|  |
| --- |
| **Appendix Table 1a: Correlation Matrix of Key Variables** |
|  | Women-Friendliness | Religious adherents | Rep. Vote | Ideo. | Moral. | Trad. | Leg. Prof. | MMD | Term Limits | State Senate | Pres. Elect. Year | Odd NumberElectYear | IWPR Rank |
| Women-Friendliness |  1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Religious adherents | -0.03 |  1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rep. Vote | **-0.50** |  0.02 |  1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ideo. | **-0.52** | -0.04 |  **0.80** |  1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Moral. | -0.15 | -0.05 | -0.01 |  0.02 |  1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trad. | -0.07 | -0.09 |  0.26 |  0.24 | -0.45 |  1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leg. Prof. |  0.23 |  0.13 | -0.31 | -0.31 | -0.01 | -0.31 |  1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MMD |  0.00 |  0.01 | -0.04 | -0.02 |  0.13 | -0.08 | -0.13 |  1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Term Limits | -0.07 | -0.19 |  0.05 |  0.12 |  0.19 | -0.10 |  0.14 | -0.01 |  1.00 |   |  |  |  |
| State Senate | -0.01 | -0.00 |  0.00 |  0.01 |  0.02 | -0.01 | -0.02 | -0.09 | -0.02 |  1.00 |  |  |  |
| Pres. Elect Year | -0.02 | -0.01 |  0.01 | -0.01 |  0.04 | -0.02 | -0.00 | -0.04 |  0.05 |  0.01 |  1.00 |  |  |
| Odd Number Elect. Year |  0.07 | -0.02 | -0.00 | -0.01 | -0.16 |  0.22 | -0.09 |  0.15 | -0.13 |  0.01 | -0.19 |  1.00 |  |
| IWPR Rank |  0.04 | -0.01 | -0.27 | -0.25 |  **0.50** | -0.55 |  0.20 |  0.11 |  0.19 |  0.01 |  0.06 | -0.21 |  1.00 |
| Note: Variables taken from Table 1, Models 1 and 3. N=33211. Values over 0.5 are bolded for presentational purposes.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Appendix Table 1b: Correlational Matrix of Key Variables** |
|  | Evangelical | Catholic | Mainline Protestant |
| Evangelical |  1.00 |  |  |
| Catholic | **-0.63** |  1.00 |  |
| Mainline Protestant |  0.10 | -0.06 | 1.00 |
| Women-Friendliness | -0.37 |  0.34 | -0.31 |
| Republican Vote |  0.48 | -0.44 |  0.16 |
| Ideology |  0.47 | -0.45 |  0.20 |
| Moralism | -0.25 |  0.02 |  0.23 |
| Traditionalism |  **0.64** | -0.50 | -0.10 |
| Legislative Professionalism | -0.31 |  0.42 | -0.15 |
| MMD | -0.15 |  0.11 |  0.06 |
| Term Limits |  0.06 | -0.13 | -0.14 |
| State Senate | -0.02 | -0.01 |  0.04 |
| Presidential Election Year | -0.01 |  0.00 | -0.02 |
| Odd Number Election Year |  0.06 | -0.07 | -0.01 |
| IWPR Rank | -0.37 |  0.34 |  0.06 |
| Note: Variable takes from Table 1, Models 2 and 4. N=33211. Values over 0.5 are bolded for presentational purposes. All other values shown in Appendix Table 1a.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Appendix Table 2a: The Effects of Religious Adherence and Women Friendliness** **Women Running for and Winning State Legislative Office, 2001-2015** |
|  | Model IAll CandidatesRunning | Model IIAll CandidatesRunning | Model IIIAll CandidatesWinning | Model IIAll CandidatesWinning |
| Women-Friendliness |  0.09 (0.01)\*\*\* |  0.08 (0.01)\*\*\* |  0.09 (0.01)\*\*\* |  0.09 (0.01)\*\*\* |
| Religious adherents | -1.09 (0.15)\*\*\* | - | -1.02 (0.18)\*\*\* | - |
| Evangelicals | - | -1.51 (0.27)\*\*\* | - | -1.24 (0.34)\*\*\* |
| Catholics | - | -0.98 (0.20)\*\*\* | - | -1.03 (0.24)\*\*\* |
| Mainline Protestants | - | -1.27 (0.30)\*\*\* | - | -1.18 (0.38)\*\*\* |
| Rep Vote Share | -0.78 (0.18)\*\*\* | -0.85 (0.19)\*\*\* | -1.73 (0.22)\*\*\* | -1.79 (0.22)\*\*\* |
| Ideology | -0.25 (0.10)\*\*  | -0.14 (0.10)  | -0.31 (0.13)\*\*  | -0.24 (0.13)\*  |
| Moralism |  0.46 (0.05)\*\*\* |  0.45 (0.05)\*\*\* |  0.34 (0.06)\*\*\* |  0.33 (0.07)\*\*\* |
