

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

8 MAI 1945 UNIVERSITY / GUELMA

جامعة 8 ماي 1945 \ قالمة

FACULTY OF LETTERS AND LANGUAGES

كلية الآداب و اللغات

DEPARTMENT OF LETTERS & ENGLISH LANGUAGE

قسم الآداب و اللغة الانجليزية



Option: Civilizations

**Hillary Clinton's Candidacy and Barack Obama's Presidency: A Break
in the Glass Ceiling or an Sneak into the White House**

A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of Letters and English Language in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master in Anglophone Language, Literature,
and Civilization.

Board of Examiners

Chairman: Prof. TOULGUI Ladi. University of 8 Mai 1945- Guelma

Supervisor: Mr. BOUDECHICHE Hamid University of 8 Mai 1945- Guelma

Examiner: Mrs. AMIAR Mounira University of 8 Mai 1945- Guelma

Candidate:

OUCIF Rima

Supervisor:

Mr. BOUDECHICHE Hamid

June 2017

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I thank Allah the Almighty for His blessings, for empowering me with determination and patience without which, this work would not be complete by now. I wish to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Mr. BOUDECHICHE Hamid, for his valuable guidance and support throughout the work. I am very thankful to him for his constructive and qualified comments.

I would like to extend my gratefulness to all my teachers from the early days in primary school to date, they enlightened my path and inspired me to work hard and fulfill my dreams.

Special appreciation and recognition go to my family, mainly my beloved parents who have paved my road with their constant prayers, encouragement and support.

To my sister Bouchra, and my lifelong friends who are going through the same journey and boosted me with their endless positive words, lucky, I am to have them all in my life.

My thankfulness is further addressed to the examining jury members who will scrutinize this work.

Dedication

This humble work is dedicated to my parents, may Allah reward them. They believe in my efforts and flood me with love and support throughout my entire educational career. They have committed their lives to my success whatever the circumstances that could have stymied them. Without their encouragement and moral backing, the completion of this work would have been impossible. Further, this work is dedicated to everyone who helped even with optimistic words.

Abstract

This dissertation explored the phenomenon of the glass ceiling in the American political context. It emphasized its substantial impact of halting women and racial minorities from obtaining influential elective public offices, and it shed the light on the presidency of Barack Obama of 2008, besides the presidential candidacy of Hillary Clinton 2016. Historically speaking, the phrase “glass ceiling” was officially first introduced in the *Wall Street Journal* in 1986, referring to the invisible barriers that crippled women from accessing to the end of the upper spectrum in corporate America. Since then, the term was popularized and extended to embrace also minorities and a wide range of fields including politics. Voluminous research was conducted to detect the sources of the phenomenon and to suggest remedies to eliminate those hurdles. Politically, data revealed that U.S. lags behind a bunch of countries worldwide in terms of women and racial minorities’ political representation at the federal and legislative level. Internally, the political underrepresentation of women and racial minorities dated back to their inferior status since the early days of the fledgling democratic nation. Statistics indicated that women and racial minorities are severely underrepresented at the national, state and local echelons, in relation to their respective populations. The blocks produced by the glass ceiling are blamed for these upshots. Based on data from the political scene about the representation of women and racial minorities in the governmental bodies, this research concluded that the cherished values of democracy in America and its reality epitomized by the phenomenon of the glass ceiling are of a sort of paradox. However, did the presidency of Barack Obama in 2008 alongside with the candidacy of Hillary Clinton in 2016 mean that a break in the enduring political glass ceiling has just happened? Accordingly, this study attempted to dig down and find relevant answer to this question.

ملخص

تحررت هذه المذكرة ظاهرة السقف الزجاجي في السياق السياسي الأمريكي مشددة على تأثيرها الحاد في منع النساء و الأقليات العرقية من الحصول على مناصب انتخابية عامة ذات نفوذ، كما سلطت الضوء على رئاسة باراك أوباما خلال عام 2008، الى جانب ترشح هيلاري كلينتون للرئاسة في 2016. من الناحية التاريخية، فقد تم اعتماد عبارة "السقف الزجاجي رسميا لأول مرة في جريدة وول ستريت عام 1986 في اشارة الى الحواجز الغير مرئية التي أعاقت النساء من الوصول الى مناصب عليا في الشركات الأمريكية. و منذ ذلك الحين تم الترويج للمصطلح الذي امتد يشمل أيضا الأقليات بالإضافة الى مجموعة واسعة من القطاعات بما في ذلك السياسة، و أجريت بحوث واسعة باستبيان مصادر هذه الظاهرة، واقتراح سبل للحد من هذه العقبات. أما من الناحية السياسية ، فقد كشفت البيانات أن الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية تحتل مراكز متأخرة من حيث التمثيل السياسي للمرأة و الأقليات العرقية على المستويين الفدرالي و التشريعي مع دول أخرى في العالم. على الصعيد الداخلي ، يعود التمثيل السياسي الناقص للمرأة و الأقليات العرقية الى وضعهما المتدني منذ الأيام الأولى لنشأة هذه الأمة الديمقراطية. كما أشارت الاحصائيات الى أن المرأة و الأقليات العرقية يعانون من التمثيل الناقص الحاد على المستويات الوطنية ، الولائية و المحلية نظرا لنسب سكانها، بحيث أن العوائق الناتجة عن ظاهرة السقف الزجاجي اعتبرت مسؤولة عن هذه النتائج. فحسب بيانات من المشهد السياسي حول تمثيل النساء و الأقليات العرقية في الهيئات الحكومية، استخلص هذا البحث أن المبادئ القيمة الديمقراطية في الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية وواقعها المتجلي في ظاهرة السقف الزجاجي هي نوع من التناقض، ومع ذلك فهل رئاسة باراك أوباما في 2008 و كذلك ترشح هيلاري كلينتون في عام 2016 تعني أن هناك كسرا في السقف الزجاجي السياسي الدائم قد حدث للتو؟ و بناءا على ذلك، فان هذه الدراسة حاولت التعمق لإيجاد اجابة مناسبة لهذا السؤال.

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

Acronym	Identification
AAUW	American Association of University of Women
AWSA	American Women Suffrage Association
CAWP	Center of American Women and Politics
DOL	Department of Labor
NWSA	National Women Suffrage Association
OFCCP	Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs
U.S.	United States

List of Tables

Table 1. Percentages of Women in Elective Office.....	36-37
--	-------

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter One: The Political Glass Ceiling in Democratic America	7
1.1. Explaining the Metaphor of the Glass Ceiling.....	7
1.1.1. The Historical Background.....	8
1.1.2. Theoretical Explanation.....	15
1.1.3. The Glass Ceilings and the Network of Metaphors.....	17
1.2. Four Criteria to Identify the Existence of the Glass Ceiling in Politics.....	19
1.3. The Glass Ceiling around the World.....	21
Chapter Two: Disappointment in Shattering the Highest and the Hardest Glass Ceiling	25
2.1. The Women’s Suffrage Movement in U.S.....	25
2.1.1. The Life of American Women before the Suffragism Movement.....	26
2.1.2. The Road of the Suffrage Movement.....	28
2.1.3. The Political Struggle from 1848 to 1920.....	31
2.2. Importance of Women’s Presence in the Political Arena.....	33
2.3. Women in Elective Offices.....	34
2.4. Women Representation in Politics.....	37
2.4.1. Women’s Low Self-Regard and Lack of Political Ambition.....	38
2.4.2. Gender Stereotypes.....	39
2.4.3. Electoral Campaigns.....	41
2.4.4. Biased Media Coverage.....	42
2.4.5. Political Parties.....	43

2.4.6.	Male Entrenchment.....	44
2.5.	Women in the Oval Office.....	45
Chapter Three: Failure of the Nation of “E Pluribus Unum” in Fair Representation for its Racial and Ethnic Minorities.....		47
3.1.	The Largest Democratic Melting Pot in	47
3.1.1.	The Influx of Immigrants in the New World.....	48
3.1.2.	Issues Related to Immigration.....	50
3.1.3.	The Inclusion of Racial and Ethnic Minorities	52
3.2.	Importance of Ethnic and Racial Minorities.....	53
3.3.	Numbers in Elective Offices.....	54
3.4.	Barriers to Fair Representation.....	56
3.4.1.	Voters' Preferences.....	56
3.4.2.	Racial Stereotypes.....	58
3.4.3.	Biased Media Coverage.....	59
3.4.4.	Fundraising.....	60
3.5.	African Americans and U.S. Politics.....	61
3.5.1.	Barack Obama and the Oval Office.....	62
Conclusion.....		64
Bibliography.....		66
Appendices.....		76

Introduction

The “glass ceiling” is a phrase used in America to refer to the invisible obstacles that hinder women and minorities from achieving advancement in their career and attaining certain social, political, economic or cultural levels. This metaphor is coined by Carol Hymowitz and Timothy D. Schellardt in the “Wall Street Journal” in 1986 in an article entitled *Breaking the Glass Ceiling: Can Women Reach the Top of America’s Largest Corporations?* The term was extended since its appearance in the article to incorporate the impediments that faced women and minorities in any sphere of their careers as they attempt to climb to higher positions. In 1991, the Federal Glass Ceiling Commission was established, and its mandate was to ascertain that the hurdles that impede the improvement of women and minorities from rising beyond a certain level of hierarchy and attain senior level positions are removed.

Though the U.S. is a heterogeneous country, politically speaking, the public elective offices are still tremendously dominated by white men. Whereas women and racial / ethnic minorities compose a large portion of the population, they are markedly politically underrepresented. The American women had a long history in struggles, in which they were denied their rights as American citizens and were forbidden from voting. With the beginning of the feminist movement, the suffrage request took place and finally women are able to vote and their voices are heard. Their fight was enthroned by the 19th Amendment that gave women the right to cast their ballots. Since then, they were included in the political arena, obtaining influential leadership offices, yet; it does not match with their numbers as citizens.

Meanwhile, the racial and ethnic minorities in United States were overwhelmingly exploited by the white Americans. Their waves of immigration were meant to be stopped in every way. The African Americans were enslaved for centuries to be freed later during the Civil War by the Proclamation of Emancipation in 1863. Whereas the Latino immigrants were

deported in every chance. Laws were enacted to stem the large waves of migrants from Asia, while the Natives were excluded from the flow of events in America. Until the 1960s, the political context witnessed more openness to the racial and ethnic minorities as public office holders.

Consequently, women were able to enter politics like Victoria Woodhull who run for the presidency of the United States on the Equal Rights Party ticket, also, the Republican Geraldine A. Ferraro in 1984 was the first women on a major party's national ticket and was selected as Vice President, besides Hillary Clinton also ran for the office of U.S. president. Yet, they are unable to occupy certain political positions like the Oval Office in the white house and no woman has made it so far despite the fact that the U.S. is the greatest democracy in the world. The same is true for the racial and ethnic minorities who were able to engage in the political atmosphere. Nevertheless, the American Barack Obama from an African descent has made it to the white house and realized the dream of this deprived minority due to a bunch of racist norms.

The aim of this study is to investigate the existence of the glass ceiling in the American political sphere, and to identify its motives, besides spotlighting its consequences on females and racial minority mainly blacks as elected officials. Moreover, this dissertation seeks to analyze the history of women and the racial minorities focusing on African Americans in politics, by shedding the light on the struggles that both women and minorities have gone through to rise into senior political offices and how they were subjected to the political glass ceiling. Also, it detects the recent achievements of women and African American politicians in the American political ground embodied by President Barack Obama and the Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton for 2016 presidential election.

This study deals with different questions concerning the impact of the glass ceiling on women and racial and ethnic minorities in the American political realm, mainly in their endeavor to hold a public and prestigious office in the White house. The research attempts to tackle the following questions; does the glass ceiling really exist or is it a mere chimera of ineffective politicians? Why are women and racial minorities the victim categories of the glass ceiling in the American political life? What are the causes behind the unexpected cracks that occurred in the political glass ceiling on women and racial and ethnic minorities? Are the inauguration of Barack Obama as U.S. President in 2008 and the nomination of Hillary Clinton as a candidate for a major party for 2016 presidential election a real shattering in the glass ceiling in US or are these simply meaningless attempts without significant consequences?

This research tends to observe and analyze the phenomenon of the glass ceiling, its impact on women and racial minorities in politics. Hence, the historical method is used to give crystal-clear view about the theory of the glass ceiling and its extension to the political sphere in United States, and to explore the history of women and racial and ethnic minorities and their participation in American politics and serving in the arenas of power. Furthermore, the use of the analytical method helps to investigate the impediments that thwart women and racial minorities' politicians in their trail to high offices in the executive and legislative branches. Additionally, it will be used to trace and confirm or disconfirm what can be considered as cracks occurring in the ceiling and its actual motives epitomized by the inauguration of Obama in 2008 and the nomination of Clinton as democratic candidate for 2016 presidential election.

This research is divided into three chapters. The first chapter entitled "The Political Glass Ceiling in the Democratic America". It begins with a look at the historical background of the concept of the "glass ceiling", its first appearance as metaphor for women in corporate

American and its extension later to the minority groups and an array of fields. A wide range of researchers were interested in this phenomenon, thus, they investigated its meaning and provided a theoretical footing for its existence, besides the maze of metaphors that was accompanied. Similarly, scholars attempted to provide criteria that indicate the existence of the glass ceiling in politics, to move later to the glass in politics worldwide in comparison to United States.

“Hopes for shattering the Highest and the Hardest Glass Ceiling Dashed” is the second chapter of this work. It deeply investigates the status of women in politics through times up to date. The chapter begins with a historical overview about the situation of the American women and the struggles they have gone through to gain substantial rights as the right of franchise in 1920. Since that date, women made roads to the political field and they hold important offices. However, their numbers in the elective public offices entail that the barriers created by glass ceiling are what cripple their appropriate representation. Accordingly, Hillary Clinton fall out as a victim of this phenomenon and she lost the presidential candidacy of 2016 in front of the Republican Donald Trump.

The third chapter, “The Failure of the Nation of “E Pluribus Unum” in Fair Representation of its Racial and Ethnic Minorities” starts with the early days of the population of the New Land with immigrants from all over the world. It moves to problems that the immigration posed for the American authority, and likewise, it drafted laws that would stop the tides of aliens to an end. Moreover, it deals with a variety of obstacles that are said to obstruct racial minorities in their road to influential political offices. Finally, it tackles the presidency of Barack Obama as a member of the black community and its gains of the highest office in the land.

The glass ceiling is a noteworthy topic and phenomenon that captures the attention of scholars and researchers who delve its meaning, sources and more. As far as this study is

about to investigating the existence of the glass ceiling as a phenomenon in the American political ambit, it is highly important to deal with some works that are considered to be the base for the exploration of the phenomenon as a whole and this work in particular.

In his research paper entitled “The Glass Ceiling Effect”, Cotter and his colleagues investigate the notion of the glass ceiling in corporate American. They examine the gender and racial inequalities that block the road of women and racial minorities from obtaining senior level positions. They come to a conclusion that not all the sexist and racist practices are said to be the so – called the “glass ceiling”. However, a bunch of measures should be met too identify its existence.

Moreover, The United States Department of Labor published *A Report on the Glass Ceiling Initiative* in 1991 that deals with the phenomenon of the glass ceiling in management. The department investigates the existence of the glass ceiling in corporate United States, besides the causes and the solutions to eradicate it. The findings confirm its existence that holds back women and minorities from achieving senior offices in the corporate ladder. In addition, a new definition for the concept of “glass ceiling” is adopted, in which it specifies those disadvantages that work against women and minorities.

Other studies that are devoted to the glass ceiling is a paper entitles “The Glass Ceiling in Politics: Formalization and Empirical Test” by Olle Folke and Johanna Rickne. They based their work on the study conducted by Cotter and his colleagues. They collected insights from other fields of research about the phenomenon of the glass ceiling and adapted it to suit the political side. Thus they provide four criteria to ascertain the existence of the glass ceiling in politics.

In the same context, Lawless and Fox have explained in their book *Men Rule: the Continued Underrepresentation of Women in US Politics* 2012 that though female candidates perform as well as their male counterparts in the political race for an elective office, they

remain underrepresented due to the gender gap. They identify seven factors that impede women's political ambition including women's self-perception about their capacities and qualifications, their responsibility for childcare and household tasks...etc.

In a parallel path, a paper prepared by Kathleen Dolan in 2006 entitled "Women Candidates in American Politics: What We Know, What We Want to Know" and tackles the major disadvantages that American women candidates face in politics. The most important points that she emphasized on is that the reason behind women's lower numbers as candidates is the glass ceiling and its arms are the sexist stereotypes, the political party gatekeepers, the media coverage and so on.

An article by the Pew Research Center "Blacks Have Made Gains in U.S. Political Leadership, But Gaps Remain", tackles the importance of the Obama's presidency for the black community and how it should lead the way for more blacks in political sphere. However, data demonstrate to the fact that black officials and specifically African American senators are still a minority in Congress.

