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#### Abstract

The United States of America was experiencing internal and external turmoil leading up to the 2020 presidential election. This capstone project will look at the impact that a specific voting block, women, had on the election outcome. The main focus question of this project is as follows, "What factors motivated women's political engagement and participation in the months before the 2020 presidential election?" Leading to the election, media attention was increasing on the importance of women going out to vote since a record number of women registered to vote could have the ability to affect the outcome of the election. I will compare the voting preferences between men and women to have a baseline of variation between the sexes. Afterward, I will further analyze the interpretation of voting between women based on significant identities such as their race. Two events that led to the presidential election that could have influenced voting trends include the \#MeTooMovement and the Black Lives Matter Movement. This project aims to look at how women's voting preferences influenced the outcome of the 2020 presidential election.

To analyze the voting preferences of the women voting block, I will research and analyze the voting data from the 2020 election as reported by the American National Election Survey (ANES). I will use gender as the control variable to break down the statistics and determine further subcategories. Afterward, I will see a correlation between respondents' demographics and preferences on a wide range of issues. By gathering this information, I will see voting patterns across many women. By analyzing women's voting patterns, I hope to see the essential factors to women constituents.
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## Introduction

In 2016 and the years proceeding, inner turmoil within the United States of America due to multiple factors created an explosive reaction. This project looks at women's influence on political elections as a part of a significant voting bloc in the political landscape. I will look at the variation of political participation between women based on race and ethnic background. For this project, political participation will be defined as respondents' answers to aspects of engagement such as attending political marches or protests and donating to a political campaign in the election cycle. The data will help determine if women are being politically active, could they make a difference in the election?

I will review two topics within the literature review to determine a shift in voting behaviors based on time and demographics. The first literature section will examine women's political participation changes, beginning with the fight for women's suffrage. Initially, there was skepticism about extending the right to vote to women in the United States. As years progressed following women's suffrage, women continued to fight for their voices in the political sphere. To look at changing political opinions within the women's voting block, I will analyze data from the 2020 presidential elections and compare the voting activity of specific demographic groups. This analysis will include early polling opinions, results of the election, and post-election surveys.

The primary focus of this capstone project is to attempt to determine how women's voting preferences influenced the 2020 election. Therefore, the questions that will lead and frame the research project are as follows:

1. How did women's voting behavior affect the outcome of the 2020 presidential election?
2. What factors were most important to women in the election cycle to determine how they cast their votes in the presidential election?
3. Was there variation in voting decisions within the women's voting blocks, for example, if a particular event affects women more than men or Black women compared to white women?

As a response to the evolving climate for those in different facets of society, the 2020 election saw more women involved in political engagement than men for the same election cycle. I hypothesize that a more significant portion of women will be considered politically active than men. Furthermore, I hypothesize that there will be variation within women's opinions regarding various events depending on their race/ethnicity; for example, Black women will be more affected by police brutality than white women.

The immediate significance of my project is to see how political participation (increased participation in marches/protest, etc.) can affect the outcome of national elections. Looking at the American National Election Survey data, I will look at the correlation between increased participation by certain groups of women based on how they responded to pre-election and post-election survey questions. The isolated data will help determine how specific engagement is increased or decreased in ethnic/race groups that may have been influenced by a political discourse they have been exposed to in the time leading up to the presidential elections. The broader significance of this project is to have the ability to take the voting results and reactions of a specific voting block that future political candidates can utilize to propagate their campaign. Targeting an immediate audience can help politicians and their teams pinpoint essential issues and topics to the constituents to get them elected into political office.

## Background

Before the 2020 presidential election, there were a lot of comments in the media about the importance of going out to be politically active. The major push aimed towards many different groups of varying demographics from both sides of the political spectrum. One in particular that there was an emphasis on was the women's voting block in both the 2016 and 2020 presidential elections.

Following the election results, agencies released data that confirmed the women's voting block was out in large numbers. News outlets stated that " ... President-elect Joseph Biden takes the oath of office in January, he'll have a group of voters to thank in particular for delivering him the white house: Women" (Miller, 2021). There are multiple arguments about why there was a change in the political landscape. With all the data presented, the piece I think is missing from the studies is the further analysis of what motivated women to come out in large numbers to elect the new president. Many topics could have resulted in how women voted from dissatisfaction with previous administrations, political movements, and more. Therefore, I aim to see how women cast their votes based on their ethnic and racial backgrounds.

