CHAPTER FOURTEEN

[Re]Negotiating Citizenship through Military Service

Rebecca H. Best

> The call to the colors gives rise to the question of not only who will live and who will die but who will be denied full citizenship and who will enjoy its benefits.
>
> —Ronald Krebs (2006)

To be a citizen of a state means not only to be subject to the laws of that state but also to have the rights and responsibilities associated in that state with citizenship. In a democracy, such rights generally include the rights to vote and hold elected office, to own property, and to have equal access to government services, such as education and law enforcement, and equal access to government protections, such as protection from employment discrimination.[1] While voting is perhaps the most visible political right, citizenship may be said to include the opportunity to participate in government office—that is, to stand for and have fair consideration for elected office. For women, as for other minorities, these rights and protections have not come quickly or easily. The cultural view that women are the protected while men are the protectors has worked to exclude women from the full benefits of citizenship as they have not been viewed as making sacrifices for their countries or as having the capacity to contribute to their defense and maintenance (see, e.g., Best, Hunter, & Thomas, 2019; Hudson, Ballif-Spanvill, Caprioli, &

Emmet, 2012; Tir & Bailey, 2018). Women and sexual minorities, perhaps more than any other class with restricted citizenship rights, are characterized by their cross-cutting cleavages; they are present in all races and nationalities, complicating in certain ways the fight for their recognition as citizens. This chapter explores and develops the argument that military service is a route to renegotiating citizenship rights for women and sexual minorities.

Theorizing the Link between Military Service and Citizenship Rights

Military service is a well-recognized route to citizenship and civil rights for racial and ethnic minorities. Scruggs observes that the literacy tests of the Jim Crow south included an exception for veterans, stipulating that "all, black or white, who served in any war of the United States, or in the war between the States may vote, provided they shall register prior to a certain date" (1903, p. 844).[2] Writing at the same time, Lyman Abbott equates the vote with the responsibility to protect, arguing, "The question, 'Shall women vote?' is really in the last analysis, the question, 'Ought woman to assume the responsibility for protecting person and property which has in the past been assumed by man as his duty alone?'" (1903, p. 292). For Abbott, granting the vote to those who do not, as a class, serve in the military is the equivalent of establishing a class that is responsible for making law and then instructing those of another class to enforce those laws; indeed, he asks, "Is it right that one sex shall alone enforce authority, but the other sex determine when and how it shall be exercised?" (1903, p. 294). It is Abbott's view that as women do not participate in military service or any other form of armed law enforcement, they do not therefore belong in government in any capacity. Indeed, Abbott's essay argues staunchly for women not to be allowed into any form of military, militia, or police force any more than they are allowed the vote.

However, by 1917, as the United States entered World War I, the country, like its European allies and adversaries, found the labor of women crucial not only for keeping the country's economy operating but also for supporting its military in a variety of roles. In addition to the thousands of nurses, mail sorters, phone operators, and ambulance drivers serving at or near the front lines of the war, the Navy enlisted around 12,000 women as noncommissioned officers, called Yeoman(F). After the war, the service of these women, both enlisted and volunteer, gave weight to their calls for suffrage, with a similar dynamic occurring in European countries, particularly the United Kingdom. In 1918, influenced by Carrie Chapman Catt, President Woodrow Wilson wrote,

> The services of women during this supreme crisis of the world's history have been of the most signal usefulness and distinction. The war could not have been fought without them, nor its sacrifices endured. It is high

> time that some part of our debt of gratitude to them should be acknowledged and paid, and the only acknowledgement they ask is their admission to the suffrage. Can we justly refuse it? (quoted in Lunardini & Knock 1980, 667)

Evaluating 200 congressional documents from 1941 through 1985 pertaining to the inclusion of women in the military or in particular military roles, according to Segal and Hansen (1992), those who favored expanded roles for women were significantly more likely to talk about citizenship roles (often in combination with military effectiveness rationales), while those who opposed women in the military tended not to talk about citizenship.