Chapter One: The Political Glass Ceiling in Democratic America

A set of hurdles have thwarted different groups in U.S. from climbing the social ladder to hold influential leadership positions. Due to their gender, race, ethnicity etc. the career of some groups is blocked notwithstanding the skills and qualifications they may possess. These odd social, professional, and political situations take place in America; a country famed for leading the world in democratic practices. Denying certain social groups access to some high jobs and leadership positions is a phenomenon known as the glass ceiling. Since its popularization in the 1980s, many researchers have attempted to investigate and explore this issue to confirm its existence, identify its nature, uncover its barriers, and provide remedies.

In their theoretical explanations of 1990, Morrison and Von Glinow proposed theories to clarify the nature of the glass ceiling phenomenon and its possible sources alongside with the social closure theory. It is about the exclusion of minority groups in the society through discriminatory systems. Moreover, after running several studies, a plethora of related metaphors and labels for the glass ceiling were introduced to shed light on other types of gender and racial discrimination mainly related to women and minorities.

The initial research works about the glass ceiling were conducted in the business and management areas. Later, some other different domains in American life were subjected to investigation among which the political field. Thus, some criteria were offered to ascertain the existence of the political glass ceiling. Consequently, a comparative analysis between United States of America and other regions in the world in terms of the representation of women and people of color in its decision-making bodies shows that the U.S. is doing unfavorably in relation to other nations around the world due to the glass ceiling effect.

1.1. Explaining the Metaphor of the Glass Ceiling

Robert Reich, the chair of the Federal Glass Ceiling Commission of November, 1995, stated in the commission's first report, *A Solid Investment: Making Full Use of the Nation*

Human Capital, that America is the land of chances and opportunities. With their hard work and play it right, all Americans can succeed and fulfill their wishes and dreams. Yet, the glass ceiling contradicts with the nation's values, and it deceives particularly the American Dream. This is due to the fact that a large portion of citizens are denied chances to progress and to achieve personal prosperity by bending under the social injustice (4).

Thus, the existence of such barriers -the glass ceiling- that block women and minorities from ascending higher, demands more efforts to be shattered (*A Solid Investment* 5). This shift occurred in accordance with the urgent need to diversify the American workforce and mainly the managerial positions where the organization's performance, according to Morrison, will be enhanced alongside the diverse management (qtd. in Jackson and Leon 351).

The phenomenon is labeled as "glass" which stands for transparency, in the sense that, those curbs are not straightly evident or palpable. They are neither coded nor sanctioned in the formal laws as the opposite of the official obstacles, such as the level of education and work experience. Further, a "ceiling" refers to the blocks that cripple the promotion of women and minorities to the upper positions in their careers (The Full Wiki). As Baxter and Wright clarify, possible promotions can take place beneath the obstacles, however, it is impossible above it (276). According to the social psychologists Eagly and Carli, the situation is ought to be called a "labyrinth" not a glass ceiling since the latter signifies the unbreakable and impermeable obstacles. Women for example recently have reached top jobs, and they did so through surfing indefinite hazy roads as if they are in a labyrinth, yet they got there, to those high rank positions (qtd. in Hyde and Else-Quest 195).

1.1.1. Historical Background

The concept of the glass ceiling was first coined by feminists referring to sex discrimination at the places of work before the 1980 (Jackson and O'Callaghan 426). While the first use goes back to March, 1984 in the American *Magazine World / Adweek's* article

written by Nora Fienkiel discussed the experiences of women in the business world (Morgan 3, Barretto, Ryan and Schmitt 5, Martin). The writer stated that “women have reached a certain point – I call it the glass ceiling. They’re in the top of the middle management and they’re stopping and getting stuck” (qtd. in Barretto, Ryan and Schmitt 5). Later, in the same year; the expression was used by Gay Bryant, the ex-editor of the *Working Women* magazine, in a book analysis about the situation of the American women in workplace (Morgan 4).

In 1986, the phrase of glass ceiling was used again in the title of the *Wall Street Journal*'s special report, “The Glass Ceiling: Why Women Can’t Seem to Break the Invisible Barrier that Blocks them from the Top Jobs” (Morgan 4). The report of thirty- two pages was about the corporate women in America (Van Horn and Schaffner 232). It was a collection of interviews with male and female managers that are carried out in executive recruitment agencies, besides universities and non-profit institutions. According to the article’s writers Carol Hymowitz and Timothy Schellhardt, the glass ceiling phenomenon is “the invisible barrier that blocks them [women] from the top jobs”. The report examined the failure of women to attain top positions in the American corporations due to the glass ceiling (232). Women are stopped at a certain level because of their male manager colleagues’ views about their performance, besides their inclination not to work with female managers (Morgan 4).

Ann Morrison, Randell White and Ellen Van Velsor by the assistance of the Center for Creative Leadership produced in 1987 a book research about the phenomenon of the glass ceiling. They based their research on an interview-based survey on women who are not yet at the top of management corporations in U.S. during 1984 to 1985. They did included male executives to compare the results. The female interviewees were interrogated about what was needed to make it to the senior positions and what obstructed them. The results showed that the corporations have automatic and natural path for the process of promotions inside the corporations. Thus, they defined the glass ceiling as “the transparent barrier that kept women

from rising above a certain level in corporations... the glass ceiling is applied to women as a group who are kept from advancing higher because they are women” (qtd. in Morgan 5).

Since then, the glass ceiling as a term became familiar in the public sphere. It prompted the social researches and studies to be held in different agents and a variety of fields such as politics, academia and professional services to match with different reasons (Smith 16).

Similarly, the metaphor was initially used to refer to gendered hurdles against women, yet; it can be extended to include other non major groups as ethnic and racial minorities (Northouse 270).

Among the noteworthy investigations made in the U.S. sphere about this phenomenon was the Glass Ceiling Initiative. It was set up by Elizabeth Dole in 1989 to be taken by Lynne Martin at the US Department of Labor. The latter has funded the Workforce 2000 report of 1987 which concluded that boosting the participation of women and minorities in US workforce is needed to assist the future economic growth. It is notable that the Department of Labor (DOL) was in charge through its Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) for warranting that the government contractors were conforming to the equal employment opportunity laws. These programs are to make sure that the contractors are providing the necessary training and opportunities to recruit employees without any sort of discrimination based on race, gender, religious affiliation, color, national origin, disabilities or veterans’ status (*A Report on the Glass Ceiling Initiative* 1).

Under the glass ceiling initiative, the department embarked on reviews using a pilot study in which Nine Fortune 500 Companies were selected. The chief aim of this process was to detect the hurdles that impeded women and minorities’ progress towards top positions, and to work to eradicate them (3-4). The earlier research concluded that there is a dearth of women in top management positions and construed that there must be barriers (1), while these current reviews go for detecting these barriers through spotting the light on the work and the

organization of each corporation. The upshots revealed that there is a crew of common institutional barriers among them, the promotion systems, mentoring and training (5).

According to *A Report on the Glass Ceiling Initiative*, released in 1991 by the Department of Labor, a new definition was given to the phenomenon of glass ceiling as "those artificial barriers based on attitudinal or organizational bias that prevent qualified individuals from advancing upward in their organization into management level positions (1). Hence, this definition recognized the barriers that obstruct women and minorities as being artificial and not based on actual natural ones such as the years of experience or qualifications. Moreover, it is not always women's deficiency as individuals or their relationships with others in the workplace that hindered them because the defect also is in the environment where they perform. Since these moments in the history of the inquiries about the glass ceiling, the concept has become a household term and well acknowledged as a real issue (Morgan 7).

Pipeline of Progress: An Update to the Glass Ceiling Initiative is the second report released by the DOL in August, 1992. It tackled the barriers to progress in organizations and provided them with measures to surpass the issue of glass ceiling. Furthermore, the report evaluated the achievements since the 1991 year's efforts to help women and minorities to progress in their careers by eradicating the impediments they encounter in corporations. The gloomy side of *Pipeline of Progress* is that the DOL's investigations showed women and minorities whom they achieved senior level management positions in corporate America are still rare and an exception though their numbers have grown and the work environment is more miscellaneous (Van Horn and Schaffner 233).

The end results of the DOL's inquiry led directly to the accessory of the Glass Ceiling Act of 1991 as Title II of the 1991 Civil Rights Act. Under this act, twenty-one members were pledged to form what is known as the Glass Ceiling Commission (Van Horn and Schaffner 233). Its chief goal is to carry out a research to detect the barriers that hindered progression of

women and minorities from climbing to top managerial positions in the organizations and set up recommendations to eliminate those artificial barriers based on the findings. The results and the conclusions that are reached out of the study of the fifteen months have to be gathered in written reports to be delivered to the president and the appropriate congressional committees (Good for Business 3, Van Horn and Schaffner 233).

Based on the investigations of the commission that gathered information from the five underrepresented groups: women, African American, American Indian, Asian and Pacific Islands and Hispanic American men in the private sector, two reports were released (Good For Business). The first that is entitled *Good for Business: Full Use of Nations Human Capital* and released in March, 1995 is an Environmental Scan that summarizes the results (Good for Business 5, Van Horn and Schaffner 233). This report confirmed the existing of the phenomenon of the glass ceiling that works to bar women and minorities from getting to high rank management positions. Also, it depicted and examined the barriers on hand. Furthermore, the report delineated the different practices and policies used by the organizations to endorse women and minorities' proportion in top levels. Finally, the Environmental Scan sums up the organizations' managers, women and minorities' beliefs and perceptions about the working environment and charts the well-known stereotypes that perpetuates the glass ceiling effect (Good for Business 5-6-7).

According to the authors *Good for Business*, three layers of barriers have been grouped and they constitute the chief hindrance to the advancement of women and minorities (7). The first one is the societal barriers that are epitomized through the stereotypes, prejudices and attitudes associated with women and people of color due to differences in gender, ethnic and racial differences, besides the available educational opportunities. The second layer is the internal structural barriers that are related to the business. Among the barriers stated under this group is the unwillingness of organizations to hire women and minorities via isolating and

excluding them. In addition, women and minorities are denied the opportunities to receive adequate mentoring, management training and career development. The concluding class is the governmental barriers, and including them, the deficiency in law enforcement as well as the inappropriate distribution and circulation of analyzed data about the existence of the glass ceiling (17-18).

The other report issued by the commission is *A Solid Investment: Making Full use of the Nation's Human Capital* is the commission's second report, and was released in November, 1995 (Van Horn and Schaffner 233). It describes the glass ceiling as "the unseen, yet the unbreachable barrier that keeps minorities and women from rising to the upper rungs of the corporate ladder; regardless of their qualifications or achievements" (A Solid Investment 4). Based on its findings, the report is a strategic plan that displayed the commission's recommendations. The latter were made to guarantee that all employees regardless of their gender, race or ethnicity will enjoy equitable chances to advance in their careers (Good for Business 6). The imperatives were directed to the society, the business and the government, in which each side takes its part of the responsibility and works to dismantle and break those artificial obstacles to progress (Good for Business 6, Van Horn and Schaffner 233).

In June, 1997, the Federal Office of Contract Compliance Programs issued a report entitled *The Glass Ceiling Initiative: Are There Cracks in the Ceiling?* as a follow-up report to the Glass Ceiling Initiative report. It investigated the breaks in the glass ceiling during 1993 and 1994. The result showed that the phenomenon of the glass ceiling was prevailing over the atmosphere, yet the number of women and minorities has multiplied in corporations (Van Horn and Schaffner 233).

Cotter et al. intended to provide a more precise definition of the glass ceiling. They suggested that "a glass ceiling is a specific type of gender or racial inequality that can be distinguished from other types of inequality" (656). They further explained that such

definition entails that the glass ceiling has a different nature than the other types of discrimination which does not mean it is more severe or it necessitates law interference. Thus, the following four criteria are said to be what highly distinguishes the glass ceiling from the other types of inequality, and that they shape its unique nature.

The first criterion is related to the fact that “the glass ceiling inequality represents gender or racial inequality that is not explained by other job-relevant characteristics” According to Cotter and his colleagues, the glass ceiling is recognized when discrimination is not explained by the employee’s past accomplishments and qualifications such as educational level and work experience. That is to say, after controlling measures related to the job, the residual differences that are associated to gender and race are what constitute the basis of discrimination (657).

Secondly, the glass ceiling implies labor market discrimination that increases at the upper positions of the corporate hierarchy as Cotter et al. stated: “a glass ceiling inequality represents gender or racial difference that is greater at higher levels of an outcome than at the lower levels of an outcome”. They added that these inequalities have to be more severe at the high levels and not constant with the same degree through all the levels of the ladder, otherwise, it is not necessary to label it glass ceiling (658-659).

The third criterion as explained by Cotter and his colleagues is “a glass ceiling inequality represents gender or racial inequality in the chances of advancement into higher levels, not merely the proportions of each gender or race currently at those higher levels” (659). The glass ceiling is directly related to raises of incomes and promotions. This latter is strongly linked to the second criterion in the sense that women and minorities face disadvantages that diminish their chances to be promoted to high level positions than when they opt for promotions to lower level positions. It is worth mentioning that both promotions and raises in

earnings are effected by inequalities at the high ranks positions where the gap gets sharper (659).

The last criterion is that the advancement to the highest ranks in the corporation will be obstructed though some progress has been made in the earlier stages of the work as Cotter et al. explained, “a glass ceiling inequality represents gender or racial inequality that increases over the course of career” (661). Relating the idea of career paths to the second criterion leads to conclude that a glass ceiling means that the deviation in the career paths is stronger at the highest levels than at the middle ones. As the third criterion suggests, even if women and minorities receive promotions to higher status positions and salary increase, it must be lower than that of the white males.

1.1.2. Theoretical Explanation

A variety of theoretical frameworks have been proposed and developed to explain the glass ceiling. Morrison and Von Glinow elucidated three general groups of these theories. According to the first one that is the Difference Theory, women who are perceived as shy, peaceful, play in safe zones and many more due to their nature, are not suitable for leadership and managerial positions. Yet, the racial differences are even higher than the gender differences. Also, the human capital theory explains that individuals’ past educational attainment and training are key factors that shape their current status. That is to say, individuals should be treated equally as long as they are equally qualified. However, it is not the case in practice in the sense that women and minorities are treated differently than white men even if they achieved similar or equal educational level (qtd. in Daniels 20).

Women and minorities are less valued than white men as well as treated disparately when it comes to holding a managerial or leadership positions, and this is what constitutes the core of the second theory, the Discrimination Theory. Morrison and Von Glinow stated that even when women and minorities are considered to be the right economic alternatives to white

men, they are denied these opportunities as a consequence of discriminatory practices. Furthermore, such biased acts stem from the preconceptions related to women and minorities and not to their performance in reality. Since these prejudices are strongly ingrained in people's minds, women who achieve better results than male colleagues are perceived as extraordinary (Daniels 21-22).

The Structural Barrier Theory is the third one and it focuses on the structural bias in organizations. According to Thomas and Alfred, the identity group (shares gender, race, age and ethnicity) and the organization group (shares position in hierarchy, joint tasks and job experience) are the two sorts of group that exist in an organization. The most importantly is that conflicts may erupt between the two groups because identity groups that do not change have gained access to high level positions that is associated with white men. Moreover, biculturalism is another structural barrier for minority groups. It represents their hard work to cope with two opposed cultural realities, in other words, to be well integrated with the system of the majority group. Among the instant consequences of this situation is the continuation of circulation of racial and gender prejudices against minorities that effect their advancement (Daniels 22-33).

In the same vein, Tomaskovic - Devey explained that the exclusion of the subordinate group is a well planned strategy by the dominant group, to retain control through a set of discriminatory practices and acts at both the organizational and the individual level that are highlighted by the concept known as the social closure. According to Murphy, social closure is the process of the subordination whereby one group monopolizes advantages by closing off opportunities to another group of outsiders beneath it (369). Roscigno, Garcia et al. also have noted that "the social closure is as much about protecting opportunities for the majority as it is about denying opportunities to others" (qtd. in Jackson and Leon 370).

Simply put, the social closure is about perpetuating exclusionary practices by the majority cohort against the subordinate one to preserve opportunities for their own gang (370). Due to the demands to diversify the senior level positions from a variety of groups, the social closure tends to exclude minority groups from such positions to less desirable jobs. As Tomaskavic-Devey and Stainback clarified that “under a social closure model, we would expect desirable jobs to integrate more slowly, if at all, as dominant groups attempt to continue to maintain their monopoly over the most desirable jobs, even as they lose the ability to control all jobs” (qtd. in Jackson and Leon 371). Consequently, the attainment of senior level positions is held back by the dominant group to extend their dominance in response to social closure through barriers and hurdles. Hence, this is what constitutes the phenomenon of the glass ceiling.

1.1.3. The Glass Ceilings and the Network of Metaphors

While the previous researches confirmed the existence of the glass ceiling, the years of 1990s witnessed a flood of studies about concepts and terms related to the concept of glass ceiling (Morgan 8). Ryan and et al. asserted that women who have broken through the glass ceiling may face a new obstacle that is the glass cliff. They hypothesized that women unlike men are most of the time upgraded to precarious managerial positions where their chances of failure are greatly predicted to occur. Additionally, in 2005, they run an experimental research in which they examined the appointments of male as well as female leaders of the top 100 companies in relation to the company’s performance. The upshots of their research showed that in the case of declining company performance, women were chosen over men to lead the organization. Ryan and Haslam in 2005 stated that women who occupy such positions are exposed to higher levels of stress and blame for the negative outcomes for which they are not responsible (Ryan et al. 269-270).