Going deeper into voter turnout, Black voters, both women, and men, were a crucial demographic to help determine the outcome (Hackney, 2020). The votes of Black people in large cities helped push their areas to turn Democratic which lost in the previous election. It was stated that Black women carried Biden over the finish line for a victory along with college-educated women white women (Miller, 2021). The Black Lives Matter movement began in 2013 to respond to the shooting death of thirteen-year-old Trayvon Martin. As time continued, the campaign looked at injustices across the country and even the world to kill Black individuals. After the acquittal of Martins's murder, George Zimmerman, there was nationwide
unrest regarding this decision. Even though the Black Lives Matter Movement began in 2013, there was a surge in protest due to publicized police brutality of unarmed Black individuals such as Breonna Taylor and George Floyd ("About - Black Lives"). Thousands of people took to the street amid the COVID-19 pandemic and were met with tear gas, rubber bullets, and other extreme measures. There was opposition to the Black Lives Matter Movement: Blue Lives Matter and white supremacy groups. These white supremacy groups also gathered and called themselves "Proud Boys" by then President Donald Trump (Frenkel and Karni, 2020). Therefore, I would like to see if this information about these events led to increased dissatisfaction (opinions) about police brutality.

The MeToo Movement began in 2006 to raise awareness for those sexually abused or assaulted, emphasizing those harmed by those in positions of power ("Get to Know Us: "). Since there was a record number of women voters, as mentioned previously, the MeToo Movement could have influenced how women voted in the election. Since there was a record number of women voters, as discussed earlier, the MeToo Movement could have influenced how women voted in the election. In the years between the presidential elections of 2016 and 2020, there was a resurgence of recognition to the movement of 2017. In 2017, director Harvey Weinstein had allegations of this behavior that brought it to the public's attention. This movement came to the forefront in 2017 when Supreme Court nominee Brett Kavanaugh was accused of sexually assaulting Amy Coney Barrett (Mansoor, 2021). As time continued, individuals from all facets of life began to tell their stories and how they survived the trauma that became publicly known as the \#MeTooMovement. Support came from across the spectrum from everyday individuals to Former First Lady Michelle Obama in the discussion of Donald Trump's alleged mistreatment of women from the 2016 election cycle. When discussing the then-presidential candidate Donal

Trump, Obama stated, " ... I can't believe that I'm saying that a candidate of the United States has bragged about sexually assaulting women (2016)." As a result of these experiences brought to light, I would like to see a correlation between the MeToo Movement and women's opinions on sexual harassment.

## Literature Review

A wide range of literature on women's voting begins with looking at the history of women's suffrage to recent literature that focuses on the opinions of intersections of women groups. There has been an interest in looking at how women have been politically active since enfranchisement because there are statistically more women than men in the American population. The literature currently focuses on data about women's demographics and identity to see if there has been any significant change between each election cycle. I would like to see if racial and ethnic groups tended to vote a certain way while determining essential issues.

First, when looking at the fight for women's suffrage, there was an uphill battle. Initially, the notion was given "that women would be inclined to 'duplicate' the male vote if they turned out at the polls at all" (Cascio and Shenhav 24, 2020). In the 1920s and prior, women had to advocate for themselves and allies to fight for their right to vote. There were preconceived thoughts that women could not decide who should govern the American population. Early suffragists took to giving speeches and other forms of activism to be heard to combat these stereotypes. For example, the Seneca Falls Convention saw the keynote address of Elizbeth Cady Santon that was given in 1848. She stated that the women were " ... assembled to protest against a form of government existing without the consent of the governed-to declare our right to be free as a man is free " (Staton, 1848). This quote shows how women fought for men's fundamental rights as there was no difference between the sexes beyond biology.

Even after the passage of the nineteenth amendment, there were battles to be fought as not every woman could vote in all states due to race. While struggling to access the political landscape, women began to show up and advocate in-depth about issues that affected them. Increased advocacy is seen in the fact that "Over the past 80 years, women's political mobilization has not only steadily converged with men's, but has overtaken it" (Cascio and Shenhav 33, 2020). Women turned out to vote, being engaged in politics has continued to grow, and women have shaped different political reforms by championing fundamental causes. There may be questions as to why women became increasingly engaged. It can be stated that "... women's differential response to increasing rates of high school graduation, with less explanatory power for rising rates of college attendance" (Cascio and Shenhav 45, 2020). Changes in access to education and the workforce could contribute to the shift in political perspective since individuals are likely to become increasingly aware of varying social issues.