| Traditionalism | -0.16 (0.06)\*\*\* | -0.05 (0.07)  | -0.01 (0.07)  |  0.05 (0.08)  |
| Lege Professionalism | -0.89 (0.17)\*\*\* | -0.97 (0.18)\*\*\* | -1.30 (0.22)\*\*\* | -1.35 (0.22)\*\*\* |
| MMD |  1.54 (0.09)\*\*\* |  1.51 (0.09)\*\*\* |  1.26 (0.09)\*\*\* |  1.25 (0.09)\*\*\* |
| Term Limits |  0.16 (0.05)\*\*\* |  0.17 (0.05)\*\*\* |  0.04 (0.06)  |  0.04 (0.06)  |
| State Senate | -0.07 (0.05)  | -0.08 (0.05)\*  | -0.18 (0.06)\*\*\* | -0.19 (0.06)\*\*\* |
| Presidential Election Year | -0.03 (0.02)  | -0.03 (0.02)\*  |  0.03 (0.02)  |  0.02 (0.02)  |
| Odd Number Election Year | -0.28 (0.10)\*\*\* | -0.29 (0.10)\*\*\* | -0.36 (0.12)\*\*\* | -0.36 (0.12)\*\*\* |
| IWPR Rank |  0.00 (0.00)\*\*  |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*\* |  0.00 (0.00)\*  |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*  |
| Constant | -0.31 (0.15)\*\*  | -0.28 (0.15)\*  | -0.36 (0.18)\*  | -0.33 (0.18)\*  |
| N | 33211 | 33211 | 33211 | 33211 |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| % Predicted | 67.16% | 67.10% | 75.89% | 75.88% |
| AIC | 40493.58 | 40458.93 | 34552.98 | 34533.66 |
| BIC | 40611.33 | 40593.50 | 34670.73 | 34668.23 |
| Note: This table is the full results of the models shown in Table 1 of the main text. All of the models presented above are logistic regressions with the standard errors clustered on the legislative district. \*p > .10; \*\*p >.05; \*\*\*p> .01, based on a two tailed test |

|  |
| --- |
| **Appendix Table 2b: The Effects of Religious Adherence and Women Friendliness** **Women Running for and Winning State Legislative Office, 2001-2015****Democrats Only** |
|  | Model IDem. CandidatesRunning | Model IIDem. CandidatesRunning | Model IIIDem. CandidatesWinning | Model IIDem. CandidatesWinning |
| Women-Friendliness |  0.09 (0.01)\*\*\* |  0.08 (0.01)\*\*\* |  0.11 (0.01)\*\*\* |  0.11 (0.01)\*\*\* |
| Religious adherents | -0.97 (0.17)\*\*\* | - | -0.73 (0.24)\*\*\* |  |
| Evangelicals | - | -1.11 (0.29)\*\*\* |  | -0.06 (0.47)  |
| Catholics | - | -1.08 (0.23)\*\*\* |  | -0.95 (0.31)\*\*\* |
| Mainline Protestants | - | -1.27 (0.34)\*\*\* |  | -1.38 (0.54)\*\*  |
| Rep Vote Share | -1.98 (0.20)\*\*\* | -2.06 (0.21)\*\*\* | -5.52 (0.28)\*\*\* | -5.57 (0.28)\*\*\* |
| Ideology | -0.22 (0.12)\*  | -0.15 (0.12)  | -0.20 (0.16)  | -0.18 (0.16)  |
| Moralism |  0.57 (0.06)\*\*\* |  0.55 (0.06)\*\*\* |  0.49 (0.09)\*\*\* |  0.48 (0.09)\*\*\* |
| Traditionalism | -0.07 (0.06)  | -0.03 (0.07)  |  0.19 (0.09)\*\*  |  0.09 (0.11)  |
| Lege Professionalism | -1.23 (0.19)\*\*\* | -1.25 (0.20)\*\*\* | -2.14 (0.28)\*\*\* | -2.15 (0.29)\*\*\* |
| MMD |  1.34 (0.09)\*\*\* |  1.34 (0.09)\*\*\* |  0.99 (0.10)\*\*\* |  1.03 (0.11)\*\*\* |
| Term Limits |  0.18 (0.05)\*\*\* |  0.17 (0.05)\*\*\* |  0.12 (0.07)  |  0.07 (0.07)  |
| State Senate | -0.05 (0.05)  | -0.05 (0.05)  | -0.13 (0.07)\*  | -0.13 (0.07)\*  |
| Presidential Election Year | -0.04 (0.02)\*\*  | -0.05 (0.02)\*\*  |  0.09 (0.02)\*\*\* |  0.09 (0.02)\*\*\* |
| Odd Number Election Year | -0.20 (0.10)\*  | -0.19 (0.10)\*  | -0.13 (0.14)  | -0.12 (0.14)  |
| IWPR Rank |  0.00 (0.00)  |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*  |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*  |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*\* |
| Constant | -0.28 (0.17)\*  | -0.23 (0.16)  |  0.23 (0.23)  |  0.25 (0.22)  |
| N | 33084 | 33084 | 33084 | 33084 |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.18 | 0.18 |
| % Predicted | 75.24% | 75.27% | 84.34% | 84.30% |
| AIC | 34555.19 | 34522.80 | 23913.16 | 23887.55 |
| BIC | 34672.89 | 34657.31 | 24030.85 | 24022.06 |