Similarly, men can be favored over women in some female dominated professions such as educational field and nursing (Smith 27). This phenomenon is labeled glass escalator or glass

elevator. Its effect is apparent through the disparities in the mobility of women to high level jobs, in which men receive more quick promotions than their female counterparts. Such behavior will hence lead to the dominance of men over the senior executive positions even in female-dominated fields. This is attributed to the stereotypes related to men as more masculine and function better as leaders unlike women who are emotional decision makers (McCallister).

A closely aligned concept was identified in the *Wall Street Journal* in 1992 is the glass wall that describes the gender horizontal segregation (Morgan 8). As Branson in his book *The last Male Bastion: Gender and the CEO Suite in America's Public Companies* noted that women are drawn in pink-collar jobs in their workplace such as head of human resources or public relation directors. Such jobs are the opposite of the line positions that need to hold responsibility, but at the same time, it is important to women to gather the right experiences to be able to move upper in their career later (137). Thus, the glass walls stand for the invisible hurdles that deprive women from moving between occupations but within the same organization so that they gain the required experience to be able advance to higher levels in their jobs (138).

If such are the hard obstacles encountered by white women and black men, the difficulties faced by black women are even worse, usually twice as hard. Women of color have to handle a concrete ceiling. It is a dense and non-transparent doubled obstacle (Bargiela-Chiappini 213, Wang 711). According to Catalyst report (2004) as cited in Wang, Black women are encountered with stereotypes that are generated about all women; besides those of racial prejudices. Moreover, Black women experience “double outsider” standing due to lack of trust in the credibility and the disagreement with other women from the rest of races, that is to say they have to deal with both sexism and racism (711).

In 1992, a new term was adopted which is the sticky floor, and it encapsulates the image of mainly women who work in the opposite side of women who face the glass ceiling. The metaphor refers to the hurdles that keep women at the lowest levels of the job ladder and they cannot move from the initial steps of the organization due to discriminatory practices (Sticky Floor). These jobs are known to be with low wages and rareness of possibilities to climb higher the career hierarchy (Morgan 8). The pink-collar workers such as secretaries and nurses are most employees who undergo the sticky floors (Sticky Floor and Glass Ceiling).

1.2. Four Criteria to Identify the Existence of the Glass Ceiling in Politics

In their paper titled “The Glass Ceiling in Politics: Formalization and Empirical Tests”, Folke and Rickne intended to gather data about the phenomenon of the glass ceiling present in a variety of sectors and incorporate them in the political field to gain insights of the glass ceiling in politics. They argue that the basis of the phenomenon of the glass ceiling is inequality in the sense that the gender and racial differences are influential factors that diminish the person’s chances to attain higher positions. Moreover, the glass ceiling is distinct from the other genres of discrimination due to the fact that those hurdles intensify with the climbing of the corporate ladder to higher senior levels. Both authors adapted Cotter and his colleagues’ definition of the concept of the glass ceiling to match with the political arena (5).

The first measure is about the gender and racial discrimination in holding high rank positions, and it is not justified by other job-relevant traits of the politician. This means that, the characteristics such as the years of experience, the level of motivation and education are not the sole measure. However; there are residual differences by which women and minorities are judged and evaluated and they block them from the access to leadership political positions. This criterion is based on the belief that the party recruiters assess similar set of qualifications in different ways according to the gender of the candidate for instance (5).

Even the disparities in the job-relevant requirements are an extension to the earlier inequalities. This point is best exemplified in the fact that minority and women politicians face scarceness to be adopted by elder politicians and receive mentoring due to their gender and minority status. This will ultimately lead to have less qualified women and minority politicians to be judged later and fail to hold influential offices. Furthermore, the years of work experience is a crucial factor in the glass ceiling and affects the underrepresentation of women for example. Similarly, male colleagues' erroneous perceptions about women lead them to quit the political field early, which consequently causes the loss of opportunities of promotions (6).

According to the writers, the second criterion is about the severity of the gender and the racial discrimination that grows and increases concurrently with the climbing of the political ladder in order to attain senior level positions. Thus, this criterion is the core representation of the metaphor of the ceiling that hits women and minorities, and prevents them from moving above a given echelon in their quest to hold senior position. It is what exactly distinguishes the concept of the sticky floor from the glass ceiling; in the sense that, the sticky floors are the primary barriers that encounter women and minorities once they enter the corporation.

Since this measure is contentious in terms of its empirical implications, Feree and Purkayastha argued that candidates face constant barriers in each stage they move through in their career, which will generate snowballing barriers to their advancement to higher positions. Accordingly, the proportion of women and minorities will be affected, and hence, decreased in the upper level positions, which is the blueprint that confirms the existence of the glass ceiling effect as Cotter et al. have clarified previously (qtd. in Folke and Rickne 7).

What is left from the four glass ceiling criteria are to separate the inequalities in progression to the upper ranks from the discriminatory representation of women and minorities, as Cotter et al. put it, at a variety of political levels (660). Thus, the third criterion

asserts that gender and race individuals are being discriminated in their upward mobility and promotion to influential high positions, and not only in their proportion in those positions, they have held. In this concern, the glass ceiling is not proved to exist because in some cases, men do enter directly to higher positions unlike women and minorities. Such situation will end up as having more men in the top positions in comparison to women and minorities. Moreover, one of the crucial reasons for the dearth in women and minorities in upper offices is due to the phenomenon of the glass cliff. Indeed, the women and the minority leaders that have broken through the glass ceiling and received promotions to occupy precarious positions are to fall off the cliff, which justifies the rareness of gender and racial leaders in top levels (Ryan, Haslam and Kulich 8-9).

The fourth criterion suggests that over the career trajectory, gender and minority inequalities intensify and chiefly for the leadership positions, in the sense that both the dominant group and the minority groups get into the organization with parallel qualifications and status to end up with unparalleled positions since women and minorities are blocked to access to top level positions. Hence, what specifies this glass ceiling criterion is that the inequalities should grow stronger together with the advancement in the career path. Moreover, this divergence should act and be detected at the higher level positions than the middle ones. A case in the point is that a female candidate against a male counterpart are similarly able to reach the middle level, yet, she will be unable to surpass this level to attain a top level in the political hierarchy due to the glass ceiling if it exists (Folke and Rikcne 9).

1.3. The Glass Ceiling around the World

In the abstract of their article entitled “Beyond Hillary and Benazir: Women’s Political Leadership Worldwide”, Jalalzai and Krook mentioned that, in recent decades, women have remarkably improved their share in the electoral politics pie, gaining a number of prestigious positions of national leadership and winning parliamentary seats around the world. However,

as Biddle expressed, it is a sort of paradox, in which the nation that advocates the spread of democracy all over the world has to smash the last impediment in the path American women to the highest office in the land (1).

According to the Pew Research Center, at present, there are fifteen elected female national leaders around the world. Nine of them serve as presidents, and eight are Prime Ministers - with the exception of the Doris Leuthard of Swiss Confederation is both head of the state and government- (Greiger and Kent). Their story in such offices started with Sirimavo Bandaranaike of Sri Lanka who was the first female leader to become a prime minister and was not a monarch in 1960 (Jalalzai and Krook 6). Afterward, in the same decade, two other female prime ministers rose to power who were Indira Gandhi from India and the Israelian Golda Meir. The year of 1974 is remarked by the inauguration of Isabel Perón of Argentina as the first female president in the world, to be followed by three other female heads of government that are Elizabeth Domitien of Central African Republic as the first female prime Minister in the African Continent, Margaret Thatcher of United Kingdom, and Maria de Lourdes Pintasilgo of Portugal. In recent times, the jailed South Korean president Park Guen-hye and the current Theresa May as the second female Prime Minister in UK made the news as other female politicians who occupy leadership offices (Aljazeera).

The conclusion is that, the rate of women who served as national leaders in these decades is considered to be handful in the sense that in 1970s, only three who served as national leaders, while the following decade, the number has increased to six, and later in 1980s to seven. However, from 1990s, a striking shift took place in which twenty-six women have come to the apex of executive leadership, and a further twenty-nine women till 2009 (Jalalzi and Krook 7) . Their term in office varied as well as their powers and roles in their countries history (Robins-Early). These conclusions show the developing number of women in leadership offices than ever (Desilver). To sum up, from 1960 to 2017, seventy nations

worldwide have elected female leaders to serve at the top of the executive posts and the U.S. is not included (Geiger and Kent).

At the legislative level, drawing on data from the Inter-Parliamentary Union released in March, 1st, 2017, 193 states of the world were classified in terms of the percentage of women's representation in their national parliaments. Rwanda tops the list with women making up 61.3% in the Lower House and 38.5% in the Upper House. Bolivia, Cuba, Iceland and Nicaragua are among the top five nations with highest women's parliamentary representation. Ethiopia was ranked as the 16th with 38.8% in the Lower House, and 32.0% in the Upper House. Surprisingly, even China was ranked as the 73rd among other Arabian Muslim conservative countries as United Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia as the 96th and the 97th, whereas Algeria was ranked as the 63th.

Moreover, Norway pigeonholed as the 13th country on the list, while Netherlands, Denmark and Germany were classified successively as 21th, 22th and 23th. Yet, the United States of America was graded the 100th country in the last elections in 2016 with 19.3% in the Lower House and 21.0% in the Senate, wherein it lags behind most democratic countries have achieved better classification such as Sweden 6th, Spain 14th, Belgium 19th, UK which ranked 47th, Canada 63th and France 64th. Even the former colonized countries by U.S. have attained better grades like Iraq as 68th and Afghanistan 54th (Women in Parliaments).

Similarly, minority groups are underrepresented in U.S. Based on Mint analysis in 2014, India for example is doing better in comparison to U.S. in the representation of minorities in its legislative branch. According to 2001 census, Muslims compose the largest group in India by making up 13.4% of the whole population; yet, they only comprise 4.24% of the Lok Sabha. That is to say, their representation counts -9.16 percentage points. U.S. at the other hand, -10 percentage points is scored for the Hispanics, while -5 for the African American

though at that time the President descends from a minority group. These statistics reveal that the Congress does poorly represent ethnic minorities (Raghavan).

Chapter Two: Disappointment in Shattering the Highest and the Hardest Glass Ceiling

Women take up different roles in the political sphere, ranging from voters, members in political parties, candidates, to officeholders. Historically speaking, U.S. women were deprived of a variety of freedoms including the voting right. The chief argument against them was that men function at the public life, whereas women's place was in the house. Yet, due to their role in the fight against the institution of slavery, American women gained the required awareness and expertise to launch their own movement in the historical Seneca Falls Convention in 1848. They identified their grievances as female citizens in the democratic U.S. Accordingly; the women's seventy-year struggle was crowned in 1920 by the 19th Amendment to the Constitution that removed sex as a disqualifier for the right of voting. However, since then, women's status did not alter that much in the political realm. Yet, few doors were open to them where they made substantial inroads in politics. A plethora of literature has tackled the significance of American women presence in politics, and their impact over policy and decisions making.

From the candidacy of Victoria Woodhull in 1872 to Hillary Rodham Clinton in 2016, women still constitute a minority in the U.S. politics at all the levels in relation to their population - federal, state and local-. Due to the phenomenon of the glass ceiling, invisible headwinds stymied qualified politician women from ascending to the top of the political hierarchy and serve in high-rank positions. Claims about women's self perceptions and lack of political ambition, stereotypes about female candidates, biased media coverage and more, impact the voters choice on the elections day. Hence, and at the large image, U.S. has not yet shattered the highest political glass ceiling and elected a woman president.

2.1. The Women's Suffrage Movement in U.S

As widely known, in a democratic nation, its people are liable for deciding on their leaders. Yet, in the United States of America, not all citizens were allowed to participate in such

decisions. Women were denied the right to vote till 1920 (Rau 4). After the country gained its independence from Great Britain, the U.S. Constitution was written down to guarantee a bunch of rights to its citizens. Women, nonetheless, were not allowed to become property owners, have a role in juries, get divorced and more (Adams 4). Moreover, in 1793, the Reverend John Cosens demonstrated that the Constitution necessitates that men ought to be elected to influential offices, while women should be the wives of those influential men (Frost-Knappman and Cullen-DuPont 3).

By the mid-nineteenth century, women expressed their dissatisfaction about their lot (DuBois 21). They moved through asking for equality with men in the political realm. They opted for more freedoms and rights and to get rid of discriminations based on sex through political activism to create a genuine society based on the value of democracy. Thus, the call for voting is a task that challenged the American political structure and the social sphere. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, a first generation activist for the enfranchisement of women, claimed that: “we solemnly vowed that there should never be another season of silence until women had the same rights everywhere on this green earth, as men” (16-18).

The year of 1848 marks the beginning of women’s suffrage movement in America as one of the three major movements in the American history alongside with the anti-slavery and the labor movements (15). Yet, historians and feminists have underestimated the role of women suffrage movement. They claimed that it did not add much to end women’s subordination and coercion. It was considered as a mere institutional reform that has not unshackled women from the bonds they are confined in. However, O’Neill acknowledged that it is inappropriate to deny the role of the suffrage movement in women’s emancipation (17). It is the foremost movement led by women that seeks to obtain their freedom. Thus, in their way to get the right to vote through this movement, women’s conditions have changed (18).

2.1.1. The Life of American Women before the Suffragism Movement

During the era of the colonies, the world of women was confined inside the home where they worked in the farms due to patriarchal beliefs (Frost-Knappman and Cullen-DuPont 1, DuBois 15-16). Women were in charge for producing clothes, medicine and even soap for family usage (Frost-Knappman and Cullen-DuPont 3). The English common law defined the relationship between a woman and her husband who owns her as he does with her estate. Even after gaining independence in 1786, their position did not get any better (1).

Alexis De Tocqueville, Frances Wright and Harriet Martineau settle on the point that, American women and mainly the married ones had an inferior status similar to slaves in the 18th and the 19th century. The husband can dispose his wife's property including inheritances, wages as his own. In case her husband's dies, she can only inherit only one-third of his asset. Moreover, they were constantly denied their fathers' estate. Granting divorce was rare event and can only take place in cases of brutality or adultery. In case a woman gets divorced, she loses the custody of her children (qtd. in Frost-Knappman and Cullen-DuPont 2).

Additionally, women were deprived of educational chances based on the belief that they lack intelligence. As a Boston speaker clarified in 1791 that daughters are expected to reincarnate the roles of friendly sisters and honorable mothers. While, sons were learning hard to attain significant positions. On the other hand, the African Americans were enslaved at that time. Consequently, no educational chances were provided for them. In the South, few schools were established by African American women and only the freed children can attend. Moreover, enslaved African American women had to handle sexual subjugation even from their white masters since their purpose of existence is to breed (3-4).

The only state during the eighteenth century that granted the voting right to women was New Jersey in its 1776 Constitution. However, some politicians claimed that women do not meet the required conditions to participate since married women lack independent income.

Hence, the voting right was restricted only to white males who own properties by 1800, putting women in the same box with people of color (3).

However, and as a result to the industrial capitalism, women took roles outside the home, violating men's sphere (Dubois 16). The rapid spread of textile mills in the United States during the first half of the nineteenth century demanded the recruitment of women (Frost-Knappman and Cullen-DuPont 4). They constituted a cheap hand labor for the mills owners. It was a precious opportunity for them to escape the domestic life and earn wages to pay their debts. By 1831, 40,000 out of 58,000 of textile mills workers were women. Yet, their wages were low and do not refer to the real effort they make in comparison to men's pay who did the same job. They worked in bad conditions, in which they had to work for 12 to 16 hours (4-5).

Women's sense of inferiority stems from the teachings in the church. The latter has indoctrinated them to be passive, submissive and voiceless. However, these religious meetings enabled women later to be involved in the public life and reform politics through charitable organizations. They aimed at combating the liquor trade; provide educational opportunities for children and more. Consequently, churches alongside with the charitable groups had a positive effect on women's self-reliance and independence, in the sense that they learnt how to operate meetings and speak up their minds publically. African American women also in 1790s founded such societies to raise money and provide help for its members. The main issues they tackled were the temperance and the missionary missions (5-6).

2.1.2. The Road of the Suffrage Movement

The first call in the American history for preserving women's rights dates back to a letter in 1776, by Abigail Adams, the wife of the American president John Adams. Following reading a draft version of the constitution, Abigail expressed to her husband that:

desire you would remember the ladies, and do not put such unlimited power into the hands of husbands, remember all men would be tyrants if

they could, if particularly care and attention is not paid to the ladies we are determined to foment a rebellion, and will not hold ourselves bound by any Laws in which we have no voice, or representation. (Adams 6)

As a response to the phrase included in the Constitution, “all men were created equal”, Abigail Adams hoped that privileges and liberties mentioned in this document should be valid to women as well (6). Hence, she pleaded the president to allow American women to take part in the new government and to give them more powers to select people who would run it (4). Moreover, she cautioned against the dominance of men over making decisions in the government. The letter had no effect on the flow of events related to the situation of women in America at that time, yet, she optimistically believed that women in the future will together make history and adjust their rights and freedoms (6).

