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Abstract

This paper will seek to answer how witnesses are treated differently on the basis of their gender, with a binary look at how party and ideology affect their treatment by committee members. I looked at three different Congressional hearings on the topic of abortion, and analyzed men and women, each with differing ideologies, testifying before the committees and Congress members of differing parties. I coded the hearings by looking at interruptions, misuse of title, condescending language, and hostility, then ran an analysis from that coding. My analysis found significant data to support women are treated with more hostility and disrespect when testifying before congressional committees, and this treatment was affected by their gender. This is important and significant research as it compromises the integrity and function of the hearings, and affects the testimony elicited during the hearing.
Introduction

Witnesses come before Congressional hearings for a variety of reasons, and testify on a plethora of different subjects. Witnesses often give a statement, and are asked questions by members of the Congressional committee. Witnesses can be male or female, and come before committees to testify on a variety of topics. Many times during these hearings, the witnesses are interrupted, talked over, or are treated with overall disrespect. This paper seeks to find if female witnesses are treated differently than male witnesses during their questioning, and if their gender plays a significant role in them being treated worse. I will also account for a witness’s ideology and partisanship, as conflict of political parties could also account for differing treatment.

This paper will try to answer how witnesses are treated differently, not only on the basis of their gender, but also on their ideology. My hypothesis is women witnesses, interacting with a male committee member of different ideologies, will experience a more hostile environment and will be treated with more disrespect. I also expect to see hostility and negative treatment from male committee members interacting with female witnesses from their same ideology, but expect the harshest treatment from different ideologies. I expect these results because of gender stereotypes present in already completed research and literature. My literature review found four major themes: congresswomen will be more active on women’s issue, women utilize cooperative leadership styles over competitive leadership styles, on committees women will speak shorter and later than men, and women witnesses have less time to talk on committees compared to men.

For the purposes of this paper, I collected data from Senate Judiciary hearings and coded them. I ran an analysis from the coding, and found the most hostile environment stems from an ideological and gender difference, with the worst treatment coming from a male, Republican committee member, questioning a liberal, female witness. I account this difference to the gender
effect, and how men react when females are in power. This can be seen in the literature and research already done, and in the leadership style utilized by both men and women while interacting on the committees.

To test my thesis, I coded and analyzed three Senate committee hearings. I coded to see if interruptions, hostility, condescending language, or misuse of title was present in each interaction, then ran an analysis to find get my final data. I saw a significant gender effect, coupled with party and ideology, to affect how a witness was treated on the basis of their gender. This differing treatment can be accounted for on the basis of the witness’s gender, as well as differing party ideology. I find female witnesses are treated differently because of their gender, and that an ideology/gender divide will create the most hostile environment for women. This is important as it compromises the deliberative nature of hearings, and does not give equal weight to every witness’s testimony. Women should not be treated differently on the basis of their gender, and witnesses should not be treated with disrespect purely because of ideological differences.

Literature Review

For the purposes of my research, I will be drawing a comparison between the treatment of Congresswomen on their committees, and throughout their campaigns, and theoretically parallel that with the treatment of female witnesses. There were four major themes that arose from my research, which were the women have different leadership styles on committees compared to men, women are more likely to be cooperative compared to competitive, women will speak later and for less amount of times while in leadership roles on these committees, and female witnesses will have less time to speak compared to men testifying on the same issues. These four themes are present across research in this field, and constantly intersect during the committee and in
Congress. Each research article supports the idea that women are treated differently because of their gender, and can parallel to show the treatment of women as witnesses during congressional hearings.