| Note: This table is the equivalent of Appendix Table 2a except the analysis is limited to only Democratic candidates. All of the models presented above are logistic regressions with the standard errors clustered on the legislative district. \*p > .10; \*\*p >.05; \*\*\*p> .01, based on a two tailed test |

|  |
| --- |
| **Appendix Table 2c: The Effects of Religious Adherence and Women Friendliness** **Women Running for and Winning State Legislative Office, 2001-2015****Republicans Only** |
|  | Model IRep. CandidatesRunning | Model IIRep. CandidatesRunning | Model IIIRep. CandidatesWinning | Model IIRep. CandidatesWinning |
| Women-Friendliness |  0.09 (0.01)\*\*\* |  0.08 (0.01)\*\*\* |  0.12 (0.02)\*\*\* |  0.09 (0.02)\*\*\* |
| Religious adherents | -1.05 (0.19)\*\*\* | - | -1.50 (0.26)\*\*\* |  |
| Evangelicals | - | -1.94 (0.37)\*\*\* |  | -3.44 (0.49)\*\*\* |
| Catholics | - | -0.37 (0.24)  |  |  0.21 (0.34)  |
| Mainline Protestants | - | -0.96 (0.39)\*\*  |  | -0.15 (0.48)  |
| Rep Vote Share |  1.86 (0.22)\*\*\* |  1.85 (0.23)\*\*\* |  5.62 (0.32)\*\*\* |  5.74 (0.33)\*\*\* |
| Ideology | -0.15 (0.13)  | -0.01 (0.13)  |  0.20 (0.18)  |  0.45 (0.19)\*\*  |
| Moralism |  0.18 (0.06)\*\*\* |  0.19 (0.07)\*\*\* |  0.12 (0.09)  |  0.08 (0.09)  |
| Traditionalism | -0.35 (0.08)\*\*\* | -0.11 (0.09)  | -0.40 (0.10)\*\*\* |  0.15 (0.12)  |
| Lege Professionalism |  0.11 (0.21)  | -0.11 (0.21)  |  0.62 (0.31)\*\*  |  0.14 (0.32)  |
| MMD |  1.33 (0.08)\*\*\* |  1.22 (0.09)\*\*\* |  1.47 (0.11)\*\*\* |  1.19 (0.12)\*\*\* |
| Term Limits | -0.01 (0.06)  |  0.05 (0.06)  | -0.20 (0.08)\*\*  | -0.02 (0.08)  |
| State Senate | -0.12 (0.06)\*\*  | -0.14 (0.06)\*\*  | -0.18 (0.09)\*\*  | -0.23 (0.09)\*\*  |
| Presidential Election Year |  0.01 (0.03)  | -0.00 (0.03)  | -0.04 (0.03)  | -0.06 (0.03)\*\*  |
| Odd Number Election Year | -0.21 (0.13)  | -0.22 (0.13)  | -0.41 (0.21)\*  | -0.40 (0.21)\*  |
| IWPR Rank |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*\* |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*\* |  0.02 (0.00)\*\*\* |  0.02 (0.00)\*\*\* |
| Constant | -2.89 (0.19)\*\*\* | -2.92 (0.19)\*\*\* | -5.55 (0.28)\*\*\* | -5.83 (0.28)\*\*\* |
| N | 33084 | 33084 | 33084 | 33084 |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.09 |  |
| % Predicted | 84.92% | 84.98% | 90.87% | 90.82% |
| AIC | 26911.35 | 26885.36 | 18400.93 | 18312.97 |
| BIC | 27029.05 | 27019.87 | 18518.63 | 18447.48 |
| Note: This table is the equivalent of Appendix Table 2a except the analysis is limited to only Republican candidates All of the models presented above are logistic regressions with the standard errors clustered on the legislative district. \*p > .10; \*\*p >.05; \*\*\*p> .01, based on a two tailed test |

|  |
| --- |
| **Appendix Table 3: The Effects of Religious Adherence and Women Friendliness****Women Running for and Winning State Legislative Office, 2001-2015** |
|  | Model IAll CandidatesRunning | Model IIAll CandidatesRunning | Model IIIAll CandidatesWinning | Model IVAll CandidatesWinning |
| Women-Friendliness |  0.11 (0.03)\*\*\* | 0.10 (0.03)\*\*\* |  0.13 (0.03)\*\*\* | 0.10 (0.03)\*\*\* |
| Religious adherents | -0.98 (0.28)\*\*\* | - | -0.62 (0.34)\*  | - |
| Religious adherents\* Women-Friendliness | -0.02 (0.05)  | - | -0.08 (0.06)  | - |
| Evangelicals | - | -1.40 (0.44)\*\*\* | - | -1.45 (0.59)\*\* |
| Evangelicals\*Women-Friendliness | - |  0.01 (0.10)  | - | 0.10 (0.12)  |
| Catholics | - | 0.27 (0.44)  | - | 0.36 (0.54)  |
| Catholics\*Women-Friendliness | - | -0.22 (0.07)\*\*\* | - | -0.23 (0.09)\*\*\* |
| Mainline Protestants | - | -2.06 (0.48)\*\*\* | - | -2.05 (0.65)\*\*\* |