Adams’ belief seemed more practical in the early 1800s. Men alongside with women adopted the issue of slavery through political activism (Adams 6, Dubois 19). Thus, the quest to end slavery paved the way to speak out about women’s rights and freedoms in U.S. (DuBois 19). The first woman delivered speeches publically was Angelina Grimké. She and her sister Sarah Grimké devoted initially their efforts towards slavery issues (Frost-Knappman and Cullen-DuPont 22). Angelina made a historical address in front of Massachusetts state legislature in 1838 about the slavery case. At that time, women were forbidden to speak publically in churches. Frances Wright gave a lecture in 1828, but she was mocked by the public. Also, Mrs. Maria W. Stewart, an African American teacher, had the opportunity to speak only four times in front of Bostonian public about slavery and education of women (22-24).

The struggle to end slavery agitated riots and violence in different regions in the nation during the years of 1834 to 1836. Therefore, the Grimkés were attacked for their efforts and the anti-slavery attitudes they adopted as female characters. Sarah responded by writing series

of letters that requested to end the segregation against women, among them, providing them with educational opportunities and equal salaries. Moreover, she clarified that the Bible has been misinterpreted for the sake of dominating women, and that it did not ask women to act passive and submissive since they were endowed with freedoms and rights (22-23).

Yet, such position towards women's issues was faced by disagreement (23). Their opponents claimed that women had no right to speak publically, or to argue men who are born superior to women since this opposes the women's sphere. Hence, Angelina replied that there is no such "women's sphere", women have the right to speak their minds in public, as well as having a hand in making all decisions. Since these moments, the debate over the rights and freedoms of women took a different path through the 1800s (24).

Consequently, joining the antislavery movements constituted as a platform where the feminists articulated their claims about women's rights. The movement stems from firstly, the awareness of American women to their subordinate status, and secondly, from their participation in the antislavery movement (DuBois 22). Inspired by the latter, the pioneers of women's rights movement crystallized their quest in demanding sexual parity and freedom; also, they opted for widely disseminating their ideology to pave the road for one of the most radical legal pleas that is, the right to vote.

The status of women has improved in the sense that they are taking vibrant actions in the public affairs. In 1836, Ernestine L. Rose started to deliver speeches about women's rights. That same year, New York state legislature proposed a bill to authorize married women property rights (Frost-Knappman and Cullen-DuPont 24). Also the state held the Women National Anti-Slavery Convention. The involvement of women in the movement to end slavery taught them to manage and ran public gatherings and collect petitions. Moreover, their numbers have been increased since holding a membership in an abolitionist society was their sole hope to participate in the political field and looking for change (25).

Educational opportunities have been broadened to American women. In 1833, Oberlin College was the first American college that accepted the enrolment of both sexes. Later, in 1837, Mount Holyoke Female Seminary that is founded by Mary Lyon was the first American college for women that provide higher education. She had to take trips through New England to raise money for funding the seminary. Similarly, another pioneer in expanding the educational opportunities was Catherine Beecher who headed the Hartford Female Seminary from 1823 to 1827 (25). She argued that women ought to be educated; instead of working plenty hours in inappropriate mills and with unfair wages (26).

2.1.3. The Political Struggle from 1848 to 1920

The Seneca Falls Convention in 1848 is the foremost circle in the chain of the women's rights movement (DuBois23). It was prepared by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott as the first convention in the world's history about women's rights (Tetrault 2). The convention was attended by thirty-two men and sixty-eight women, in which third of them signed the document that stated the demands of women known as the "Declaration of Sentiments" (McConnaughy 1). The document was prepared by Stanton and patterned after the Declaration of Independence and claimed that: "We hold these truths to be self evident: that all men and women were created equal..." (McConnaughy 1). This decision signifies that the convention bases its legitimacy from the American Revolution. On the other hand, it entails that men's despotism is in charge of women's accusation (DuBois 23).

Supported by the abolitionist Frederick Douglas, the Declaration forthrightly advocated grievances and rights of women and among them achieving the right of franchise (McConnaughy 1). The government did not respond to the convention's demands fast, it took seventy years to attain the vital right of enfranchisement. The primary hindrance for women was patriarchy (McKeever and Davies 70). Yet, some women actually were opposing the demand of voting for women justifying their cause as "women's nature" that did not match

with voting. In the convention, the demand of voting was the only one that made a controversy and was not passed unanimously (70).

By the year of 1851, Stanton met Susan B. Anthony and they forged a life time friendship (Tetrault 6). Afterward, they lobbied the Congress to incorporate the right of suffrage in the provisions of the 14th and 15th Amendments (The Women's Rights Movement). By the year of 1869, Stanton and Anthony established the National Women Suffrage Association (NWSA) that focused its struggle at the federal level, in an attempt to modify the Fifteenth Amendment that excluded women. Meanwhile, Lucy Stone, an abolitionist activist created the American Women Suffrage Association (AWSA), which directed its efforts to state level (The Women's Rights Movement). In 1887, a constitutional amendment was proposed to the congress to grant the voting right to women (Tetrault 2).

During 1890, the two factions integrated to create the National American Women Suffrage Association (NAWSA). Accordingly, their efforts later were devoted to state level, attempting to persuade individual states to grant women the voting right. Wyoming is the first American state to admit women's enfranchisement in 1869, to be followed by Colorado 1893, in addition to Utah and Idaho in 1896. Successively, further states from 1910 to 1914 granted women the right to vote. Until 1917, President Wilson called the Congress to approve the franchise amendment. Consequently, the seventy years battle was crowned by the Nineteenth Constitutional Amendment in August, 18, 1920, that states: "The right of the citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any States on account of sex" (Tetrault 2, the Constitution of the United States Article XIX).

Their gain of the voting right did not change that much. The notion of "separate spheres" still an ongoing idea that occupies the American social and cultural ideology. Women have reached political parity, yet, still severely underrepresented socially and economically (McKeever and Davies 71). They still constitute a rare minority in the high rank political

offices during the 20th century. At the federal level mainly, no women has been chosen for the office of president or vice president (81).

2.2. Importance of Women's Presence in the Political Arena

Tackling the issue of women's representation in the elected offices of the government, women can be either represented descriptively or substantively (Bos and O'Loughlin 5). The descriptive one refers to the relative percentage of women in the political branches in relation to their population. Whereas the substantive representation demands that the concerns of women as a group are introduced to the government. It is believed that even male representation can work for women's issues without the presence of women themselves. Yet, Mansbridge demonstrated that the better women are descriptively represented, the better their matters are raised to the authorities (qtd. in Bos and O'Luoghlin 5).

Though American women constitute more than 50 percent of population, they are severely underrepresented in the American politics (Pyeatt and Yanus 2). Researchers claimed that women's enduring political underrepresentation threatens the American democracy (2). It raises serious worries about the democratic legality (Lawless and Fox 2). Further, the more women are present in politics, the more their concerns and experiences are discussed in policy deliberations (2). Specifically, at the legislative level; studies pointed out that the gender of the legislator influences the policy making process priorities (Markham 7). Women lawmakers set issues of importance to women at the top of their agendas, including; gender equity, social and family concerns (Pyeatt and Yanus 2, Markham 7). They tend, furthermore, to look after the underrepresented and minority groups' issues and provide them with assistance (Markham 7).

Additionally, when women act as committees' chairs, they use the consensus by allowing each individual to express his mind in the political operation (Pyeatt and Yanus 2). Thus, they are considered to be more cooperative and collaborative leaders than the male leaders (2). In

this respect, Markham stated that women legislators embrace democratic principles and perform on the basis of less hierarchical order when solving conflicts. Moreover, they are considered to be more law-abiding and dependable than the male counterparts (8).

Women as candidates play a major role in turning out the votes of female voters. When a woman participates in an electoral race, women as voters are more likely to participate in the electoral event, and cast their ballots in higher rates. In this sense, women voters feel that their voices can be heard and they can make changes in the political sphere, besides; the new government is more representative to their concerns (3). The presence of women as candidates implies that the political arena is no further a male bastion (Dolan 43). Consequently, other women will notice that female representation does matter, henceforth; they will be encouraged to run for an office one day (43). Also, having women politicians function as role models which accordingly encourages young women to take a part in politics (Bell 3).

2.3. Women in Elective Offices

Based on data from U.S. Department of Education, women attain university degrees more than men do. During the years of 2012 and 2013, women gained, in comparison to men, higher numbers of both bachelor's and master's degrees, besides, more doctoral grades (Barriers and Bias 16). Such rates entail that women are educationally well-qualified to hold leadership offices that are exclusively confined to men (16).

Tracing the political history of American women, they have held different posts in the political field since the Nineteenth Amendment to the constitution, though they were tokens. According to Washington Week, from Victoria Woodhull in 1872 as the first American woman to run for the office of president in the Equal Rights Party, to Hillary Clinton in 2016 who ran as a democrat presidential candidate and received more than 16 million votes in the nomination primaries. Jeanette Rankin in 1916 was the first elected women in Congress,

Shirley Chisholm as the first elected representative in 1968 African American woman, Carol Moseley Brown as the first elected senator in 1992, to Nancy Pelosi as the first woman to serve as Speaker of the House from 2007 to 2011 and the most powerful American woman. To name a few, women have made important stride to the world of politics (A Brief History of Women).

Data from the Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP) for 2017, at the federal level, shows women holding 104 seats in the 115th U.S. Congress, which means 19.4 percent of the 523 seats. They occupy 21 seats in the Senate that is 21 percent of 100 seats, and 83 seats in the House of Representatives, which is 19.1 percent of the 435 seats. Of these 104 women members of the Congress; 38 are women of color, in which 18 are African American, 10 Latinas, 9 are Asian American / Pacific Islands and one is multiracial delegate for Washington D.C., Puerto Rico, American Samoa and the Virgin Islands. To note that among the current number of women serving in Congress, 78 are Democrats and 26 are Republicans. According to Geiger and Gramlich, the House has witnessed gradual and stable increase in the number of women legislators since 1920s, however; the Senate had only two women till 1993, when the 103th Congress was held (Current Numbers, Women in Elective offices 2017).

These figures as provided by CAWP reveal that at the state level, 75 women serve in statewide elective executive offices, which stand for 24.0 percent of the 312 seats. Of these seats, 7 seats or 9.3 percent are held by women of color. In addition, 32 women are Democrats, 42 are Republicans and one is non-partisan. To specify the numbers, women hold 18 seats as Governors and 57 seats in other elective offices such as Attorney General, Secretary of State and State Treasurer (Current Numbers).

Moreover, women constitute 24.9 percent from the 7,383 state legislature seats, which accompany 1,840 seats. They occupy 442 or 22.4 percent of the 1,972 state senate seats, and 25.8 percent of 5,411 house state seats, or 1,398 seats. Further, women of color serve in

437 seats, which accounts for 5.9 percent of the total 7,383 seats. Amongst these seats, women Democrats hold 1112 seats, while women Republicans occupy 706, and 14 seats are held by non-partisan women (Current Numbers).

At the local level, 20 of the largest U.S. states have a women mayor. The U.S Conference of Mayors stated that women comprise 58 seats or 20.4 percent of the 284 mayors of the largest cities with populations of 100,000 and more. While they hold 292 women mayor or 20.7 percent of 1,408 of the cities with populations of 30,000 and over. Among these current numbers of women mayor in office, 8 are women of color; 5 are African America, one is Latina and two are Asian Pacific Islanders (Current Numbers, Women Mayor).

Table 1: Percentages of Women in Elective Office

Source: “Women in Elective Office 2017,” *CAWP*.

Year	U.S. Congress	Statewide Elective	State Legislatures	Year	U.S. Congress	Statewide Elective	State Legislatures
1971	3%	7%	N/A	1997	11.0%	25.4%	21.6%
1973	3%	8%	N/A	1999	12.1%	27.6%	22.4%
1975	4%	10%	8%	2001	13.6%	27.6%	22.4%
1977	4%	10%	9%	2003	13.6%	26.0%	22.4%
1979	3%	11%	10%	2005	15.0%	25.7%	22.4%
1981	4%	11%	12%	2007	16.1%	24.1%	23.5%

1983	4%	11%	13%	2009	16.8%	22.6%	24.3%
1985	5%	14%	15%	2011	16.8%	22.1%	23.7%
1987	5%	14%	16%	2012	16.8%	23.4%	23.7%
1989	5%	14%	16%	2013	18.5%	23.0%	24.2%
1991	6%	18%	18%	2014	18.7%	22.6%	24.3%
1993	10.1%	22.2%	20.5%	2015	19.4%	24.7%	24.6%
1995	10.3%	25.9%	20.6%	2016	19.6%	24.0%	24.5%
				2017	19.4%	23.7%	24.9%

2.4. Women Representation in Politics

In her article entitled “Women and Politics- the Glass Ceiling”, Zamfirache stated that the few scholars, who investigated areas related to women and politics, declared that women had secondary roles in positions related to power and prestige (176). She further added that, since positions of power are masculine; the glass ceiling made it hard for women to gain access to such positions as men did (176). Elstain highlighted that the stereotypes and male as well as female’s personal perceptions of their roles in the society make it harder to overcome the social boundaries (qtd.in173).

He further demonstrated that men are traditionally assigned to the public sphere –politics and economy-, while women are associated to home and family, the private sphere (qtd. in Jalalzai and Krook 6). The public-private divide was used against women to grant them the voting right, yet; till contemporary era, it displays itself as an argument against women politicians (Jalalzai and Krook 6). Although women have made incremental inroads in the political participation, they still severely underrepresented from the lowest ranks to the highest ones in the government (Okimoto and Brescoll 923, Los Angeles Times).Further, women who hold political seats through quota policies are considered to be a “second-rate politicians”. Consequently, women’s role as politicians sounds a superficial one with no influential impact on the public (Zamfirache182).

2.3.1. Women’s Low Self-Regard and Lack of Political Ambition

Lawless and Fox attempted to investigate reasons behind the consistent underrepresentation of women in elective public office. They stated that women candidates have equal chances to win the race as men. There is no such gender discrimination that blocks their road when they run for an office. Women achieve similar vote rates and fundraising as their male counterparts. Rather, they argued, due to the effect of the gender gap in political ambition; women just do not run for an elective office. Thus, they conducted a study in 2001 and 2011 to confirm their argument. They interviewed and e-mailed thousands of female and male who are well-fitted to be potential candidates such as lawyers, educators and political activists (2-3).

The results revealed that men and women are not equally motivated to run for an office, rather, they are less interested in the idea of future running for an office. The 2001 survey showed that 51 percent of the respondents have thought of running for a public office. However, male respondents were more 16 percentage points that female to run for an office. After a decade, in 2011; women still less than men were to think of running for a candidacy

though the American political landscape has changed. In fact, the upshots indicated a decrease in women's interest for holding an elective office from 18 percent in 2001 to 14 percent in 2011 (3-4).

Moreover, women are less likely than men to take steps to enlarge their understanding of how to precede a candidacy (5). Finally, the surveys uncovered that women are interested more in running for local offices such as school board. While men, are more likely than women interested in holding a seat in the state legislature, and even more keen to run for a federal level position. Accordingly, they identified seven factors that cripple gender equality when running for a public office in the United States (6), that is to say, hurdles to women's interest in running for an elective office (1).

They have identified seven factors that cripple the gender equality in U.S. elective offices. At the outset, women tend to see the electoral landscape as highly competitive and that the system is biased against them (6). This is partially due to Hillary Clinton's and Sara Palin's candidacies in 2008, in which they shed the light on the importance of their candidacies to all women and the amount of sexism they faced (7-8). Moreover, there is a gender gap in self-perception. Women perceive themselves as less likely to be competent and skilled to run for the office (9). Thus, they are less self-assured and reluctant to take risks than men (10). Further, they have a negative image on the current electoral campaigns such as losing their privacy (11). In addition, women are less than men to be recruited by parties and encouraged to run for an office (12). Last but not least, women are still in charge for the family and children care, that is to say, women are still conforming to their traditional gender roles, which leaves a little space for work outside home (13-14).

2.3.2. Gender Stereotypes

Men and women in politics were looked at through the lens of stereotypes constructed by the public (Dolan 12). Yet, there is no evident proof that stereotypes affect the voters'

choices, it can only direct them to evaluate a candidate (Bos and O'Loughlin 7). Amongst the stereotypes that shape the views about female politicians and candidates that women are more liberal than men (Dolan 12). Studies have reinforced this belief, and confirmed that voters perceive female candidates as more liberal than their male counterparts. Nevertheless, Koch conducted a study to explore the truthfulness of such claim. He revealed that women candidates of both the Democratic and the Republican parties not only are identified as more liberal than men candidates, but; their tendency to liberalism is much more amplified by the voters than it is in reality. He further stated that, these erroneous claims about female candidate have unconstructive effects at the polls. Bearing in mind that voters regard themselves as moderate, thus; the overt liberalism may diminish the votes that these women can receive (12-13).