One major theme that rose from my research is the relationship of gender in politics, and how women act in Congress. Keiser, Wilkins, Meier, and Holland analyze the success of representative democracy (2002). They analyze the activeness of representation on the basis of sex, using the theoretical groundwork laid about the activeness of race (Keiser et. al 2002). The benefits of representative democracies are the allowance of groups to advocate based on their specific groups attributes and detriments (Keiser et. al 2002). They parallel feminist theory and the complicated relationship between politics and gender (Keiser et al. 2002). They conclude women will be more active on women’s issues, through analyzing their activity on education bills (Keiser et al. 2002). This is also shown in Swers analysis on voting records in Congress, and how women support “women’s issues” bills and policies (1998). She analyzes bipartisan support for bills on gendered issue, and how their gender affects their voting pattern (Swers 1998).

Swers analyzes women and their voting patterns on women’s issues in Congress, and how gender affects a woman supporting a bill dealing with women’s issues (1998). She looks at the voting record in the 103rd Congress, and specifically gendered bills focused on (Swers 1998). This is also supported by Keiser et al., and the research mentioned above on women’s activeness on women’s issues (2002). She finds gender exerts a substantial influence on legislators votes on women’s issues, but that gender takes a second seat to party and ideology (Swers 1998). She analyzes three legislative amendments: The Hyde Amendment, FACE, and the Family Planning Amendments (Swers 1998). The influence of gender is magnified bills are specific to women’s
issues (Swers 1998). She concludes moderately conservative, Republican women are far more likely to vote in favor of the women’s issue bill than conservative men, supporting a correlation between gender and the support of the bill (Swers 1998). Although ideology and party is the strongest predictor of support, she finds gender is the second most influential (Swers 1998). This is also supported in Keiser et. al, with their conclusion that women would be most active on women’s issues bills because of representative democracy (2002). The way women act in Congress on the basis of their gender is important to my research, as I am both looking at the treatment of witnesses and the actions of male and female representatives.

Once in Congress, representatives are placed on different committees. These committees are important as they are where the nuts and bolts of the policymaking happen. There is research to suggest men and women act differently on these committees, and engage in different leadership style due to their gender (Rosenthal 2000, Kathlene 1994). Rosenthal analyzes the leadership style used by women in legislatures and how the style differs between men and women (2000). As cited in Rosenthal, Thomas finds women are more likely to be cooperative in the legislature than men, and are more likely to pursue cooperative styles compared to competitive (2000). Lyn Kathlene also analyzes committee chairs and the effect gender has on the chair of the committee (1994). Kathlene specifically looks at the actions of the head of committees in Congress, and compares gender as an dependent factor (1994). Her analysis shows a positive correlation between gender and a more cooperative leadership style (Kathlene 1994). Rosenthal looks at the in-depth, organizational factors that contribute to the gendered nature of institutional power, and specific to her paper, leadership style in legislative committees (2000). She looks at conflict resolution styles of state legislative committee chairs of both genders, and compares them (Rosenthal 2000). She finds women are significantly more likely to be
cooperative instead of competitive, and men are more likely to be competitive rather than cooperative (Rosenthal 2000). She also concludes men’s cooperation decreases significantly as women’s power and presence increase on the committee, thus concluding men resist the influence of women (Rosenthal 2000).

Women specifically act differently on committees than men, and this is especially seen in leadership roles. Policy starts to the top of the committee, and many laws are influenced disproportionately by the chairs (Norton 117, as cited in Duerst-Lahti et Kelly). If women are not in these positions of power, they cannot initiate legislation in their favor (Norton 118). Norton analyzes the importance of committee position in her research (Norton 117). In Rosenthal’s book, *When Women Lead*, she analyzes specifically women legislative committee chairs, and how their style is not gender neutral (Rosenthal 2010). She finds women have different motivations for leadership, but that many formal positions are still held by men (Rosenthal 2010). She states men are not analyzed on the basis of their sex or position, because they are considered the norm in legislatures (Rosenthal 2010). She explains these differences in leadership style with differing socialization in youth, women experience different things before holding their position, and there are less women in Congress and positions of power, as compared to men (Rosenthal 2010). This is important to my question, as women are on and chair the committees I am looking at. This research as to women’s leadership and resolution style will directly affect their treatment of both female, and male witnesses.