| Mainline Protestants\*Women-Friendliness | - | 0.18 (0.12)  | - | 0.18 (0.15)  |
| Rep Vote Share | -0.78 (0.19)\*\*\* | -0.73 (0.19)\*\*\* | -1.70 (0.22)\*\*\* | -1.65 (0.23)\*\*\* |
| Ideology | -0.25 (0.10)\*\*  | -0.22 (0.11)\*\*  | -0.33 (0.13)\*\*\* | -0.32 (0.13)\*\*  |
| Moralism |  0.46 (0.05)\*\*\* |  0.40 (0.05)\*\*\* |  0.33 (0.07)\*\*\* |  0.27 (0.07)\*\*\* |
| Traditionalism | -0.16 (0.06)\*\*\* | -0.10 (0.07)  | -0.02 (0.07)  | -0.02 (0.08)  |
| Lege Professionalism | -0.89 (0.17)\*\*\* | -0.87 (0.18)\*\*\* | -1.28 (0.22)\*\*\* | -1.22 (0.22)\*\*\* |
| MMD |  1.54 (0.09)\*\*\* |  1.52 (0.09)\*\*\* |  1.26 (0.09)\*\*\* |  1.26 (0.09)\*\*\* |
| Term Limits |  0.15 (0.05)\*\*\* |  0.16 (0.05)\*\*\* |  0.03 (0.06)  |  0.02 (0.06)  |
| State Senate | -0.08 (0.05)\*  | -0.08 (0.05)\*  | -0.19 (0.06)\*\*\* | -0.18 (0.06)\*\*\* |
| Presidential Election Year | -0.03 (0.02)  | -0.03 (0.02)\*  |  0.03 (0.02)  |  0.03 (0.02)  |
| Odd Number Election Year | -0.28 (0.10)\*\*\* | -0.26 (0.10)\*\*\* | -0.36 (0.12)\*\*\* | -0.31 (0.12)\*\*  |
| IWPR Rank |  0.00 (0.00)\*\*  |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*\* |  0.00 (0.00)\*  |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*\* |
| Constant | -0.37 (0.19)\*  | -0.46 (0.19)\*\*  | -0.56 (0.23)\*\*  | -0.50 (0.23)\*\*  |
| N | 33211 | 33211 | 33211 | 33211 |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.08 |
| % Predicted | 67.16% | 67.17% | 75.78% | 75.91% |
| AIC | 40495.07 | 40422.34 | 34550.49 | 34488.22 |
| BIC | 40621.23 | 40582.14 | 34676.65 | 34648.03 |
| LR Test p-value1 | 0.48 | 0.00\*\*\* | 0.03\*\* | 0.00\*\*\* |
| Note: This is the complete regression table for Table 2 in the text. All of the models presented above are logistic regressions with the standard errors clustered on the legislative district. \*p > .10; \*\*p >.05; \*\*\*p> .01, based on a two tailed test1- The likelihood-ratio test compares the model presented in the Table 1 without the interaction to the model presented here with the interaction.  |

|  |
| --- |
|  **Appendix** **Table 4: The Effects of Religious Adherence and Women Friendliness****Women Running for State Legislative Office, 2001-2015** |
|  | Model IDemocratic Candidates | Model IIRepublicanCandidates | Model IIIDemocraticWinners | Model IVRepublican Winners |
| Women-Friendliness |  0.07 (0.03)\*\* |  0.11 (0.03)\*\*\* |  0.13 (0.04)\*\*\* |  0.10 (0.05)\*\*  |
| Evangelicals | -1.26 (0.49)\*\* | -1.86 (0.60)\*\*\* |  0.74 (0.83)  | -4.27 (0.81)\*\*\* |
| Evangelicals\*Women-Friendliness |  0.05 (0.10)  |  0.03 (0.13)  | -0.18 (0.16)  |  0.31 (0.18)\*  |
| Catholics | -0.63 (0.50)  |  1.28 (0.52)\*\*  | -0.31 (0.73)  |  2.48 (0.67)\*\*\* |
| Catholics\*Women-Friendliness | -0.07 (0.08)  | -0.29 (0.08)\*\*\* | -0.11 (0.12)  | -0.41 (0.12)\*\*\* |
| Mainline Protestants | -1.95 (0.55)\*\*\* | -1.85 (0.66)\*\*\* | -2.28 (1.00)\*\*  | -1.44 (0.85)\*  |
| Mainline Protestants\*Women-Friendliness |  0.17 (0.13)  |  0.19 (0.15)  |  0.22 (0.20)  |  0.24 (0.22)  |
| Rep Vote Share | -2.01 (0.21)\*\*\* |  1.99 (0.23)\*\*\* | -5.55 (0.28)\*\*\* |  5.87 (0.33)\*\*\* |
| Ideology | -0.18 (0.12)  | -0.10 (0.13)  | -0.20 (0.16)  |  0.30 (0.19)  |
| Moralism |  0.53 (0.06)\*\*\* |  0.13 (0.07)\*  |  0.47 (0.09)\*\*\* | -0.02 (0.09)  |
| Traditionalism | -0.05 (0.07)  | -0.17 (0.09)\*  |  0.10 (0.11)  |  0.03 (0.12)  |
| Lege Professionalism | -1.18 (0.20)\*\*\* |  0.00 (0.22)  | -2.11 (0.29)\*\*\* |  0.31 (0.32)  |
| MMD |  1.35 (0.09)\*\*\* |  1.23 (0.09)\*\*\* |  1.04 (0.11)\*\*\* |  1.21 (0.12)\*\*\* |
| Term Limits |  0.17 (0.05)\*\*\* |  0.04 (0.06)  |  0.08 (0.07)  | -0.05 (0.08)  |