In the years preceding the 2020 election, the atmosphere had changed for women dramatically. There was a shock after the election of 2016 when Donald Trump was elected as President of the United States, especially after a video resurfaced where he talked about sexually assaulting women. As a result, "Trump's surprise victory also propelled many American women to engage in the politics of resistance, forming grassroots organizations to protest against his policies and inspiring a record number to run for political office..." (Deckman and Gardner 107, 2020). The year 2018 was deemed the "New Year of the Women" when more women were elected into Congress than ever before. According to Hora, "A record 102 women currently serve in the 435 -member House of Representatives, while 25 women serve in the 100 -member Senate, representing the highest rate of women in Congress ever at 23.7 percent of the overall body" $(134,2019)$. This push for women's representation in the elected offices shows support
from outside factors to women. The motivation for women's representation is exemplified in the crowdsources "Black Women in Politics" database that gave the public access to information (Gillespie and Brown 48, 2019).

During the four years between 2016 and 2020, many political events impacted everyday life. Women in Trump's America tries to determine how women's behavior was in the 2016 elections and the following two years into the Trump Administration. This study looks at the intersections of a person's identity to see who they vote on specific issues in an attempt to prove that not one precise characterization can tell the whole picture of one's voting behavior. For example, "Women of color historically and strongly prefer Democratic Presidential candidates" (Deckman and Gardner 110, 2020). Sources recognize that women of color are "the fastest-growing electorate in the American political process, and represent 55 percent of the growth in eligible women voters since 2000 " (Hora 137, 2019). Therefore, it is crucial to see what topics were important to women of color that resulted in them trying to make a change. The Me Too Movement was a major news story after the Supreme Court nomination of Brett Kavanaugh, who faced allegations of sexual assault. In response to the nomination, there was " ... heightened attention to the attention of sexual assault and harassment made Trump's nomination to the Supreme Court of Brett Kavanaugh, who was later accused of sexual misconduct by multiple women" (Deckman and Gardner 120, 2020). The ability to bring these allegations to the forefront of the media and the public mind allowed for other victims of sexual assault and harassment to speak out against the alleged perpetrator.

As mentioned in the background of this project, Black women came out to vote in record numbers. Therefore, it is essential to see factors that could result in Black women voting in a particular manner. Previously, "Blacks have historically voted less often than whites, directly
because of discrimination or voter suppression in some cases, and indirectly because of discrimination disadvantages Blacks socioeconomically, making it more difficult for them to vote" (Gillespie and Brown 43, 2019). Voter suppression and limited access would lead to a decrease in the ability to vote. In the 2020 election cycle, various groups run by Black entities discussed the importance of being registered to vote and to see if individuals with specific backgrounds were eligible to vote.

In conclusion, there is a lot of research on how women have been politically active in the past. What is currently missing from the data and literature is a long-term analysis of specific events leading up to the 2020 presidential election. With the increase in voting from women voting blocks, there is the possibility of changing the course of history through a national election.

## Design and Data Analysis

To look at shifts in political perspectives, I will analyze data from the American National Election Survey (ANES) that conducts information that ranges from early voting opinions and post-election results. The data will be cross-referenced between the answers of men and women to find out if there is any divergence in the political issues that were important for the groups in the 2020 election from the responses. This basis will also allow me to see if there was consistency in the pre-election opinions and how individuals voted. In this project, "political participation/engagement" is defined as constituents engaging in the following activities: voting in the presidential election, participating in political marches/protests, and donating to political campaigns. The variables that are used in the survey are first for sex $(\mathrm{V} 201600)$, further broken down into men $(\mathrm{V} 201600=1(1 . \mathrm{Male}))$ and women $(\mathrm{V} 201600=2(2$. Female)), and many more variables to help denote the specific question or demographic
information. It is important to note that there is the possibility to cross-reference pre-election and post-election data in the same chart as many pre-election questions concern demographic information.

## Considerations

I will be looking at data collected from individual participation by the ANES. Since I will analyze and adapt data previously collected by other entities, they have already obtained the green light to study human subjects. Therefore, I will not need to obtain IRB approval for this research capstone project. Lastly, it is essential to consider the possibility that participants who were not entirely truthful when filling out the ANES survey for many reasons could result in a skew of the data collected. However, data will be evaluated at face value as it is impossible to know if individuals accurately represented their perspective and how they cast their vote.