Once on a committee, party and gender can both affect how a Congress member acts. Carroll elaborates on the idea of the intersection between gender and party partisanship (2002). She analyzes the gender gap from the 1970’s, and whether the increase of women in politics has helped lessen the gap (Carroll 2002). She expected to find an increase in Republican women in
office if the gender gap had in fact lessened (Carroll 2002). She finds the gender gap is still present and effecting women, but the underlying partisan gap has increased immensely and effected this gender gap (Carroll 2002). Republican women have become substantially more conservative, and more likely to call themselves conservatives as compared to moderates (Carroll 2002). She concludes the reason for this gap is the decrease in Democratic women state legislators (Carroll 2002). Women hadn’t changed their partisanship, but the make up of the state legislators was significantly more conservative women as compared to liberal women (Carroll 2002).

Harp, Loke, and Bachmann analyze the language and communication used with women politicians, as compared to their male counterparts (2016). The utilize Jamieson’s 1995 research on the feminine/competence bind, to explain how women, and in this specific case Hillary Clinton, are treated differently on the basis of their gender (Harp et al. 2016). They used Hillary Clinton as their framework of study, because she was consistently shown to be one of the most competent politicians (Harp et al. 2016). They found her gender did not affect her competency, and akin that to her years of service and work experience (Harp et al 2016). They argue a new bind came out of Hillary Clinton’s career, one of competency and emotional control (Harp et. al 2016). Secretary Clinton was often referred to as angry, combative, or sad during the news coverage of her (Harp et. al 2016). This relates back to my research, as women witnesses are often seen as combative, or are treated like they are being too emotional.

Delving further into committees, the gender dynamic becomes clear through the treatment of committee members and witnesses. Kathlene offers a limited analysis of the gender dynamic during Congressional debates and hearings, while accounting for many other dependent factors (1994). She challenges the notion that gender does not matter during these hearings, by
researching and concluding that it has an effect (Kathlene 1994). She concludes women are more likely to act as facilitators, and be more cooperative then their male counterpart (Kathlene 1994). In addition, she analyzes the treatment of women as witnesses, and offers conclusions on the basis of their gender (Kathlene 1994). The analysis offers support that gender has an effect on witnesses, and can affect how a woman is talked to, interrupted, talked over, and how long it takes her to talk (Kathlene 1994). She also found evidence of sexist remarks in the hearings she analyzed, and found that committee hearings follow the same expected gender patterns (Kathlene 1994).

There has been some research done in the field of treatment of witnesses, and the correlation that has with his/her gender. Kathlene offers a piece about the gender of a witness, and how that affects the treatment by Congressional members (569). She found female witnesses had less opportunity to talk, and generally talked less (Kathlene 569). This was consistent with other gendered research Kathlene had completed (570). Women are more likely to be downgraded and treated with less respect than her male counterparts, such as being referred to by her first name (Lyn 572). However, Lyn does not look at the effect of party on the treatment of witnesses, and how the party factors in to the treatment of a witness, as does the gender. However, she did not look at the dual effect of party/ideology and gender, which means party/ideology could be attributing to the treatment, or it could be both.

The hole in the research comes from looking at gender and party, and the relationship between the two. There has been research about the treatment of women as witnesses, but the intersection of party and gender has not been looked at. I will explore this hole in the research, and how party and gender combine with the Committee member and witness to create a hostile or friendly environment. The research on the treatment of women while testifying as witnesses
is sparse, and specific to state legislature. I will be looking at the federal level, during Congressional hearings and the treatment of both male and female witnesses during these hearings. My research will focus on the binary effect of gender and party/ideology, to account for each factor on the treatment of witnesses. Each factor is important to analyze in the treatment of witnesses, as they can both add to the negative treatment.