| State Senate | -0.05 (0.05)  | -0.13 (0.06)\*\*  | -0.13 (0.07)\*  | -0.20 (0.09)\*\*  |
| Presidential Election Year | -0.04 (0.02)\*\*  |  0.00 (0.03)  |  0.09 (0.02)\*\*\* | -0.06 (0.03)\*  |
| Odd Number Election Year | -0.18 (0.10)\*  | -0.16 (0.13)  | -0.13 (0.14)  | -0.30 (0.21)  |
| IWPR Rank |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*  |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*\* |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*\* |  0.02 (0.00)\*\*\* |
| Constant | -0.23 (0.21)  | -3.17 (0.23)\*\*\* |  0.11 (0.30)  | -5.95 (0.33)\*\*\* |
| N | 33084 | 33084 | 33084 | 33084 |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.18 | 0.10 |
| % Predicted | 75.25% | 84.95% | 84.29% | 90.84% |
| AIC | 34518.11 | 26847.12 | 23885.96 | 18223.87 |
| BIC | 34677.84 | 27006.85 | 24045.69 | 18383.60 |
| LR Test p-value1 | 0.01\*\* | 0.00\*\*\* | 0.06\* | 0.00\*\*\* |
| Note: This is the complete regression table for Table 3 in the text All of the models presented above are logistic regressions with the standard errors clustered on the legislative district.\*p > .10; \*\*p >.05; \*\*\*p> .01, based on a two tailed test1- The likelihood-ratio test compares the model presented with a model without the interaction (not shown). |

|  |
| --- |
|  **Appendix Table 5: The Effects of Religious Adherence and Women Friendliness****Women Running for State Legislative Office, 2001-2015** |
|  | Model IDemocratic Candidates | Model IIDemocratic Candidates | Model IIIRepublican Candidates | Model IVRepublican Candidates |
| Women-Friendliness | -1.17 (0.31)\*\*\* |  0.07 (0.03)\*\* | -0.89 (0.34)\*\*\* |  0.11 (0.03)\*\*\* |
| Religious adherents |  0.07 (0.03)\*\*  | - |  0.11 (0.03)\*\*\* | - |
| Religious adherents\* Women-Friendliness |  0.04 (0.06)  | - | -0.03 (0.06)  | - |
| Evangelicals | - | -1.26 (0.49)\*\* | - | -1.86 (0.60)\*\*\* |
| Evangelicals\*Women-Friendliness | - |  0.05 (0.10)  | - |  0.03 (0.13)  |
| Catholics | - | -0.63 (0.50)  | - |  1.28 (0.52)\*\*  |
| Catholics\*Women-Friendliness | - | -0.07 (0.08)  | - | -0.29 (0.08)\*\*\* |
| Mainline Protestants | - | -1.95 (0.55)\*\*\* | - | -1.85 (0.66)\*\*\* |
| Mainline Protestants\*Women-Friendliness | - |  0.17 (0.13)  | - |  0.19 (0.15)  |
| Rep Vote Share | -1.99 (0.21)\*\*\* | -2.01 (0.21)\*\*\* |  1.87 (0.22)\*\*\* |  1.99 (0.23)\*\*\* |
| Ideology | -0.21 (0.12)\*  | -0.18 (0.12)  | -0.16 (0.13)  | -0.10 (0.13)  |
| Moralism |  0.57 (0.06)\*\*\* |  0.53 (0.06)\*\*\* |  0.18 (0.06)\*\*\* |  0.13 (0.07)\*  |
| Traditionalism | -0.06 (0.07)  | -0.05 (0.07)  | -0.36 (0.08)\*\*\* | -0.17 (0.09)\*  |
| Lege Professionalism | -1.24 (0.19)\*\*\* | -1.18 (0.20)\*\*\* |  0.12 (0.21)  |  0.00 (0.22)  |
| MMD |  1.34 (0.09)\*\*\* |  1.35 (0.09)\*\*\* |  1.33 (0.08)\*\*\* |  1.23 (0.09)\*\*\* |
| Term Limits |  0.18 (0.05)\*\*\* |  0.17 (0.05)\*\*\* | -0.01 (0.06)  |  0.04 (0.06)  |
| State Senate | -0.05 (0.05)  | -0.05 (0.05)  | -0.12 (0.06)\*\*  | -0.13 (0.06)\*\*  |
| Presidential Election Year | -0.04 (0.02)\*\*  | -0.04 (0.02)\*\*  |  0.01 (0.03)  |  0.00 (0.03)  |
| Odd Number Election Year | -0.20 (0.10)\*  | -0.18 (0.10)\*  | -0.21 (0.13)  | -0.16 (0.13)  |
| IWPR Rank |  0.00 (0.00)  |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*  |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*\* |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*\* |
| Constant | -0.18 (0.21)  | -0.23 (0.21)  | -2.97 (0.23)\*\*\* | -3.17 (0.23)\*\*\* |
| N | 33084 | 33084 | 33084 | 33084 |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.04 |
| % Predicted | 75.24% | 75.25% | 84.92% | 84.95% |
| AIC | 34555.91 | 34518.11 | 26912.78 | 26847.12 |
