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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Candidates 2011** | |  |  |  |  | **Elected MPs 2011** | |  |  |
| Parties | Male | Female | % Male | % Female |  | Male | Female | % Male | %Female |
| KESK | 137 | 96 | 58.80 | 41.20 |  | 23 | 12 | 65.71 | 34.29 |
| KOK | 128 | 104 | 55.17 | 44.83 |  | 29 | 15 | 65.91 | 34.09 |
| SDP | 135 | 103 | 56.72 | 43.28 |  | 15 | 27 | 35.71 | 64.29 |
| VAS | 133 | 103 | 56.36 | 43.64 |  | 8 | 6 | 57.14 | 42.86 |
| VIHR | 110 | 118 | 48.25 | 51.75 |  | 5 | 5 | 50.00 | 50.00 |
| KD | 109 | 82 | 57.07 | 42.93 |  | 3 | 3 | 50.00 | 50.00 |
| RKP | 46 | 37 | 55.42 | 44.58 |  | 4 | 5 | 44.44 | 55.56 |
| PS | 159 | 79 | 66.81 | 33.19 |  | 28 | 11 | 71.79 | 28.21 |
| Others | 18 | 4 | 81.82 | 18.18 |  | . | 1 | 0.00 | 100.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total** | **975** | **726** | **57.32** | **42.68** |  | **115** | **85** | **57.50** | **42.50** |

**B. Technical information on the three surveys**

**Gender Barometer Survey:** 2500 respondents living in Finland are selected randomly (but balancing or taking into account different geographical areas, age and gender). The telephone interviews are conducted in the two official languages (Finnish or Swedish). The percentage of people who agree to answer the questions has been between 64 and 77%. Unfortunately, there is no available information on the interviewer’s sex. In 1998, 2001, and 2012 the survey included a question about the competence of female and male politicians. More information in Kiianmaa (2012).

**Presidential Survey 2012**: TNS Gallup nr. 220102032. The gender questions were asked during the weekend of the first round of presidential election, 20-24.01.2012 in Gallup Channel, which is a weekly omnibus survey with 2000 panellists that are 15-74 year old and typically achieves a 80% response rate.

**Finnish National Election Study (FNES) 2011**: Stored as FSD2653. The FNES is funded by the Academy of Finland and the Ministry of Justice and is archived at the Finnish social science data archive (FSD). It is available to the scholarly community via an application procedure. The 2011 FNES (n=1,298) data were collected by Taloustutkimus via face-to-face interviews with Finns aged 18+ (excluding Aland) and a self-administered questionnaire given to each respondent after the interview. For more information, see Borg and Grönlund (2011)http://www.fsd.uta.fi/en/data/catalogue/FSD2653/meF2653e.html

**C. Wording of used questions from the three datasets**

**(a) Item from Finish Gender Barometer (1998-2012)**

YL4 Next I will name five policy areas. Which one is more suited, a man or a woman, to take care of tasks of high responsibility in these areas, or does the gender not matter?

A economic policy

D social and health policy

1. Man
2. Woman
3. Gender doesn’t matter
4. Cannot say

**(b) Items from Survey conducted during the 2012 Finnish Presidential Election**

Q2. In your opinion, an MP of which gender is better able to act in the following matters:

Q2\_1 …security policy

Q2\_2 …economic policy

Q2\_3 …social policy

Q2\_5 …equality policy

1. male MPs

2. female MPs

3. male and female MPs are equally good

Q3 Considering that two equally competent candidates - a man and a woman - are running for presidency in the second round of the elections which candidate would you rather vote for?

1. Man

2. Woman

Q4. When you consider the candidates running in elections and the elected representatives in general, do you relate the following characteristics to men or to women:

Q4\_1 …assertive?

Q4\_2 …compassionate?

Q4\_3 ….consensus-building?

Q4\_4 … ambitious?

1. men

2. women

3. no difference

**(c) Items from Finnish National Election Study (FNES) 2011**

K23 Did you vote for a candidate who is of the same gender as you?

Yes/No

P9\_2 It was important to me that my own gender would be well-represented among decision-makers

1. strongly agree
2. somewhat agree
3. neither agree or disagree
4. somewhat disagree
5. strongly disagree
6. can't say

P12 In your opinion, is a male or a female MP better able to work on the following issues:

P12\_1 security policy

P12\_2 economic policy

P12\_3 social policy

P12\_5 gender equality policy

1. male MP
2. female MP
3. male and female MPs are equally good

P9\_4 Men are better decision-makers than women[[1]](#footnote-1)

1. strongly agree
2. somewhat agree
3. neither agree or disagree
4. somewhat disagree
5. strongly disagree
6. can't say

P9\_5 Women as decision-makers are better informed than men are on issues important to ordinary people[[2]](#footnote-2)