## Findings

To begin research, I looked at the variables that were given in the data set of the 2020 election from the ANES that is entitled "American National Election Study (ANES) 2020 Full Release - released (7/18/21 (SDA 3) | SDA 3.5)." The survey took the response of around 5,700 individuals of different genders and varying backgrounds. Individuals were asked an array of questions before and following the presidential election to collect data that would display the temperatures or mood of the constituents. The total sample pre-election weight for all data sets is the variable V200010a.


Fig.1. For whom did R vote for President? "SDA 4.1.3: Tables." SDA, 25 Jul. 2021
For a baseline of the data, I wanted to see the number of individuals who voted for each political candidate in the 2020 election that was further separated by gender and then split into racial/ethnic backgrounds. I put in the variable for gender (V201600) as the control, the pre-election question of the respondent's self-identified race/ethnicity (V201549x) in the column, and the post-election question of "For whom did the R [respondent] vote for President" (V202073) in the row. First, I looked to compare the voting patterns between women and men further broken down by their race/ethnicity. Figure 1 presents the data collected from the variables above, especially at the voting pool's male population, V201600 $=1$ (1. Male). Data shows that over half of the male respondents who identified themselves as men voted for former President Donald Trump. In striking contrast, men who identify as Black men voted for Joseph Biden, with the majority reporting their vote in his favor, $87.9 \%$. The other major voting block of Hispanic males reported $70.1 \%$ voting in favor of Biden compared to the $25 \%$ who voted for Trump.

| Statistics for V201600 = 2(2. Female) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cells contain: <br> -Column percent <br> -Weighted N |  | V201549x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1 1. <br> White, nonHispanic |  | 3 3. Hispanic | 4 <br> 4. Asian or Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, nonHispanic alone | 5 <br> 5. Native American/Alaska Native or other race, nonHispanic alone | 6 6. Multiple races, nonHispanic | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROW } \\ & \text { TOTAL } \end{aligned}$ |
| V202073 | 1: 1. Joe Biden | $\begin{array}{r} 45.9 \\ 959.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 91.2 \\ 299.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 77.5 \\ 244.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.5 \\ & 63.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51.5 \\ & 21.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65.3 \\ & 66.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 55.4 \\ 1,654.7 \end{array}$ |
|  | 2: 2. Donald Trump | $\begin{array}{r} 52.0 \\ 1,087.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.9 \\ 19.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.7 \\ & 62.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40.2 \\ & 43.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.4 \\ & 14.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 29.0 \\ 29.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 42.1 \\ 1,255.8 \end{array}$ |
|  | 3: 3. Jo Jorgensen | $\begin{array}{r} .9 \\ 18.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .0 \\ & . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.5 \\ & 4.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \\ & 1.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.6 \\ & 2.8 \end{aligned}$ | 3.4 3.5 | $\begin{array}{r} 1.0 \\ 31.2 \end{array}$ |
|  | 4: 4. Howie Hawkins | .1 2.8 | $\begin{aligned} & 2.1 \\ & 6.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .1 \\ & . \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | . 0 | . 0 | . 0 | $\begin{array}{r} .3 \\ 10.1 \end{array}$ |
|  | 5: 5. Other candidate \{SPECIFY\} | $\begin{array}{r} .7 \\ 14.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} .6 \\ 1.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.2 \\ & 3.7 \end{aligned}$ | . 3 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.8 \\ & 2.0 \end{aligned}$ | 2.3 2.4 | $\begin{array}{r} .8 \\ 24.8 \end{array}$ |
|  | 7: 7. Specified as Republican candidate | . 0 | $\begin{aligned} & .0 \\ & .0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .0 \\ & .0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .0 \\ & .0 \end{aligned}$ | 1.3 .6 | . 0 | .0 .6 |
|  | 11: 11. Specified as don't know | .1 2.1 | $\begin{aligned} & .0 \\ & .0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .0 \\ & .0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .0 \\ & .0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .0 \\ & .0 \end{aligned}$ | . 0 | $\begin{array}{r} .1 \\ 2.1 \end{array}$ |
|  | 12: 12. Specified as refused | $\begin{array}{r} .2 \\ 4.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .2 \\ & .5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .0 \\ & .0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .0 \\ & .0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.3 \\ & 1.0 \end{aligned}$ | . 0 | $\begin{array}{r} .2 \\ 5.8 \end{array}$ |
|  | COL TOTAL | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 2,090.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 328.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 315.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 107.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 41.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 101.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 2,985.1 \end{array}$ |