| BIC | 34682.01 | 34677.84 | 27038.88 | 27006.85 |
| LR Test p-value1 | 0.26 | 0.01\*\* | 0.45 | 0.00\*\*\* |
| Note: All of the models presented above are logistic regressions with the standard errors clustered on the legislative district. \*p > .10; \*\*p >.05; \*\*\*p> .01, based on a two tailed test1- The likelihood-ratio test compares the model presented with a model without the interaction (not shown). |

|  |
| --- |
| **Appendix Table 6: The Effects of Religious Adherence and Women Friendliness****Women Winning State Legislative Office, 2001-2015** |
|  | Model IDemocratic Candidates | Model IIDemocratic Candidates | Model IIIRepublican Candidates | Model IVRepublican Candidates |
| Women-Friendliness | -0.43 (0.48)  |  0.13 (0.04)\*\*\* | -1.11 (0.45)\*\*  |  0.10 (0.05)\*\*  |
| Religious adherents |  0.14 (0.04)\*\*\* |  |  0.17 (0.05)\*\*\* |  |
| Religious adherents\*Women-Friendliness | -0.06 (0.08)  |  | -0.09 (0.09)  |  |
| Evangelicals |  |  0.74 (0.83)  |  | -4.27 (0.81)\*\*\* |
| Evangelicals\*Women-Friendliness |  | -0.18 (0.16)  |  |  0.31 (0.18)\*  |
| Catholics |  | -0.31 (0.73)  |  |  2.48 (0.67)\*\*\* |
| Catholics\*Women-Friendliness |  | -0.11 (0.12)  |  | -0.41 (0.12)\*\*\* |
| Mainline Protestants |  | -2.28 (1.00)\*\*  |  | -1.44 (0.85)\*  |
| Mainline Protestants\*Women-Friendliness |  |  0.22 (0.20)  |  |  0.24 (0.22)  |
| Rep Vote Share | -5.51 (0.28)\*\*\* | -5.55 (0.28)\*\*\* |  5.65 (0.32)\*\*\* |  5.87 (0.33)\*\*\* |
| Ideology | -0.22 (0.16)  | -0.20 (0.16)  |  0.18 (0.18)  |  0.30 (0.19)  |
| Moralism |  0.48 (0.09)\*\*\* |  0.47 (0.09)\*\*\* |  0.10 (0.09)  | -0.02 (0.09)  |
| Traditionalism |  0.18 (0.09)\*  |  0.10 (0.11)  | -0.41 (0.10)\*\*\* |  0.03 (0.12)  |
| Lege Professionalism | -2.13 (0.28)\*\*\* | -2.11 (0.29)\*\*\* |  0.64 (0.31)\*\*  |  0.31 (0.32)  |
| MMD |  0.99 (0.10)\*\*\* |  1.04 (0.11)\*\*\* |  1.47 (0.11)\*\*\* |  1.21 (0.12)\*\*\* |
| Term Limits |  0.11 (0.07)  |  0.08 (0.07)  | -0.21 (0.08)\*\*  | -0.05 (0.08)  |
| State Senate | -0.13 (0.07)\*  | -0.13 (0.07)\*  | -0.18 (0.09)\*\*  | -0.20 (0.09)\*\*  |
| Presidential Election Year |  0.09 (0.02)\*\*\* |  0.09 (0.02)\*\*\* | -0.04 (0.03)  | -0.06 (0.03)\*  |
| Odd Number Election Year | -0.13 (0.14)  | -0.13 (0.14)  | -0.41 (0.21)\*  | -0.30 (0.21)  |
| IWPR Rank |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*  |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*\* |  0.02 (0.00)\*\*\* |  0.02 (0.00)\*\*\* |
| Constant |  0.08 (0.31)  |  0.11 (0.30)  | -5.75 (0.33)\*\*\* | -5.95 (0.33)\*\*\* |
| N | 33084 | 33084 | 33084 | 33084 |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.09 | 0.10 |
| % Predicted | 84.32% | 84.29% | 90.87% | 90.84% |
| AIC | 23913.90 | 23885.96 | 18400.42 | 18223.87 |
| BIC | 24040.00 | 24045.69 | 18526.53 | 18383.60 |
| LR Test p-value1 | 0.26 | 0.06\* | 0.11 | 0.00\*\*\* |
| Note: All of the models presented above are logistic regressions with the standard errors clustered on the legislative district. \*p > .10; \*\*p >.05; \*\*\*p> .01, based on a two tailed test1- The likelihood-ratio test compares the model presented with a model without the interaction (not shown). |

|  |
| --- |
| **Appendix Table 7a: The Effects of Religious Adherence and Women Friendliness** **Women Running for and Winning State Legislative Office, 2001-2015****Lower Houses Only** |
|  | Model IAll CandidatesRunning | Model IIAll CandidatesRunning | Model IIIAll CandidatesWinning | Model IIAll CandidatesWinning |
| Women-Friendliness |  0.10 (0.01)\*\*\* |  0.09 (0.01)\*\*\* |  0.10 (0.01)\*\*\* |  0.09 (0.01)\*\*\* |
| Religious adherents | -1.08 (0.17)\*\*\* | - | -1.03 (0.21)\*\*\* | - |
