

[Home](#) > [Public Choice](#) > Article

# Gender Bias and Selection Bias in House Elections

| Published: October 2000

| Volume 105, pages 41–59, (2000) [Cite this article](#)
[Save article](#)
[View saved research](#) >

[Public Choice](#)
[Aims and scope](#) →

[Submit manuscript](#) →

[Jeffrey Milyo](#)<sup>1</sup> & [Samantha Schosberg](#)<sup>1</sup>

 484 Accesses 71 Citations 2 Altmetric [Explore all metrics](#) →

## Abstract

We demonstrate that female incumbents are of higher average candidate quality than male incumbents. This quality difference is the result of barriers to entry faced by potential female candidates, although the observed effects of this quality differential on vote share are partially masked by the fact that female incumbents are also more likely to be opposed or to be opposed by high quality challengers. Using data from House elections for 1984–1992, we estimate that the gender-based differential in candidate quality yields an extra six percentage points of vote share for female incumbents.

## Access this article

Log in via an institution →

## Subscribe and save

✓ Springer+

from €37.37 /Month

- Starting from 10 chapters or articles per month
- Access and download chapters and articles from more than 300k books and 2,500 journals
- Cancel anytime

View plans →

## Buy Now


Buy article PDF 39,95 €

Price includes VAT (Poland)

Instant access to the full article PDF.


[Institutional subscriptions](#) →

## Similar content being viewed by others




### The Gendered Politics of Congressional Elections

Article | 26 March 2020



### Ideology and Gender in U.S. House Elections

Article | 28 September 2018



### Looking inside the ballot box: gender gaps in Argentine presidential elections

Article | 30 April 2023

## Explore related subjects

Discover the latest articles, books and news in related subjects, suggested using machine learning.

[Gender and Health](#)

[Gender Economics](#)

[Party Research](#)

[Politics and Gender](#)

[Sexual Selection](#)

[Sexual Dimorphism](#)

## References

Ansolabehere, S. and Snyder, J. (1996a). The inter-election dynamics of campaign finance: U.S. House elections, 1980 to 1994. Unpublished manuscript, presented at the 1996 meetings of the American Political Science Association in San Francisco, CA.

Ansolabehere, S. and Snyder, J. (1996b). Money, elections and candidate quality. Unpublished manuscript; presented at the 1996 meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association in Chicago, IL.

Blau, F. and Beller, A. (1988). Trends in earnings differentials by gender, 1971-1981. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 41: 513-529.

[Google Scholar](#)

Box-Steffenmeier, J. (1996). A dynamic analysis of the role of campaign war chests in campaign strategy. *American Journal of Political Science* 40: 352-371.

[Google Scholar](#)

Burrell, B. (1985). Women's and men's campaigns for the U.S. House of Representatives. *American Politics Quarterly* 13: 251-272.

[Google Scholar](#)

Burrell, B. (1994). *A woman's place is in the House*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

[Google Scholar](#)

Darcy, R., Welch, S. and Clark, J. (1994). *Women, elections and representation*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

[Google Scholar](#)

Erickson, R. and Palfrey, T. (1998). Campaign spending and incumbency: An alternative simultaneous equations approach. *Journal of Politics* 60: 355–373.

[Google Scholar](#)

Flammers, J. (1997). *Women's political voice*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

[Google Scholar](#)

Fox, R. and Smith, E. (1998). The role of candidate sex in voter decision-making. *Political Psychology* 19: 405–419.

[Google Scholar](#)

Gaddie, R. and Bullock, C. (1995). Congressional elections and the year of the woman: Structural and elite influences on female candidates. *Social Science Quarterly* 76: 749–762.

[Google Scholar](#)

Goodliffe, J. (1995). War chests and challenger quality. Unpublished manuscript, presented at the 1995 meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association in Chicago, IL.

Green, D. and Krasno, J. (1988). Salvation for the spendthrift incumbent: Reestimating the effects of campaign spending in House elections. *American Journal of Political Science* 32: 884-907.

[Google Scholar](#)

Groseclose, T. and Stewart, C. (1998). The value of committee seats in the House, 1947-1991. *American Journal of Political Science* 42: 453-474.

[Google Scholar](#)

Heckman, J. (1979). Sample selection bias as a specification error. *Econometrica* 47: 153-161.

[Google Scholar](#)

Herrick, R. (1996). Is there a gender gap in the value of campaign resources? *American Politics Quarterly* 24: 68-80.

[Google Scholar](#)

Hersch, P. and McDougall, G. (1994). Campaign war chests as a barrier to entry in congressional races. *Economic Inquiry* 32: 630-641.

[Google Scholar](#)

Jacobson, G. (1990). *The electoral origins of divided government*. San Francisco: Westview Press.

[Google Scholar](#)

Jacobson, G. and Dimock, M. (1994). Checking out: The effect of bank overdrafts on the 1992 House elections. *American Journal of Political Science* 38: 601-624.

[Google Scholar](#)

Kahn, K. (1996). *The political consequences of being a woman*. New York: Columbia University Press.

[Google Scholar](#)

Krasno, J. and Green, D. (1988). Preempting quality challengers in House elections. *Journal of Politics* 50: 920-936.

[Google Scholar](#)

Leeper, M. (1991). The impact of prejudice on female candidates. *American Politics Quarterly* 19: 248-261.

[Google Scholar](#)

Levitt, S. (1994). Using repeat challengers to estimate the effects of campaign spending on election outcomes in the U.S. House. *Journal of Political Economy* 102: 777-798.

[Google Scholar](#)

Levitt, S. and Wolfram, C. (1996). Decomposing the sources of incumbency advantage in the U.S. House. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 22: 45-60.

[Google Scholar](#)

Milyo, J. (1997a). The electoral and financial effects of changes in committee power: GRH, TRA86 and the money committees in the House. *Journal of Law and Economics* 60: 93-112.

[Google Scholar](#)

Milyo, J. (1997b). The economics of campaign finance: FECA and the puzzle of the not very greedy grandfathers. *Public Choice* 93: 245-270.

[Google Scholar](#)

Milyo, J. (1998). *The electoral effects of campaign spending in House elections*. Los Angeles: Citizens' Research Foundation.

[Google Scholar](#)

Milyo, J. (1999). What do candidates maximize (and why should anyone care)? Unpublished manuscript, presented at the 1999 meetings of the Public Choice Society in New Orleans, LA.

Squire, P. (1989). Competition and uncontested seats in U.S. House elections. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 14: 281-295.

[Google Scholar](#)

Squire, P. (1995). Candidates, money and votes. *Political Research Quarterly* 48: 891-917.

[Google Scholar](#)

Uhlener, C. and Schlozman, K. (1986). Candidate gender and campaign receipts. *Journal of Politics* 48: 30-50.

[Google Scholar](#)

Werner, B. (1997). Financing the campaigns of women candidates and their opponents: Evidence from three states, 1982-1990. *Women & Politics* 18: 81-97.

[Google Scholar](#)

## Author information

---

### Authors and Affiliations

## Rights and permissions

---

[Reprints and permissions](#)

## About this article

---

### Cite this article

Milyo, J., Schosberg, S. Gender Bias and Selection Bias in House Elections. *Public Choice* **105**, 41–59 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005198906982>

Issue date

October 2000

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005198906982>

## Keywords

[Public Finance](#)

[Vote Share](#)

[Quality Difference](#)

[Candidate Quality](#)

[House Election](#)

## Search

Search by keyword or author



## Navigation

Find a journal

**Publish with us**

---

**Track your research**