1. strongly agree
2. somewhat agree
3. neither agree or disagree
4. somewhat disagree
5. strongly disagree
6. can't say

**D. Comparison of identical items in presidential and legislative surveys**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Presidential survey (2012)*** | **Male** | **Equally Good** | **Female** |
| 'Issue Competence' Stereotypes | | | |
| Security | 44.82 | 53.93 | 1.07 |
| Economy | 27.14 | 69.46 | 3.39 |
| Social Policy | 6.07 | 58.39 | 35.54 |
| Equality Policy | 9.29 | 64.64 | 26.07 |
| N=560 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| ***Legislative survey (2011)*** |  | |  |
| 'Issue Competence' Stereotypes |  |  |  |
| Security | 43.00 | 56.16 | 0.84 |
| Economy | 21.42 | 73.69 | 4.89 |
| Social Policy | 1.52 | 60.03 | 38.45 |
| Equality Policy | 2.87 | 70.66 | 26.48 |
| N=593 |  |  |  |

**E. Gender Barometer Graphs (Figures 1 and 2 in original manuscript) separated by age groups**

**Figure E1:** Gender Barometer Graphs separated by age groups

**Figure E2**: Gender Barometer Graphs separated by age groups

**F. Descriptive Statistics for Regression Models**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Mean** | **Std. Dev.** | **Min** | **Max** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Presidential survey (2012)*** |  |  |  |  |
| Female Traits | 4.65 | 1.01 | 2 | 6 |
| Male Traits | 4.79 | 0.88 | 2 | 6 |
| Female Policies | 4.46 | 1.00 | 2 | 6 |
| Male Policies | 4.68 | 0.88 | 2 | 6 |
| High education | 0.37 | 0.48 | 0 | 1 |
| Sex | 1.50 | 0.50 | 1 | 2 |
| Age | 53.47 | 14.52 | 19 | 84 |
| Ideology | 5.90 | 2.76 | 0 | 10 |
| N=560 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Legislative survey (2011)*** |  |  |  |  |
| Female Policies | 4.61 | 0.84 | 2 | 6 |
| Male Policies | 4.59 | 0.81 | 2 | 6 |
| General Competence | 4.54 | 1.85 | 2 | 10 |
| High education | 0.43 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 |
| Sex | 1.51 | 0.50 | 1 | 2 |
| Age | 53.32 | 16.86 | 19 | 91 |
| Ideology | 5.30 | 2.29 | 0 | 10 |
| Descriptive representation important | 2.70 | 1.40 | 1 | 6 |
| Prior experience of candidate important | 2.35 | 0.99 | 1 | 4 |
| R party with female incumbent in district | 0.66 | 0.47 | 0 | 1 |
| N=593 |  |  |  |  |

**Figure F1 Male stereotypes separated by party supporters (differences)**

Note: this figure shows the difference in stereotype holding among partisans of the six largest parties in Finland. Reading example for first column: KOK voters are overrepresented by 6.8% in the group holding security policy stereotypes (20.5% KOK supporters in general while 27.4% among Respondents stating that a man is better in handling security issues).

**Figure F2 Female stereotypes separated by party supporters (differences)**

Note: this figure shows the difference in stereotype holding among partisans of the six largest parties in Finland. Reading example for first column: KOK voters are overrepresented by 4 % in the group holding social policy stereotypes (20.5% KOK supporters in general while 24.5% among Respondents stating that a women is better in handling social issues).