Fig. 2. For whom did R vote for President? "SDA 4.1.3: Tables." SDA, 25 Jul. 2021
Figure 2 presents the variables above with the magnified look for female voters, V201600 - 2(2.Female). As I hypothesized, this result shows variation between white women and other ethnic/racial groups in who they voted for. Similar to their male counterparts, white or non-Hispanic women voted for Donald Trump with a majority of $52 \%$. All other female ethnic/racial groups overwhelmingly voted in favor of Joe Biden.

| Statistics for V201600 $=\mathbf{2}$ (2. Female) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cells contain: <br> -Column percent <br> -Weighted N |  | V201549x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1 1. <br> White, nonHispanic | 2 <br> 2. Black, nonHispanic | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 3 . \\ \text { Hispanic } \end{gathered}$ | 4 <br> 4. Asian or Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, nonHispanic alone | 5 <br> 5. Native American/Alaska Native or other race, nonHispanic alone |  | ROW <br> TOTAL |
| V201127 | 1: 1. Approve | $\begin{array}{r} 50.8 \\ 1,388.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7.6 \\ 41.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20.5 \\ 112.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.6 \\ & 46.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43.0 \\ & 28.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22.4 \\ & 36.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 39.2 \\ 1,654.2 \end{array}$ |
|  | 2: 2. Disapprove | $\begin{array}{r} 49.2 \\ 1,342.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 92.4 \\ 504.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 79.5 \\ 436.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 70.4 \\ 111.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57.0 \\ & 38.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 77.6 \\ 126.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathbf{6 0 . 8} \\ 2,560.4 \end{array}$ |
|  | COL TOTAL | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 2,730.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 546.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 549.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 158.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 67.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 163.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 4,214.5 \end{array}$ |

Fig. 3. Approve or disapprove of the President handling job. "SDA 4.1.3: Table." $S D A, 25$ Jul. 2021

With the tension going into the 2020 presidential election, I thought it was essential to see individuals' opinions regarding the incumbent president's job to see if it may correlate with the
outcome. The control variable of the data set is what is the respondent's sex (V201600), the variable in the column is the individuals identified ethnicity/race (V201549x) , and in the row is the pre-election question of "Approve or disapprove President handling job" (V201127). As shown in Figure 3, most women "Disapprove[d]" of President Trump's job as an officer with a percentage of $60.8 \%$. Black women lead this category with a disapproval rate of 90.9 percent. In the opposition, 45.1 percent of women approved of the way President Trump was handling his job. The majority of this population comprises white women with an approval rate of $53.3 \%$.

Me Too Movement

| Statistics for V201600 $=\mathbf{2}$ (2. Female) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cells contain: <br> -Column percent <br> -Weighted N |  | V201549x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1 1. <br> White, nonHispanic |  | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 3 . \\ \text { Hispanic } \end{gathered}$ | 4 <br> 4. Asian or Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, nonHispanic alone | 5 <br> 5. Native American/Alaska Native or other race, nonHispanic alone | 6 <br> Multiple races, nonHispanic | ROW total |
| V201639 | 1: 1. Agree strongly | $\begin{array}{r} 6.5 \\ 174.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.1 \\ 32.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7.3 \\ 38.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \\ & 2.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11.2 \\ 7.3 \end{array}$ | 3.9 6.2 | $\begin{array}{r} 6.3 \\ 261.7 \end{array}$ |
|  | 2: 2. Agree somewhat | $\begin{array}{r} 26.7 \\ 722.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19.5 \\ 104.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20.3 \\ 106.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.1 \\ & 21.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31.2 \\ & 20.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.2 \\ & 30.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24.3 \\ 1,006.9 \end{array}$ |
|  | 3: 3. Neither agree nor disagree | $\begin{array}{r} 32.3 \\ 874.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 37.5 \\ 201.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 41.1 \\ 215.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43.6 \\ & 67.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.7 \\ & 21.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34.8 \\ & 56.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 34.6 \\ 1,437.4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | 4: 4. Disagree somewhat | $\begin{array}{r} 18.0 \\ 485.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19.4 \\ 104.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.2 \\ & 69.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 26.4 \\ 41.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14.2 \\ 9.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.9 \\ & 30.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17.8 \\ 739.9 \end{array}$ |
|  | 5: 5. Disagree strongly | $\begin{array}{r} 16.5 \\ 447.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.5 \\ & 94.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.1 \\ & 95.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.4 \\ & 22.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.6 \\ & 6.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23.3 \\ & 37.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16.9 \\ 703.2 \end{array}$ |
|  | COL TOTAL | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 2,704.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 537.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 525.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 155.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 65.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 160.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 4,149.0 \end{array}$ |