Theory Design

I expect to find a correlation between the gender of the Congressmen/women and the gender of the witnesses, but also to find a relationship to the party of the Congressional member and the issue. When both of these factors collide (i.e. differing ideology and gender), I expect to find the harshest treatment. For example, I expect to find a woman, who is testifying about a Democratic issue, will be interrupted more and treated with less respect by a male, Republican member of the committee compared to the other Congressional members. However, because of the gender effect mentioned above in the literature, I only expect this to work in one direction. Because women utilize a cooperative approach, rather than competitive, I expect to find they will be more cooperative with witnesses as well (Rosenthal 2010). This means they will listen more before speaking, and thus will not interrupt a witness like a male Congressman would (Rosenthal 2010). This gender effect is only in effect when a male is in power and questioning or leading a female, and does not work in the other direction. Since power is in the committee members favor, I expect the disrespect will go from committee member to witness, not witness to committee member. The gender effect does not work in reverse, so I do not expect a female committee member to interrupt a male witness often.

I believe this will happen because of the intersection of gendered dynamics and political parties in American politics. Republican lawmakers disagree with liberal ideas, and vice versa,
which sets the stage for a negative atmosphere to begin with. The addition of gender in the sphere of politics sets up a hostile environment, which is the reason I believe gender and party cause a more hostile environment than just one factor. However, when ideologies are the same, I believe party will still create an environment where women are interrupted more than men, by men. I believe this because of the effect of gender, and the stereotypes women face in society. This theoretical groundwork was laid in my literature review, where stereotypical gender dynamics are present.

This theory is present in the literature I analyzed, and the four main themes that arose from the research. The treatment of women is paralleled in society, from Congress and campaigns, to the treatment of women as witnesses coming before Congress. Women are not seen as competent as men, and are often questioned in their professional lives (Rosenthal 2000). This treatment can be seen across society and continues into the political arena. However, there is an intersection of party in the mixture, which will be analyzed in my paper. I expect to find a correlation between gender and the amount of interruptions a witness receives, while accounting for party and ideological differences that are also present.

I expect to find the treatment of women because of the gender dynamic found in Congress and Congressional hearings, as already seen in my literature review. Gender dynamics show the effect of gender on women in every day life, and I expect these differences to correlate in the treatment of Congressional witnesses. I will fine evidence that women are treated differently on the basis of their gender, and party, during testimony in front of Congressional committees. I believe women will be treated differently purely based on gender, and the mistreatment of witnesses will also be present with an ideology divide.

*Research Design*
The data for my research came from three Congressional hearings before the House and Senate Judiciary Committee. All of these hearings were about abortion, and the committee had a mixture of Committeemen and women, while also being bipartisan. These hearings also provided witnesses from both ideologies, and both men and women testifying. I chose the issue of abortion because it creates a hostile environment, and is a partisan issue with ideological differences. This created an environment where I believed I would see the starkest results of hostility and disrespect. I wanted an interaction where ideology and party had a clear divide, and abortion provided that divide.

The Senate Judiciary is an important, partisan committee which is in charge of confirmation hearings, and hearings regarding legislation. It is comprised of twenty members, and is currently Republican controlled. It was also Republican controlled during this hearings, which I believed would create a hostile environment for the issue of abortion. The committee chair is Senator Grassley, a male, Republican Senator from Iowa. During the hearings I analyzed, he was the chair. This is a powerful committee in Congress, as it confirms Presidential nominees and holds hearings regarding current legislation and federal funding. This committee votes on legislation and confirmations by the President, and is comprised of both Republican and Democrats, as well as men and women. I wanted a powerful committee, to see how men and women in power differ in treatment of witnesses.

I chose the subject of abortion because it is a partisan, hostile issue, where there is a lot of current and past legislation. It is also a women’s issue, which brings in themes from my literature review. Women often speak sooner and more in depth on traditional women’s issues (Kathlene 1994). I chose abortion because it is considered a women’s issue, and I figured women would feel more comfortable in this situation. As the literature shows, women speak more comfortably
and sooner on women’s issues, and are often more vocal with their opinions on women’s issues (Kathlene 1994). I expected Republican men to be more hostile towards liberal, female witnesses, which is why I chose an issue that Republicans opposed. Abortion was my chosen topic because it is already a hostile, aggressive discussion, and I wanted to see how the gender of a witness affected that environment.