Keyssar notes a strong correlation between expansions in the American franchise and war generally, noting "it was rhetorically as well as practically difficult to compel men to bear arms while denying them the franchise" (2000, xxiv). Similarly, one-half of Krebs's (2006) twofold argument for the link between military service and expanded citizenship hinges on the rhetorical difficulty of denying the vote to those who have served in the military; however, Krebs goes a step beyond by applying scope conditions to the utility of rhetorical coercion. Krebs argues that when republican conceptions of citizenships, which rely on service and sacrifice as the test of membership in the nation, are predominant and when there is an audience that will view service-based claims to rights as legitimate and that threatens to punish the government should it not respond to such claims, minorities who have served bravely in war may rhetorically coerce the government into expanding their political rights. Notably, Krebs argues that while African Americans served in World War I, their postwar calls for expanded rights and protections fell on deaf ears due to racism, whereas similar claims from women were more successful in contributing to the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment (2006, pp. 118 and 185). Additionally, he argues that policy changes that restrict or expand minority roles in the military may serve as a credible signal (particularly in times of peace) of how the state would respond to demands for political rights.

While Krebs develops his argument using case studies of racial and ethnic minorities in the United States and Israel, it is clear that he intends it to be generalizable to women and sexual minorities (see, e.g., Krebs, 2006, p. 181). There are elements of his argument that do not apply perfectly to these types of minorities;[3] however, his argument that military service can redraw the lines of citizenship by changing who has the perceived right to claim, on republican grounds, the benefits of full citizenship corresponds nicely with the history of women's suffrage. This tactic may also be useful to sexual minorities calling for legal rights and protections (e.g., the right to marry, adopt, or use restrooms consist with one's gender identity), though it is not clear that these arguments have yet been made explicit and it would be

difficult to untangle the causality of any LGBT advances in the wake of the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell in 2010. How effective rhetorical coercion can be in matters, such as candidate viability, which require not a change in the law but a change in voter perceptions, remains an open question. However, rhetorical coercion may play a role in candidate endorsements, such as from veterans' groups or civic groups that value republican principles. Notably, many of the female veterans running for Congress in 2018 gained endorsements from such groups, including political action committees (PACs) With Honor and VoteVets.

Other prominent explanations for the link between military service and citizenship rights include socialization, contact theory, and elite formation and transformation (see Krebs, 2006, pp. 6–8). The socialization theory argues that the military serves as a schoolhouse of the nation. The idea is that military service shapes the values of those who serve, molding them into desirable citizens. Lessons of military service and civic responsibility disseminate through the group through training and formal classes. This explanation makes less sense when applied to women than, for example, to a new immigrant community, because mostly, women will already have been raised and educated in families from the majority group. Contact theory proposes that the increasing interactions and acceptance between minority and majority groups that the military's integration-based and merit-based command structure (where present) facilitate will make service members hailing from both minority and majority groups more inclined to view the other as a partner and conationalist rather than an adversary. Therefore, as men and women of the majority group return home from serving with those in the minority, they will view calls from the minority for expanded political rights more favorably. While the fact that gender is a cross-cutting cleavage makes it unlikely, if not impossible, that servicemen will not have encountered and even worked and lived with women in their private lives, it is possible that through serving alongside servicewomen, men's views of what women can do and who women are may shift. However, it is not clear how this would in itself lead to expanded citizenship rights for women in states without compulsory service for both men and women simply because of the low probability of any given male citizen having served in the military, whether alongside a woman or not. Finally, military service characterizes the elite within both minority and majority groups, making minority veterans more electable and creating common ground between elites of the majority and minority. The next section revisits the question of elite formation as it regards the citizenship and political aspirations of female veterans.

The link between military service and citizenship is so strong that Krebs notes states have resisted the call to expand military service to minority groups as a means of maintaining the political exclusion of these groups (2006). In particular, Krebs points to the debate under the administration of

President Bill Clinton over the inclusion of gays in the military, in which advocates and opponents both clearly viewed such a liberalization of military policy as a first step to expanding other political rights (2006, p. 182). Similarly, in the midst of the debate over the Trump administration's efforts to ban transgender people from the military, the American Civil Liberties Union's (ACLU) Joshua Block has argued, "Excluding trans people from the military sends a powerful message that trans people are not part of the fabric of American civic life."[4] As this concern clarifies, enfranchisement is not the only critical political and civil right of those living in a democracy. Within the United States, not only the LGBT community but also the African American and Japanese American communities and women have sought to parlay military service into expansions of rights. For African Americans, service in World War II and the Korean and Vietnam Wars helped to secure the Civil Rights Acts of the 1960s.