| Evangelicals | - | -1.53 (0.29)\*\*\* | - | -1.25 (0.37)\*\*\* |
| Catholics | - | -1.16 (0.23)\*\*\* | - | -1.18 (0.28)\*\*\* |
| Mainline Protestants | - | -1.23 (0.35)\*\*\* | - | -1.18 (0.44)\*\*\* |
| Rep Vote Share | -0.68 (0.20)\*\*\* | -0.75 (0.21)\*\*\* | -1.56 (0.24)\*\*\* | -1.63 (0.24)\*\*\* |
| Ideology | -0.25 (0.11)\*\*  | -0.16 (0.12)  | -0.33 (0.14)\*\*  | -0.26 (0.14)\*  |
| Moralism |  0.45 (0.06)\*\*\* |  0.42 (0.06)\*\*\* |  0.32 (0.07)\*\*\* |  0.30 (0.07)\*\*\* |
| Traditionalism | -0.18 (0.07)\*\*\* | -0.09 (0.08)  | -0.01 (0.08)  |  0.03 (0.09)  |
| Lege Professionalism | -0.93 (0.20)\*\*\* | -0.95 (0.20)\*\*\* | -1.28 (0.25)\*\*\* | -1.28 (0.25)\*\*\* |
| MMD |  1.52 (0.09)\*\*\* |  1.51 (0.10)\*\*\* |  1.24 (0.09)\*\*\* |  1.24 (0.10)\*\*\* |
| Term Limits |  0.11 (0.05)\*\*  |  0.11 (0.05)\*\*  | -0.00 (0.06)  | -0.01 (0.06)  |
| Presidential Election Year | -0.02 (0.02)  | -0.03 (0.02)  |  0.03 (0.02)\*  |  0.02 (0.02)  |
| Odd Number Election Year | -0.28 (0.11)\*\*  | -0.29 (0.11)\*\*\* | -0.34 (0.14)\*\*  | -0.34 (0.14)\*\*  |
| IWPR Rank |  0.00 (0.00)\*  |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*\* |  0.00 (0.00)  |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*  |
| Constant | -0.32 (0.17)\*  | -0.27 (0.17)  | -0.44 (0.20)\*\*  | -0.40 (0.20)\*\*  |
| N | 26779 | 26779 | 26779 | 26779 |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| % Predicted | 67.02% | 66.97% | 75.24% | 75.21% |
| AIC | 32819.37 | 32778.39 | 28376.35 | 28351.26 |
| BIC | 32925.91 | 32901.32 | 28482.89 | 28474.19 |
| Note: All of the models presented above are logistic regressions with the standard errors clustered on the legislative district. \*p > .10; \*\*p >.05; \*\*\*p> .01, based on a two tailed test |

|  |
| --- |
| **Appendix Table 7b: The Effects of Religious Adherence and Women Friendliness****Women Running for and Winning State Legislative Office, 2001-2015****Lower Houses Only** |
|  | Model IAll CandidatesRunning | Model IIAll CandidatesRunning | Model IIIAll CandidatesWinning | Model IVAll CandidatesWinning |
| Women-Friendliness |  0.11 (0.03)\*\*\* | 0.09 (0.03)\*\*\* | 0.12 (0.04)\*\*\* | 0.07 (0.04)\*\*  |
| Religious adherents | -0.95 (0.32)\*\*\* | - | -0.77 (0.39)\*\* | - |
| Religious adherents\* Women-Friendliness | -0.03 (0.06)  | - | -0.05 (0.07)  | - |
| Evangelicals | - | -1.70 (0.50)\*\*\* | - | -1.82 (0.66)\*\*\* |
| Evangelicals\*Women-Friendliness | - |  0.08 (0.11)  | - |  0.18 (0.13)  |
| Catholics | - | -0.14 (0.49)  | - | -0.18 (0.60)  |
| Catholics\*Women-Friendliness | - | -0.17 (0.08)\*\*  | - | -0.16 (0.10)  |
| Mainline Protestants | - | -2.05 (0.57)\*\*\* | - | -2.12 (0.77)\*\*\* |
| Mainline Protestants\*Women-Friendliness | - | 0.18 (0.14)  | - |  0.20 (0.17)  |
| Rep Vote Share | -0.67 (0.20)\*\*\* | -0.65 (0.21)\*\*\* | -1.55 (0.24)\*\*\* | -1.53 (0.24)\*\*\* |
| Ideology | -0.26 (0.12)\*\*  | -0.23 (0.12)\*\*  | -0.34 (0.14)\*\*  | -0.33 (0.14)\*\*  |
| Moralism |  0.45 (0.06)\*\*\* |  0.38 (0.06)\*\*\* |  0.31 (0.07)\*\*\* |  0.25 (0.08)\*\*\* |
| Traditionalism | -0.18 (0.07)\*\*\* | -0.13 (0.08)\*  | -0.02 (0.08)  | -0.03 (0.10)  |
| Lege Professionalism | -0.92 (0.20)\*\*\* | -0.85 (0.21)\*\*\* | -1.27 (0.25)\*\*\* | -1.16 (0.25)\*\*\* |
| MMD |  1.52 (0.09)\*\*\* |  1.52 (0.10)\*\*\* |  1.24 (0.09)\*\*\* |  1.25 (0.10)\*\*\* |
| Term Limits |  0.11 (0.05)\*\*  |  0.10 (0.05)\*  | -0.01 (0.06)  | -0.02 (0.06)  |
| Presidential Election Year | -0.02 (0.02)  | -0.03 (0.02)  |  0.03 (0.02)\*  |  0.03 (0.02)  |
| Odd Number Election Year | -0.28 (0.11)\*\*  | -0.26 (0.11)\*\*  | -0.34 (0.14)\*\*  | -0.29 (0.14)\*\*  |