**G. Additional model specifications**

**Table G1 - controlled for parties plus income and marital status**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Baseline preference for female candidate** | |  | **Vote for female candidate** | | | |  | |
| Female Traits | 0.719 | 0.168 | \*\*\* |  | |  | |  | |
| Male Traits | -0.761 | 0.170 | \*\*\* |  | |  | |  | |
| Female Policies | 0.232 | 0.163 |  | 0.131 | | 0.119 | |  | |
| Male Policies | -1.065 | 0.197 | \*\*\* | -0.193 | | 0.134 | |  | |
| General Competence |  |  |  | -0.033 | | 0.057 | |  | |
| High education | 0.973 | 0.270 | \*\*\* | 0.226 | | 0.214 | |  | |
| Age | -0.019 | 0.009 | \*\* | 0.002 | | 0.006 | |  | |
| Sex | -1.534 | 0.258 | \*\*\* | 0.718 | | 0.202 | | \*\*\* | |
| Ideology | -0.188 | 0.060 | \*\* | -0.042 | | 0.056 | |  | |
| Married | 0.362 | 0.312 |  | 0.092 | | 0.194 | |  | |
| Income | -0.065 | 0.040 |  | -0.061 | | 0.039 | |  | |
| Descriptive representation important |  |  |  | 0.276 | | 0.073 | | \*\*\* | |
| Prior experience of candidate important |  |  |  | 0.238 | | 0.102 | | \*\* | |
| R party with female incumbent in district | |  |  | 0.909 | | 0.259 | | \*\*\* | |
| Gender equality attitudes |  |  |  | 0.071 | | 0.047 | |  | |
| Female interviewer |  |  |  | 0.131 | | 0.263 | |  | |
| Constant | 7.991 | 1.314 | \*\*\* | -3.702 | | 1.178 | | \*\* | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.427 |  |  | 0.122 | |  | |  | |
| Log Likelihood | -214.049 |  |  | -356.062 | |  | |  | |
| N | 560 |  |  | 590 | |  | |  | |
| \* p<.10, \*\* p<.05, \*\*\* p<.001 |  |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  |  |
| Please note: Data for model 1 is from the presidential survey, for models 2 and 3 from the legislative survey. In these models we additionally control for party vote choice (candidate of which party have you voted for, question Q21C in survey) (coefficients not shown). Logit coefficients and Standard errors shown. | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Table G2 controlled for social class plus marital status**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Baseline preference for female candidate** | |  | **Vote for female candidate** | | |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | |
| Female Traits | 0.718 | 0.167 | \*\*\* |  |  | |  | |
| Male Traits | -0.771 | 0.171 | \*\*\* |  |  | |  | |
| Female Policies | 0.171 | 0.160 |  | 0.040 | 0.139 | |  | |
| Male Policies | -1.061 | 0.194 | \*\*\* | -0.097 | 0.157 | |  | |
| High education | 0.876 | 0.277 | \*\* | 0.306 | 0.260 | |  | |
| Age | -0.021 | 0.009 | \*\* | -0.001 | 0.008 | |  | |
| Income | -0.069 | 0.041 | \* | -0.002 | 0.034 | |  | |
| Married | 0.316 | 0.309 |  | -0.013 | 0.261 | |  | |
| General competence |  |  |  | -0.062 | 0.069 | |  | |
| Sex | -1.646 | 0.255 | \*\*\* | 0.949 | 0.256 | | \*\*\* | |
| Ideology | -0.291 | 0.053 | \*\*\* | -0.073 | 0.053 | |  | |
| Descriptive representation important | |  |  | 0.285 | 0.118 | | \*\* | |
| Prior experience of candidate important | | |  | 0.156 | 0.115 | |  | |
| R party with female incumbent in district | | |  | 1.060 | 0.243 | | \*\*\* | |
| Gender equality attitudes |  |  |  | 0.065 | 0.055 | |  | |
| Female interviewer |  |  |  | 0.155 | 0.314 | |  | |
| Constant | 8.821 | 1.355 | \*\*\* | -3.236 | 1.463 | | \* | |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.418 |  |  | 0.129 |  | |  | |
| Log Likelihood | -217.2083 |  |  | -269.8392 |  | |  | |
| N | 560 |  |  | 451 |  | |  | |
| \* p<.10, \*\* p<.05, \*\*\* p<.001 |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |
| Please note: Data for model 1 is from the presidential survey, for models 2 and 3 from the legislative survey. In these models we additionally control for social classes (perceived class belonging, question K7 in survey) (coefficients not shown). Logit coefficients and Standard errors shown. | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table G3 models without non-alphabetical lists** | | | | | | |
|  | **Model 1** | |  | **Model 2** | |  |
|  | **Baseline preference for female candidate** | |  | **Vote for female candidate** | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Male Policies** | -1.067 | 0.193 | \*\*\* | -0.242 | 0.132 | \* |
| **Female Policies** | 0.156 | 0.158 |  | 0.164 | 0.119 |  |
| **Female Traits** | 0.703 | 0.165 | \*\*\* |  |  |  |
| **Male Traits** | -0.711 | 0.168 | \*\*\* |  |  |  |
| **General competence** |  |  |  | -0.036 | 0.056 |  |
| High education | 0.844 | 0.257 | \*\* | 0.222 | 0.205 |  |
| Female | -1.615 | 0.252 | \*\*\* | 0.724 | 0.198 | \*\*\* |
| Age | -0.017 | 0.009 | \*\*\* | 0.000 | 0.006 |  |
| Ideology | -0.286 | 0.050 | \*\*\* | -0.049 | 0.044 |  |
| Descriptive representation important |  |  |  | 0.263 | 0.072 | \*\*\* |
| Prior experience of candidate important |  |  |  | 0.123 | 0.100 | \* |
| R party with female incumbent in district |  |  |  | 0.799 | 0.207 | \*\*\* |
| Constant | 8.189 | 1.264 | \*\*\* | -2.156 | 0.895 | \*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.412 |  |  | 0.096 |  |  |
| Log Likelihood | -216.62 |  |  | -346.68 |  |  |
| N | 552 |  |  | 558 |  |  |

Note: \* p<.10, \*\* p<.05, \*\*\* p<.001. Data from the presidential survey (Model 1) and legislative survey (Model 2). In this specification Respondents faced with non-alphabetical lists are excluded from the analysis. This concerns the SPD voters in the districts of Häme, Kymi, Pohjois-Karjala (Northern Carelia) and Oulu.

