a small amount from the 22nd Congressional District (Population of New York). This newly re-drawn district will mainly consist of Representative Hayworth's old base of constituents. This area is located in the southern section of upstate New York and consists of sections of many counties, including Dutchess, Rockland, Orange, Westchester, and Putnam. Historically, this district flip-flopped in each election over the past few cycles, as it has been split between Republican and Democratic bases. The district has been subject to constant re-districting, and in recent years even cut out the Bronx section, which used to connect Up-State New York with Manhattan.

The demographic of the Hayworth's current 19th district's constituents is typical of the region; between upstate and Manhattan, the area has a higher-than-national average for income and is predominantly white. The median income of the area is almost $83,000, which is greater than the median average income of Americans in 2010 with $52,000. The district mainly voted for Republican candidates since the early 1990's; before that, Democrats held the area for almost 70 years. In 2006 Democrat John Hall was able to defeat long-term Republican Representative Sue Kelly who had held the office for 12 years. Representative Hall was then only able to hold his office for two terms before Republican Nan Hayworth defeated him. This type of voting shows that these constituents are not afraid to take drastic actions to change the politicians who represent them. Before being defeated, Sue Kelly enjoyed comfortable victories and wide margins each election. Her defeat can be credited with ties to a political scandal, absence from a crucial debate, and refusal to speak at important interviews. The citizens of the former 19th district have a strong voice and they are not afraid to use it, and in the upcoming election they have the choice to use that voice in the 18th district (New York 19th District).

During her time in office, Nan Hayworth voted on a variety of issues. She considers herself a politician who is willing to work with both sides in order to get the job done. She stated, "I'm one of the members of the House majority, who has voted most frequently – actually, about a third of the time I voted the way President Obama has also supported voting/So, I'm confident that I'll be able to work successfully to make our Democratic voters feel well served" (Weathers).

With this attitude in mind, a citizen may believe that Nan Hayworth is more moderate and open to a variety of issues, particularly women's rights. However, during her term she voted for limiting contraceptive coverage and defunding Planned Parenthood. In fact she voted with her party 88% of the time (Nan Hayworth). During her campaign for the 2010 election she promised to be a moderate politician for her district, yet she actively recruited the help of the Tea Party and their resources in order to assure her victory. The Tea Party supported her efforts and committed money and publicity to her campaign. After securing her office, Hayworth quickly shed her Tea Party ties and actively voted similarly to her Republican peers. During her campaign she also recruited the support of large interest groups and big businesses, including Mount Kisco Medical Group, of which her husband is a board member.

During her term Representative Hayworth voted on many important bills. The way she voted greatly affected her district, and her constituents took notice. While campaigning in 2010, Hayworth voiced her support for women's reproductive rights, but after assuming office she voted to defund Planned Parenthood and also voted to expand the Hyde Amendment (Pillifant). In 2010, Hayworth also ran on the platform of securing our national debt and fixing our finances. She convinced her voters that jobs would be created in her district and her term would lead to a new economic direction. However, what she voted for resembles little of what she promised. Hayworth proposed many budget cuts that encourage capital investment and even voted against local projects such as the Taylor Biomass Project, which would have created many local jobs. Her votes against such projects could have cost local counties hundreds of jobs. At one point Hayworth stated that, "it was not the government's place to create jobs" (Weathers). Her campaign promises are in direct conflict with her voting actions. Her local financial voting record is not even in line with her fellow area Republican Representatives. The latter said projects such as the Taylor Biomass Project are fantastic opportunities for the area and supported them. She also supported tax cuts for the rich and the demise of Medicare, to the dismay of her elderly constituents.