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Abstract: The Covid-19 pandemic has gendered implications for women’s time and resources. The use of Informal institutions that pose obstacles to women’s electoral viability may also be particularly consequential at a time of rapid change, when election dates and procedures are amended due to health concerns. Together, these dynamics suggest that the Covid-19 pandemic may impact women’s electoral participation, support, and viability in meaningful ways. The upcoming Brazilian municipal elections provide an opportunity to explore this. Employing data from an original survey with eligible individuals and aspirant candidates, we find that the main obstacle to women’s representation rests not on personal political ambition or efforts, but in women’s perceptions of their access to support for their candidacies. In the face of greater challenges, resilient aspirants are choosing to work harder to compensate for potential losses in campaign support and funds.
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Less access to financial resources, less time availability, and more restricted social networks are common barriers to women’s electoral prospects (Inglehart and Norris 2003). Additionally, parties’ reliance on unwritten, yet persistent practices and norms (i.e., informal institutions) of candidate recruitment and campaign support allocation can also serve as obstacles to women’s elections, sometimes even when formal institutions favor women (Bjarnegård and Zetterberg 2019).

As a number of emerging analyses show, the pandemic seems to be decreasing women’s financial stability, increasing their shares of unpaid domestic and care work, and restricting their possibilities to establish key contacts (Wenham, Smith, and Morgan 2020). Times of change—such as the one prompted by the pandemic—also increase opportunities for informal practices to flourish (Waylen 2014). Together, these dynamics suggest that the Covid-19 pandemic may be detrimental to women’s electoral prospects.

In particular, we anticipate that changes in electoral dynamics may impact political aspirations, perceptions of electoral viability, and expectations of access to resources in gendered ways. More specifically, by affecting individuals’ household responsibilities, financial resources, and emotional stability, the pandemic could impose higher personal costs to running for office, *de-motivating women’s candidacies*. In addition, constraints on face-to-face interactions and the reduction of campaign time could increase traditional forms of political capital and incumbent’s advantage (Pereira and Rennó 2001), *making women less certain of their electoral prospects*. Finally, disruptions to interactions with party brokers could increase candidates’ reliance on resources attained through informal institutions and established networks—*decreasing women’s perceptions of their access to valuable campaign resources*. The upcoming Brazilian elections provide an opportunity to explore these possible scenarios.
Due to the pandemic, Brazil delayed to November 2020 municipal elections for mayor and city councilors originally scheduled for October. Voting in Brazil is mandatory and only done in-person. Changes to campaign procedures, formal isolation protocols, and individuals’ fears of personal interactions are likely to drastically change electoral dynamics; personal interactions between party leaders and candidates, and between candidates and voters have traditionally been crucial in Brazil, particularly at the local level (Barreira 2006).

In spite of having adopted a gender quota for municipal elections in 1995, the persistence of gendered political practices and employment of informal institutions in Brazil have largely kept women out of elected office (Wylie and dos Santos 2016). Currently, women occupy 15% of the lower house of Congress—up from 10% in 2014.

This 50% increase in women’s representation in 2018 has not gone unnoticed. Some authors associate it with the newly-instituted reservation of 30% of public campaign finance for women (Haje 2019). Meanwhile, others have observed that, similarly to the U.S., the electoral popularity (and subsequent election) of a far-right and misogynist candidate, Jair Bolsonaro, might have increased women’s costs of not running (Dittmar 2020). Within this context and considering that many politicians start their careers at the local level, the 2020 elections were expected to be a turning-point for women’s political participation in Brazil.

The pandemic, however, could change this scenario. Employing data from an original survey of party members (including individuals eligible for candidacy and active aspirants to elected office), this research note provides an exploratory investigation of how Covid-19 may impact women’s electoral opportunities. We find that Covid-19 did not disproportionately impact women’s plans to run or their evaluations of their electoral chances—but that it decreased women’s perceptions of their levels of access to campaign support and resources.
These findings reinforce previous work that shows women to be particularly resilient aspirants even amidst unexpected adversity.

**Data & Methods**

Covid-19 is likely to impact candidacy decisions and campaign strategies heterogeneously, depending on individuals’ backgrounds and levels of political experience. To attain a diverse sample of respondents, we partnered with the Paraná state branch of the *Partido Republicano da Ordem Social* (Social Order Republican Party, PROS). The party branch was responsible for disseminating the survey link to all their registered members in Paraná.