I chose three committee hearings, two from the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act and one from the Prenatal Non-Discrimination Act from 2015. In these specific hearings, I looked for interactions that were both similar and different between the committee member and witness. I analyzed the different treatment and hostilities present between committee member and witness, while accounting for both gender and ideology/party. Specifically, I found interactions between committee members and witnesses that met my criteria for both dependent variables (gender and ideology). These hearings provided the interactions I needed between witnesses and members, including the complex interactions between party/ideology, with the mixture of gender and hostile questioning.

For each interaction, I found situations where both my variables were present, but also situations where one was present and one was not present. I had interactions between similar party and ideology, with differing gender, and same party/ideology with differing genders. This could have included a Republican committee member, and a liberal, male witness. Utilizing this method accounted for the treatment of witnesses because of their ideology/party, as that does have an effect on their treatment as well. However, I also found instances where ideology matched (i.e. Republican committee member and conservative, female witness), and analyzed the treatment purely based on gender. I wanted to get an analysis of how party affected the treatment of a witness, but the root of my analysis was the affect of gender. Interactions with the
same party and ideology, but differing genders, helped me narrow down my dependent variables to just gender.

For my coding, I analyzed and looked for interruptions, misuse of title, condescending language, and hostility. If any of these variables was present, I gave it a one. Once I had coded thirty interactions between committee members and witnesses, I ran a statistical analysis to separate the treatment based off of gender, party/ideology, and both gender and party. An interruption counted if a witness was speaking, and a Congress member talked over them or cut them off. Hostility was considered cutting off, talking over, or an aggressive back and forth interaction. A misuse of title was present if a witness was a doctor or went by doctor, and a Senator used Mr./Ms. to refer to the witness’s name. Condescending language was coded as a tone of voice when listening to the hearings, or using overly polite language while being hostile. Overall, each of these dependent variables made for an environment that was hostile for the witness, when one or more of these variables were present.

Hostility and condescending language were very similar variables to code, and were often seen together. However, I separated them into two separate categories because they are different in minute ways. For the purposes of this paper, condescending language was coded based on the tone of the askers voice, and how the witness was spoken to. Hostility was coded as an aggressive back and forth interaction, often with multiple interruptions and talking over. Hostility was over a longer period of time, and usually occurred throughout the entire questioning of a witness. Interruptions were coded as a quick talking over.

Results

My results show that gender plays a significant effect on the treatment of witnesses, but party and ideology also have an effect on the treatment of witness during their testimony. In
each case, the dependent variable created an environment where gender, or party/ideology, played a factor in the treatment of witnesses. I analyzed three different sets of data: accounting for just gender, accounting for only party, and combining the two and analyzing the interaction when both gender and party differ. Then, I ran a third analysis where both party and gender have an effect, and how that effected the treatment of these witnesses.

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Condition</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
<th>All cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Male committee member with female witness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruptions</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misuse Title</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Credibility</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condescending Language</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows the treatment of witnesses while analyzing for the gender affect. For an interaction to meet this condition, the gender of the committee member and witness had to differ. This means any interaction with two men, or two women, would fall under “not present”. If an interaction had a male committee member and female witness, or a female committee member and male witness, it would have met the condition. However, we would not expect to see the gender effect go in reverse. Drawing from the literature, the gender effect only works in one direction, and that is with a powerful male, questioning a female. First, for every variable, gender played a significant role in the treatment. Women were interrupted more than men, treated with more hostility, had their titles misused more, and were talked down to more than...
men. For example, hostility increased from being present 57.1% of the time, to being present 89.5% of the time when accounting just for gender. This does not include party/ideology in the mix.

