

Supplemental Data Appendix

Dependent Variable

Support for Women in Politics: Responses to the question: “In general, men are better political leaders than women, do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree?” Higher scores indicate less support for women as political leaders, but given the nature of HLM’s ordered logit procedure, positive coefficients in the analysis indicate *more* support for women. Range: 1 – 4. Standard deviation: .91.

Country-Level Independent Variables (for in-text models):

Female Labor Force Participation: Proportion of the female population age 15-64 in the labor force, 2007. Observed range: .38 - .74. Standard deviation: .11. Source: World Bank (2009).

Female Professionals: Proportion of professional and technical workers who are female. Data are for the most recent year available between 1996 and 2006. Observed range: .22 - .59. Standard deviation: .08. Sources: UNDP (2007a); Wilkie, Aleman and Ortega (2001) for Guatemala, Paraguay, and Haiti (average for 1990-1996); AWOJA (2006) for Jamaica (data for 2002).

Women in the Cabinet: Proportion of Cabinet members who are female, January 2008. Observed range: .07 – .39. Standard deviation: .09. Sources: UNDP (2009); Llanos and Sample (2008) for Honduras.

Women in the Legislature: Proportion of national legislators (in the lower house) who are female, 2008. Observed range: .03 - .37. Standard deviation: .09. Source: CEPAL (2009).

Left Leader: Coded one if the average ideology score for the party of the president (or prime minister) at the time of the survey fell on the left half of the scale (1-5.5); coded zero if the president’s party did not fall on the left (5.6-10). Observed range: 0 - 1. Standard deviation: .45. Source: Created by authors from AmericasBarometer 2008.

GDP per capita Index: GDP per capita adjusted for purchasing power parity and indexed to range from 0 to 1. Observed range: .47 - .78. Standard deviation: .08. Source: UNDP (2007b).

Individual-Level Independent Variables: All are from the 2008 Americas Barometer.

Reported standard deviations are for the full sample.

Democracy is Best: Responses to the question: “It may be that democracy has problems, but it is better than any other form of government. To what extent do you agree or disagree?” Higher values indicate more agreement. Range: 1 – 7. Standard deviation: 1.74.

Tolerance: Responses to the question: “And thinking of homosexuals, with how much firmness do you approve or disapprove that they be allow to run for public office?” Higher values indicate stronger approval. Range: 1 – 10. Standard deviation: 3.27.

Trust in Government: A factor score based on responses to items about trust in five institutions: “How much confidence do you have in 1) the justice system; 2) the electoral tribunal; 3) the legislature; 4) the national government; 5) the high court?” Higher values indicate more trust. The Eigenvalue for the factor score is 3.5, and the factor loadings are all over .7. Range: -1.89 – 2.18. Standard deviation: 1.0.

Left Ideology: Response to the question: “These days a lot of people, when they talk about political tendencies, they talk about people who sympathize more with the left and those who sympathize more with the right. According to this sense that we have for these terms “left” and “right” when you think about your own political point of view, where would you locate yourself on this scale.” Higher values are further left. Range: 1 – 10. Standard deviation: 2.51.

Left Party Sympathizer: Respondents who identify with a left party score a 1; all others score a 0. To identify left parties, we first calculated the mean ideology of respondents from each country. We define left parties are those with an average ideological self-placement among its supporters

that place the party to the left of the mean ideology in the country. Standard deviation: .33.

Education: Total years of education completed by the respondent. Range: 0 – 18. Standard deviation: 4.51.

Material Wealth: A scale that sums the number of 9 possible material items the respondent owns. Range: 0 – 9. Standard deviation: 2.06.

Employment: A series of dummy variables based on responses to: “To what do you dedicate yourself primarily?” Work in the home: 23% of the sample; student: 8%; retired: 6%; not working: 3%; employed: 60%.

Professional Occupation: Responses to: “What is the occupation or type of work that you do?” Respondents who said they were in professional, intellectual, scientific, managerial, technical, educational or white-collar government work are coded as 1; all others are coded as 0. Standard deviation: .30.