Created in 2013, PROS is one of the newest parties in Brazil’s highly fragmented system of 33 registered parties and offers good representation of a typical Brazilian party. As Appendix A shows, PROS is the party closest to the mean value of Brazilian parties’ left-right ideological placement. Additionally, the overwhelming majority of politicians in Brazil belong to non-programmatic parties such as the PROS, which offer particular career incentives (Zucco and Power 2019). Findings derived from a sample of respondents from the PROS should thus be generalizable to the majority of Brazilian parties.

**Data**

We collected a sample of 139 responses through the online platform *Qualtrics* from 04 to 21 June 2020. Our recruitment strategy oversampled highly-educated and politically-active members: 66% of respondents had (and continue to have) candidacy plans (see Appendix B). To understand whether and how Covid-19 is likely to have gendered implications for women’s political representation, we use answers to survey questions to derive three types of dependent variables (see Table 1).
Table 1. Dependent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Question/Answers</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>candidacy plans</td>
<td>Has the pandemic changed your 2020 candidacy plans?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Answer options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before the pandemic, I was planning to run, but now I will not.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have never planned to run and I still do not have any plans.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have always planned to run and I still have these plans.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before the pandemic, I did not plan to run, but now I will.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electoral chances</td>
<td>How will Covid-19 impact yours/your party’s electoral chances?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Answer options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mine/my party’s electoral chances will be lower.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mine/my party’s electoral chances will not change.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mine/my party’s electoral chances will increase.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resource access</td>
<td>How will Covid-19 impact access to campaign resource X?i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Answer options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to X resource will decrease.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to X resource will not change.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to X resource will increase.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given our focus on the potential gendered impacts of Covid-19, our main independent variable is respondents’ gender. In our binary variable, woman, women respondents are assigned a value of 1. In our sample, 56 respondents (40%) are women.

We also add controls for respondents’ age, race (with the binary variable white), and household income. Since electoral campaigns require candidates’ contributions of money and time, we also control for whether they are the main breadwinner and whether minors live with them. We also employ the variable personal changes to account for whether Covid-19 impacted respondents’ domestic and care responsibilities, finances, health, or emotional stability. Since individuals’ political opportunities can be shaped by their relationship to their parties and political experiences, we also control for their party membership length (in years), number of past candidacies, and number of past electoral successes. Finally, given that our sample includes eligible individuals and aspirants, we control for whether a respondent plans to run for office in 2020 with the variable aspirantii. Appendix C outlines our survey questionnaire and Appendix D shows descriptive statistics for our variables.
Discussion

To simplify interpretation, we run ordinary least square (OLS) models for all of our dependent variables, but also report results from ordered logit models in the Appendix. Interestingly, the pandemic led 12 respondents (8.6%) to change candidacy plans: five of them (two women) will no longer run and seven (three women) became encouraged to run. As shown in Appendix G, gender is not a statistically significant characteristic shaping candidacy decisions. Women also do not statistically differ from men in respect to their evaluations of how the pandemic will impact their or their parties’ electoral chances. As one woman explained: “I believe there are always adaptations to the new.”

![Graph showing the impact of Covid-19 on campaign support and resources, OLS](image)

**Figure 1. Covid-19’s impact on campaign support and resources, OLS**

Note: N = 139.

However, women significantly differ from men in their evaluations of how Covid-19 will impact access to campaign support and resources (findings that also hold when we restrict our models to aspirants only, as per Appendix H). Specifically, as shown in Figure 1, women are more likely than men to believe that Covid-19 will diminish donations in money
and support from party brokers—resources that are crucial for electoral success in an open-list proportional representation system (Jalalzai and dos Santos 2015).

Since 2018, 30% of public campaign funds distributed to parties have been reserved for women. Yet, party brokers have discretion over the distribution of these funds. In the 2018 elections, parties largely used this reserved 30% on the campaigns of women incumbents and on those of women running mates of male, primary candidates.

Even in this context, our findings suggest that women are as confident as men about access to public campaign funds. However, the unequal distribution of these public resources and the high costs associated with campaigns in a candidate-centric system ultimately mean that these additional sources of finance remain important for candidates’ electoral success. Women’s perception that the pandemic will decrease their access to monetary donations is thus a relevant finding in the run-up to the 2020 elections. Among eligible women, perceptions of lower access to funds could also impact decisions to run in the future.