Specific to Table 1, the results show the effect of gender while not accounting for party/ideology. My results show interruptions, misuse of title, condescending language, and hostility occurs while the gender affect is not present. However, these dependent variables are more likely to occur when the gender effect is present. Walk through the numbers a bit more. Every dependent variable was more present when gender was accounted for, compared to when it was not accounted for. Next, I analyzed the treatment of witnesses based off their ideology, and the party of the committee member questioning them.

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Behaviors under Presence and Absence of Party Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Party Condition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Differing committee party and witness ideology)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misuse Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condescending Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 accounts for the effect of party or ideology on the treatment of a witness. For the condition to be present, party/ideology had to be differing. This means the interaction had to be between a Republican/liberal witness, or a Democrat/conservative witness. Here, it shows party and ideology play a significant role in the treatment of a witness as well. As expected, differing
party and ideology creates an hostile environment. Note that in instances where committee member and witness ideology conflicted, interruptions occurred 85% of the time, and only 50% when no party/ideological conflict was present. Once again, each of the dependent variables was present without accounting for party/ideology divide. But, when party is factored into the analysis, each dependent variable is present more often. Hostility increases almost 20%, meaning it was present in twenty percent more of cases compared to instances where party was the same. In the cases of interruptions, there was only an interruption fifty percent of the time without the condition of party present. However, when I analyzed for the effect of party, interruptions increased to eighty-five percent of the time.

I analyzed the treatment on the basis of party to account for party in my final table. While my paper seeks to look at the differing treatment of witnesses on the basis of gender, party and ideology had to be accounted for as well. As I found in Table 2, party and ideology do affect the treatment of a witness. When ideology and party match, once again each dependent variable is present. When party and ideology does not match, my results show an increase in the presence of every variable.

Table 3.
Last, Table 3 accounts for both party and gender affecting the treatment of a witness. For the condition to be present, both party and gender had to differ. For example, this means a Republican male committee member and a female, liberal witness would be considered. However, an interaction between a Republican male committee member and a female, conservative witness would not have been. Accounting for both of these factors, I found the most hostile environment for women witnesses.

Accounting for party/ideology and gender showed the most hostility towards female witnesses, especially when Republican men were questioning them. It is interesting to combine both ideology and gender, and see that Republican men are the worst offenders of negative treatment. This is significant to know how they treat witnesses, and how their treatment differs based on gender of the witness. It is expected for opposing parties to treat each other with some hostility or disrespect, as shown in the literature above. However, treating a witness with disrespect or hostility on the basis of his/her gender should not occur during these hearings. Committee hearings exist for debate and expanding the knowledge of issues, not for there to be a gendered bias facing women.

This shows while party and ideology does matter, gender does affect how a witness is treated. I found the worst treatment of women with differing ideology and gender from their questioner, especially when it was a Republican, male committee member. This was my expected result, as I expected to find the most hostility when party/ideology and gender differed. However, I did not expect the percentages to increase as much as they did. In each dependent variable, the percent of times present increased by almost twenty percent.

There were a few specific interactions between Congressmen and witnesses that presented the most dependent variables. During the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act hearing,
Senator Hatch interacted with multiple liberal, female witnesses. In each of his interactions, he interrupted the female witness, talked over, used hostility, and used condescending language. His treatment of women witnesses was the same across these variables. However, when Senator Hatch was questioning Carol Tobias, a conservative witness, he had the same interactions and behavior as the liberal witnesses. In his case, it was not a matter of party/ideology, but his treatment of female witnesses was much more aggressive and disrespectful than his treatment of male witnesses. This is important because it shows while party and ideology matter, the gender of the witness will still illicit a hostile environment, especially if her gender is opposite of her questioner. A male in power is more likely to interrupt, as seen in the interaction between Senator Hatch and Ms. Tobias. They both agreed on many points, but four out of the five dependent variables were still present.