Female Veterans and Political Leadership

Despite accumulating research indicating the advantages of women in political leadership and governance (e.g., Best, Shair-Rosenfield, & Wood, 2019; Caprioli, 2003; Hudson et al., 2012; Melander, 2005; Shair-Rosenfield & Stoyan, 2018; Shair-Rosenfield & Wood, 2017) and international calls for women's political equality,[5] women remain underrepresented in government internationally. While women in democracies around the world have gained the right to vote, and this right is so entrenched now that we would be hard pressed to call a state that denied women this right a democracy, their gains in political representation have been slow. The usual explanations for this are that the media cover female candidates differently than male candidates, emphasizing their "softer" qualities and personal lives (e.g., Braden, 1996; Bystrom & Miller, 1999; Kahn, 1992);[6] that women tend to favor (or are believed to favor) domestic issues and stereotypical "women's issues" over foreign policy and the economy and may be viewed as "dovish" on foreign policy; that an incumbency advantage disproportionately benefits men (Kahn, 1993; Murray, 2008);[7] and that, in countries such as the United States that use single-member district plurality elections, women face a higher incumbency barrier than in proportional representation systems where their incumbent opponents likely have much lower name recognition (Matland, 1993).

However, it is notable that within the United States, the only population of women that has achieved descriptive representation in the U.S. Congress proportional to their share of the national adult population is veteran women. Though their overall numbers are small, the percentage of female veterans in Congress has grown rapidly in the past five years, and they are now the only demographic of women who are represented proportionally in the U.S.

Congress. Indeed, while past military service carries electoral value for both men and women in the United States, the electoral value of being a veteran is greater for women than for men.[8,9] Female veterans have been able to break into politics in a way that civilian women have not.

This suggests the possibility that veteran preference may be both an overlooked partial explanation for the dearth of women in higher office, at least in states with a tradition favoring veterans, and at least a partial solution to getting greater representation of women in elected office. It is possible that some part of the gender gap in national government is due to widespread perceptions that women do not contribute to the national defense, that their contributions are not as significant as those of men, and that, as a result, they are less qualified to speak on and make decisions regarding national security and especially the deployment of troops. Therefore, when individual women candidates are able to credibly make the claim, as Senator Tammy Duckworth and others have done, that they have served and that their service was meaningful and risky, they may be able to overturn such perceptions, at least as applied to themselves. An alternative possibility is that veterans are simply less likely to be intimidated by the prospect of running for and holding national elected office and more interested in doing so given their service experiences with both foreign policy and federal institutions in the form of the military and the Veterans' Administration.[10]

Best, Hunter, et al. (2019) find that not only are female veterans more likely to report experiencing challenges to their military service but, as they experience such challenges, they also become more inclined to consider running for elected office. Just as Enloe has argued that women who in earlier wars took on nongender normative roles were often reluctant to return to a traditional, private conception of femininity (2004, p. 199), the women who have fought in today's wars are not uniformly content to return to a private life in which their sacrifices are overlooked because of their gender. Ultimately, Best, Hunter, and Thomas conclude that the general public's limited awareness of the numbers and sacrifices of American military women both harms women's chances at winning political office because they are not viewed as a class and as contributing to the national defense *and* increases the likelihood of any given female veteran running for office.

European political campaigns by and large do not feature appeals to military service. By contrast, in the United States, the all-volunteer force, widening civil military gap, absence of memories of destructive wars on the home front, and republican rhetoric surrounding democracy and service combine to produce a great trust in the military and in military veterans,[11] which can have value on the campaign trail. Where calls for gender inclusion on a liberal basis have failed, veteran women are striving to achieve inclusion in the highest ranks of political life on the basis of their service, just as women a

century ago relied on their service, both as volunteers and as Navy Yeoman(F), to lobby for the vote.