Additionally, PROS-Paraná’s efforts to promote women’s leadership through daily online meetings do not seem to have been sufficient to make women equally as confident as men about support from party leaders. This is a significant finding, particularly given our oversampling of politically active party members.

Open-ended answers indicate that, to compensate for potential losses in support and funds, women are increasing their political engagement. Remarkably, some women do not seem to view recent changes as a handicap, but, as an opportunity. As one respondent conveyed: “My performance has increased as I now have to try to do more and better.” Crucially, although some men mentioned problems concerning money and party dynamics, women’s answers most commonly focused on adaptations to their campaign strategies.
another woman said: “We have been more participative in social activities, as this strengthens our relationship with others.”

In sum, our results indicate that women are particularly resilient aspirants: even amidst a crisis that has gendered implications for personal time and resources, the main obstacle to women’s prospects rests not at personal political ambition or efforts, but in their perceptions of access to campaign resources and party brokers’ support. These findings are aligned with existing scholarship that shows that women’s underrepresentation in politics cannot be explained by their personal attributes or constrains, or by their lower levels of political ambition and perception of electoral viability than men, but by the different levels of campaign support they encounter (Piscopo and Kenny 2020): a pattern of which they seem to be aware and that is reproduced during crises.

1 Consists of the following six dependent variables: party funds, party leadership support, donations in money, donations in work, street campaigns, and social media campaigns.

ii Not included in models of candidacy plans.

iii Our measure of personal changes due to Covid-19 is also not statistically significant in any of our models, suggesting that, within our sample, personal adversities brought-up by the pandemic have not influenced respondents’ decision to run or their assessments of their electoral viability (Appendixes G-I). In logistic regressions using the individual components of personal changes as dependent variables, we additionally find that gender is not a statistically significant explanatory variable (Appendix F). A note of caution when interpreting these results is that our sample is composed of highly educated respondents whose income might not have been as threatened by the pandemic.

iv This is also not due to gendered differences in assessments of the importance of these resources, as shown in Appendix I.
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Appendix A. Case selection

Figure 1. Brazilian parties’ placement on the left-right ideology scale (2018)
Note: Figure produced using data from Rodrigues and Power (2019), which places all 35 Brazilian parties on a left-right ideology scale—where negative values correspond to left-leaning ideology, 0 to the center, and positive values indicate right-leaning ideology. The vertical line takes the mean value of left-right ideology (0.095) to illustrate each party’s distance from the mean. To aid the visualization of variation across left-right ideology (x-axis), we plot it against parties’ identification numbers (i.e., variation on the y-axis does not have a meaningful interpretation). All figures were compiled with plotplain (Bischof 2017).
## Appendix B. Sample characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% known pop.</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>% sample</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>4238</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>7817</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 30</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 35</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 40</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 45</td>
<td>1589</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 50</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 55</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 to 60</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 to 65</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;65</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (incomplete)</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (complete)</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (incomplete)</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (complete)</td>
<td>4682</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>-0.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary (incomplete)</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary (complete)</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Population corresponds to registered members of the PROS in the state of Paraná. Information on population characteristics were provided by the party. The total population size is 13,358. However, the official party registry did not contain information on gender for 1,303 members, age for 1,312 members, and education for 2,161 members. Population shares are calculated from the “known populations,” which refer to the number of people for whom the party has data for each type of information. The sample size is 139. Differences between population and sample characteristics were calculated by subtracting a category’s share in the population from its share in the sample. Positive numbers can thus be interpreted as oversampling (and negative numbers as under-sampling). Our sample is reasonably similar to the population on gender and age, but significantly more highly educated. This is likely the result of the type of party members we managed to recruit: those who are more actively engaged with the party: 66% of respondents had (and continue to have) plans to run for elected office in 2020.
Appendix C. Survey questions and variables

woman
0 = Man
1 = Woman

age
17-67

white
0 = All other
1 = White

Income (household)
1 = Less than two minimum wages
2 = Two to four minimum wages
3 = Five to ten minimum wages
4 = More than ten minimum wages

breadwinner (Are you the breadwinner?)
0 = No
1 = Yes

minors (total number of minors who live with respondent calculated based on answers to the questions: Do you have kids?; What is their age?; Do they live with you?)
1-4

care (Did the pandemic increase the time you spend taking care of children and elderly and/or doing housework?)
0 = No
1 = Yes

