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## Key findings:

- Replacing male councilor with female causes a 25p.p. increase in women's participation despite only causing a 20p.p. increase in council female share.
- Discrepancy driven by a behavioral effect: women with at least one female colleague participate more than otherwise similar isolated women.
- No detectable impact on voting patterns or policy outcomes.

Consistent with "behavioral" model of critical mass with similar female/male preferences.
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Contributes to broader literature on gender in politics by studying city councils:

- Ferreira and Gyourko (2014), Gagliarducci and Paserman (2012), Chattopadhyay and Duflo (2004), Wasserman (WP) and others.
- Our results + model suggest male/female preferences drive much heterogeneity.
- Also related work on race and political representation (e.g. Beach and Jones, 2017).
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## Close Cross-Gender Election

|  | Male B Wins |
| :--- | :--- |
| Female A Wins | Female L |
| Female L | Male M |
| Male M | Male N |
| Male N | Male O Member |
| Male O | Male P |
| Male P |  |
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## Meeting minutes:

- 40,000 PDF's collected from cities with close gendered elections.
- Extract basic "meta-data" on attendance, meeting dates, etc. from every PDF.
- Extract "motions data" on who moved/second, votes for/against, and topics for every motion made during 3 randomly chosen meetings each council-year.

Estimation sample of small to mid-size cities for 34 states over $\approx 8$ years.

## Minutes

City Council/Redevelopment Agency/Public Financing Authority City of Huntington Beach

> Monday, November 15, 2010 4:00 PM - Room B-8
> 6:00 PM - Council Chambers Civic Center, 2000 Main Street Huntington Beach, California 92648

An audio recording of the 4:00 PM portion of this meeting and a video recording of the 6:00 PM portion of this meeting and are archived at www.surfcity-hb.org/government/agendas/

## 4:00 PM - ROOM B-8

The City Clerk recessed until 4:30 PM due to a lack of quorum.
CALL TO ORDER - 4:35 PM
ROLL CALL
Present: Carchio, Coerper (arrived at 5:15 PM for Closed Session), Hardy, Green, Bohr, Dwyer, and Hansen

ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED AFTER AGENDA DISTRIBUTION
ursuant to the Brown "Open Meetings" Act, City Clerk Joan Flynn announced that the following communication was received by her office after distribution of the City Council agenda packet:

Communication received from Shari L. Freidenrich, CPA, City Treasurer, dated November 15 2010 entitled City of Huntington Beach Investment Advisory Board (IAB) Annual Report to the City Council for the Period October 1, 2009 to September 30, 2010
28. Approved for introduction Ordinance No. 3905 amending Chapter 14.12 of the Huntington Beach Municipal Code (HBMC) relating to fees, rates and deposits for water billing.

A motion was made by Coerper, second Hardy to after the City Clerk reads by title, approve for introduction Ordinance No. 3905, "An Ordinance of the City of Huntington Beach Amending Chapter 14.12 of the Huntington Beach Municipal Code Relating to Water Billing." The motion carried by the following roll call vole:

AYES: Carchio, Coerper, Hardy, Green, Bohr, Dwyer, and Hansen NOES

None
ORDINANCES FOR ADOPTION
29. Adopted Ordinance No. 3902 amending Huntington Beach Municipal Code (HBMC) section 8.43 relating to emergency response costs Approved for introduction November 1, 2010.

A motion was made by Hansen, second Carchio to after the City Clerk reads by title, approve for introduction Ordinance No. 3905, "An Ordinance of the City of Huntington Beach Amending Chapter 14.12 of the Huntington Beach Municipal Code Relating to Water Billing." The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

AYES
Carchio, Coerper, Green, Dwyer, and Hansen
Hardy, and Bohr
30. Adopted Ordinance No. 3903 accepting modifications to Local Coastal Program Amendment (LCPA) No. 2-10 approved by the California Coastal Commission and amend the Local Coastal Program (LCP) accordingly Approved for introduction November 1, 2010.