In terms of specifically ideology, the interactions between Republican committeemen and liberal witnesses created the most hostile environment for witnesses to testify in. The issue of abortion is the most likely cause of this hostility, since Republican lawmakers are often very strongly opposed to abortion. This can be seen most clearly in the interactions with Senator Graham and liberal female witnesses, across the different interactions he had with them. For example, Senator Graham was the only congressman to misuse a female’s title, as he repeatedly referred to Dr. Chireau as Ms. Chireau. This interaction between Senator Graham and Dr. Chireau could be a result of ingrained stereotypes towards women, or a deliberate move to talk down to the woman. Many of the interactions between Republican men, in a powerful position, and liberal female witnesses had at least three of the dependent variables present.

Conclusion
The treatment of witnesses can be affected by the party/ideology of the witness and Congress member pair, but can also be affected by gender. I found significant data to suggest women are treated differently while they are testifying before these committees than men, and this divide in the treatment stems from their gender. Though each dependent variable reacts with both gender and party/ideology, the worst treatment came from differing party/ideology and gender. This was my predicted result from my hypothesis, and is shown in Table 3. The table shows every dependent variable is more present during interactions where party and gender differ.

I expected to find this result because of the literature and research already collected on this matter, and how women are treated in society. Four major themes arose out of the literature: women have different leadership style compared to men, women will be more cooperative compared to competitive when in leadership roles, women on these hearings will talk less and later, and female witnesses will have less time to speak compared to male witnesses on the same subject. These themes continued across my research, and can be seen in my results. Female Congress members did not interrupt male witnesses, and did not interrupt female witnesses as much as men.

The interaction between of gender and the treatment of witness produces a hostile environment for the witness, as seen in Table 1. This is important because in each case, the dependent variables were present. However, when I added the gender effect in, each dependent variable was present in a higher percentage in every interaction. This is significant because it is showing the effect that just gender has, without accounting for ideology. However, ideology and party must be accounted for, which is shown in Table 2. This breaks down the interactions purely based on party and ideology, and does not include gender. This is significant to my
research because it shows that differing ideologies will produce a hostile environment, just like differing genders will. These two variables alone did not produce a highly significant effect of the treatment of witnesses, but when combined they showed a significant effect.

This hostility is important because it creates an environment that could be uncomfortable for the witness, and thus the testimony may be affected by the hostility. The purpose of a hearing is to illicit discussion, but in some of these interactions, there is no discussion. It is imperative to illicit fair and accurate testimony from witnesses, that is not dependent on his/her gender. It is the job of the Congress member to listen and respectfully question the witnesses, without being disrespectful or hostile. The committee members talk over witnesses, talk down to them, and treat them with overall disrespect. This can be expected on partisan issues, and could be a result of the ideology divide. However, when gender is also accounted for, the differences in treatment are more apparent. Witnesses are interrupted more, talked over more, and treated with more hostility when the witness is female compared to male.

The treatment of women during hearings is important because it compromises the deliberative nature of the hearings. Hearings are meant to illicit testimony and information about potential legislation, and this means each testimony is important and imperative to the function of the hearing. Witnesses should be treated fairly and without bias, and be allowed to fully answer questions about their area of expertise. If a Congress member is not treating witnesses with respect, they are not fully listening and comprehending the testimony of the witness. Congress members vote on the bill after hearings, and they should be making informed decisions on these bills. The purpose of a hearing is to debate bills and ideologies, but should be done with respect for each witness, regardless of gender. There will always be debate and disagreement in
a two party system, but witnesses should not be treated differently because of their ideology or gender.

This is important research that goes beyond Congressional hearings and witnesses testifying before them. My research has overarching themes with how women are treated in society across many environments, and how they are treated with hostility or disrespect when they disagree with men. This research is applicable to women deciding to run for office, as my research extends past witnesses. There has already been research done to show women are treated differently while involved in politics, and it is harder for a woman to decide to run for office. This decision to run is based on many factors, including family, societal expectations, and a feeling of lack of competence.
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