When veteran women do run for national political office, their advertisements differ from those of other women and male veterans in key respects. As women's military service, and particularly combat service,[12] has become more visible in the post-9/11 era, veteran women running for office have been more prone to highlight their service and especially their combat service. Notably, Senator Duckworth's advertisements in her first campaign for a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives and later in her 2016 Senate campaign highlighted her military service and the featured images of her both in the cockpit of her Black Hawk helicopter and learning to walk with prosthetic legs while wearing an Army T-shirt.[13] Similarly, Representative Martha McSally's advertisements for the U.S. House of Representatives and in her 2018 Senate race show McSally in her military uniform and reference her position as America's first woman fighter pilot and the first woman to command a fighter squadron.[14] Likewise, Representative Tulsi Gabbard, Senator Joni Ernst, Donna McAleer, and Wendy Rogers have all run advertisements in recent years highlighting their military services.[15] The 2018 midterm elections brought out a raft of women veteran candidates, including political newcomers Amy McGrath[16] and M.J. Heger,[17] whose advertisements introduced them via stories of their combat experience, and Gina Ortiz Jones who has spoken in interviews about her experience serving under Don't Ask, Don't Tell as an LGBT woman.[18] In her campaign advertisements, Amy McGrath discusses the 89 combat missions she flew in Iraq and Afghanistan as well as her experience sitting in an F-18 waiting for orders on September 11, 2001. Heger, on the other hand, describes being shot down by the Taliban, returning fire while strapped to the skids of a rescue helicopter and later suing the Pentagon to open all combat roles to women. These women are using their military experience to negotiate new roles for themselves in the national government. They are proving to be more eager than other candidates to discuss foreign policy, national security, terrorism, and military and veterans' issues than other female candidates, and they readily trade on their military experience as a signal that they are tough, capable, and ready to put country before party (a theme common to many of their advertisements).

Using content analysis, Kahn (1992) determined that the media are more inclined to focus on the viability and to discuss candidate viability in negative terms when covering female candidates and to cover candidate issue positions when covering male candidates. This may be due to the perception that female candidates for national office are less viable or have less well developed policy positions, particularly as regards foreign policy. Using an experiment to manipulate gender and media coverage, Kahn finds that candidates who receive media treatment characteristic of that normally reserved

for women are evaluated as more honest and compassionate and stronger on health-care issues but less viable as candidates and weaker on military issues (1992). Meanwhile, Sanbonmatsu's (2002) survey results indicate that when a sample of 455 respondents (about 60 percent female) were asked which gender would do a better job handling foreign affairs in Congress, 56 percent responded that men would do better, 29 percent were neutral, and only 15 percent felt that women would do a better job. Consistent with Kahn's findings, Sanbonmatsu finds that women are favored (42 percent compared to men's 23 percent) for protecting social security. Results for a question on dealing with crime were largely similar. Veteran women are uniquely positioned to take advantage of both the perceptions of honesty that are associated with both women and veterans and the perception that women are stronger on health care while also capitalizing on their military service to present a strong foreign policy and defense position. Veteran women may also benefit from additional favorable media coverage because of their status as veteran women given the relatively small percentage of the population with military service and the lingering perception that the military is a masculine domain.

Reimagining Gender Roles

In the wake of World War I, women in the United States and Europe campaigned for voting rights on the grounds of their war service and sacrifices. Today, female veterans of the first Gulf War and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan are breaking new ground as they run for and win seats in Congress in record numbers. These women are not only emboldened by their military service to run in tough districts but they are also emboldened to take on issues with which voters have not traditionally entrusted women. Where other female voters might be perceived as less competent on military and foreign policy issues (Sanbonmatsu, 2002), these women, by virtue of their firsthand experience in the military, can command respect on such issues. While voters might be inclined to subconsciously view nonveteran female candidates as weaker or less invested in the country's defense, female veterans, and especially combat veterans, are sending powerful messages of strength, leadership, and patriotism through their advertisements and media appearances.

The electoral success of female veterans is not only a victory for the individual candidates, their parties, or female veterans but also carries the potential to be a victory for female candidates generally. Shair-Rosenfield (2012) finds that as voters observe successful female candidates in one district, they become more likely to vote for future female candidates. As female veterans win public office, voters see not only female veterans in office but also *women*

in office. And, as they become more accustomed to viewing these women as strong leaders in the national government, knowledgeable and interested in foreign affairs, an extension of Shair-Rosenfield's work would suggest that they will be more open to entrusting other women with these roles, just as voters trust veteran and nonveteran male candidates to be competent to handle foreign policy and military issues. The visibility of veteran women running for or holding national office also highlights women's increasing share of the veteran population, shifting perceptions of what women do and what veterans look like. This holds true not only as women veterans run for office at the national level but also as they run at the state and local levels. Today's female veterans, as they engage in civic life and run for offices ranging from county commissioner to senator, are paving the way for a new vision of who veterans are and of what women can and will do.

Notes

1. However, a definition of citizenship that stipulates that citizens have such rights implies, among other things, that women were not legally citizens of many Western democracies prior to the early- to mid-twentieth century.