A motion was made by Hansen, second Coerper to after the City Clerk reads by title, adopt Ordinance No. 3903, "An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Huntington Beach amending sections 203.06, 216.04, 216.18, 221.10 and 230.82 of the Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance thereof to conform LCP Amendment No. 2-10 made by the California Coastal Commission." The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

AYES
NOES

Carchio, Coerper, Hardy, Green, Bohr, Dwyer, and Hansen None

## Council Meeting Characteristics

|  | All | 1 Non-Focal Women | > 1 Non-Focal Women |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Panel A: Process |  |  |  |
| Number of meetings | 45.3 | 45.2 | 43.4 |
| Meeting length | 146.7 | 138 | 160.7 |
| Panel B: Motions |  |  |  |
| Moved by women (share) | 0.3 | 0.26 | 0.43 |
| Seconded by women (share) | 0.35 | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| Passed | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.93 |
| Passed Unanimously | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Panel C: Topics 0.9 |  |  |  |
| Admin (share) | 0.61 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Finance (share) | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.2 |
| Public Utility (share) | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.13 |
| Regulation (share) | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.09 |
| Observations (councils) | 325 | 136 | 124 |
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## Preferred Model:

- Includes council size, term length, and baseline spending as controls for precision.
- Specify $F()$ as piece-wise linear around the threshold.
- Data-driven bandwidth fixed across outcomes within each sample (Calonico et al., 2020).

Robustness: Similar results with no controls, varying the functional form of $F()$, allowing bandwidth to vary, and fixing the bandwidth across samples.
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(b) Female Share: Non-focal Councilors

Increase in female rep of approx 20 p.p., composition of rest of council continuous.
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## Female Win Effect on Female Participation


(a) Share of Motions made by Women

(b) Share by Non-focal Women ( $N_{w}=1$ )

Share of motions by women increases by more than increase in rep., in part driven by increase in motions by otherwise isolated non-focal women.

## Female Win Effects for Full Council Motions

|  | Full sample | 1 Non-Focal <br> Woman <br> $(2)$ | $>1$ Non-Focal <br> Women <br> $(3)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of Motions | $(1)$ | -6.038 | 4.004 |
|  | -4.962 | $(8.180)$ | $(8.580)$ |
| Share moved by women | $(5.674)$ | $0.301^{* * *}$ | $0.156^{*}$ |
|  | $0.247^{* * *}$ | $(0.054)$ | $(0.080)$ |
| Share seconded by women | $(0.048)$ | $0.267^{* * *}$ | $0.214^{* * *}$ |
|  | $0.235^{* * *}$ | $\left(0.055^{*}\right.$ | $0.394^{* * *}$ |
| Share moved or seconded by women | $0.335^{* * *}$ | $0.217^{* * *}$ |  |
|  | $(0.060)$ | $(0.072)$ | $(0.083)$ |
| Share moved and seconded by women | $0.077^{* *}$ | $0.084^{* * *}$ | 0.100 |
|  | $(0.035)$ | $(0.025)$ | $(0.073)$ |
| Bandwidth | 0.076 | 0.055 | 0.070 |
| Observations | 325 | 136 | 124 |

## Female Win Effects for Non-Focal Council Motions

|  | 1 Non-Focal Woman |  |  | $>1$ Non-Focal Women |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Men | Women |  | Men | Women |
|  | $(1)$ | $(2)$ |  | (3) | $(4)$ |
| No. of Motions | -6.531 | $4.349^{* *}$ |  | 3.695 | 0.494 |
|  | $(5.839)$ | $(1.967)$ | $(4.742)$ | $(4.340)$ |  |
| Share moved by women |  | $0.148^{* *}$ |  | -0.045 |  |
|  |  | $(0.058)$ |  | $(0.095)$ |  |
| Share seconded by women |  | 0.088 |  | 0.032 |  |
|  |  | $(0.076)$ |  | $(0.089)$ |  |
| Share moved or seconded by women |  | $0.219^{* * *}$ |  | 0.142 |  |
|  |  | $(0.064)$ |  | $(0.087)$ |  |
| Bandwidth | 0.055 | 0.055 | 0.070 | 0.070 |  |
| Observations | 136 | 136 | 124 | 124 |  |

No additional behavioral effect once two women on council.