Fig. 4. Women interpret innocent comments as sexist. "SDA 4.1.3: Table." SDA, 25 Jul. 2021
As mentioned previously, the \#The MeToo Movement may have influenced the voting patterns of American individuals. Therefore, it is essential to look at the reaction between women in the context of remarks or comments made by politicians leading up to the 2020 election. For the following data evaluation, the control variable was sex (V201600), the pre-election question of the respondent's self-identified race/ethnicity (V201549x) in the column. Lastly, in the row, the pre-election question of "Women interpret innocent comments as sexist" (V201639). I looked at the difference between the subcategories of women's racial/ethnic
groups, which is demonstrated in Figure 4. The data for this subsection is very spread out in its distribution. The leading majority for this data set is the answer for the respondent that they "neither agree nor disagree" with the statement that women interpret innocent commons as sexist. Besides the leading answer, the rest are somewhat evenly distributed through the racial groups.

Black Lives Matter Movement/Police Force

| Statistics for V201600 = 2 (2. Female) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cells contain: <br> -Column percent <br> -Weighted N |  | V201549x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1 1. <br> White, nonHispanic | 2 <br> 2. Black, nonHispanic | 3 3. Hispanic | 4. Asian or Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, nonHispanic alone | 5 <br> 5. Native American/Alaska Native or other race, nonHispanic alone | 6 6. Multiple races, nonHispanic | ROW TOTAL |
| V201605x | 1: 1. Increased a great deal | $\begin{array}{r} 47.5 \\ 1,288.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 46.2 \\ 251.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 38.9 \\ 210.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26.3 \\ & 41.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43.1 \\ & 287 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45.2 \\ & 72.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 45.3 \\ 1,892.7 \end{array}$ |
|  | 2: 2. Increased a moderate amount | $\begin{array}{r} 25.6 \\ 694.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24.4 \\ 132.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 31.3 \\ 169.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31.2 \\ & 49.2 \end{aligned}$ | $18.6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.0 \\ & 24.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 25.9 \\ 1,082.8 \end{array}$ |
|  | 3: 3. Increased a little | $\begin{array}{r} 6.8 \\ 183.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.7 \\ 31.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.8 \\ 20.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.4 \\ & 16.3 \end{aligned}$ | $9.4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.4 \\ & 7.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.3 \\ 265.3 \end{array}$ |
|  | 4: 4. Stayed the same | $\begin{array}{r} 17.9 \\ 484.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20.7 \\ 112.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 23.5 \\ 127.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.4 \\ & 46.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23.8 \\ & 15.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31.3 \\ & 50.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20.0 \\ 836.8 \end{array}$ |
|  | 5: 5. Decreased a little | $\begin{array}{r} .8 \\ 20.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} .7 \\ 3.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.2 \\ & 6.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} .7 \\ 1.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.9 \\ & 1.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.4 \\ & 2.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} .9 \\ 35.7 \end{array}$ |
|  | 6: 6. Decreased a moderate amount | $\begin{array}{r} .9 \\ 25.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.7 \\ & 9.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.2 \\ & 6.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \\ & 1.6 \end{aligned}$ | 3.2 2.1 | 1.5 2.4 | $\begin{array}{r} 1.1 \\ 47.4 \end{array}$ |
|  | 7: 7. Decreased a great deal | $\begin{array}{r} .4 \\ 11.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} .5 \\ 2.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .0 \\ & .0 \end{aligned}$ | .9 1.4 | .0 .0 | 1.3 2.0 | $\begin{array}{r} .4 \\ 17.9 \end{array}$ |
|  | COL TOTAL | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 2,708.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 544.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 540.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 157.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 66.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 160.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 4,178.6 \end{array}$ |

