

significant and positive (beta = 1.28, 95% CI [0.83, 1.72], $p < .001$; Std. beta = 1.28, 95% CI [0.83, 1.72])

- The effect of thinkcand [sim_e_ja_se_candidatou] is statistically non-significant and positive (beta = 0.74, 95% CI [-0.30, 1.74], $p = 0.150$; Std. beta = 0.74, 95% CI [-0.30, 1.74])

- The effect of sex [feminino] \times haskids [tem filhos] is statistically significant and positive (beta = 0.87, 95% CI [0.11, 1.64], $p = 0.025$; Std. beta = 0.87, 95% CI [0.11, 1.64])

Standardized parameters were obtained by fitting the model on a standardized version of the dataset. 95% Confidence Intervals (CIs) and p-values were computed using a Wald z-distribution approximation. We fitted a logistic model (estimated using ML) to predict high_interest with haskids (formula: $\text{high_interest} \sim (\text{sex} * \text{haskids}) + \text{haspartner} + \text{incomeinterval} + \text{educalevel} + \text{assoc} + \text{paidjob} + \text{religion} + \text{candwchance} + \text{regiao} + \text{thinkcand}$). The model's explanatory power is moderate (Tjur's $R^2 = 0.17$). The model's intercept, corresponding to haskids = nao tem filhos, is at -0.71 (95% CI [-1.55, 0.11], $p = 0.093$). Within this model:

- The effect of sex [feminino] is statistically significant and negative (beta = -1.20, 95% CI [-1.80, -0.63], $p < .001$; Std. beta = -1.20, 95% CI [-1.80, -0.63])

- The effect of haskids [tem filhos] is statistically significant and negative (beta = -0.89, 95% CI [-1.49, -0.29], $p = 0.004$; Std. beta = -0.89, 95% CI [-1.49, -0.29])

- The effect of haspartner [tem_companh] is statistically non-significant and negative (beta = -0.21, 95% CI [-0.64, 0.23], $p = 0.353$; Std. beta = -0.21, 95% CI [-0.64, 0.23])

- The effect of incomeinterval [linear] is statistically non-significant and positive (beta = 0.26, 95% CI [-0.40, 0.93], $p = 0.442$; Std. beta = 0.26, 95% CI [-0.40, 0.93])

- The effect of incomeinterval [quadratic] is statistically significant and positive (beta = 0.68, 95% CI [0.18, 1.18], $p = 0.007$; Std. beta = 0.68, 95% CI [0.18, 1.18])

- The effect of incomeinterval [cubic] is statistically non-significant and negative (beta = -0.20, 95% CI [-0.62, 0.24], $p = 0.372$; Std. beta = -0.20, 95% CI [-0.62, 0.24])

- The effect of incomeinterval [4th degree] is statistically non-significant and negative (beta = -0.21, 95% CI [-0.59, 0.15], $p = 0.255$; Std. beta = -0.21, 95% CI [-0.59, 0.15])

- The effect of educalevel [linear] is statistically significant and positive (beta = 0.49, 95% CI [0.07, 0.93], $p = 0.025$; Std. beta = 0.49, 95% CI [0.07, 0.93])

- The effect of educalevel [quadratic] is statistically significant and positive (beta = 0.33, 95% CI [9.23e-03, 0.66], $p = 0.044$; Std. beta = 0.33, 95% CI [9.23e-03, 0.66])

- The effect of assoc [sou_membro_de_assoc] is statistically non-significant and positive (beta = 0.19, 95% CI [-0.23, 0.61], $p = 0.371$; Std. beta = 0.19, 95% CI [-0.23, 0.61])

- The effect of paidjob [sim] is statistically non-significant and positive (beta = 0.23, 95% CI [-0.24, 0.71], $p = 0.347$; Std. beta = 0.23, 95% CI [-0.24, 0.71])

- The effect of religion [sem religiao ou crenca] is statistically non-significant and positive (beta = 0.35, 95% CI [-0.21, 0.89], $p = 0.215$; Std. beta = 0.35, 95% CI [-0.21, 0.89])

- The effect of religion [outra] is statistically non-significant and negative (beta = -0.45, 95% CI [-1.63, 0.55], $p = 0.414$; Std. beta = -0.45, 95% CI [-1.63, 0.55])

- The effect of religion [espirita] is statistically non-significant and positive (beta = 0.45, 95% CI [-0.31, 1.17], $p = 0.229$; Std. beta = 0.45, 95% CI [-0.31, 1.17])

- The effect of religion [evangelica] is statistically non-significant and positive (beta = 0.07, 95% CI [-0.39, 0.51], $p = 0.778$; Std. beta = 0.07, 95% CI [-0.39, 0.51])

- The effect of candwchance [sim] is statistically non-significant and positive (beta = 0.27, 95% CI [-0.14, 0.69], $p = 0.197$; Std. beta = 0.27, 95% CI [-0.14, 0.69])

- The effect of regiao [nordeste] is statistically non-significant and negative (beta = -0.27, 95% CI [-0.90, 0.40], $p = 0.422$; Std. beta = -0.27, 95% CI [-0.90, 0.40])

- The effect of regiao [centro-oeste] is statistically significant and negative (beta = -1.02, 95% CI [-2.09, -0.04], $p = 0.048$; Std. beta = -1.02, 95% CI [-2.09, -0.04])

- The effect of regiao [sudeste] is statistically non-significant and negative (beta = -0.51, 95% CI [-1.13, 0.14], $p = 0.118$; Std. beta = -0.51, 95% CI [-1.13, 0.14])

- The effect of regiao [sul] is statistically non-significant and negative (beta = -0.13, 95% CI [-0.85, 0.61], $p = 0.730$; Std. beta = -0.13, 95% CI [-0.85, 0.61])

- The effect of thinkcand [sim_mas_nunca_se_candidatou] is statistically significant and positive (beta = 1.28, 95% CI [0.83, 1.72], $p < .001$; Std. beta = 1.28, 95% CI [0.83, 1.72])