| IWPR Rank |  0.00 (0.00)\*  |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*\* |  0.00 (0.00)  |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*  |
| Constant | -0.39 (0.22)\*  | -0.36 (0.21)\*  | -0.57 (0.26)\*\*  | -0.42 (0.26)  |
| N | 26779 | 26779 | 26779 | 26779 |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| % Predicted | 67.03% | 67.05% | 75.16% | 75.23% |
| AIC | 32820.88 | 32751.11 | 28376.85 | 28317.86 |
| BIC | 32935.62 | 32898.62 | 28491.59 | 28465.38 |
| LR Test p-value1 | 0.48 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.00 |
| Note: All of the models presented above are logistic regressions with the standard errors clustered on the legislative district. Lower houses only.\*p > .10; \*\*p >.05; \*\*\*p> .01, based on a two tailed test1- The likelihood-ratio test compares the model presented in the Table 1 without the interaction to the model presented here with the interaction.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Appendix** **Table 7c: The Effects of Religious Adherence and Women Friendliness****Women Running for State Legislative Office, 2001-2015****Lower Houses Only** |
|  | Model IDemocratic Candidates | Model IIRepublicanCandidates | Model IIIDemocraticWinners | Model IVRepublican Winners |
| Women-Friendliness |  0.05 (0.03)  | 0.10 (0.04)\*\*\* |  0.10 (0.05)\*\* |  0.08 (0.05)\*  |
| Evangelicals | -1.51 (0.55)\*\*\* | -2.13 (0.67)\*\*\* |  0.39 (0.92)  | -4.58 (0.90)\*\*\* |
| Evangelicals\*Women-Friendliness |  0.12 (0.12)  |  0.08 (0.14)  | -0.09 (0.17)  |  0.37 (0.20)\*  |
| Catholics | -0.90 (0.55)  |  0.92 (0.56)  | -0.71 (0.82)  |  2.03 (0.72)\*\*\* |
| Catholics\*Women-Friendliness | -0.05 (0.09)  | -0.23 (0.09)\*\*  | -0.07 (0.13)  | -0.32 (0.13)\*\*  |
| Mainline Protestants | -1.98 (0.63)\*\*\* | -1.75 (0.77)\*\*  | -2.67 (1.14)\*\*  | -1.07 (0.96)  |
| Mainline Protestants\*Women-Friendliness |  0.22 (0.15)  |  0.15 (0.17)  |  0.30 (0.22)  |  0.14 (0.25)  |
| Rep Vote Share | -1.98 (0.23)\*\*\* |  2.11 (0.25)\*\*\* | -5.37 (0.30)\*\*\* |  5.91 (0.35)\*\*\* |
| Ideology | -0.20 (0.13)  | -0.09 (0.14)  | -0.23 (0.18)  |  0.30 (0.20)  |
| Moralism |  0.51 (0.07)\*\*\* |  0.10 (0.07)  |  0.44 (0.10)\*\*\* | -0.04 (0.10)  |
| Traditionalism | -0.10 (0.09)  | -0.18 (0.10)\*  |  0.04 (0.12)  |  0.06 (0.14)  |
| Lege Professionalism | -1.11 (0.23)\*\*\* |  0.00 (0.24)  | -1.90 (0.33)\*\*\* |  0.09 (0.35)  |
| MMD |  1.35 (0.09)\*\*\* |  1.25 (0.09)\*\*\* |  1.03 (0.11)\*\*\* |  1.17 (0.12)\*\*\* |
| Term Limits |  0.12 (0.06)\*\*  |  0.01 (0.07)  |  0.00 (0.08)  | -0.06 (0.09)  |
| Presidential Election Year | -0.04 (0.02)\*  |  0.00 (0.02)  |  0.10 (0.02)\*\*\* | -0.07 (0.03)\*\*\* |
| Odd Number Election Year | -0.16 (0.12)  | -0.18 (0.15)  | -0.12 (0.16)  | -0.25 (0.22)  |
| IWPR Rank |  0.00 (0.00)\*  |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*\* |  0.01 (0.00)\*\*\* |  0.02 (0.00)\*\*\* |
| Constant | -0.11 (0.24)  | -3.14 (0.25)\*\*\* |  0.20 (0.34)  | -5.87 (0.35)\*\*\* |
| N | 26779 | 26779 | 26779 | 26779 |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.18 | 0.10 |
| % Predicted | 75.00% | 84.42% | 83.92% | 90.35% |
| AIC | 28105.01 | 22110.50 | 19705.84 | 15225.03 |
| BIC | 28252.52 | 22258.02 | 19853.36 | 15372.55 |
| LR Test p-value1 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.00 |
| Note: All of the models presented above are logistic regressions with the standard errors clustered on the legislative district. Lower houses only.\*p > .10; \*\*p >.05; \*\*\*p> .01, based on a two tailed test1- The likelihood-ratio test compares the model presented with a model without the interaction (not shown). |