A different array of stereotypes that is held by voters towards female candidates is related to the character qualities. Women are generally conceived to be as sympathetic, caring and more, whereas men are said to be, strong, aggressive and severe (13). Leeper and Sapiro stated that female candidates are judged on the basis face of these stereotypes when they seek an elective office; even if their tone is masculine (qtd.in Dolan 13). Since leadership is believed to be a masculine heritage as Hyde held (Barriers and Bias 5), the public assesses the good politician in relation to the masculine traits (Dolan 13).

Similarly, voters do associate female candidates to a certain sort of issues they tackle, labeled as compassion issues such health care, family and childhood concerns, environment and more. In contradiction, men would be related to affairs such as economy and business, defense and crime. Thus, voters who are concerned with economic matters, for example, may make use of these policy disparities negatively against female candidates and discard them as not fitting the political office. However, in few times, some stereotypes can work in favor of women. They are mostly seen as well as and trustful and adept besides the fact that they are

alien in relation to politics. Thus, women candidates can benefit from these particularities, chiefly in times of voters' frustration with the current government. Dolan clarified that the year of 1992 noticed high numbers of voters who lined with women in the polls during the Congressional election (14-15).

One more thing is that, regardless of sex stereotypes that are attached to women candidates, their image can also be assessed by the lens of the political party they belong to. Consequently, the candidates' attitudes and beliefs can be neglected in front of the party image. Among the overlapped stereotypes related to sex and political party is that Republicans and men are perceived as better for the military and economic concerns, while Democrats and women are seen as well fitting for the social matters. Yet, in an analysis that investigated how often people mention the stereotypical masculine and feminine concerns when they assess candidates. The results uncovered that the respondents referred to feminine issues when they evaluated the Democratic women candidates more than they did with the male candidate. Dolan demonstrated that, with the Republican Party, respondents were likely to cite the feminine matters regardless of the sex, when assessing the party's candidates (15-16).

To conclude, women candidates are often subjected to sex stereotypes when people assess their beliefs more than they do with male candidates (16). Fox and Lawless revealed that stereotypes worked against women candidates in post 9/11 because they were seen as less capable to make laws related to military concerns and secure the country (Bos and O'Loughlin 8). This reality is due to fact that women as candidates are still conceived as atypical (Dolan 16). Consequently, this distorted image in most cases may affect them at the polls. To mention at last that minority women candidates are not only subjected to sex stereotypes, but also to racial stereotypes. Thus, the public will double evaluate them (16).

2.3.3. Electoral Campaigns

Flowing from gender stereotypes to electoral campaigns, women candidates have to make choices about the image and the message that the public will capture about them through their campaign. Such decisions will work as pro-gender stereotypes that are already perceived about women, or against, that is to say, they either will emphasize those stereotypes by adopting a woman style, traits and more feminine issues as the core of the campaign, or they defy that image and present a counter one by focusing more on masculine issues and adopt their leadership style (18). Accordingly, the image that women candidate will construct about themselves during the campaign can positively or negatively work for them depending on the conditions at that electoral environment (21).

2.3.4. Biased Media Coverage

To disseminate their political agenda, male and female candidates take benefit of media. Yet, the amount of media coverage given to women candidate differs of the one given to men candidates (Dolan 24). Studies stated that male candidates who run for statewide positions receive more media coverage than their female counterparts. Even more, researchers revealed that the attention that is given to female candidates is most of the time attempts to garble the substance of the message that the candidate wants to convey (25). Moreover, media tends to focus on the stereotypes associated to women candidates and their interests in the feminine concerns. Accordingly, women's perpetuation by the media can negatively affect the public opinion (24-25).

Few studies pointed out that since 1990s, female candidates received similar and positive tone attention from the media as the male candidates (25). However, Gelber stated that women are still stereotyped by media. One example of this is that Hillary Clinton and Sara Palin who were subjected to sexism during their campaign in 2008. They were a target of rude and vulgar slogans in the internet. Palin who was first welcomed as the well-chosen mate for

John McCain, was later made fun of her by Tina Fey on Saturday Night Live, and was insulted by David Letterman (9).

Moreover, Elizabeth Dole was evaluated by media based on her gender, and look, in contradiction to men. Ultimately, this negative coverage damaged her image at the polls (Dolan 26). On the same point, Wicks and Lang-Dion clarified that female politicians are over and over assessed by their voice tone, how they dress and appearance generally, and totally neglecting their political qualifications and sharpness (34). During the 2008 nomination race between Obama and Clinton, A Fox News commentator claimed that Clinton can lose male votes because of her strident voice. Additionally, an article of the Canadian Globe and Mail criticized Clinton and the way she wears her clothes.

2.3.5. Political Parties

The American electoral system frames many facets of male and female's candidacy since it is a gendered one. The power of incumbency backs those who are already occupying the office. Consequently, women candidates have to fight for the office through open seat races since all those in the office are men. Women candidates are equally successful to men when they run their candidacies for open seat races. Even more, they are likely to win the race as. Yet, researchers claim that the discrepancy in male and female's success is due partially the party they run with, or the paucity of fundraising they receive unlike their male counterparts (Dolan 28-29).

Further, it is observed that the Democrats tend to allow more women to run for primaries and they succeed unlike the Republicans. Thus, Bratton's investigation confirmed the relation between women and the major parties; also, she found that whenever the number of women who are running in the primaries goes up, their portion of votes decreases (Dolan 29). Similarly, Niven and Sanbonmatsu suggested that female candidates face difficulties to be recruited or nominated by the party leaders (qtd.in dolan 30). In relation to campaign

financing, studies indicated that since the 1970s, women candidates have received equal fundraising to male candidates. Yet, Green found that women incumbents' vote share is affected by campaign costs unlike that of men. She further explained that, such results entail that, women candidates should be supported by more resources to attain similar results to men who have more resources (31-32).

Alongside with the disparities in parties' representation of women candidates, their representation also is associated to the geographical map. Women candidates have better chances to be chosen in regions that are more democratic, wealthier and urban far of the South (32). To strengthen this point, Palmer and Simon presented the notion of "women friendly district", in which women are more likely to guarantee a seat in Congress (205). What distinguishes these districts is that they are ethnically and racially diverse, besides, the educational and income measures are higher than the national average (Dolan 32).

Women candidates are less likely to be chosen in states that still maintain the traditional political cultures. The latter frames the sort of office that women can seek to occupy. Women in the South often do not run for or win offices that are seen as masculine. Moreover, once a pattern of selecting women candidates in a specific state or district for a period of time, it becomes easier for the new female candidates to win at that area because it became more open to the idea of a women candidate (Dolan 32-33).

2.3.6. Male Entrenchment

Besley, Folke, Persson and Rickne developed a theoretical model that tries to explain a disadvantage to women's political descriptive and even substantive representation (Folke and Rickne Female 8). It stated that the entrenched male elites work intentionally to restrict the representation of the female newcomers. Their main motive is to maintain their own access to political offices, which simultaneously upholds their impact over the policy. The party leader, who can be considered as elite, is in charge for preparing the party list (9). He tends to select

candidates that would support his re-election in the internal election. Based on the idea that candidates do back the leader of his same sex, the party leader is likely to fill the list with male candidates (9).

The voters in this model are considered to be a restraint to the party elite, in the sense that, the swing voters who do not show an evident association to any party and perceive everything else as equal, may opt for selecting a representative from their own gender. Consequently, the party leader diversifies the party list by selecting both female and male candidates to secure the swing votes and win the election. Thus, the more the electoral atmosphere is competitive, the more gender equality is achieved to please and capture the swing voters (9). Yet, the desire of the party elite to surround himself with members of his own sex, whom are likely to vote for his re-election stands as a constraint against women's equal representation in the parties (9). Moreover, the party elites work towards preserving the power by restraining and even excluding women from elected seats (10).

2.4. Women in the Oval Office

Women have not stepped yet the door of the Oval Office. Thus, works in this area investigated the reason behind lacking a women president. During her first battle against Barack Obama to win the Democratic presidential nomination, Hillary Clinton has shattered the political glass ceiling while seeking the presidential nomination, claimed the CBS News poll 2008. According to the poll that questioned 789 adults nationwide, 712 among them are registered voters, U.S. is ready for a woman president, declared 60 percent of the respondents. Moreover, 46 percent of voters believed that women candidates encounter more hurdles in their campaign than the African Americans. Due to her gender, 68 percent of voters think that media treated Clinton ruthlessly (3).

Other research emphasized that the presidential office is highly gendered. Due to the control and command mechanisms, women are less likely to have an access to this position.

Duerst-Lahti and Kelly pointed out to the role of the language used in public discourses that highlights the typical gendered masculine presidency (qtd.in Bos and O'Loughlin 14).

Furthermore, women presidential candidates are confronted with the interests of the party, that is to say, if the party leaders are interested in a masculine figure, they are less likely to nominate a more feminine woman for the race (14).

Dittmar stated that the highest executive office of the nation is the most masculine one (807). Thus, both male and female presidential candidates like presidents are supposed to match with the expected standards of being enough masculine for the office, via utterances and deeds. She also considered that the American presidential election is too far from the perceived gender neutral. The gendered treatment prevails over the presidential electoral climate through media coverage, the discriminated views of the rivals and the voters. Though polls revealed that Americans are ready for a woman president, the actual treatment of female candidates demonstrates that bias for men as leaders still valid. They are evaluated on the basis of their appearance, which may impact the voters' perceptions and diverge away their focus from the contender's weightiness and competency as a future leader (807-808).

Accordingly, Hillary Clinton declared in the concession speech that: "I know we have still not shattered that highest and hardest glass ceiling, but someday, someone will and hopefully sooner than we might think now" (Hillary Clinton's Concession Speech). However, as the Los Angeles Times editorial board stated that having a woman as presidential candidate for a major party is itself a major gain in the American political history. She is a well-qualified politician due to her several decades experience in public service. Clinton herself declared that by gaining the Democratic presidential nomination, she has already made the biggest cracks in the glass ceiling.

Chapter Three: Failure of the Nation of “E Pluribus Unum” in Fair Representation for its Racial and Ethnic Minorities

Since its discovery, the northern part of the New Found land was populated by a variety of settled races, ethnicities and nationalities from all over the world. In an endeavor to coexist and assimilate, they composed what is known now as the United States of America. It is considered as the largest melting pot that gathered wide tide of immigrants who fled from their home lands due to a number of reasons. However, not all of them had equal status, in the sense that, some groups were dominant, while others were inferior. Accordingly, the Anglo-whites Europeans excluded the Native Americans, African Americans, Latinos and Asian Americans in U.S. by enacting laws that deny them the citizenship right, voting right and stemming their floods of immigration.

Centuries later, and largely during the 20th century, these marginalized groups gained access to economic and political institutions, improving their social circumstances. They made substantial inroads to the political arena, in which they held influential public offices. Yet their aggregate representation does not match with their respective population. Bearing in mind that fair equitable representation is of tremendous importance for sustaining the democratic values that the nation cherishes. Ranging from racial stereotypes to biased fundraisings, which found the phenomenon of the glass ceiling, the racial and ethnic minorities are halted from sufficient representation and obtaining influential positions that would make change in their lives in the land of immigrants. Yet, Obama’s 2008 election as the first president from African American ancestry meant to change a lot. The reality in U.S. implies that not much had altered since then.

3.1. The Largest Democratic Melting Pot in the World

According to McKeever and Davis, the United States of America is the land of immigration. This is better epitomized by its Great Seal. It is composed of the national bird,

the eagle, grasping with its talons the branch of olive of peace, and the arrows of war. The eagle holds in its beak a scroll engraved with the words “E pluribus Unum”, which stands for “one out of many”. At first, this emblem referred to the unification of the thirteen states and their people into one state. Two centuries later, it is thought to be a metaphor that draws the image of the United States populations, with its diverse racial and ethnic composition under one nation. Though Americans are mostly pleased by the racial and ethnic diversity of their home, not each group had equal chances and tolerance to develop within the country (86).

3.1.1. The Influx of Immigrants in the New World

The United States of America is a melting pot manufactured through its rich history of immigration (Bailey 25). In his speech in 1938 to the Daughters of the American Revolution, Franklin D. Roosevelt stated that: “Remember, remember always that all of us, and you and I especially, are descended from immigrants.”(qtd. in Walch ix). America has been a nation of immigrants since 1565, the date of the establishment of the first European settlement at St. Augustine in Florida. Also, the founding fathers meant for the young America to be a shelter for anyone who is looking for freedom far from despotism and looking for the equality of chances.

A flood of migrants from all over the world have been poured to America after the first expeditions led by Europeans (Bailey 25). The first census in 1790 demonstrated that about 5 million American residents are foreign-born. From 1820 and 1975, 47 million immigrants arrived to United States. By the 21st century, immigration rates have heightened, in the sense that, in 2005, 12 per cent of the U.S. populations are foreign-born. The native-born Americans encouraged these new settlers to adopt the American manners (Walch x).

But before this, the first inhabitants of the American soil were the Native Americans (Bailey 26). Statistics approximated that about 10 million Natives were living in the land by the coming of the first European settlers. Nevertheless, their invasion to the land led to a

severe decrease in their numbers, due to partially the diseases brought by new comers.

Smallpox and measles were amongst the illnesses that the indigenous people had no immunity against. Moreover, their lands were raped by the European colonists. Ultimately, the 1890 census has estimated only about 325,464 Native American are left, and compelled to leave to reservations in the American West.

Moreover, the English settlers are considered to be the earliest residents of the new land during the colonial era. Another group of European settlers in the New World is the Spanish. They reached America 70 years before the English coming, in 1513. By 1699, they were numbered over 400,000 Spanish residents in America (28). French population also took its share from the early waves of immigration to the New World. By the year of 1775, 70,000 French colonists came to American, settling in areas such as Louisiana and Mississippi Valley. Moreover, by the same year, more than 150,000 German have arrived to America. Another group that made inroads to America is the Scots-Irish. By the year of 1790, 320,000 Scots-Irish migrated to U.S., settled in Boston initially, and moved later to areas like New Hampshire and Pennsylvania. Additionally, as part of a major transatlantic slavery trade, about 13 million Africans were captured and brought to U.S, composing the largest group of immigrants during the early centuries of the migration (Wright 7, Bailey 29). Between 1619 and 1808, 475,000 Africans were migrated by force (Wright 7).

During the Revolutionary War from 1775 to 1783, the numbers of immigrants to U.S. have declined (Bailey 29). The post- Independence War witnessed a noticeable increase.

Irreversible tide of immigrants poured to the U.S. Italians, Austrian-Hungarians, Polish, Greek and Russians came in 1890 with large numbers, also the Chinese to work in gold mines. While Koreans and the Japanese worked in the rice and sugar fields (30-31). Between the years of 1911 and 1929, one million Mexican fled the Mexican Revolution, and they immigrated to United States as refugees to stand-in the workers who joined the military

service. More than two million Jews have arrived to the American shores, coming from Russia, Poland and other regions around the world as religion refugees. Just after the end of the World War, immigration took a different path by rising ever since (31-32).

3.1.2. Issues Related to Immigration

Arnold highlighted the fact that United States as democracy is well perceived for its equal treatment of its citizens (xxi). Consequently, immigrants are said to be outsiders that should be treated differently. Moreover, America, the land of immigrants, is an idea that fits only America during the British colonial era, claimed Graham Jr. (3). He further added that America is the land of the native-born populations; yet, immigration is a mark in the American history. It is always connected to benefits for the hosting state and the immigrants. Yet, historians have praised immigration as a positive issue. The indigenous inhabitants of the New Found land do not share this point with them. The European immigration to their soil meant to them death and termination.

Once these European immigrants become Americans by birth, their views about others' immigration to their land were cautious. The main reason to welcome immigrants was to extend the American population. The Founding Fathers had some reservations about the issue of immigration, though they exhibited the welcoming face. George Washington declared that the nation is open for all immigrants from all over the world, however; he also stated that the waves of immigration are welcomed to meet certain purposes. Moreover, Jefferson encouraged immigration to raise the population of Virginia, though he had some fears about the difficulty of those immigrants to adapt to the customs and the institutions of America. His rival, Hamilton, agreed with him on this point. He stated that foreign immigration would damage the American spirit. Accordingly, the sentiments of anti-immigration were present all the time, though in some instances, immigration was welcomed and only for specific portions

of the society, as Madison clarified, “foreigners of merit” but not the “common class of vagrants” (4-5).

Between 1820 and 1850, America witnessed a booming in the rates of immigrants, with whom problems of racism, discrimination and nativism appeared (Bailey 42). Thus the anti-immigration sentiments grew day after day; Americans worried that immigration is changing the white face of their land (Jaret 24). The new immigrants that come from Mexico, Asia, Southern and Eastern Europe as opposed to the old white immigrants that descend from Northern and Western Europe are racially different and cannot easily assimilate with the new environment. Thus they were perceived as inferior and less desirable to be in America, and it is better to be excluded. Accordingly, governmental regulations opted to diminish and restrict the numbers of the foreign comers (23-24).