Fig. 5. Political violence compared to 4 yrs ago. "SDA 4.1.3: Table." SDA, 25 Jul. 2021
The following data set is directly related to the Black Lives Matter Movement and the public demonstrations against police brutality. The question was evaluated to see if protests during the Black Lives Matter movement amid the COVID-19 pandemic affected the population as rubber bullets and pepper spray was used against protesters. The same control of gender and column of race/ethnic variables remain from the previous data set. However, the pre-election question of "Political violence compared to 4 yrs ago" (V201605x) is in the row. The results of these questions are shown in Figure 5, which looks at women's opinions on this question. Across the spectrum, a large portion of women in all ethnic and racial groups believe that political violence has "increased a great deal" over the last four years. Out of the women polled in the
study, $45.3 \%$ thought a significant increase was $1,892.7$ individuals. The two largest ethnic groups who agree with that statement are White and Black non, Hispanic women. However, it is essential to note that there was little difference between the women of other ethnic groups, ranging from $19 \%$ to $1 \%$ from the top to in the agreement. Going down to the next possibility, another of police violence has "increased a moderate amount" shows that $25.9 \%$, or $1,082.2$ women, agree with this statement. The following five answers that decrease in the severity of whether police violence has occurred in the past four years asked the following: increased a little, stayed the same, decreased a little, decreased a moderate amount, and decreased a great deal. The five categories combined make up $28.7 \%$ overall. Therefore, it can be concluded that a large part of the women's voting block does believe that police violence has increased over the past four years.


Fig. 6. How often do police officers use more force than necessary? "SDA 4.1.3: Table." SDA, 25 Jul. 2021

After looking at the pre-election questions, it is crucial to see what individuals thought following the election. The first post-election question I wanted to evaluate was police officers' use of force, shown in Figure 6. The question of the police force was looked at to see if news
coverage of police brutality affects the population. The control variable of this set is the pre-election question of "What is your (R) sex? [revised]" (V201600), the variable in the column is what is the respondent's self-identified race/ethnicity (V201549x), and in the row is the post-election question of "How often do police officers use more force than necessary" (V202351). Across the board, there seems to be agreement within the voting block regarding this answer that 1,277.3 individuals agreed. Among women in general, the most significant percentage of a solution is found with the response that police officers use excessive force "Rarely." 36.9 percent of the women's voting block believe that excessive violence is rarely used. Though, it is essential to note that only $6.2 \%$ of Black women are in this category. The second-highest-ranking category is the response of "About half of the time" police exhibit excessive use of force. The most significant percentage of women in this category identify as Asian or Native Hawaiianother Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic alone with 54.1\%. On the other end of the spectrum, only27 9.4\% of the women's block agreed that excessive force is used "All the time." $31 \%$ of Black women agree within this category, and only $4.6 \%$ of white women agree.

## Political Participation/Engagement



Fig. 7. R contribute money to an individual candidate running for political office. "SDA 4.1.3:
Table." SDA, 25 Jul. 2021

| Statistics for V201600 $=\mathbf{2}$ (2. Female) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cells contain: -Column percent -Weighted N |  | V201549x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1 <br> 1. <br> White, nonHispanic | $2$ <br> 2. Black, nonHispanic | 3 <br> 3. <br> Hispanic | 4 <br> 4. Asian or Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, nonHispanic alone | 5 <br> 5. Native American/Alaska Native or other race, nonHispanic alone | 6 <br> 6. <br> Multiple races, nonHispanic | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROW } \\ & \text { TOTAL } \end{aligned}$ |
| V202017 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1:1. } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18.6 \\ 464.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.6 \\ & 69.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.9 \\ & 57.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.7 \\ & 16.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16.2 \\ 9.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.5 \\ & 24.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17.0 \\ 643.2 \end{array}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2: } 2 . \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 81.4 \\ 2,033.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 85.4 \\ 408.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 88.1 \\ 424.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 87.3 \\ 114.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83.8 \\ & 50.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 82.5 \\ 117.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 83.0 \\ 3,147.3 \end{array}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COL } \\ & \text { TOTAL } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 2,497.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 478.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 481.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 130.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 59.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 142.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 3,790.5 \end{array}$ |

Fig. 8. R contribute money to an individual candidate running for political office. "SDA 4.1.3:
Table." SDA, 25 Jul. 2021
To help determine participation, I began to look at the statistics regarding the women participating in the election cycle. The first topic I evaluated is how likely people were to contribute to an individual's campaign in the election cycle. To help determine participation, I began to look at the statistics regarding the women participating in the election cycle. The variables for this data set included: the control of sex, the column of self-identified ethnicity/race, and the row of " R contribute money to an individual candidate running for a public office" (V202017). Figure 7 demonstrates the number of men who donated to a political campaign. $18.8 \%$ of males donated to a campaign, and the largest population with contributors are those who identify as White, non-Hispanic. Overwhelmingly, a low percentage of women contributed to a campaign. Only 17 percent of all women respondents donated to a campaign, with the largest benefactors being white women and women who identified as multiple races, non-Hispanic with $18.6 \%$ and $17.5 \%$, respectively. Alternatively, $83 \%$ of women did not give monetary contributions to a campaign.