Marital Status: A dummy variable based the question: “What is your civil state?” Respondents who indicated they were married or in a common law marriage scored 1. All others scored 0. Standard deviation: .49.

Parent: Respondents with at least one child are coded 1; all others are coded 0. Standard deviation: .44.

Religiosity: Scale measuring frequency of attendance at religious services, where 1 equals never and 5 equals more than once per week. Standard deviation: 1.33.

Race: Respondents’ self-identification. Those who identified as white scored 1; all others are 0. 21% of the sample identifies as white. Standard deviation: .41.

Age: Respondents are coded into six chronological age groupings. Range: 1 – 6. Standard deviation: 1.57.

Country-Level Independent Variables (supplemental models only):

Gender Quotas: The supplemental analysis contains four different operationalizations of gender quotas. Tables C1a and C2a employ a measure in which countries without quota laws score zero, countries with a quota law that requires women be placed in electable positions on the ballot score two, and those with a quota law that does not make such ranking requirements score one. Observed range: 0 – 2. Standard deviation: 0.83. The models in column 1 in Tables C1b and C2b use a dichotomous measure in which countries with a quota requirement score one (Observed range: 0 – 1. Standard deviation: 0.51). The models in column 2 employ a measure of the proportion of spots on the ballot that are to be reserved for women; countries without quotas score zero (Observed range: 0 – 0.40. Standard deviation: 0.17). The models in column 3 use a dichotomous measure in which countries with a quota law requiring women be placed in electable positions on the ballot score one and all others score zero (Observed range: 0 – 1. Standard deviation: 0.45). All data for the closest election preceding the survey. Source: Global Database of Quotas for Women (Quota Project 2009).

Past Female Executive: Dummy variable on which countries score one if they had a female executive at any point between 1958 and the time of the survey in 2008. Observed range: 0 – 1. Standard deviation: 0.50.

Female Executive Candidate: Dummy variable indicating the presence of a female candidate for chief executive in the most recent election. Observed range: 0 – 1. Standard deviation: 0.48.

Level of Democracy: 2008 Freedom House score; higher values indicate less democratic. Observed range: 1 – 4.5. Standard deviation: 0.87. Source: Freedom House (2008).

References

- AWOJA (Association of Women's Organizations in Jamaica). 2006. "Jamaica and the CEDAW: The NGO Perspective" Paper presented at the 36th session of the CEDAW Committee, August 2006.
- Comisión Económica para América Latina (CEPAL). 2009. "Estadísticas de Género: Mujeres en la adopción de decisiones" *CEPALSTAT*
<http://websie.eclac.cl/infest/ajax/cepalstat.asp?carpeta=estadisticas> (15 July 2009).
- Freedom House. 2008. "Freedom in the World." <http://www.freedomhouse.org> (14 August 2009).
- Llanos, Beatriz and Kristen Sample. 2008. "30 Years of Democracy: Riding the Wave? Women's Political Participation in Latin America." Lima, Peru: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance.
http://www.idea.int/publications/30_years_of_democracy/upload/30-years-of-democracy-2.pdf (31 July 2009).
- Quota Project. 2009. "Global Database of Quotas for Women" International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, Inter-Parliamentary Union, and the University of Stockholm. <http://www.quotaproject.org> (14 August 2009)
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 2007a. "Table 29. Gender Empowerment Measure." *Human Development Indices: A Statistical Update 2008*. New York: UNDP, pp. 330-333. http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_20072008_EN_Complete.pdf (14 August 2009).
- UNDP. 2007b. *Human Development Report 2007/2008*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan and UNDP. http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_20072008_EN_Indicator_tables.pdf (15 February 2010).
- UNDP. 2009. "Women in ministerial positions" *Human Development Report 2009*.
<http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/indicators/134.html> (20 February 2010).
- Wilkie, James W., Eduardo Aleman and Jose Guadalupe Ortega. 2001. *Statistical Abstract of Latin America*. Volume 37. Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications.
- World Bank. 2009. "Labor force Participation Rate, Female" *Genderstats: Latin America and the Caribbean*. World Bank Group <http://go.worldbank.org/4PIIORQMS0> (30 July 2009).