2. Notably, this was one of two exceptions to the literacy test. The first one stipulated that anyone who could vote in 1866 and their descendants would be guaranteed the right to vote. The veteran clause, unlike the "grandfather clause," did not apply to descendants. Further, the registration date restriction did not apply to the "grandfather clause." The date restriction, coupled with a reluctance to enforce laws protected blacks in the Jim Crow south, largely neutered the ability of the veteran clause to facilitate the actual enfranchisement of black veterans.

3. For example, his argument that military participation is a means of redrawing the lines of the nation to include formerly excluded groups does not translate smoothly to the discussion of women and sexual minorities due to their ability to simultaneously be a part of the nation and second-class citizens.

4. https://www.aclu.org/blog/lgbt-rights/transgender-rights/breaking-down-trumps-trans-military-ban

5. See, for examples, UN Security Council (UNSC) Resolutions 1325, 1820, 1888, 1889, 1960, 2106, and 2122. Complete texts of these resolutions can be found at https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/content/resolutions-0

6. However, recent quantitative findings from Hayes and Lawless (2015) indicate that there is minimal bias in coverage of male and female candidates in the more recent elections.

7. Though research finds that when women do win their first election, they benefit from incumbency, and women candidates generally benefit from the incumbency of other women (Shair-Rosenfield, 2012; Shair-Rosenfield & Hinojosa, 2014).

8. In 2015, 77 percent of the U.S. population, or 247,279,859, were adults (http://datacenter.kidscount.org/data/tables/99-total-population-by-child-and-adult#detailed/1/any/false/870,573/39,40,41/416,417). If we assume that the percentage of women has remained somewhat constant since the 2010 Census (in which women were 50.8 percent of the population) and that this percentage can be applied to the adult population, then, in 2015, there were about 125,618,168 adult women and 121,661,691 adult men in the United States. As of September 2015, 1,835,849 of the country's veterans were women, while 18,947,705 were men (VetPop 2016, available from https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/vetpop2016). By 2017, 4 of the 104 voting women in Congress were veterans, while 97 of Congress's 431 voting men were veterans. We calculate that .00022 percent of female veterans were serving in Congress in 2017 as compared to .00051 percent of male veterans, .00008 percent of women, and .00035 percent of men. Therefore, female veterans are about 2.6 times as likely as their civilian counterparts to serve in Congress, while male veterans are about 1.5 times as likely to serve in Congress as their civilian counterparts.

9. It is important to note that while veteran status provides a greater boost for women than for men, it is also true that female veterans are less well represented than are male veterans and male civilians. This is because women are so severely underrepresented that even the boost that women receive from being veterans is not enough to bring them to parity with even male civilians, who are about 1.6 times as likely to serve in Congress as female veterans.

10. It is worth noting that Harvey Milk, the first openly gay elected official in the state of California, served just shy of four years in the U.S. Navy and referenced his service (and antigay discrimination in the military) on the campaign trail.

11. Data from Wave 5 (2005–2009) of the World Values Survey indicate that trust in the military rests at 79.8 percent in the United States. By way of comparison, Germany's trust in the military is at 46.3 percent, and the United Kingdom's is at 68.7 percent. It is perhaps telling that on the question of agreement with the statement that men make better political leaders, the trend reversed, with 17.8 percent in both the United Kingdom and Germany agreeing or strongly agreeing while 24.2 percent in the United States agreeing or strongly agreeing. Available from http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSDocumentationWV5.jsp.

12. While the Pentagon only recently opened all combat roles to women, the ban on women in air and naval combat was lifted in 1993. Prior to the lifting of the ban on ground combat, women still found themselves engaging in combat on the front lines as female engagement teams (FETs) (adopted by the Marine Corps in 2003 and later by the Army) deployed with infantry units, and women in earlier conflicts, including the first Gulf War, in which 13 servicewomen were killed, found the lines between combat and noncombat roles blurred.

13. See, for example, "House_IL08_Duckworth_Fueled" advertisement available in the Wesleyan Media Project's 2012 House Video Files and the 2016 version of the advertisement available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mLfyb6-pLoM.

14. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DVLqelgf-aE and https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=obHlECvtrEs

15. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eVTHESwMHfI; https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n45VV9Ra2fg; https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I_Ke7CkXwnE; and "House_UT01_MCALEER_SERVE" available in the Wesleyan Media Project's 2014 House video files.

16. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CcjG2fK7kNk

17. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Zi6v4CYNSIQ

18. For example, https://www.advocate.com/election/2018/11/05/lesbian-gina-ortiz-jones-wants-be-texass-first-out-congress-member

References

Abbott, Lyman. (1903, September). Why women do not wish the suffrage? *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1903/09/why-women-do-not-wish-the-suffrage/306616/

Best, Rebecca, Hunter, Kyleanne, & Thomas, Kate H. (2019). *Fighting for a seat at the table: Veteran reintegration experiences and civic engagement*. Unpublished manuscript.

Best, Rebecca H., Shair-Rosenfield, Sarah, and M. W, Reed. (2019). Leadership diversity and the termination of civil conflict. *Political Research Quarterly*. (In press).

Braden, Maria. (1996). *Women politicians and the media*. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press.

Bystrom, Dianne G., & Miller, Jerry L. (1999). Gendered communication styles and strategies in campaign 1996: The videostyles of women and men candidates. In Linda Lee Kaid and Dianne G. Bystrom (Eds.), *The electronic election: Perspectives on the 1996 campaign communication* (pp. 303–318). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Caprioli, Mary. (2003). Gender equality and state aggression: The impact of domestic gender equality on state first use of force. *International Interactions, 29*(3), 195–214.

Enloe, Cynthia. (2004). *The curious feminist: Searching for women in a new age of empire*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hayes, Danny, & Lawless, Jennifer L. 2015. A non-gendered lens? Media, voters, and female candidates in contemporary congressional elections. *Perspectives on Politics, 13*(1), 95–118.

Hudson, Valerie M., Ballif-Spanvill, Bonnie, Caprioli, Mary, & Emmet, Chad. (2012). *Sex and world peace*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Kahn, Kim F. (1992). Does being male help? An investigation of the effects of candidate gender and campaign coverage on evaluations of U.S. Senate campaigns. *Journal of Politics, 54*(2), 497–512.

Kahn, Kim Fridkin. (1993). Gender differences in campaign messages: The political advertisements men and women candidates for the U.S. Senate. *Political Research Quarterly, 46*(3), 481–502.

Keyssar, Alexander. (2000). *The right to vote: The contested history of democracy in the United States* (Rev. ed.). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Krebs, Ronald R. 2006. *Fighting for rights: Military service and the politics of citizenship.* New York, NY: Cornell University Press.

Lunardini, Christine A., & Knock, Thomas J. (1980). Wilson and woman suffrage: A new look. *Political Science Quarterly, 95*(4), 655–671.

Matland, Richard. (1993). Institutional variables affecting female representation in national legislatures: The case of Norway. *Journal of Politics, 55*(3), 737–755.

Melander, Erik. (2005). Political gender equality and state human rights abuse. *Journal of Peace Research, 42*(2), 149–166.

Murray, R. (2008). The power of sex and incumbency: A longitudinal study of electoral performance in France. *Party Politics, 14*(5), 539–554.

Sanbonmatsu, Kira. (2002). Gender stereotypes and vote choice. *American Journal of Political Science, 46*(1), 20–34.

Scruggs, William L. (1903). Citizenship and suffrage. *The North American Review, 177*(565), 837–846.

Segal, Mary W., & Hansen, Amanda F. (1992). Value rationales in policy debates on women in the military: A content analysis of congressional testimony, 1941–1985. *Social Science Quarterly, 73*(2), 296–309.

Shair-Rosenfield, Sarah. (2012). The alternative incumbency effect: Electing women legislators in Indonesia. *Electoral Studies, 31*(3), 576–587.

Shair-Rosenfield, Sarah, & Hinojosa, Magda. (2014). Does female incumbency reduce gender bias in elections? Evidence from Chile. *Political Research Quarterly, 67*(4), 837–850.

Shair-Rosenfield, Sarah, & Stoyan, Alissandra. (2018). Gendered opportunities and constraints: How executive sex and approval influence executive decree issuance. *Political Research Quarterly, 71*(3), 586–599.

Shair-Rosenfield, Sarah, & Wood, Reed. (2017). Governing well after war: How improving female representation prolongs post-conflict peace. *Journal of Politics, 79*(3), 995–1009.

Tir, Jaroslav, & Bailey, Maureen. (2018). Painting too "Rosie" a picture: The impact of external threat on women's economic welfare. *Conflict Management and Peace Science, 35*(3), 248–262.