## Female Win Effects for Full Council Voting Outcomes

|  | Full sample | 1 Non-Focal <br> Woman <br> $(2)$ | $>1$ Non-Focal <br> Women <br> $(3)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Share unanimous | 0.005 | -0.015 | 0.011 |
|  | $(0.026)$ | $(0.052)$ | $(0.033)$ |
| Share failed | 0.005 | -0.000 | 0.020 |
|  | $(0.006)$ | $(0.006)$ | $(0.013)$ |
| Vote margin | 0.012 | -0.084 | 0.061 |
|  | $(0.138)$ | $(0.252)$ | $(0.215)$ |
| Votes in favor | 0.007 | -0.062 | 0.036 |
|  | $(0.072)$ | $(0.140)$ | $(0.111)$ |
| Votes against | 0.003 | 0.010 | 0.027 |
|  | $(0.044)$ | $(0.068)$ | $(0.076)$ |
| Bandwidth | 0.076 | 0.055 | 0.070 |
| Observations | 325 | 136 | 124 |

No evidence of "gridlock" or changes in internal voting strategy.

## Female Win Effects on Per-Capita Spending

|  | Total <br> (1) | Public Utility <br> (2) | Health and Hospital (3) | Parks and Recreation <br> (4) | Library <br> (5) | Housing and Com Dev <br> (6) | Airports and Water Ports <br> (7) | Police and Fire <br> (8) | Sewerage and Waste <br> (9) | Roads and Parking (10) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Councils | $\begin{gathered} -38.452 \\ (123.392) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -2.012 \\ (44.313) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.023 \\ (9.443) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -14.833 \\ (13.942) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -5.115 \\ & (5.177) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19.289 \\ (40.067) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.717^{* *} \\ (8.363) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.885 \\ (20.837) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -41.357 \\ (55.610) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -44.890 \\ & (38.663) \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 Non-focal Woman | $\begin{gathered} 101.065 \\ (115.167) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -19.421 \\ (54.343) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -5.829 \\ (15.453) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -21.668 \\ (23.146) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -12.070^{* *} \\ (4.690) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 103.363 \\ & (92.616) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17.964* } \\ & \text { (9.697) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40.074 \\ (41.725) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.296 \\ (32.759) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -4.017 \\ (28.196) \end{gathered}$ |
| $>1$ Non-focal Woman | $\begin{aligned} & -147.084 \\ & (128.751) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -82.800 \\ & (66.792) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.860 \\ (1.807) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.677 \\ (13.891) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -8.021 \\ (10.932) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -16.694 \\ (19.533) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.894 \\ (2.997) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -2.103 \\ (14.655) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -4.974 \\ (38.811) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -16.891 \\ (25.149) \end{gathered}$ |
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## Develop our own model of a council to explain these findings

- Project arrives and is characterized by female/male utilities $\left(u_{w}, u_{m}\right)$.
- Councilors incur cost $C\left(N_{g}\right)$ (strictly decreasing in $N_{g}$ ) to join committee and add $\delta$.
- Random committee member chosen to make a motion to approve the project.
- If majority votes in favor, councilors receive $U_{g}=u_{g}+\sum_{j} D_{j} \delta_{j}$.
- Otherwise, councilors receive outside option $u_{0}$.
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## Effect on policy outcomes varies with gender gap in preferences

- When $d\left(u_{w}, u_{m}\right)$ is large: Consequential changes in voting patterns, topical content of motions brought to the floor, and the substantive content of public policy.
- When $d\left(u_{w}, u_{m}\right)$ is small: No impact on voting patterns, topical content of motions brought to the floor, or the substantive content of public policy.


## Share of motions in given topic by gender

|  | Men's Share | Women's Share | Gender Gap | SE of Gap | P-Value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administration | 0.581 | 0.580 | -0.002 | 0.008 | 0.846 |
| Finance | 0.206 | 0.219 | 0.014 | 0.007 | 0.035 |
| Regulation | 0.100 | 0.092 | -0.009 | 0.005 | 0.071 |
| Property | 0.183 | 0.175 | -0.008 | 0.006 | 0.180 |
| Public Utilities | 0.133 | 0.129 | -0.004 | 0.005 | 0.503 |
| Health | 0.009 | 0.012 | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.187 |
| Parks | 0.030 | 0.031 | 0.001 | 0.003 | 0.684 |
| Libraries | 0.005 | 0.005 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.814 |
| Police | 0.033 | 0.033 | 0.000 | 0.003 | 0.947 |
| Airports | 0.005 | 0.006 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.423 |
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## Questions or Comments Welcome!
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