Amongst the laws that were passed, The United States passed Naturalization Act of 1790 (Bailey 51). It stated that the naturalized citizens must be U.S. free white residents for at least two years, and one year in the resided state. Through time, the term of residence to acquire citizenship was extended to 14 years of residency. Moreover, the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798 granted the president the authority to deport any foreigner who is suspected to be danger for the nation, and to condemn any forged spoken or written material about the president and the Congress (51). The 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act, prohibited immigrants from Chinese descents to arrive to U.S. for a period of 10 years (42-52). Additionally, in 1921, the U.S. government executed the law of quotas that determine the allowed numbers of immigrants from each state to enter the land, though it encouraged the illegal immigration. During the 1930s, the years of the Great Depression, the government deported about one-half of the Mexican immigrants, and it urged the Filipinos to go back their home land and never come back (42-43). The Congress passed the Immigration Act of 1882, which calls for controlling

influx of immigration to U.S. and to taxation estimated by 5 cents for every immigrant arrives to the land (52).

3.1.3 The Inclusion of Racial and Ethnic Minorities

Racism has always sculpted the American chronicle. The ethnic and racial minorities have suffered consistent racial inequalities and segregation leading to denial of certain rights amongst slavery issues, holding no citizenship and they were forbidden from the right of vote. Though slavery was ended during the Civil War, discrimination's strands restrained ethnic and racial minorities and mainly blacks.

The American stances about race and racial matters affect deeply the democratic values of the nation (Cottam et al. 221). To highlight, the principals of racial equality have been adopted since 1950s to redress the equilibrium. Yet, the actual living socioeconomic scales indicate that Blacks from one side and white from the other side are still unequal in terms of available resources and influence. Further, whites are still making more money than blacks of the same educational grade. However, the traces of past prejudice are still present. Peffley and Hurwitz conducted a study, which revealed that there is still a segment of white population who perceive Blacks as indolent, less motivated for success, aggressive and less disciplined (221-222).

Consequently, the Fourteenth Amendment was proposed and ratified in 1868, and it states: "all persons born in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside" (The Constitution of the United States Article XIV Section 1 16). It granted the citizenship to all born persons in the U.S. Whereas, the Fifteenth Amendment was ratified in 1870 and declared that: "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any states on the account of race, color or previous condition of servitude" (The Constitution of the United States Article XV Section 1 18). This amendment was an explicit statement of the secured

right of vote to all American citizens who were deprived due to race and color or slavery issue.

3.2. Importance of Racial and Ethnic Minorities Representation

Tate and Harsh demonstrated that the Founding Fathers emphasized that the American government is better to be descriptively represented (216). Madison stated in the Federalist No. 10 in 1787 that the representative government is the favored tool to ensure the protection of the rights of political minorities- racial and ethnic minorities- from the despotism of majority (Hero and Telbert172). In addition, John Adams visualized the Congress as a portrayal of the American people. Yet, the actual descriptive representation does not mirror the demographical composition of the American population, in the sense that, women and ethnic minorities are underrepresented (216).

Moreover, according to Bird, appropriate participation of ethnic minorities in the political and public arena is required in liberal democracy. The point behind this is to ascertain that their concerns are incorporated and represented, which in turn can be executed by appointed officials that may compel citizens to their decisions. Nevertheless, the ignored fractions of a society from participating in the electoral events and logging on into elective offices, threatens their interests. Hence, the legitimacy of democratic representation and the policies enacted is questioned. Thus, minority inclusion in the political life is a means to an end (4).

In addition, minority members are empowered when they reach a considerable descriptive representation in the decision making institutions (Banducci, Donovan and Karp 194). This is due to the fact that minority citizens are likely to realize the benefits of voting. They conducted a study on the impact of African American elected officials as mayors of U.S. large cities. The results revealed that African American citizens are more engaged and participative in the public life (194). Consequently, significant rates of black voters' turnout are marked.

Moreover, the presence of minority representatives boosts the minority citizens' trust. A study revealed that the African Americans of New Orleans are more trusting than other African Americans throughout the nation, due to the presence of an African American mayor (195).

Tate and Harsh highlighted that marginalized groups must be descriptively represented in the legislative branches to make sure that their concerns are heard and will be taken into account (218). The empirical literature proved that African American legislators introduce to the Congress more diverse racial legislation contents, agendas and styles (219). They support mostly the racial concerns and affirmative action policies (Minta 5). Besides, they interfere most of the time during the congressional deliberations while decisions are being made for the benefits of minorities' advantages. Also, they press on the agency officials to carry out policies related to civil rights and also, they work on fostering solutions for racial class-based issues such as, bringing poverty to an end, and promoting health care services (Minta 5). Moreover, they are more attentive to tackle the issues related to blacks than are white legislators with the whites (219).

In addition, research showed that blacks in large cities with a black mayor are more engaging and politically active when they are represented by one like them (221). Minta argues that studies confirmed the significance of the race and the ethnicity of the legislator in presenting and advocating minorities' concerns. Moreover, minority descriptive representation offers massive substantive representation of their concerns and enhances the quality of their representation (4-5). African Americans unlike whites as local elected officials tend to pay more attention to the desegregation laws insides schools (Crowder-Meyer et al. 3). Moreover, the African Americans and Latinos substantially influence the public employment policies and educational rules related to minorities (4).

3.3. Numbers in Elective Offices

Drawing on data from the United States Census Bureau, the total American population in 2016, is estimated about 323,127,513 Americans. Whites alone constitute 77.1 per cent in 2015. Hispanics / Latinos are the largest ethnic group and they compose 17.9 per cent of the total U.S. population. Whites whom are not Hispanics or Latino are 61.6 per cent. Black or African Americans are 13.3 per cent of the nations' citizens. Moreover, Asians cover 5.6 per cent of the overall population. 1.2 percent citizens are American Indians and Alaska Natives, while Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islanders compose 0.2 per cent. Finally, two or more races embrace 2.6 per cent of the aggregate population (Population Estimates).

However, their percentage and numbers as representatives are as follows: at the national level, racial and ethnic minority members are accounted for 19 per cent of the current 115th Congress, in comparison to their population which accounts for 38 percent of the nation's total populace (Bialik and Krogstad). More detailed numbers, 34 out of 38 Hispanic elected members serve as representatives, while 4 members are senators (Marcos). For the African American, 49 elected members joined the 115th Congress, in which 46 serve in the House of Representatives, whereas, 3 serve in the Senate (Estrada). 15 Asian American officials will represent their racial group as 12 for the House of Representatives and 3 as senators. Meanwhile, 3 members are representatives for other racial and ethnic groups in which they make up 0.7 per cent of the Congress (Estrada).

Statistics indicate an increase in the numbers of minorities as lawmakers. In 1986, minority served as 6 per cent in Congress, representing 20 percent of nonwhites. By 2001, 31 percent of the nation's population are racial and ethnic minorities, and they represented only by 12 per cent of all the members in the Congress. Thus, the 115th Congress is hailed as the most racially and ethnically diverse one of all times. However, it still less representatives, in the sense that white members hold 81 per cent of the current seats, while their constitute 62 percent of America's population. Moreover, the ethnic and racial gap has enlarged between

the majority and the minorities in U.S., in which in 1984, 80 per cent of United States population are whites and they were represented by 94 per cent representatives (Bialik and Krogstad).

At the state level, recent data from the Center of the American Governor shows that only three racial and ethnic elected offices hold the office of governor. Two are Hispanics that are Suzana Martinez of NM and Brian Sandoval of NV: Nevada. David Ige is the sole Asian American governor for Hawaii, whereas, African Americans hold no office of governors (Center on the American Governor). Based on latest data from the New American Leader Project (NALP) 2014, Asians and Latinos hold only 377 state legislatures seats out of the 7383 seats, which stands for 5.1 per cent. Moreover, African Americans accounts for 8.1 per cent in relation to their total population in the country. Accordingly, the representative parity is not achieved yet (Reny and Bhojwani).

3.4. Barriers to Fair Representation

According to Carnes, racial and ethnic minorities are encountered with obstacles that seem to cripple their paths towards obtaining a public office and accordingly, a fair equal descriptive representation. This is the glass ceiling that blocks them is embodied through a bewildering array of barriers such as the racial stereotypes that impact on voters, unsupportive party and more (86).

3.4.1. Voters' Preferences

Slocum and Yeuh-Ting stated that in a biracial electoral race, the rates of a polarized racial and ethnic voting choice are likely to increase. White voters are most likely to select a white candidate, while minority voters tend to vote for a minority candidate. This can be exemplified through the Chicago mayoral race of 1983, between Harold Washington and Bernard Epton, also with the North Carolina Senate race of 1990 and 1996, between Jesse Helms and Harvey Gantt. Yet, this does not imply that voters may prefer candidates from a candidate of the

opposite group. In 1983, the black Harvey Gantt won the Charlotte, North Carolina mayoral race, and defeated her white rival by uniting massive black votes with considerable white votes creating a biracial voting alliance (82-83).

To note that most studied cases contain a white candidate against a black one. In rare cases, Latinos, Asian Americans and Native Americans who won elective offices are due to the fact that they descend from majority-minority districts. Moreover, a massive minority voters' mobilization is needed to secure enough votes for a minority contender. In the same vein, it is said that recently when a minority candidate loses the race, it is due other reason but not his race. The loss of Tony Sanchez, a Latino candidate for the office of governor of Texas, was attached to the fact that Texas whites do not favor the Republicans. Thus, he was defeated and race was not amongst the reason (83).

Accordingly, racial polarization in voting effects minority candidates the most since the most voting districts are of a white majority (83). Yet, the case of Jesse Helms in North Carolina Senate race of 1996, he won the race due to the support of white voters whom were racially neutral and backed him solely for his conservative opinions (84). However, the case of L. Douglas Wilder who was a black democrat and from slavery ancestors, run for Virginia governorship race in 1989, against the white Marshall Coleman, a white Republican, showed a racial polarization voting. Before the Election Day, polls indicate that Wilder is likely to win with a vast votes' gap, but, after the election took place, he won with 50.1 majority votes. Explanations revealed that race besides prejudices had made their way to the voting choices during the Election Day, whereas, the justification of the racial neutrality seem less persuasive (84). The same happened with New York City mayoral race of 1989, in which the black David Dinkins won with a narrow margin though the pre-election polls demonstrated his vast winning (85).

To sum up, racial stereotypes are still pervasive in the U.S. elections. In addition, most racial and ethnic groups in United States are attached to set of stereotypical traits, yet, those attributed to blacks are the most powerful, that is to say, blacks are ascribed as violent, lazy and they lack the ethic work, to name but few. Ultimately, and chiefly a minority candidate from the black face is likely to face obstacles in election against a white contender. Those barriers are evident through the voting process, in which repress minority voter's turnout from one side. From the other side, the whites' vote choice that is hidden, yet, strong to hold back a minority candidate from being elected (85).

3.4.2. Racial Stereotypes

Crowder-Meyer et al. explained that the American electoral system may impact the racial minorities' descriptive representation. Racial minority candidates' supply shapes the voters' behaviors and tendencies (2). Though racist attitudes are less pervasive, negative stereotypes are still persisting. Additionally, in the local level for instance, stereotypes play a vital role for voters who lack enough information about the candidates in the local race (4). And since local elections usually do not receive sufficient media coverage, voters use racial stereotypes to decide on the candidate they prefer to win when they do not have party cues (5).

Moreover, Americans do link black people with pessimistic words, while whites with optimistic ones (5). Studies revealed that American still retain negative racial sentiments towards racial minorities. Amongst them is that blacks are careless and idle, while whites are diligent. Moreover, these traits are what led to the decreased socioeconomic situation of African Americans and the wide- spread poverty among them (6). Consequently, holding these attitudes towards minority groups will affect the chances of a minority candidate to win. Further, surveys demonstrated that working hard and being prudent are cherished qualities to have in a political candidate. Moreover, studies have revealed that Obama's share of votes decreased due to racial stereotypes during his presidential nomination. Further, studies stated

that it is not always the case that racial prejudices will affect the voters' choice. Sometimes, voters do monitor their attitudes and reverse their selections (7).

3.4.3. Biased Media Coverage

Janda, Berry and Goldman stated that media plays an influential role in shaping the public opinion and the political institutions in America (182). Many researchers believe that media influence lies in setting the political agenda, by deciding on what matters more for citizens so that the government lends it more attention (183).

Dewhirst and Rausch claimed that in the second half of the 20th century, media is the major wherewithal for voters to receive information about the candidates in the electoral races. During the congressional campaigns, contenders compete for news coverage to get the voters' notice. Yet, these voters can receive a mixture of messages from the media. News reporters may emphasize on certain points that candidate attempts to evade like scandalous news and minor concerns in the political agenda of the candidate campaign (132). Moreover, the media tend to depict the candidacy of the racial and ethnic minorities candidates as special and particular, mainly when they compete with a white contender. Also, they focus the most on the issues that are vital to these groups as health care. Additionally, Zibler and Niven highlighted the consequences of the overt focus on the racial issues and the racial identity of the already incumbent racial minority representatives, which has a reverse impact (110). They argued that news coverage in this case repels the votes of whites that can be important to win high profile public offices.

According to Lemi, the more citizens are exposed widely to political news, the more voters' turnout will take place. Political news consumption upgrades the voters' awareness and deep knowledge of the candidates, which ultimately influences their choices and participation. Studies revealed that racial cues are used to guide and alter voters' preferences during campaigns. Consequently, racial candidates are disadvantaged from the media

coverage. In case of a black candidate against a white one, the emphasis will be focused on the non-white candidate's race, leading to a destructive coverage built by the stone of his racial particularity (6).

During his first election in 2008, Barack Obama was subjugated by media for his race (Zurbriggen and Sherman 2). He was portrayed in T-shirts written on them "Obama is my slave". Moreover, media channels used the expression "tar baby", when he uttered his attitudes about immigration. Consequently, research revealed that such negative media coverage strengthens the "otherness" of candidates of color. Accordingly, the voters' preferences and tendencies will be affected since they have limited data about their contenders. In Virginia's gubernatorial races, biased media coverage was detected against L. Douglas Wilder, an African American candidate. Racial prejudices were used implicitly to assess the minority candidate (3).

3.4. 4. Fundraising

Drawing on data from the 2010 census, Hispanics are the largest racial – ethnic minority group in the U.S. (Cox 3). He noted that racial and ethnic minority candidates are segregated when it comes to the campaigns fundraisings. African American candidates obtain less total financial support than their white contenders (9). In comparison to female candidates, Thielmann and White stated that:

"After controlling for attributes such as candidate strength, opposition strength, party affiliation, and the incumbency advantage, black candidates received substantially lower level of funds than did nonblack candidates.... The differential appears to be racially motivated. Results for female candidates were less dramatic. In all five election cycles there was no discernible funding differential between male and female candidates." (qtd. in Cox 10).

Thus, and according to them, contributors tend to provide funds to candidates who are influential, show strength and are more likely to win the electoral race (10). Moreover, Cox's investigation on 2004 and 2008 congressional elections revealed similar results, African Americans candidates collected low funds for their campaigns. The sole reason was determined as the candidate's racial status. The situation is no different for Hispanic contenders who are viewed as challengers, and challengers are perceived as powerless (23-24).

3.5. African Americans and U.S. Politics

After their hard history with slavery, blacks were freed during the Civil War in 1865. Consequently, they can claim their rights as American citizens. Right after the constitutional amendment that abolished slavery, African Americans were restricted by the segregation policies and discriminatory systems ((McKeever and Davies 97). Shortly after that, the Fourteenth and the Fifteenth Amendments were passed; granting some core rights for all Americans (Watts 46). Yet, blacks are still suffering from segregation and coercion even after that. Thus, they moved for political action to restore their rights through the Civil Rights Movement (McKeever and Davies 98). The U.S. court declared accordingly that racial segregation is illegal, in the case of *Brown v. Board of Education* of 1954. And a series of Civil Rights took place (McKeever and Davies 98). Some laws were annexed to attain racial equality including the Civil Right Act of 1957 that condemns any person who deprives mainly ethnic and racial people from voting in the federal election. Moreover, a statute was instituted in 1964 following the series of the Civil Rights Acts, in which it forbade discrimination on the basis of race, national origin and religion when it comes to the federal funded programs (Watts 46).

Even with these legislations, black Americans are still less equal to the white community in terms of the educational attainment and housing, and poverty. After the decay of major

hurdles that denied black Americans from the political participation, their numbers as representatives increased though the majority of the 73 U.S. House of Representatives come from constituencies of thick non- white population during the 108th Congress (2003-5). The numbers of African Americans holding federal offices grew (McKeever and Davies 99).

3.5.1. Barack Obama and the Oval Office

A Noble Prize winner in 1962, Dr. James Watson was able to decode the structure of the DNA, claiming that genetically, black people are less intelligent than the whites (Beyond Being Black 47), and that he confirmed this through his tests. Such claims are used to destroy the black identity and they were shared everywhere. Thus, Obama's presidency refuted one of the well-rooted prejudices about the black people.

Furthermore, John F. Kennedy was elected as the first Catholic U.S. president (Welch et al. 202). But before this, a survey indicated that the majority of Americans will not vote for a Catholic president. Two decades later, Ronald Regan was the first president divorced. In the same vein, racial obstacles would prevent an African American from becoming the U.S. president; however, the new millennium witnessed the election of Barack Obama. Obama was backed millions of African Americans, whites, women and men during his campaign. Moreover, he gathered massive amount of money.

