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GENDER GAP IN POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE

• Well documented finding

• 2 types of explanations
  1. Methodology (questions)
  2. Resources (micro-level)

• Research mainly focused on US, Canada, UK

• Few comparative studies, macro implications never tested
DATA


• 106 post-election surveys conducted in 47 countries, 30 countries have repeated surveys.

• Over 300 political knowledge items.

• Positive knowledge scale from 3 items (unstandardized).
Additive distribution of correct responses to three political information items by gender

Source: The Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES.org) based on 161432 valid observations (pooled Modules 1, 2, and 3). Number of correct answers to three questions were simply added, don’t knows are coded as incorrect.
Distribution of the size of the gender-gap on the positive knowledge scale, in 107 post-election surveys between 1996-2011.

NOTE: Graph presents difference in mean score on political information between men and women in each 107 election study (CSES). Positive knowledge scale.
### Gender gaps in political knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0.5441***</td>
<td>0.2931***</td>
<td>0.3932***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0.1145**</td>
<td>0.1474***</td>
<td>0.2830***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0.4321***</td>
<td>0.4552***</td>
<td>0.2277***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0.3807***</td>
<td>0.2917***</td>
<td>0.2037***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0.3871***</td>
<td>0.2188***</td>
<td>0.3087***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0.7988***</td>
<td>0.4041***</td>
<td>0.4508***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0.4245***</td>
<td>0.4688***</td>
<td>0.4220***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0.2687***</td>
<td>0.2914***</td>
<td>0.3090***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0.3213***</td>
<td>0.4630***</td>
<td>0.0959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0.5953***</td>
<td>0.5439***</td>
<td>0.5797***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mexico:
- Same items over time (content)
- Same question format

Finland: Size of Gender Gaps
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Finland:
- Different items (content)
- Different format
IMPLICATIONS

• Question format matters.

• Question content/difficulty matters.

• Questions display some amount of randomness, regardless of format, content, difficulty.

• Scales might be too short (3 items) to allow reliability tests.

• Enough questions now to look at items that present a large departure from average patterns.
CONCLUSIONS

• How much is due to question format/content, how much to randomness?

• Despite fragile measurements, tests confirm existing substantive work on gender gaps.

• Room for further tests:
  – Using other operationalization of knowledge scale (expressive scales, political accuracy scales)
  – Criterion validity tests: using party placements
  – New items from Module 4
THANK YOU!!
**Norway: Size of Gender Gaps**

- Similar, but not the same items over time (content)
- Same question format (open)

**Sweden: Size of Gender Gaps**

- Different items in 2002 (content)
- Similar format (True/false)