| Statistics for V201600 $=1$ (1. Male) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cells contain: <br> -Column percent -Weighted N |  | V201549x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1 1. <br> White, nonHispanic | 2 <br> 2. Black, nonHispanic | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 3 . \\ \text { Hispanic } \end{gathered}$ | 4 <br> 4. Asian or Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, nonHispanic alone | 5 <br> 5. Native American/Alaska Native or other race, nonHispanic alone | 6 6. <br> Multiple races, nonHispanic | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROW } \\ & \text { TOTAL } \end{aligned}$ |
| V202025 | 1: 1 . Have done this in past 12 months | $\begin{array}{r} 8.7 \\ 201.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.0 \\ 16.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8.3 \\ 37.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.6 \\ & 15.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.2 \\ & 3.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.4 \\ & 22.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8.6 \\ 297.3 \end{array}$ |
|  | 2: 2. Have not done this in the past 12 months | $\begin{array}{r} 91.3 \\ 2,125.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 95.0 \\ 319.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 91.7 \\ 416.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 89.4 \\ 129.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95.8 \\ & 72.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80.6 \\ & 95.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 91.4 \\ 3,159.0 \end{array}$ |
|  | COL TOTAL | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 2,326.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 335.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 454.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 145.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 76.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 118.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 3,456.3 \end{array}$ |

Fig. 9. Has R in the past 12 months: joined a protest march, rally, or demonstration. "SDA 4.1.3:
Table." SDA, 25 Jul. 2021


Fig. 10. Has R in the past 12 months: joined a protest march, rally, or demonstration. "SDA

### 4.1.3: Table." $S D A, 25$ Jul. 2021

For this capstone project, the next topic I looked into was political participation in attending political protests and marches. The variables in this data set include the control as sex, ethnicity in the column, and the answer to the question of "Have done/not done this in the past 12 months" (V202025). Figure 9 shows the number of males who participated in a political protest and march in the past 12 months. Only $8.8 \%$ of the men took part in political
demonstrations. Those who self-identify as multi-racial participated the most, with an average of $19.4 \%$. Of the $3,788.5$ respondents, only 373.2 or $9.9 \%$ participated in a political march protest in the previous 12 months, as shown in Figure 10. Women who identified with multiple races, non-Hispanic were the leaders in this part of participation at a rate of $12.7 \%$. Considering the number of political protests and marches held in this period makes this surprising. However, it may be a question of access to individuals when you think about it. Areas may not have had protests, or when they occurred, individuals may not have had the time to take off from work or other responsibilities.

## Conclusions

After looking at the data released by the American National Elections Survey, I conclude that there is a statistical similarity between the views between men and women in some categories. Beginning with who the respondent voted for as president, there was only a $3.8 \%$ difference between men and women who voted for Joseph Biden. There was also only a 3.4\% difference in the amount who voted for Donald Trump between the sex. Regarding political participation, my hypothesis of women being increasingly active as defined in this project is unclear whether true or false. Since there were only two data topics to compare, it is difficult to determine since men donated at a higher percentage and women protested at a higher rate. Therefore, there is no way for this hypothesis to be concluded with the parameters given.

In terms of political opinions differing within the women's voting block, there is a difference of opinion regarding specific categories. For example, Figure 6 shows a $17.1 \%$ difference between Black and white women's most common answers. Alternatively, there is a consciousness in topics such as women regarding innocent comments as sexual, with most answering that they neither agree nor disagree.

In conclusion, looking at the differences between men's and women's voting choices could help candidates in the future to determine how to target a specific voting block. Seeing that men and women were participating in political activities at a rate of interest, there was a preconceived notion that women would be increasingly politically active. In terms of events leading up to the presidential election changing the opinions of the women voting block, there is evidence that shows ethnic and racial groups are affected in different ways. There was a significant decrease between Black women and other ethnic groups in their disapproval of the job done by former President Trump and his administration. There is a 43.2 percent difference between Black women and the subsequent highest disapproval. Black women are more likely to view political violence and police brutality at an increased severity than other ethnic groups. It is important to note that there is an awareness of global events from women in different ethnic groups. The understanding is exemplified in White, non-Hispanic women believing that police use excessive force. Inciting on women's voting preferences can alter the outcome of elections, and voting preferences can be attributed to events occurring around election time. Viewing the differences between the women's voting block allows politicians to see what matters are essential to this specific set of constituents.
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