provided by the League of Women Voters (Blakey 1928), we create a state-level index of *electoral laws* indicating presence of (1) literacy tests; (2) poll taxes; and (3) residency requirements greater than six months (all of the states in our sample had some form of personal registration system). Because these measures are highly correlated, we sum the three into a general index of the number of legal hurdles faced by citizens. We employ a state-level measure of *previous pro-suffrage activity* that indicates mass exposure to suffrage appeals (see McCammon and Campbell 2001; McCammon et al. 2001). To measure the extent of public exposure to suffrage appeals, we use the total number of *outsider* strategies employed in the state since the Civil War. We also include a measure of the *years since suffrage extension*. While only in Illinois had women been permitted to vote in a previous presidential

election, women in these other states had some opportunity to exercise their suffrage right or adjust to the idea of women's suffrage before 1920.

*Table A-3 about here.*

The remaining contextual variables are measured at the county or MCD level. Our data collection strategy permits identification of wholly urban areas, a measure that is foreclosed when using county-level data. We identify as *urban* any area that is a ward in a city of 50,000 or more and any area that is a city or other MCD of 50,000 or more. This measure delineates about 10 percent of the observations as urban areas, but over one half of the eligible electorate resides in these urban areas in 1920. We construct an indicator of *electoral competition* that indicates the closeness of the election. The measure is a function of the absolute difference between the county-level Democratic and Republican shares of the two party vote for president or governor. The measure ranges from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating close competition (each party receives the same share of the votes, or 0.5) and 0 indicating one-party dominance (one party receives all of the votes). We retain the greater of either the gubernatorial or Presidential measure in each election year. We measure electoral competition at the county-level, which allows for the fact that while one party may dominate a state, closer party competition may characterize other sub-state races. We choose not to measure electoral competition at the level of the MCD, as MCD-levels of competition might misrepresent sub-state competition in places like congressional districts which may be comprised of many MCDs. The county is large enough to encompass various local contexts and small enough to capture within state variation in competition. Electoral competition is expected to stimulate turnout overall with a perhaps greater or lesser effect on women. The average levels of competition and the percentage of the population in wholly urban areas is reported in Table A-4.

*Table A-4 about here.*

### ***State-level Estimates***

We can aggregate MCD point estimate to examine average male and female turnout by state. Table A-5 reports estimated turnout for men and women in each sample state in 1920 and 1924. In each state the difference between male and turnout is in the neighborhood of 20 percent, consistent with the observed difference in 1920 (and 1916) Illinois, although the size of the differential varies between states by as much as 7 points in 1920 and 6 points in 1924. All states, except Michigan, experience a modest increase in female turnout and slightly larger increase in male turnout, with the net effect that the gap between male and female turnout widens from 1920 to 1924. This is surprising, given that we expected experience to drive up women's turnout, but consistent with what was observed in Illinois between 1916 and 1920 (Goldstein 1984).

*Table A-5 about here.*

### **References**

- Blakey, Gladys C. 1928. *A Handy Digest of Election Laws*. Washington, D.C.: League of Women Voters.
- Goldstein, Joel H. 1984. *The Effects of the Adoption of Women's Suffrage: Sex Differences in Voting Behavior—Illinois, 1914-21*. New York: Praeger.
- McCammon, Holly J. and Karen E. Campbell. 2001. "Winning the Vote in the West: The Political Success of Women's Suffrage Movements." *Gender & Society* 15(February):55-82.
- McCammon, Holly J., Karen E. Campbell, Ellen M. Granberg, and Christine Mowery. 2001. "How Movements Win: Gendered Opportunity Structures and U.S. Women's Suffrage Movements, 1866 to 1919." *American Sociological Review* 66(February):49-70.

**TABLE A-1. SAMPLE STATES FOR ANALYSIS.**

State	ICPSR Region	Electoral College Vote Share (1920)
Connecticut	New England	1.3
Illinois	East North Central	5.5
Massachusetts	New England	3.4
Michigan	East North Central	2.8
New York	Middle Atlantic	8.5

**TABLE A-2. GEOGRAPHIC UNITS OF SAMPLE STATES, 1920.**

Aggregation Type	Number of Observations	Average Population
County	114	22,226
County less city	1	29,440
City	1	21,500
MCD grouping	92	14,079
Minor Civil Division (MCD)	2,474	1,889
Urban ward	277	26,621
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,959</b>	<b>5,383</b>

**TABLE A-3. CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES (STATE LEVEL).**

State	Year Suffrage Extended	Pro-suffrage Outside Activity	Electoral Laws (3=most restrictive)
Connecticut	1920	57	2
Illinois	1913	62	1
Massachusetts	1920	106	3
Michigan	1918	59	0
New York	1918	79	2

**TABLE A-4. CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES (COUNTY OR MCD LEVEL).**

State	Percent Urban (MCD)	Average Electoral Competition (County)
Connecticut	39	0.68
Illinois	43	0.54
Massachusetts	41	0.68
Michigan	54	0.69
New York	68	0.63

**TABLE A-5. ESTIMATED TURNOUT BY STATE, 1920 AND 1924.**

State	Female turnout	Male turnout	Differential
<i>1920</i>			
AVERAGE	0.37	0.55	0.18
Connecticut	0.32	0.54	0.22
Illinois (est.)	0.44	0.60	0.16
Massachusetts	0.33	0.52	0.19
Michigan	0.40	0.55	0.15
New York	0.34	0.52	0.18
Illinois (actual)	0.41	0.64	0.23
<i>1924</i>			
AVERAGE	0.38	0.58	0.20
Connecticut	0.32	0.56	0.24
Illinois	0.48	0.66	0.18
Massachusetts	0.39	0.59	0.20
Michigan	0.34	0.56	0.22
New York	0.35	0.55	0.20