During the electoral campaign, from one side, few racist comments were made about him. Furthermore, race was inserted during the campaign, in the sense that many white voters claimed before the election that they would not vote for a black man. Consequently, the negative prejudices about him as a black candidate impacted the votes. From the other side, his rival McCain repeatedly mentioned the issue of his different race. Moreover, conservative commentators frequently brought to attention his middle name, Hussein, to indicate that he is Muslim and alien. Also, interrogations dominated the web about his ancestry to shed the light on the fact that is not American.

Despite of these conspiracies due to his race, he won the 2008 presidential election with a vast margin. Americans cast out their insecurities about his abilities, and mainly the whites rejected the racial prejudices and elected the first African American president (Welch et al. 202).

According to Dupuis and Boecklman, Obama's presidency implies the shattering of the glass ceiling for the minority candidates generally and blacks specifically (119). However, according to Taylor, a political reporter of NBS News, there is still a dearth of African Americans' representation, though they made some progress. Since 2008, their numbers for statewide offices for instance are in increase and they occupy large numbers of public offices than ever (Dupuis and Boecklman 119). Donna Edwards, Maryland Democratic Republican added that since the Voting Rights Act in 1965 was issued, more African Americans were ascended to Congress, however; not totally representative of their respective population (Taylor).

Data reveals that though African Americans made significant strides to politics (Brown and Atske). Even after Obama's election as a president, the blacks' representation in the Senate is still rare (Taylor). Notwithstanding that African Americans also have made considerable roads to politics and the House of Representatives mainly (Taylor).

Yet, during the past fifty years and after Obama's inauguration, blacks were rarely elected as senator. In 1965, no African American has served as a senator. By 2015, a little change took place, in which only two blacks are senators. Thus, since 1965 to 2015, only eight have served as U.S. senators. To note, the majority of African Americans who serve in Congress are Democrats.

Conclusion

The phenomenon of the glass ceiling is a real trouble for women and racial minorities in politics. It is a threat to the American Dream that promises that all categories can fulfill their wishes and obtain positions they merit. However, statistics revealed that qualified women and racial minorities' politicians are encountered with transparent disadvantages that block their roads to the top offices. Consequently, the all –times praised values of democracy that the nation is proud of, are endangered and contradicting with its reality.

Women and racial / ethnic minorities are the victims of the sexist and the racist political system due to their historical underestimated status since the first days of the young democracy. Women are said to look after domicile issues known as the private sphere. Whereas men function outside home, the public sphere. Thus, when women violate the rules of society, they were encountered with sexist beliefs that doubt their competencies. Politically speaking, they are condemned to lack self-confidence and ambition to make elementary steps towards the politics that is said to be a male zone. Once they are in, the biased media coverage, the voters' preferences and so on conspired against them, and deprived them of senior public offices.

From the other side, the racial and ethnic minorities had an inferior status to that of the major white group before the establishment of the democracy, for instance, the African Americans are the prominent damaged group earlier. Thus, the idea of having an elected leader from a minor group who might descend from an enslaved ancestry was unacceptable. Accordingly, their positions in politics in general and in representative and leadership continued as degraded. They are mostly bumped into racial stereotypes and biased media coverage that do its work and impact the public opinion. Consequently, voters and mainly the whites are not willing to support a racial minority candidate.

Yet, both of the groups made victories to the political world. Based on statistics, the 115th Congress in the most gender varied so far. Similarly, it is the most racially and ethnically diverse Congress in the whole history. It can be said that the Democratic Party has, for long, embraced the minority groups in society including the racial / ethnic minorities and women. Therefore, most women and racial minority representatives, besides, both Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama are Democrats.

To sum up, the American political province is witnessing a massive transformation from the all- white male sphere to a gender and racial miscellaneous atmosphere. Best exemplified through the inauguration of Barack Obama from an African American enslaved ancestry, as well as the 2016 presidential candidacy of Hillary Clinton for the Democratic Party. These are said to be a weighty triumph and worthy cracks in the political glass ceiling, nonetheless, data indicates that both the American women alongside the racial and the ethnic minorities are still underrepresented in the elective public offices in relation to their respective population. Hence, Obama's 2008 presidency and Clinton's 2016 candidacy are momentous cracks in the political glass ceiling, but; so far, they are not a true breakthrough.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

The Constitution of the United States of America.

Governmental Publications

A Report on the Glass Ceiling Initiative. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1991. Web.

A Solid Investment: Making a Full Use of the Nation's Human Capital. Washington, D.C.:

The Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995. Web.

Good for Business: Making a Full Use of the Nation's Human Capital. Washington, D.C.:

The Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995. Web.

Secondary Sources

Discussion Papers

Bell, Curtis. "What Happens After the Glass Ceiling Shatters? The Influence of the First

Female Leader Has on Women's Representation in Elected Offices." One Earth Future Research, 2016. Web.

Gelber, Alexis. "Digital Divas: Women, Politics and the Social Network." *Shorenstein Center*

Goldsmith Fellow. Harvard U: 2011. Web.

Markham, Susan. "Women as Agents of Change: Having a Voice in Society and Influencing

Policy." *Gender and Equality Development*. National Democratic Institute, 2013. Web.

E-Books

Adams, Colleen. *Women's Suffrage: a Primary Source History of the Women's Rights*

Movement in America. New York: Rosen Central Primary Source, 2003. Web. 1 Apr. 2017.

Bos, Angela L. and Paula L. O'Loughlin. "Gender and Politics in the U.S." *In 21st Century*

Political Science: A Reference Handbook, ed. John Ishiyama and Marijke Breuning.

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2010. Web. 20 Apr. 2017.

- Arnold, Kathleen R., ed. *Anti-Immigration in the United States: a Historical Encyclopedia A-R*. Vol. 1. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press, 2011. Web. 2 June 2017.
- Bailey, Rayna. *Immigration and Migration*. New York: Fact On File, 2010. Web. 2 June 2017.
- Banducci, Susan A., Todd Donovan, and Jeffery A. Karp. "Effects of Minority Representation on Political Attitudes and Participation." *Diversity in Democracy: Minority Representation in the United States*. Ed. Segura, Gary M. and Shaun, Bowler. Charlottesville: U of Virginia Press, 2005. Web. 3 June 2017.
- Bargiela-Chiappini, Francesca, ed. *The Handbook of Business Discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh U Press, 2013. Web. 3 June 2017. 1 March 2017.
- Barreto, Manuela Da Costa, Michelle K. Ryan, and Michael T. Schmitt. *The Glass Ceiling in the 21st Century: Understanding Barriers to Gender Equality*. California: American Psychological Association, 2009. Web. 3 June 2017.
- Beyond Being Black*. Comfort Babalgbon: Boomington, 2010. Web. 10 June 2017.
- Bird, Karen, Thomas Saalfeld, and Andreas M. Wußst, ed. *The Political Representation of Immigrants and Minorities: Voters, Parties and Parliaments in Liberal Democracies*. New York: Routledge, 2011. Web. 2 June 2017.
- Branson, Douglas M. *The Last Male Bastion: Gender and the CEO Suite in America's Public Companies*. New York: Routledge, 2010. Web. 10 March 2017.
- Cottam, Martha L., et al. *Introduction to Political Psychology*. 3rd ed. Florence: Taylor and Francis, 2015. Web. 4 June 2017.
- Dewhirst, Robert E. and John David Rausch, Jr. *Encyclopedia of the United States Congress*. New York: Facts on File, 2007. Web.
- DuBois, Ellen Carol. *Feminism and Suffrage: the Emergence of an Independent Women's Movement in America, 1848-1869*. Ithaca: Cornell, 1999. Web. 5 Apr. 2017.

- Dupuis, Martin and Keith Boecklman. *Barack Obama, the New Face of America*. Praeger: Westport, 2008. Web. 3 June 2017.
- Frost-Knappman, Elizabeth and Kathryn Cullen-DuPont. *Women's Suffrage in America*. New York, NY: Facts On File, 2005. Web.
- Graham Jr., Otis L. *Unguarded Gates: A History of America's Immigration Crisis*. Maryland: Rowmen and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2004. Web. 2 June 2017.
- Hero, Rodney E. and Caroline J. Tolbert. "Exploring Minority Political Efficacy: Considering the Impact of Social and Institutional Context." *Diversity in Democracy: Minority Representation in the United States*. Ed. Segura, Gary M. and Shaun, Bowler. Charlottesville: U of Virginia Press, 2005. Web. 4 June 2017.
- Hyde, Janet Shibley and Nicole Else-Quest. *Half the Human Experience: The Psychology of Women*. 8th ed. California: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2012. Web. 20 Feb. 2017.
- Janda, Kenneth, Jeffrey M. Berry, and Jerry Goldman. *The Challenge of Democracy: Government in America*. 9th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 2008. Web. 5 June 2017.
- Jaret, Charles. "Troubled by Newcomers: Anti-Immigration Attitudes and Actions during Two Eras of Mass Migration." *Mass Migration to the United States: Classical and Contemporary*. Ed. Min, Pyong Gap. Periods. California.: AltaMira Press, 2002. Web. 5 June 2017.
- Lawless, Jennifer L., and Richard L. Fox. *Men Rule: the Continued Under-Representation of Women in U.S. Politics*. Washington, DC: Women and Politics Institute, 2012. Web. 25 Apr. 2017.
- McConaughy, Corrine M. *The Woman Suffrage Movement in America: a Reassessment*. New York, NY: Cambridge U Press, 2015. Web. 14 Apr. 2017.

- McKeever, Robert J. and Philip Davies. *Politics USA*. 2nd ed. Edingburgh Gate: Pearson Longman, 2006. Print. 25 Apr. 2017.
- Minta, Michael D. *Oversight: Representing the Interests of Blacks and Latinos in Congress*. Princeton: Princeton U Press, 2011. Web. 6 June 2017.
- Northouse, Peter Guy. *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. 4th ed. Thousands Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2007. Web. 7 June 2017.
- Palmer, Barbara, and Dennis Simon. *Breaking the Political Glass Ceiling: Women and Congressional Elections*. New York: Routledge, 2006. Web. 7 June 2017.
- Rau, Dana Meachen. *Great Women of the Suffrage Movement*. Minneapolis: Compass Point , 2006. Web. 11 Apr. 2017.
- Slocum, Frederick, and Lee Yeuh-Ting. "Racism, Racial Stereotypes, and American Politics: Prejudice, Negative Stereotypes and Politics." *The Psychology of Prejudice and Discrimination: Racism in America*. Vol.1. Ed. Chin, Jean Lau. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2004. Web. 8 June 2017.
- Tate, Katherine, and Sarah Harsh. "A Portrait of the People: Descriptive Representation and its Impact on U.S. Members' Rating." *Diversity in Democracy: Minority Representation in the United States*. Ed. Segura, Gary M. and Shaun, Bowler. Charlottesville: U of Virginia Press, 2005. Web. 6 June 2017.
- Tetrault, Lisa. *The Myth of Seneca Falls: Memory and the Women's suffrage Movement, 1848-1898*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina Press, 2014. Web. 10 Apr. 2017.
- Van Horn, Carl E., and Herbert A. Schaffner. *Work in America: An Encyclopedia of History, Policy, and Society: A-M*. Vol.1. California: ABC-CLIO, 2003. Web. 15 Dec. 2017.
- Walch , Timothy, ed. *Immigrant America: European Ethnicity in the United States*. New York: Routledge, 1994. Web. 5 June 2017.

Wang, Victor C. X. *Encyclopedia of Strategic Leadership and Management*. Hershey: IGI Global, 2016. Web. 25 March 2017.

Watts, Duncan. *Dictionary of American Government and Politics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh U Press, 2010. Web. 2 June 2017.

Welch, Susan et al. 14th ed. *Understanding American Government*. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2014. Web. 2 June 2017.

Wright, Sharon D. *Race, Power, and Political Emergence in Memphis*. New York: Garland, 2000. Web. 6 June 2017.

Zilber, Jeremy, and David Niven. *Racialized Coverage of Congress: The News in Black and White*. Westport : Praeger, 2000. Web. 6 June 2017.

Journals

Baxter, Janeen, and Erik Olin Wright. "The Glass Ceiling Hypothesis." *Gender & Society* 14.2 (2000): 275-94. Web.

Carnes, Nicholas. "Why Are There So Few Working-Class people in Political Office? Evidence from State Legislatures." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 4.1 (2015): 84-109. Web.

Cotter, David A. "The Glass Ceiling Effect." *Social Forces* 80.2 (2001): 655-81. Web.

Dittmar, Kelly. "Watching Election 2016 with a Gender Lens." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 49.04 (2016): 807-12. Web.

Jackson, Jerlando F. L., and Elizabeth M. O'Callaghan. "What Do We Know about Glass Ceiling Effects? A Taxonomy and Critical Review to Inform Higher Education Research." *Research in Higher Education* 50.5 (2009): 460-82. Web.

Jackson, Jerlando F. L., and Raul A., Leon. "Enlarging Our Understanding of Glass Ceiling Effects with Social Closure Theory in Higher Education." *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (2010): 351-79. Web.

Jalalzai, Farida, and Mona L. Krook. "Beyond Clinton and Benazir: Women's Political Leadership Worldwide." *International Political Science Review* 31.1 (2010): 5-23. Web.

Okimoto, Taylor G., and Victoria L. Brescoll. "The Price of Power: Power Seeking and Backlash Against Female Politicians." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 36.7 (2010): 923-36. Web. 20 Jan. 2017.

Ryan, Michelle K. et al. "Opting out or Pushed off the Edge? The Glass Cliff and the Precariousness of Women's Leadership Positions." *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 1.1 (2007): 266-79. Web.

Zamfirache, Irina. "Women and Politics- the Glass Ceiling." *Journal of Comparative Research in Anthrpology and Sociology* 1.1 (2010): 175-88. Web.

Zurbriggen, Eileen L., and Aurora M. Sherman. "Race and Gender in the 2008 U.S. Presidential Election: A Content Analysis of Editorial Cartoons." *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy* 10.1 (2010): 223-47. Web.

Newspapers

Wicks, Ann, and Raylene Lang-Dion. "Women in Politics: Still Searching for an Equal Voice." *Canadian Parliamentary Review*. N.p., 22 Mar. 2008. Web. 15 Apr. 2017.

News Agency

Biddle Joe. "America's Last Glass Ceiling will Shatter ...Some Time". N.p.: France-Presse, 13, Nov, 2013. Pdf.

News Channels

CBS News Poll. *Breaking the Glass Ceiling: A Woman Presidential Candidate*. N.p.: n.d., 2008. pdf.

Papers of Meetings

Crowder-Meyer, Melody, et al. "Complex Interactions: Candidate Race, Sex, Electoral Institutions and Voter Choice." The Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association. Chicago, Illinois. April, 16-16, 2015.

Dolan, Kathleen. "Women Candidates in American Politics: What We Know, What We Want to Know." *Midwest Political Science Association Meeting*. Wisconsin: 2006.

Lemi, Danielle. "Mixed Messages: Media Coverage and Multiracial Candidates." *The Annual Western Political Science Association Meeting*. UC Riverside.

Pyeatt, Nicolas L. and Alixnadra B. Yanus. "Breaking the Statehouse Glass Ceiling: Examining Women-Friendly Districts in the State Legislatures." *The Annual Meeting of the State Politics and Policy Organized Section of the American Association*. Political Science. Bloomington, IN: May 2014.

Reports

Barriers and Bias: the Status of Women in Leadership. Washington, DC: AAUW, 2016. Web. 20 Nov. 2016.

Theses

Cox, Jamesha. "The Influence of Campaign Contributions on Proportionality of Representation in the United States Congress." Honors Thesis. University of Central Florida, 2013. N.p.: n.d. Web.

Daniels, Kathleen B. "The Social Construction of Race and Gender: Black Women Officers in the U.S. Navy." Master of Science in Management Thesis. Naval Postgraduate School, June, 1994. N.p.: n.d. Web.

Smith, Paul . "Connections between Women's Glass Ceiling Beliefs, Explanatory Style, Self Efficacy, Career Levels and Subjective Success." Ph.D. Thesis. University of Wollongong, N.p.: School of Psychology, 2012. Web.

Websites

“A Brief History of Women in American Politics.” *PBS*. Public Broadcasting Service, 12 June 2016. Web. 15 May 2017.

Bialik, Kristen, and Jens Manuel Krogstad. "115th Congress Sets New High for Racial, Ethnic Diversity." *Pew Research Center*. N.p., 24 Jan. 2017. Web. 9 June 2017.

Brown, Anna and Sara Atske. "Blacks Have Made Gains in U.S. Political Leadership, but Gaps Remain." *Pew Research Center*. N.p., 28 June 2016. Web. 10 June 2017.

“Center on the American Governor.” N.p., n.d. Web. 9 June 2017.

“Current Numbers.” *Current Numbers / CAWP*. N.p., n.d. Web. 15 May 2017.

Desilver, Drew. "Despite Progress, U.S. Still Lags many Nations in Women Leaders." *PewResearch Center*. N.p., 26 Jan. 2015. Web. 20 Mar. 2017.