Job (Did you or anyone who lives with you lose a job?)
0 = No
1 = Yes

illness (Did you or anyone who lives with you get infected with Covid-19?)
0 = No
1 = Yes

death (Did any of your relatives or friends die from Covid-19?)
0 = No
1 = Yes

income (Did you or anyone who lives with you and contributes to household finances, lose their income?)
0 = No
1 = Yes

**personal changes** (sum of *care, job, illness, death, and income*)
1-5

**membership length** (When did you get affiliated to the PROS?)
0-10 (years)

**past candidacies** (Have you ever been a candidate?)
0-9 (times)

**past successes** (Have you ever been elected?)
0 = No
1 = Yes

**candidacy plans** (Has the pandemic changed your 2020 candidacy plans?)
-1 = Before the pandemic, I was planning to run, but now I will not.
0 = I have never planned to run and I still do not have any plans.
1 = I have always planned to run and I still have these plans.
2 = Before the pandemic, I did not plan to run, but now I will.

**electoral chances** (How will Covid-19 impact yours/your party’s electoral chances?)
-1 = Will be lower
0 = Will not change
1 = Will increase

**resource importance** battery (How would you describe the relevance of [X] for your electoral success/the electoral success of those you support?)

**importance: party funds**
0 = Not important
1 = Somewhat important
2 = Very important

**importance: support from party leaders**
0 = Not important
1 = Somewhat important
2 = Very important

**importance: personal funds to finance campaign**
0 = Not important
1 = Somewhat important
2 = Very important

**importance: private donations in money**
0 = Not important
1 = Somewhat important
2 = Very important

*importance: private donations in hours of work*

0 = Not important
1 = Somewhat important
2 = Very important

*importance: street campaign*

0 = Not important
1 = Somewhat important
2 = Very important

*resource access* battery (How do you think Covid-19 will impact access to [X]?)

*access: party funds*

-1 = Will decrease
0 = Will not change
1 = Will increase

*access: support from party leaders*

-1 = Will decrease
0 = Will not change
1 = Will increase

*access: personal funds to finance campaign*

-1 = Will decrease
0 = Will not change
1 = Will increase

*access: private donations in money*

-1 = Will decrease
0 = Will not change
1 = Will increase

*access: private contributions in hours of work*

-1 = Will decrease
0 = Will not change
1 = Will increase

*access: street campaign*

-1 = Will decrease
0 = Will not change
1 = Will increase

*open-ended question* (Has Covid-19 changed your political engagement? If so, how?)
## Appendix D. Descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>candidacy plans</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electoral chances</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party funds (change)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>-0.122</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leader support (change)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal funds (change)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>donation money (change)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>-0.230</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>donation work (change)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>street campaign (change)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>-0.158</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>woman</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>43.295</td>
<td>10.083</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2.338</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breadwinner</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minors</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal changes</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.496</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>membership length</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.252</td>
<td>1.930</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past candidacies</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>1.367</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past successes</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>candidate</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E. Frequency distribution of dependent variables

Figure 2. Frequency distribution of candidacy plans and electoral chances

Figure 3. Frequency distribution of resource access
Appendix F. Results, personal changes due to Covid-19

Figure 4. Changes in personal life due to Covid-19, Logit

Note: N=139. One component of personal changes, illness, is not included in the analysis as no woman surveyed reported having been infected by the virus (i.e., gender perfectly explains the outcome).
Appendix G. Results, candidacy plans and perceived viability

Figure 5. Candidacy plans and perceived electoral viability, OLS
Note: N=139.

Figure 6. Candidacy plans and perceived electoral viability, Ordered logit
Note: N=139.
Appendix H. Results, expected impact of Covid-19 on campaign support and resources

Figure 7. Covid-19’s impact on campaign support and resources among aspirants only, OLS
Note: N=99.

Figure 8. Covid-19’s impact on campaign support and resources, Ordered logit
Note: N=139.
Appendix I. Results, importance of campaign support and resources

Figure 9. Importance of campaign support and resources, OLS
Note: N=139.

Figure 10. Importance of campaign support and resources, Ordered logit
Note: N=139. Model of leader support does not include control for past successes as this variable perfectly explains the outcome.
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