**H. Model separated by ideology**

**Table H1 (presidential survey)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Baseline preference*** | **left ideology** | | |  | | **centrist ideology** | | | |  | | **right ideology** | | | |  | |
| Male Policies | 1.157 | | 0.393 | | \*\* | | 0.689 | | 0.390 | |  | | 0.797 | | 0.235 | | \*\* | |
| Female Policies | -0.531 | | 0.356 | |  | | -1.467 | | 0.478 | | \*\* | | -0.754 | | 0.228 | | \*\* | |
| Female Traits | 0.791 | | 0.341 | | \*\* | | -0.380 | | 0.321 | |  | | 0.149 | | 0.236 | |  | |
| Male Traits | -1.994 | | 0.452 | | \*\* | | -0.708 | | 0.422 | |  | | -0.802 | | 0.272 | | \*\* | |
| High education | 0.973 | | 0.613 | |  | | 1.429 | | 0.673 | | \* | | 0.726 | | 0.347 | | \* | |
| Female | -2.024 | | 0.536 | | \*\* | | -1.959 | | 0.708 | | \*\* | | -1.800 | | 0.373 | | \*\* | |
| Age | -0.058 | | 0.021 | | \*\* | | 0.014 | | 0.024 | |  | | -0.034 | | 0.012 | | \*\* | |
| Constant | 8.789 | | 2.342 | | \*\* | | 9.648 | | 3.229 | | \*\* | | 5.715 | | 1.781 | | \*\* | |
|  |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.4810 |  | |  | | 0.3776 | |  | |  | | 0.3527 | |  | |  | |
| Log Likelihood | -51.78 |  | |  | | -39.55 | |  | |  | | -112.30 | |  | |  | |
| N | 154 |  | |  | | 93 | |  | |  | | 313 | |  | |  | |
|  |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| \* p<.05, \*\* p<.001 |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| Please note: This table is based on Table 3, Model 1, separated for ideology. Logit coefficients and Standard errors shown. | | | | | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |

**Table H2 (legislative survey)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Vote for female candidate*** | **left ideology** | |  | **centrist ideology** | |  | **right ideology** | |  |
| Male Policies | -0.088 | 0.345 |  | -0.216 | 0.180 |  | -0.444 | 0.232 |  |
| Female Policies | 0.198 | 0.301 |  | 0.025 | 0.170 |  | 0.378 | 0.202 | \* |
| General competence | -0.070 | 0.129 |  | -0.130 | 0.083 |  | 0.117 | 0.101 |  |
| High education | 1.244 | 0.528 |  | 0.151 | 0.314 |  | -0.012 | 0.339 |  |
| Female | 1.087 | 0.489 |  | 0.599 | 0.302 |  | 0.731 | 0.326 |  |
| Age | 0.016 | 0.014 |  | 0.007 | 0.010 |  | -0.013 | 0.011 |  |
| Ideology | -0.491 | 0.226 |  | 0.282 | 0.211 |  | -0.209 | 0.190 |  |
| Descriptive representation important | 0.373 | 0.187 |  | 0.250 | 0.106 |  | 0.200 | 0.125 |  |
| Prior experience of candidate important | 0.296 | 0.235 |  | 0.408 | 0.151 | \*\* | -0.156 | 0.164 |  |
| R party with female incumbent in district | 1.546 | 0.480 |  | 0.769 | 0.299 | \* | 0.748 | 0.400 |  |
| Constant | -4.824 | 2.215 | \* | -3.691 | 1.654 | \* | 0.015 | 1.975 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.229 |  |  | 0.107 |  |  | 0.1541 |  |  |
| Log Likelihood | -75.176 |  |  | -144.798 |  |  | -109.175 |  |  |
| N | 141 |  |  | 236 |  |  | 189 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \* p<.05, \*\* p<.001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Please note: This table is based on Table 3, Model 2, separated for ideology. Logit coefficients and Standard errors shown. | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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1. This question is modeled on the question used in U.S. research about whether men are more emotionally suitable to politics. As the specific formulation and in particular the term “emotionally” would sound very awkward and strange in Finnish, the question has been adapted accordingly. A loose translation of the original sentence "Miehet soveltuvat naisia paremmin päätöksentekijöiksi" would read “Men make better decision-makers (= politicians) than women". [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. In Finnish, the question reads "Naiset ovat päätöksentekijöinä miehiä paremmin perillä tavallisten ihmisten asioista", whose loose translation (focused more on the meaning) would read "Women as decision-makers know better than men the issues/situations that ordinary citizens grapple with." [↑](#footnote-ref-2)