Estrada, Sheryl. "The 115th Congress Not a Model for Diversity." *DiversityInc*. N.p., 19 Jan. 2017. Web. 08 June 2017.

“Facts on Women of Color in Office.” *Facts on Women of Color in Office CAWP*. N.p., n.d. Web. 15 May 2017.

Geiger, Abigail, and John Gramlich. "The Changing Face of Congress in 5 charts." *Pew Research Center*. N.p., 02 Feb. 2017. Web. 15 May 2017.

Geiger, Abigail, and Lauren Kent. "Number of Women Leaders around the World has Grown, but they're Still a Small Group." *pew research center*. N.p., 08 mar. 2017. Web. 20 mar. 2017.

“Hillary Clinton's Concession Speech (full text).” *CNN*. Cable News Network, 09 Nov. 2016. Web. 10 June 2017.

AlJazeera. "Women Leaders around the World." *Al Jazeera English*. N.p., n.d. Web. 20 March 2017.

Los Angeles Times. Los Angeles Times, n.d. Web. 15 May 2017.

Marcos, Cristina. "115th Congress will be most racially diverse in history." *The Hill*. N.p., 12 June 2017. Web. 08 June 2017.

Martin, Gary. "Glass Ceiling - the Meaning and Origin of this Phrase." *Phrasefinder*. N.p., n.d. Web. 20 Mar. 2017

McCallister, Jessica. "Glass Escalator in Sociology: Definition & Effects." *Study.com*. Study.com, n.d. Web. 22 Mar. 2017.

"Population estimates, July 1, 2016, (V2016)." *UNITED STATES QuickFacts from the US Census Bureau*. N.p., n.d. Web. 01 June 2017.

Raghavan, TCA Sharad. "Minorities Better Represented in the Indian Parliament than in the US." [Http://www.livemint.com/](http://www.livemint.com/). Livemint, 17 June 2014. Web. 20 Mar. 2017.

Reny, Tyler, and Sayu Bhojwani. "Minority Representation Gaps, by the Numbers." *The Washington Post*. WP Company, 22 Oct. 2014. Web. 8 June 2017.

Robins-Early, Nick. "Here's When The Rest Of The World Elected their First Female Leaders." *The Huffington Post*. TheHuffingtonPost.com, 17 Apr. 2015. Web. 20 Mar. 2017.

Ryan, Michelle K., S. Alexander Haslam, and Clara Kulich. "Politics and The Glass Cliff: Evidence That Women Are Preferentially Selected to Contest Hard-to-Win Seat." *CORE. SAGE / Wiley Blackwell*, 01 Jan. 1970. Web. 12 Mar. 2017.

"Sticky Floor and Glass Ceiling: Barriers to Career Advancement." N.p., n.d. Web. 22 Mar. 2017.

"Sticky floor." *Sticky Floor - Oxford Reference*. N.p., 17 Mar. 2017. Web. 22 Mar. 2017.

Taylor, Jessica. "Senate Remains a Glass Ceiling for African-American Politicians in Years since 1963 march." *NBCNews.com*. NBCUniversal News Group, 28 Aug. 2013. Web. 10 June 2017.

"The Full Wiki." *Glass Ceiling : Wikis (The Full Wiki)*. N.p., n.d. Web. 4 Apr. 2017.

“The Women's Rights Movement, 1848–1920 | US House of Representatives: History, Art & Archives.” *The Women's Rights Movement, 1848-1920 | US House of Representatives: History, Art & Archives*. N.p., n.d. Web. 22 Apr. 2017.

“Women in Elective Office 2017.” *Women in Elective Office 2017 CAWP*. N.p., n.d. Web. 15 May 2017.

“Women in Parliaments: World Classification.” N.p., n.d. Web. 20 Feb. 2017.

“Women in the U.S. Congress 2017.” *Women in the U.S. Congress 2017 CAWP*. N.p., n.d. Web. 14 May 2017.

“Women Mayors in U.S. Cities 2017.” *Women Mayors in U.S. Cities 2017 CAWP*. N.p., n.d. Web. 15 May 2017.

“Women of Color in Elective Office 2017.” *Women of Color in Elective Office 2017 CAWP*. N.p., n.d. Web. 15 May 2017.

Working papers

Folke, Olle, and Johanna Rickne. "Female Representation and Male Rule: Elite Enrichment, Gender Quotas and the Political Glass Ceiling." 2011. Web. 20 Nov. 2016.

---. “The Glass Ceiling in Politics: Formalization and Empirical Tests”. N.p.: Research Institute of Industrial Economics, 2014.

Morgan, Marry S. “Glass Ceilings and Sticky Floor: Drawing New Ontologies”. *London School of Economics and Political Science*. London: 2015.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Hillary Clinton's Concession Speech December 2016

CLINTON: Thank you. Thank you all. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

Thank you all very much. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you so much.

(APPLAUSE)

Very rowdy group. Thank you, my friends. Thank you. Thank you, thank you so very much for being here and I love you all, too.

Last night, I congratulated Donald Trump and offered to work with him on behalf of our country. I hope that he will be a successful president for all Americans. This is not the outcome we wanted or we worked so hard for and I'm sorry that we did not win this election for the values we share and the vision we hold for our country.

But I feel pride and gratitude for this wonderful campaign that we built together, this vast, diverse, creative, unruly, energized campaign. You represent the best of America and being your candidate has been one of the greatest honors of my life.

(APPLAUSE)

I know how disappointed you feel because I feel it too, and so do tens of millions of Americans who invested their hopes and dreams in this effort. This is painful and it will be for a long time, but I want you to remember this. Our campaign was never about one person or even one election, it was about the country we love and about building an America that's hopeful, inclusive and big-hearted.

We have seen that our nation is more deeply divided than we thought. But I still believe in America and I always will. And if you do, then we must accept this result and then look to the

future. Donald Trump is going to be our president. We owe him an open mind and the chance to lead.

Our constitutional democracy enshrines the peaceful transfer of power and we don't just respect that, we cherish it. It also enshrines other things; the rule of law, the principle that we are all equal in rights and dignity, freedom of worship and expression. We respect and cherish these values too and we must defend them.

(APPLAUSE)

Now -- and let me add, our constitutional democracy demands our participation, not just every four years but all the time. So let's do all we can to keep advancing the causes and values we all hold dear; making our economy work for everyone not just those at the top, protecting our country and protecting our planet and breaking down all the barriers that hold any American back from achieving their dreams.

CLINTON: We've spent a year and a half bringing together millions of people from every corner of our country to say with one voice that we believe that the American dream is big enough for everyone -- for people of all races and religions, for men and women, for immigrants, for LGBT people, and people with disabilities. For everyone.

(APPLAUSE)

So now, our responsibility as citizens is to keep doing our part to build that better, stronger, fairer America we seek. And I know you will.

I am so grateful to stand with all of you. I want to thank Tim Kaine and Anne Holton for being our partners on this journey.

(APPLAUSE)

It has been a joy getting to know them better, and it gives me great hope and comfort to know that Tim will remain on the front lines of our democracy representing Virginia in the Senate.

(APPLAUSE)

To Barack and Michelle Obama, our country owes you an enormous debt of gratitude.

(APPLAUSE)

We -- we thank you for your graceful, determined leadership that has meant so much to so many Americans and people across the world.

And to Bill and Chelsea, Mark, Charlotte, Aidan, our brothers and our entire family, my love for you means more than I can ever express. You crisscrossed this country on our behalf and lifted me up when I needed it most -- even four-month-old Aidan who traveled with his mom. I will always be grateful to the creative, talented, dedicated men and women at our headquarters in Brooklyn and across our country.

(APPLAUSE)

You poured your hearts into this campaign. For some of you who are veterans, it was a campaign after you had done other campaigns. Some of you, it was your first campaign. I want each of you to know that you were the best campaign anybody could have ever expected or wanted.

(APPLAUSE)

And to the millions of volunteers, community leaders, activists and union organizers who knocked on doors, talked to neighbors, posted on Facebook, even in secret, private Facebook sites...

(LAUGHTER)

(APPLAUSE)

... I want everybody coming out from behind that and make sure your voices are heard going forward.

(APPLAUSE)

To everyone who sent in contributions as small as \$5 and kept us going, thank you. Thank you from all of us.

And to the young people in particular, I hope you will hear this. I have, as Tim said, spent my entire adult life fighting for what I believe in. I've had successes and I've had setbacks.

Sometimes, really painful ones. Many of you are at the beginning of your professional public and political careers. You will have successes and setbacks, too.

This loss hurts, but please never stop believing that fighting for what's right is worth it.

(APPLAUSE)

CLINTON: It is -- it is worth it.

(APPLAUSE)

And so we need -- we need you to keep up these fights now and for the rest of your lives.

And to all the women, and especially the young women, who put their faith in this campaign and in me, I want you to know that nothing has made me prouder than to be your champion.

(APPLAUSE)

Now, I -- I know -- I know we have still not shattered that highest and hardest glass ceiling, but some day someone will and hopefully sooner than we might think right now.

(APPLAUSE)

And -- and to all the little girls who are watching this, never doubt that you are valuable and powerful and deserving of every chance and opportunity in the world to pursue and achieve your own dreams.

Finally...

(APPLAUSE)

Finally, I am so grateful for our country and for all it has given to me. I count my blessings every single day that I am an American. And I still believe as deeply as I ever have that if we stand together and work together with respect for our differences, strength in our convictions and love for this nation, our best days are still ahead of us.

(APPLAUSE)

Because, you know -- you know, I believe we are stronger together and we will go forward together. And you should never, ever regret fighting for that. You know, scripture tells us, "Let us not grow weary in doing good, for in due season, we shall reap if we do not lose heart."

So my friends, let us have faith in each other, let us not grow weary, let us not lose heart, for there are more seasons to come. And there is more work to do.

I am incredibly honored and grateful to have had this chance to represent all of you in this consequential election.

May God bless you and may God bless the United States of America.

(APPLAUSE)

Source: "Hillary Clinton's Concession Speech (full text)." *CNN*. Cable News Network, 09

Nov. 2016. Web. 10 June 2017.

Appendix 2: CBS NEWS POLL Impact of Hillary Clinton Candidacy

Hillary Clinton's campaign as the first serious woman contender for the Democratic presidential nomination represents a shattering of the glass ceiling in presidential politics. Most voters think that win or lose, her candidacy will make it easier for other women to run for president.

HAS CLINTON'S CANDIDACY MADE IT EASIER FOR OTHER WOMEN TO RUN?

(Among registered voters)

	All	Men	Women
Made it easier	69%	60%	76%
Made it harder	9	13	5
Had no effect	21	25	17

Majorities of both men and women agree, although more women than men think she has made it easier for future women candidates.

The historic importance of Clinton's candidacy is also reflected in the bipartisan nature of voters' views. Although more Democrats think she has made it easier for other women to run, nearly two thirds of

Republicans also think that's the case.

HAS CLINTON'S CANDIDACY MADE IT EASIER FOR OTHER WOMEN TO RUN?

(Among registered voters)

	All	Reps	Dems	Inds
Made it easier	69%	63%	75%	65%

Made it harder	912	7	9
Had no effect	2125	17	23

In addition, about seven in 10 voters under age 64 think Clinton has made it easier for other women candidates.

Voters embrace the concept of a woman as a serious presidential candidate. 88% agree with the statement “I am glad to see a woman as a serious contender for president.”

GLAD TO SEE A WOMAN AS CONTENDER FOR PRESIDENT

(Among registered voters)

Agree	88%
Disagree	9

Nearly all Democrats and nine in 10 independents agree with this statement, as do most Republicans (76%).

This is a more widespread welcome than Geraldine Ferraro received in 1984: a CBS News/New York Times Poll then found that 62% of voters agreed they were “glad that a woman was nominated as vice president.”

Two thirds of voters would like to see a woman as president in their lifetime. More women than men want to see that happen.

HOPE FOR A WOMAN PRESIDENT IN YOUR LIFETIME?

(Among registered voters)

	All	Men	Women
Yes	63%	57%	69%
No	21	26	17

Younger voters are also more likely to say they hope for a woman president in their lifetime.

And seven in 10 think a woman president in their lifetime is likely. Voters under age 45, who have more years when this can happen, are most apt to think this is likely (79%); just 44% of those 65 and older think it is.

**IS A WOMAN PRESIDENT IN YOUR
LIFETIME LIKELY?**

(Among registered voters)

	All	Men	Women	Under 45	45-64	65+
Yes	69%	65%	72%	79%	69%	44%
No	23	25	20	16	22	39

In a Life Magazine poll conducted by Gallup in 1992, 61% of all Americans said they hoped for a woman president (a number similar to today's), but just 46% thought that was likely to occur.

But when it comes to the question of exactly who might be a future female presidential candidate, more than half cannot name any current woman they would like to see run. 13% of voters suggested Condoleezza Rice and 5% volunteered Nancy Pelosi. About 2% mentioned Oprah Winfrey or Elizabeth Dole.

WOMAN WOULD LIKE TO SEE RUN FOR PRESIDENT

(Among registered voters)

Condoleezza Rice	13%
Nancy Pelosi	5
Oprah Winfrey	2
Elizabeth Dole	2
No one	57

The absence of any currently visible successor to candidate Clinton is underscored by the fact that nearly half of voters say they would like to see more women hold high-level political

office, such as governor or member of Congress. Four in 10 think the number of women politicians is about right. 53% of women would like to see more women hold political office, 39% of men would.

WOMEN HOLDING POLITICAL OFFICE

(Among registered voters)

	All	Men	Women
Would like more	46%	38%	53%
Would like fewer	3	7	1
About right	39	43	35

The months of primaries and caucuses, and the more than 17 million votes cast for Clinton in those events haven't changed views on one key question, however. 60% of voters think the country is ready to elect a woman president, a figure that has not changed in recent months. 36% think the country is not ready.

U.S. READY FOR WOMAN PRESIDENT?

(Among registered voters)

	Now	3/2008	1/2008	1/2007
Yes	60%	59%	58%	54%
No	36	34	32	40

More (68%) think the country is ready for a black president -- but that may be because Barack Obama is currently closer than Clinton to achieving the number of delegates needed to secure the Democratic nomination.

Both Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama have motivated voters to follow this political race.

49% of voters say that having Clinton run for the nomination has made them more interested

in the campaign (about the same percentage as say Obama has done so). 54% of women and 60% of Democrats say her candidacy has sparked their interest in the campaign.

INTEREST IN CAMPAIGN AS A RESULT OF CLINTON’S CANDIDACY

(Among registered voters)

	All	Men	Women
More interested	49%	44%	54%
No difference	49	54	44
Less interested	1	1	1

SEXISM ON THE CAMPAIGN TRAIL?

Despite Clinton’s almost-successful campaign for the Democratic nomination, voters still see women as having a more difficult time than African Americans when it comes to presidential politics. 46% think women candidates in this arena face more obstacles, while 32% think black candidates do. Women (52%) are more likely than men (40%) to say that a woman faces more obstacles than a black candidate.

WHO FACES MORE OBSTACLES IN PRESIDENTIAL POLITICS TODAY?

(Among registered voters)

	Now 3/2008	
A woman candidate	46%	39%
A black candidate	32	33
No difference (vol.)	18	21

Nearly half of voters think the media has been harder on Hillary Clinton than on the other candidates. That percentage has even risen since last month, from 36% then to 45% now. Women are particularly likely to think Clinton has been treated more harshly; 48% of women think the media has been harder on her, compared to 40% of men.

COMPARED TO OTHER CANDIDATES, THE NEWS MEDIA HAVE BEEN...?

(Among registered voters)

	Now	5/2008
Harder on Clinton	45%	36%
Easier on Clinton	8	12
The same	44	49

67% of those who think the media has been harder on Clinton feel that's at least somewhat the result of her gender.

MEDIA HAS BEEN HARDER ON CLINTON BECAUSE OF HER GENDER?

(Among registered voters who think media has been harder on her)

A lot	32%
Some	35
No much/not at all	31

When it comes to most of the people they know, most voters think Clinton has been judged no differently because she is a woman. However, four in ten voters say the people they know have judged her more harshly because she's a woman – and women in particular say this. Hardly any think her gender has made their acquaintances' treat her less harshly.

PEOPLE THEY KNOW HAVE JUDGED CLINTON ... BECAUSE SHE'S A WOMAN

(Among registered voters)

	All	Men	Women
More harshly	39%	33%	44%
Less harshly	3	5	2
No difference	56	61	51

25% of Democratic primary voters (including 31% of women Democratic primary voters) say that gender was a factor in deciding which candidate to support. They divided their vote between Clinton and Obama.

This poll was conducted among a random sample of 798 adults nationwide, including 712 registered voters, interviewed by telephone May 30-June 2, 2008. Phone numbers were dialed from RDD samples of both standard land-lines and cell phones. The error due to sampling for results based on the entire sample could be plus or minus four percentage points. The error for subgroups is higher. The error for the sample of registered voters is plus or minus four points.

Source: CBS News Poll. *Breaking the Glass Ceiling: A Woman Presidential Candidate*. N.p.: 2008. pdf.

Appendice